

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Ancillary Citizenship and stratified Assimilation: How American Indian Education was developed to force American Indians into the United States economy as reserve laborers

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9q60b9bp>

Author

Richards, Kimberly R.

Publication Date

2017

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

Ancillary citizenship and stratified assimilation: How American Indian Education
was developed to force American Indians into the United States economy as reserve
laborers

By

Kimberly R. Richards

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

Requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

In

Ethnic Studies

In the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Thomas Biolsi, Chair

Professor Catherine Ceniza Choy

Professor Daniel H. Perlstein

Abstract

Ancillary citizenship and stratified assimilation: How American Indian Education was developed to force American Indians into the United States economy as reserve laborers

By Kimberly R. Richards

Doctor of Philosophy in Ethnic Studies

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Thomas Biolsi, Chair

In 1933, the newly appointed director of Education for the Indian Service, Dr. William Carson Ryan, the director of Extension and Industry, A.C. Cooley, and R.M. Tisinger, State Supervisor of Indian Education of Arizona, took a tour of four Mexican States on behalf of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This trip was to assess the school systems the Mexican government had been implementing in rural indigenous communities. It was especially enticing for these progressive educators, given that the director of the program was none other than Dr. Moises Saenz, a student of John Dewey. What was it about this rural school program that was so enticing to these three men? As lead investigator of the educational section of the Meriam report, Ryan had advocated for a more progressive form of education, one that would utilize the child's surrounding community and environment as an integral part of the learning process. However, just as Indian educational models had done in the past, progressivism, as it would be used for Native students as well as racialized minorities and newly arrived immigrants, was deeply entrenched in liberal protestant American values, norms and beliefs.

In order to understand the trajectory of progressive education as it was thought to apply to Indian students, it is important to gauge the dialogue and rhetoric surrounding the transition. With this research in mind this dissertation aims to reconstruct and question the policies, practices and motivations that enabled the BIA to maintain a long-standing assimilation policy through schooling. In particular this dissertation asserts that rather than shifting policy towards an ambitious liberal agenda of cultural acceptance, the union of policy makers and educators of the progressive era further entrenched the assimilation project.

Yet, only a handful of scholars have focused their analysis on the progressive era, and an even smaller cohort has been able to illuminate the longer assimilation trajectory of Indian education and BIA aspirations. This dissertation adds to this small body of work in part by arguing that the purpose of Indian schooling was to incrementally force Native peoples into American intuitions, not to usher in a new era of cultural pluralism or acceptance. Moreover, the initial steps of this assimilation educational policy, which were

focused on creating a reserve labor force of ancillary citizens also laid the foundation for mid-twentieth century BIA Relocation efforts.

Introduction

Parallel Strategies: The Colonial relationship between Conquest and Assimilation

The purpose of Federally supported American Indian education was to force Native students into the position of ancillary citizens, until such a time that they could be individually integrated into American society as classed citizens. In order to understand the purpose and processes of this transformation, it is vital to recognize the ways in which the United States had slowly and systematically subverted the position of Native peoples to that of wards of the state. Through an extensive list of rulings and policies in the better part of the nineteenth century, beginning with the first U.S. legal documents, including the Treaty and Commerce clauses of the Constitution, Chief Justice John Marshall's rulings of occupancy title, domestic dependent status and the Doctrine of Discovery, the *United States v. William S. Rogers*¹ which bound Indianness to biology, the end of Treaty making in 1871, the 1885 major Crimes Act extending federal jurisdiction over Indian territories, the 1887 Allotment Act which all told led to the loss of over 75% of reservation lands and 60% of the of population, Chief Justice Edward White's Lone Wolf decision that claimed congressional plenary power over Native Affairs, to the hundreds of smaller actions on the part of the U.S. agents and their citizens; all three branches of the United States government actively worked to undermine and silence the sovereignty, self-determination, and epistemologies that Native peoples held.²

As wards of the State, Native peoples were both isolated from and a threat to the New Nation. After multiple half-hearted attempts at conversation and/or conquest alongside the impetus of a newly re-united republic, the Ulysses S. Grant administration made a concerted effort to deal with this Indian problem through the reorganization of the Indian Affairs office and policy. While many of these initial resolutions were short lived, Grant's 1868 Peace Commission ushered in an era of untold pain, suffering, and violence against Native peoples in the name of *civilization*. U.S. officials and missionary philanthropists used the rhetoric of injustice to devise a total program that would do away with the Indian problem once and for all. In the initial Report of the Indian Peace Commission, the committee argued:

...In making treaties is was enjoined on us to remove, if possible, the causes of complain on the part of the Indians. This would be no easy task. We have done the best we could under the circumstances, but it is now rather late in the day to think of obliterating from the minds of the present generation the remembrance of wrong. Among civilized men war usually springs from a sense of injustice. The best possible way then to avoid war is to do no act of injustice. When we learn that the same rule holds good with Indians, the chief difficulty is removed. But it is said our wars with

¹ THE UNITED STATES, PLAINTIFFS, v. WILLIAM S. ROGERS. 45 U.S. 567 (1946) 4 How. 567 Supreme Court of United States.

² LONE WOLF v. HITCHCOCK. 187 U.S. 553 (1903) No. 275 Supreme Court of United States.

them have been almost constant. Have we been uniformly unjust? We answer, unhesitatingly, yes!³

This declaration that the United States had been engaged in unjust wars against Native peoples was not a new sentiment but was part of a long standing rhetorical tradition of condemning policies of conquest through the language of Republican ideals; justice liberty, humanity. Yet this rhetoric was as much a part of the larger colonial logic, as conquest, as it was used to promote civilization among Native peoples. Rather than being separate actions, conquest and assimilation were parallel strategies of colonialism; often employed at the same time, and in certain cases against the same community. The authors of the Peace Commission were no different from their predecessors, as they condemned previous wars, while promoting a strategy of assimilation. “The white and Indian must mingle together and jointly occupy the country, or one of them must abandon it. If they could have lived together, the Indian by this contact would soon have become civilized and war would have been impossible. All admit this would have been beneficial to the Indian.”⁴ The narrative that the authors have set up is one in which two these two racialized communities can only exist in peace if they are united by culture and lineage. While this statement might at first seem to advocate a two-way process, syncretism, supported by the terms “mingle together,” and “jointly occupy” the authors clarify this misinterpretation by stating that if this had taken place Native peoples would have become assimilated in the process and war would not have ensued. Thus, the purpose of condemning previous American wars against Native peoples was to re-introduce the *civilization* strategy.

What prevented their living together? First. The antipathy of race. Second. The difference of customs and manners arising from their tribal or clannish organization. Third. The difference in language, which in a great measure, barred intercourse and a proper understanding of the other’s motives and intentions. . . . Now by education the children of these tribes in the English language these differences would have disappeared, and civilization would have followed at once. Nothing then would have been left but the antipathy of race, and that too is always softened in the beams of higher civilization.⁵

The authors specifically cite race, customs and manners, and language as the reasons why Indians and Whites were unable to live together. They then claim that an education in English would have dealt with the differences of language and customs, only leaving race as an issue to be “softened”. In this statement, the majority of the assimilation strategy is narrowed down to the American education of Native pupils. Which would mediate Indian difference through the education of what the authors cite as the “higher civilization”. The

³ Prucha, Francis Paul. Ed. (2000) *Report of the Indian Peace Commission (January 7 1868)*. House Executive Document no. 97, 40th cong., 2d sess., serial 1337. In Documents of United States Indian Policy. Third Edition. University of Nebraska, Lincoln. pp.15-17, 20-22

⁴ Prucha, Francis Paul. Ed. (2000) *Report of the Indian Peace Commission (January 7 1868)*. House Executive Document no. 97, 40th cong., 2d sess., serial 1337. In Documents of United States Indian Policy. Third Edition. University of Nebraska, Lincoln. pp.15-17

⁵ Prucha, Francis Paul. Ed. (2000) *Report of the Indian Peace Commission (January 7 1868)*. House Executive Document no. 97, 40th cong., 2d sess., serial 1337. In Documents of United States Indian Policy. Third Edition. University of Nebraska, Lincoln. pp.15-17, 20-22

assimilation process is elaborated on in their next statement; “Through the sameness of language is produced sameness of sentiment and thought; customs and habits are molded and assimilated in the same way, and thus in process of time the differences producing trouble would have been gradually obliterated.”⁶ Civilization according to this colonial logic established in the Peace Commission, meant a full investment in American society and epistemology. In order for this investment to take place however, the assimilation process would first have to focus on the complete dismantling of Native communities, and the forced removal of Native languages, spiritualities, cultures, epistemologies, land, and lastly race. Thus assimilation policy would first need to breakdown and strip Native peoples of their tribal identity, to then initiate a longer course of assimilation steps. Even though assimilation has often been discussed in terms of how one individual, policy, institution, or person transformed, the colonial logic that supported it was treated as an ongoing development that would take an undeterminable amount of time, over multiple generations. This was because assimilation was not believed or experienced as one single process but a larger project aimed at replacing both social-cultural beliefs as well as racial presence. For instance Race was used as an obvious outward measurement of a Native individual’s investment and integration in American society. Because assimilation was viewed as a long-term project with many different steps, the United States used a variety of ideologies and intuitions to initiate a full-scale attack on every aspect of Tribal communities.

One of the most wide spread and enduring institutions that has promoted the assimilation of Native students, for over one-hundred and fifty years, is the federally funded school. The school has been a central colonial tool, used at each juncture in the assimilation project to both physically and epistemologically remove Native students from their communities, inculcate American values and ideologies, and force them into the corporate capitalist system as laborers. While these processes are often viewed in tandem, they were not all achieved at the same time, nor were they necessarily meant to. In fact, except in very rare cases, the schools were only able to achieve limited success. But most educators were well aware of such outcomes even if they also complained about them, as Native peoples were neither the first, nor the only group that was dealt with through American education.

With this research in mind this dissertation aims to reconstruct and question the policies, practices and motivations that enabled the BIA to maintain a long-standing assimilation policy through schooling. In particular this dissertation asserts that rather than shifting policy towards an ambitious liberal agenda of cultural acceptance, the union of policy makers and educators of the progressive era further entrenched the assimilation project.

However, only a handful of scholars have focused their analysis on the progressive era, and an even smaller cohort has been able to illuminate the longer assimilation trajectory of Indian education and BIA aspirations, which continue to effect

⁶ Prucha, Francis Paul. Ed. (2000) *Report of the Indian Peace Commission (January 7 1868)*. House Executive Document no. 97, 40th cong., 2d sess., serial 1337, pp.15-17, 20-22. In Documents of United States Indian Policy. Third Edition. University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Indian students in the early part of the twenty-first century. This dissertation adds to this small body of work in part by arguing that purpose of Indian schooling was to incrementally force Native peoples into American economic, social and finally political intuitions, not to usher in a new era of cultural pluralism or acceptance. Moreover, the initial steps of this assimilation educational policy, which were focused on creating a reserve labor force of ancillary citizens also laid the foundation for mid-twentieth century BIA Relocation efforts.

When conducting my examination of the trajectory of Indian Schooling in the early twentieth-century I employed several methods, including using archival documents as well as reinterpreting secondary sources. In particular I used various historical materials including archival research especially of legal cases, textbooks, conference proceedings, and BIA bulletins, newsletters, and briefings that allowed me to piece together the histories of progressive era Indian education. In addition, I traced educational and American Indian policy shifts at the state, and federal levels in order to understand how policy makers viewed the issues and needs of Native students and communities in the progressive era.

This dissertation is divided into six chapters that build off of each other to trace the course of Indian education into early twentieth-century progressive ear. In chapter one I argue that early the American educational intuitions that utilized schooling as a method to reform populations deemed a threat to society and the nation, influenced the architects of the late nineteenth century American Indian boarding school system. I am going to peruse this argument by analyzing the historical development and discourse of educational reform institutions, such as charity schooling and manual labor boarding schools, which were created as a means to ensure national stability through citizen formation. The process of citizenship formation was not the same for every American as it was an inherently classed process, which neither promised equality nor strived to achieve it. Rather the purpose citizen formation through reform schooling was to mediate problem populations by socially reforming them as individuals to uphold American-Protestant expectations while also training them in the rudimentary industries of the Nation, and in the process creating obedient laborers. Thus, at this juncture of the colonial process, agents maintained that the main purpose of education was for Native peoples to be transformed into ancillary citizens; that is integrated into the American economic system as surplus labor.

The examination of this process is carried over into chapter two where I argue that the architects and administrators of American Indian boarding School developed the outing Program as a way to ensure the transformation of their students into ancillary citizens. I am going to peruse this argument by analyzing the rhetoric and discourse of proposed curricular and pedagogical methods for economic integration. In addition, I examine the outing program that while initiated by Samuel C. Armstrong for African-American students at the Hampton Institute, was incorporated and expanded as a key function of American Indian education, becoming the organizational precursor to mid-twenty century BIA Relocation and Employment Assistance programs.

In chapter three I consider the impact and transition the 1928 Meriam Report initiated in the Indian Education department. I argue that the recommendations made in the report were far from supporting cultural or language preservation or even relativism. Rather the findings put forth called for the reorganization of the department in order to streamline and expand the assimilation project. I am going to peruse this argument by examining the findings and subsequent claims made by William Carson Ryan Jr., the head Educational Reporter and his team.

In chapter four I further peruse the origins of progressive educational pedagogy in the transition and development of New Deal era Indian education programs. I argue that the educational plans set forth by the Indian education department were connected to a larger colonial paradigm influenced by both the ideals of John Dewey and the contemporary Mexican community schooling movement which called for the modernization and economic assimilation of Indigenous peoples into the Colonial state.

Chapter five analyzes the relationship between the rhetoric of racial salvation, initially touted by John Collier, and the educational institutions that the Indian Education department established. This rhetoric was used to argue that the only way forward for Native peoples was their modernization, a code word for their stratified assimilation as ancillary or classed citizens. The two educational programs that were promoted for Indian communities were based on the BIA's concept of Indianness, which placed Tribes in a binary of Full-blood Traditional or Part-Indians. This binary conflated ancestral heritage with the measurement of epistemology and culture, in order to gauge the kind of schooling that would be offered.

The last chapter will examine the BIA's creation and use of an Indian binary; the full-blood on one side and the Part-Indian on the other. his binary, used by progressive educators and policy makers was used to argue for two separate forms of education, that depended on the designation of the community as Full-Blood or Part-Indians. Both of these educational models were part of a colonial strategy that staggered and stratified the assimilation process into separate steps that would integrate students as ancillary or classed citizens.

Chapter 1

The Heart and the Hand: The Development of the Ancillary

The rhetoric and expansion of federally controlled Indian education came out of the 1869 Grant Peace Policy which sought to rid the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) of its rampant corruption through a close partnership with both Christian agencies and philanthropic organizations.⁷ The policy itself was short lived, but it ushered in an era focused on the expansion and use of formalized education in the new ideological and cultural strategy against Native peoples. Although much of the assimilation rhetoric harkened back to pre-Louisiana purchase Jeffersonian policies, such as the civilization fund, the tactics changed with this new assimilation policy. Rather than sending Tribal elite to Western schools to become diplomats, this latest educational discourse went about creating separate and unequal education programs for all Native youth.

As mentioned above, Western schooling was not a new concept, as missionaries had been using western educational models in the attempt to convert and “civilize” Native peoples since the early 1600s. This nineteenth century overall used education in similar ways with a focus on the reformation of character and culture of Native peoples, but also incorporated several key aspects meant to wholly destroy Native cultures, languages and epistemologies in order to force them into the lowest rungs of the American economic system; as reserve laborers within the corporate capitalistic system. These key aspects of this BIA educational policy; industrial training and total cultural destruction, were not just specific to Indian Affairs as they both coincided with and grew out of, broader developments of educational institutions/programs that were used to subjugate and assimilate colonized communities throughout Imperial America. Moreover, key leaders in the schooling movement began to compare these colonized groups in an effort to promote a federal education system for Native Americans.

By the mid-nineteenth century North Eastern missionary education had come full circle, as the missionary model was spread throughout the developing U.S. colonial empire and adapted to assist in colonizing effort. These missionary connections are no accident but show a pattern of how conversion efforts were as much about instilling American epistemologies and practices in order to discipline and reform colonized populations, as they were about indoctrinating Christian Religion.

Colonization has often been reserved to describe the geo-political relationship between a colonial state and the indigenous peoples but this description does not take into account the different ways in which colonialism operates. Colonization is not merely an act of seizing land but also aims to conquer the body, language, beliefs, history, etc., of the colonized. “Colonized groups become part of a new society through force or violence; they are conquered, enslaved, or pressed into movement”.⁸ While Native peoples and

⁷ See Adams, D. (1995). *Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

⁸ Blauner, Bob. (2001) *Still the Big News: Racial Oppression in America*. Temple University Press. Philadelphia. pp.46

African Americans have unique histories, they are connected by their shared designation and experiences as colonized peoples within the United States; denied their liberty as conquered and enslaved peoples who were deemed inherently inferior in order to justify their colonial subjugation. Physical, geographic and legal colonization is not where the story of American colonization ends, rather it is just the beginning. Government and Missionary schools along with other colonial strategies were employed to transform the perspective of the colonized, to accept the colonizer's version of their history, identity, and epistemology. Albert Memmi argues

...the colonizer denies the colonized the most precious right granted to most men: liberty. Living conditions imposed on the colonized by colonization make no provision for it; indeed, they ignore it. The colonized has no way out of his state of woe—neither a legal outlet (naturalization) nor a religious outlet (conversion). The colonized is not free to choose between being colonized or not being colonized.⁹

Memmi's argument that liberty is denied to the colonized, resonates across colonial experiences, highlighting the fact that the colonizer is in control of the colonial process. Memmi's claim, however, that "the legal outlet...and/or religious outlet" is an avenue towards liberation is not supported by the experience of colonized populations in what is today the United States. These methods, citizenship and conversion, instead were essential to the colonial process, in which the colonized minority was required to shed their identity, epistemology, spirituality/religion; expected to assimilate to the beliefs, manners, and expectations of the colonizer, and yet still continued to be designated as anti-citizens. The only way to obtain, equal citizenship, was to, in fact become Euro-American, that is not only walk the walk, talk the talk, but also cross the color line. In other words, unless, the colonized could racially pass as "white" and sever all ties to their colonized community; language, culture and epistemology included, they continued to be treated as inferiors, whether Indian ward, or ex-slave in the case of African Americans.¹⁰

Rather than condense colonization into a checklist of practices, which either opens this classification to any oppressed ethno-racialized group or on the other side of the spectrum confines colonialism to the pre-20th century experiences of conquest, I argue that similar colonial ideas and practices were used to control and oppress both Native peoples and African Americans, both of which became regarded as ancillary-citizens, those that were primed for economic incorporation but considered too "savage," "primitive" or "morally rude" to gain access to social or political representation under their own terms. The development of the ancillary-citizen in the nineteenth century United States, grew out of the inherent opposition between the rhetoric of democracy and processes of colonization. Where the colonial state actively worked to resolve the consequences of an imperfect and incomplete conquest, that is to contend with whole populations that were neither fully subdued nor fully incorporated, but in the shadow of democracy, continuing to be cast as physical, racial and/or ideological enemies of the

⁹ Memmi, Albert. (1965) *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. 1991 Expanded Edition Beacon Press, Boston. pp. 85-6.

¹⁰ Lomawaima, K. Tsianina. (Summer 2013). "The Mutuality of Citizenship and Sovereignty." *American Indian Quarterly*. Vol. 37 Issue 3. pp 330-351.

state. The development of the ancillary-citizen in the United States, like modernity itself, is relatively recent, given that both Indigenous and African populations had been the property of either the federal government and/or citizens of the state, and were thus nowhere near the status of full citizen, even as debates arose around such a possibility. Moreover, the ancillary-citizen, is not simply a classification of a non-citizenship, immigration status or statelessness, but rather a nuanced status of colonization in which the individual and their larger community is intrinsically bound and controlled by the state, viewed as an inherent and perpetual threat to it, and without full political, social, or economic rights. This said, in the mid-nineteenth century the United States was not interested in maintaining a perpetual colonized class, as it is both politically and economically draining, more so, than the initial conquest that preceded it. First, the end of the Civil War marked a change in the relationship between colonizer and colonized; specifically, the emancipation of African Americans, and the physical removal and subsequent containment of Native Americans. Even as the subjugation of Native and African peoples had previously had separate functions within the colonial state, providing land and/or labor, both populations were put under the direct control of the federal government.

Secondly, possibly due to the brutality of the Civil War, as much as the weak economic state that the United States was left in, the U.S. began to transform their domestic colonial policies. Contrasting the genocidal and removal practices that characterized the first half of the century, a newly Re-united America, employed a rearticulated form of Jeffersonian humanitarianism and paternalistic idealism, which called for a gentler treatment of colonized peoples. In part this meant, “undoing” the myriad of justifications of conquest, while simultaneously reforming the colonized class into ancillary-citizens, until such a time, in which they were completely programmed to uphold the norms, values and beliefs of the nation. In short, this meant they could no longer constitute a real or perceived threat to the institutions or values of the Republic.

However, as historians have shown, access to a full U.S. citizenship has involved more than just culture and/or linguistic assimilation. It is a complicated and ever shifting conundrum in which what or who constitutes U.S. nationality, is simultaneously the new and the same. That is an individual (this is not an option for an entire community) can “assimilate” to the point of gaining full access, making the population seem ethnically, politically or even economically “diverse”, however, a key component of this access is not that they are able to assimilate at some future day, but prove the completion of such. This is because U.S. nationality was founded on a very specific set of racial, religious, linguistic and cultural expectations; none of which the colonized, or even the majority of first generation immigrants, have either been willing or able to adopt in-mass.

For instance, it is well understood that the process of conquest included the racialization of the body by affixing outward appearance to a vast list of inferiority types ranging from biological to social-cultural, but racialization was also used as an outward measure of the epistemological attainment of Americanism aka whiteness. In short, throughout the majority of the U.S. history an individual’s perceived racial status has directly correlated with their supposed investment or threat to the nation. While this

chapter does not attempt to explain the full trajectory or even consequences of these processes it is my intent to examine how “education” was cast as a way to transition the position of the colonized to that of ancillary-citizen. Again, the position of the ancillary-citizen was not an attempt at instant integration, nor did it mean equal integration, nor even full ideological assimilation aka “Kill the Indian, Save the Man”. It was aimed at the complete destruction of cultures, languages, beliefs, norms, community reciprocity, and eventually race, all in an effort to “liberate” the lands, resources, and labor of colonized peoples, in order to finally stabilize i.e. create a homogeneous nation.

The slow process to resolve the conundrum of colonization hinged on the assimilation policies of the nineteenth century, which actively worked to attack every aspect of colonized communities, from the legal systems, gender, and language to spirituality and even material consumption. Since the inception of the nation, social theorist and policy makers had long posited schools as a way to both introduce and control the reformation of the student body, a process that became a central aspect of America’s ancillary-citizen solution. Of course, the reformation of colonized peoples was not framed as a destructive much less an oppressive process, least it be compared to conquest. But as Samuel Chapman Armstrong, the founder of the first federally funded institution to enroll both African American and Native students, argued such an education was their salvation; “in both instances, he maintained that it was the duty of the superior race to rule over the weaker dark-skinned races until they were appropriately ‘civilized’”¹¹. In the context of Armstrong’s sentiments on civilization, this inferior position would necessarily entail an appropriately colonial education; manual labor boarding school was used as a tool of American assimilation and subjugation. Thus, even as “Blacks,” “Indians,” Native Hawaiians and later colonized groups such as Filipino, Mexican and Puerto Rican were considered problem populations for different reasons, even being classified in different degrees of “assimilability,” the United States used an almost identical educational “solution” for each, begging the question what were the motivating factors and purpose behind these educational institutions?

As exceptional as this period of colonial history might seem, an American strategy of reform through education was neither a new concept or based on newly erected institutions. Rather schooling had been touted as strategy to fulfill the contradictory desires of the new republic to both support American ideals of egalitarianism, including economic access and political representation while maintaining a paternalistic control over the ever-growing population. What was different from these early educational attempts, which sought to immediately assimilate poor and immigrant communities in to the larger “American” polity, were both the stakes at hand, as well as the perpetual colonized status ancillary-citizens, even in light of the rhetoric of assimilation. Thus, in order to understand why and how manual labor boarding schools became the colonial tool of choice for this reformation, it is vital to first understand the discourse and arguments, not only the architects of the assimilation policy. Richard Henry Pratt, John H. Oberly, Henry Dawes and The Friends of the Indian to name a few,

¹¹ Beyer, C. K. (February 01, 2007). The Connection of Samuel Chapman Armstrong as both Borrower and Architect of Education in Hawai'i. *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 47 No. 1. pp. 42.

but those educators, social theorists, and policy makers that used similar models in the quest to reform the most dangerous citizens of the new Republic.

At the Dawn of the Republic: Education in the Role of National Stability

In 1892, at the *Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Correction*, Richards Henry Pratt, founder of the first federally sanctioned American Indian Industrial School, Carlisle Industrial School, urged his fellow friends of the Indians, to support federal assimilation policies to incorporate Native peoples into American schools and society. However, rather than focus on procedural details he used his time to address the assimilation model of African Americans to make a case for American Indians.¹² Pratt, well aware of the second class status of African Americans, argued that their position was better than their “savage state” in Africa stating: “Horrible as it were the experiences of its introduction, and of slavery itself, there was concealed in them the greatest blessing that ever came to the Negro race—seven millions of blacks from cannibalism in darkest Africa to citizenship in free and enlightened American; not full, complete citizenship, but possible—probable—citizenship, and on the highway and near to it”. The fact that Pratt posits slavery and later a possible full citizenship¹³ within a “free and enlightened” America shows that neither he nor the audience he addressed were ready to admit a full citizenship to African Americans. However, he uses their partial incorporation into American society as an example, to argue that like African Americans who as he pointed out were once “savage,” “cannibals” from the “darkest Africa,” American Indians could also be assimilated and “civilized” into American society by what he terms “the higher race.” His statements show that he was not simply interested in mediating or even removing their culture and epistemologies but about subduing the threat of the anti-citizen.

This was not the first time that Pratt utilized African American assimilation as a model to fulfill his vision for American Indians. In 1877, Pratt partnered with Samuel Chapman Armstrong, director of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, to develop an Indian education program at the school. Their collaboration not only marked a transformative period in Native Education but was also a moment in which the education of colonized people came full circle; as Armstrong like his parents before him had been trained by the American Board of Foreign Missions. However, as unique as their ideologies, rhetoric and educational institutions may have seemed at the time, or might seem today, for that matter, they were a continuation of a century long political and social reform movement sparked by the American revolution itself. U.S. political leaders and theorists, came to believe schooling was the most effective tool to acculturate, reform and control the children of populations deemed dangerous.

¹² Pratt, Richard H. (1973) *Official Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Correction (1892)*, reprinted in *Americanizing the American Indians: Writing by the “Friends of the Indian” 1889-1900*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge. pp. 260-271.

¹³ While Pratt does not explain why he described the citizenship of African Americans as “not full, complete citizenship” at the time he gave the speech African Americans had become citizens of the United States through the 14th Amendment (Ratified in 1868). However, full citizenship, or at least a citizenship that was equal to “Whites” such as voting rights, equal access to schools, cities/neighborhoods and public spaces had been severely restricted by means of state laws and policies throughout much of the South/South West/and West. In addition, African Americans did not receive the same protections against public and/or private sanctioned violence.

While it has been argued that many aspects of BIA boarding schools, including the role of manual labor and moral training in the larger educational curriculum, was reproduced from Armstrong's Hampton model;¹⁴ both Samuel and Richard Armstrong, had themselves been influenced by earlier theories, pedagogies and institutions.¹⁵

Hence, both Carlisle Indian School and the Hampton Industrial School for Negroes were part of a larger national movement propelled in part by protestant (Christian evangelical) and democratic ideals of the fledgling nation. While there were many factors involved in these reformation movements, notions around the destiny, duty and control of the individual in the new republic were fundamental in shaping the discourse of reformers.

Christian Dogma had long held that the destiny of the Individual was under the control of "God." By the 17th century, various Doctrines supporting predestination¹⁶, that one's fate was preordained to eternal salvation or damnation, were actively being debated by Christian practitioners, especially Protestant communities. American Colonists, as well as their British counterparts begin to question predestination and along with it, if and how class, behavior and even "crime reflected on the human condition and failing—men were born in sin—and not on any basic flaws in social order."¹⁷ Predestination, was no mere passing theological fad, but had been discussed, debated and touted as the holy grail for several centuries. This staunch belief in predestination stemmed from the conviction that "Christ's" life on earth and subsequent execution, not only allowed for the absolution of sin, but was also preordained by God. Thus, because Christ's life and death had been designed for a higher purpose, so to, it was argued that every individual's life was predestined to salvation or damnation. However, this belief became harder to support after the enlightenment and reformation of the Protestant and Lutheran Churches. As pastors and practitioners alike questioned both the degree and scale of predestination, especially in relationship to the idea of free will. The significance of this ideological shift cannot be understated as it not only completely changed the way Christian societies viewed their relationship with "God," but how they viewed their relationships with community, family, and government.

In 1876, several hundred years after the emergence of such debates, Rev. James Breckenridge, continued to reassure his congregation about this ideological shift, in his three-part sermon, simply entitled *Predestination*¹⁸. After arguing, "the death of Christ was predetermined, or foreordained, so also the time of his death, the manner of it, and the agents by who it was to be effected", the Reverend makes a rhetorical inquiry into the

¹⁴ Fear-Segal, Jacqueline (2007). *White Man's Club: Schools, Race, and the Struggle of Indian Acculturation*. University of Nebraska Press.

¹⁵ the Lethe Agricultural Seminary, established in 1797 is believed to be the first Manual labor boarding school in the United States. Knight W. Edgar Ed. (1953) *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860* Vol. IV. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill. pp. 63

¹⁶ Reese J. William (2005) *American Public Schools: From the Common School to 'No Child Left Behind'*. The Johns Hopkins University Press. pp17

¹⁷ Rothman, David J. (1995) *Perfecting the Prison: United States 1789-1865*. In *The Oxford history of the Prison*. Oxford University Press Inc, New York.

¹⁸ Breckenridge, James. (1876). *Predestination a sermon*. Presbyterian Print House. Toronto. HathiTrust: <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5db8jp1f>.

precise meaning of predestination... “The question then naturally arises, is this what is here affirmed of the death of Christ, viz: that it was foreordained only of that event?¹⁹ Or is it true only of some events, such as are foretold in prophecy? Or is it true of all events whatever?”²⁰ By questioning the scope and degree of predestination the Reverend begins to organize his case into linear steps, which ultimately leads to the most significant consequence of predestination for his audience; how it affects the free will of the individual. The Reverend’s first four points argue that predestination is all encompassing; “God” has a plan and purpose for everyone and everything, this plan is “is sovereign, absolute, most wise and holy, eternal, and unchangeable”.²¹ After explaining the scope of “God’s” plan, the Reverend in an almost frustrated tone argues “the accomplishment of that purpose does not make God the author of sin, does not interfere with the liberty of free agents, does not destroy human responsibility, and does not discourage the use of means.”²² Thus, while “God” has a plan, which is most “wise and holy”, neither “God” nor his plan are responsible for the behavior, choices or growth of the individual. The Reverend, and more precisely the argument of Christian theologians and reformers, then absolves “God” of creating individual sin and injustice, while also placing the responsibility of overcoming such evils on both the individual and larger society.

With this shift in Christian doctrine came a “declining support for the Calvinist ideal of predestination and growing emphasis upon free will and salvation by good works, evangelical Christianity held out the promise of individual reformation and social improvement...”²³ These new ideals around the “perfectibility of man and institutions” meant, in practical terms, that not only the individual but also the larger society had the ability to both shape and/or reform the behavior of the individual.²⁴

The theory of a malleable destiny enabled political theorists and leaders to envision a new socio-political relationship between government and layman; the citizen. In particular the discussion of the founding fathers revolved around an almost feverish desire to impart responsibility and duty of the individual to state and society. The cultivation of this new relationship--position within society--came out of the fears of “not only protecting liberty, for which the Revolution had been fought, but also with maintaining order, without which all might be lost”.²⁵ As Carl Kaestle points out “in the large commercial seaports, poverty had increased in the years preceding the Revolution, as had factional politics and ideological splintering... These tendencies to fragmentation added to the anxieties of newly won independence and created an urgent question for

¹⁹ Breckenridge, James. (1876). Predestination a sermon. Presbyterian Print House. Toronto. HathiTrust: <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5db8jp1f>. pp.5

²⁰ Breckenridge, James. (1876). Predestination a sermon. Presbyterian Print House. Toronto. HathiTrust: <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5db8jp1f>. pp.5

²¹ Breckenridge, James. (1876). Predestination a sermon. Presbyterian Print House. Toronto. HathiTrust: <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5db8jp1f>. pp. 6

²² Breckenridge, James. (1876). Predestination a sermon. Presbyterian Print House. Toronto. HathiTrust: <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5db8jp1f>. pp.6

²³ Reese J. William (2005) American Public Schools: From the Common School to ‘No Child Left Behind’. The Johns Hopkins University Press. pp.17

²⁴ Kaestle F. Carl. (1983). Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780-1860. Hill and Wang, New York. pp. 6

²⁵ Kaestle F. Carl. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780-1860*. Hill and Wang, New York. pp.5

coherence, discipline, and public unity among the new nation's leaders".²⁶ The answer to this political and social fragmentation was the reformation of the individual, which is illustrated in the wide spread development of educational and reform institutions.

The belief that society could be reconstructed was not new, as this was a key aspect of the enlightenment, what was new was the belief in both the individual's ability and duty to become an enlightened citizen within the Republic.²⁷ This new "nationalism" as it were, facilitated and spread the doctrine of Republicanism. In his book *America's Public Schools: From the common School to 'No child Left Behind'* William Reese argues that "among the keywords that dominated educational discourse in the antebellum period, none was so ubiquitous as republicanism," however for all its ambiguity, for the reformers, political theorists and community leaders, republicanism was more than rhetoric but a call to unity.²⁸ As Kaestle attests "Republicanism untied concepts of virtue, balanced government, and liberty. By 'virtue,' republican essayists meant discipline, sacrifice, simplicity, and intelligence, and they called upon ministers, teachers, and parents to aid in the creation and maintenance of a virtuous citizenry".²⁹

Various types of schooling were developed with values of Republicanism in mind. In connection with this vision of the enlighten citizen, were new ideas about the malleability of children. "Contrary to Calvinist percepts; children did not enter the world fully formed or with a certain destiny; even if some children had vicious parents, moral education might save them from a life of vice and crime."³⁰ In order to ensure that the upmost morals and values were impressed upon the young it was argued that schools should not only develop academic knowledge, but moral aptitude. "Public school activist and educators never strayed beyond a few core beliefs: that the soundest morals came from Christianity in general and Protestantism in particular; that learning without piety was dangerous; and that schools, while concerned with training the mind, should preeminently focus on shaping character."³¹

Not all U.S. leaders or communities supported the common school movement, as its development and connection to the Republic was deeply debated along regional, Christian, class, and racial and ethnic lines. But regardless of the organization and accessibility of schooling, among almost all the early debates several key arguments shaped the way the Republic targeted certain "populations" to reform through education. Thus, the purpose of schooling was different for separate "classes" of people, especially those who were considered alien or dangerous to society and the Republic. For the more affluent classes, private tuition based schooling was the norm. These schools tended to

²⁶ Kaestle F. Carl. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780-1860*. Hill and Wang, New York. pp. 4

²⁷ Karier, Clarence J. (1986) *The individual, society, and education*. Revised edition of Man, Society and education 1967. Illni Books, University of Illinois.

²⁸ pp24 Reese J. William (2005) *American Public Schools: From the Common School to 'No Child Left Behind'*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.

²⁹ Kaestle F. Carl. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780-1860*. Hill and Wang, New York. pp.5

³⁰ Reese J. William (2005) *American Public Schools: From the Common School to 'No Child Left Behind'*. The Johns Hopkins University Press. pp.24

³¹ Reese J. William (2005) *American Public Schools: From the Common School to 'No Child Left Behind'*. The Johns Hopkins University Press. pp.35

reflect and further develop the social, religious and political views of parents. On the other hand, free schools, including Sunday schools, Charity schools, and infant schools were built to intercept future burdens on the state, including crime, poverty, and foreign anti-republic or Protestant views.³² In this sense these institutions were firmly rooted in reform through education. “Charity schooling was an explicit attempt to intervene between the parents and the children of a supposedly alien culture. Charity schools were thus antagonistic to the child’s family and peer influences”.³³

Free educational institutions ranged in breadth and location. In the north, charity schools, tended to be organized on a day school model, and focused on basic academic and moral teachings. Far from the perceived equality that these schools may have appeared to support, the actual purpose of the schools was to acculturate and control poor, immigrant and racialized (usually freed-men) communities. Thus, American charity schools were not “designed to implement equality of opportunity. On the contrary, mobility was quite incidental to the educational goals of those philanthropists and public officials who advocated education for the poor in America”.³⁴ Rather, most reformers, who were themselves Protestant Americans, designed these reforms to tackle two key issues they believed were foundational to maintaining the slightest bit of socio-political and economic stability; the first was to Americanize immigrant populations, creating a “common national destiny” in the process, and the second was to implement “self-discipline and moral character,” both of which would aid as the “antidote to crime, defense of republicanism, and a bulwark against atheism, socialism, and alien ideologies, that threatened private property and public morals.”³⁵ Although these aims were primarily directed towards, poor, immigrant and/or non-protestant communities (Catholics being the major concern), they were increasingly adopted to reform racialized communities. And similar to euro-American populations, both the intended aims and outcomes were the same.

Thus, just as access to equal economic or social opportunity was a non-issue in the charity schools for the poor given that “most whites were not bothered by the discouraging prospects of educated black youths. In this venture, as in all charity schooling, the upward mobility of the students was incidental. The main thrust was moral education, and literacy was directed more to this purpose than to individual advancement.”³⁶

By analyzing the earliest debates surrounding the education of African Americans, gives insight into how “race” in combination with the status of the anti-citizen (one who will never become or meant to become a full citizen) or colonized was theorized and connected to this larger educational reform movement. In his book “*The*

³²Kaestle F. Carl. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780-1860*. Hill and Wang, New York.

³³ Kaestle F. Carl. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780-1860*. Hill and Wang, New York. pp.55

³⁴ Kaestle F. Carl. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780-1860*. Hill and Wang, New York. pp.35

³⁵ Reese J. William (2005) *American Public Schools: From the Common School to ‘No Child Left Behind’*. The Johns Hopkins University Press. pp.16-17 and 42-43

³⁶ Kaestle F. Carl. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780-1860*. Hill and Wang, New York. pp.39

South-West. By a Yankee”, Joseph Holt Ingraham’s arguments set the ideological underpinnings for the speech Captain Henry Pratt would make to the Friends of the Indians fifty five years later, by claiming the intellect of an African American could both be cultivated and reformed, to the effect that they could become the intellectual equals of Euro-Americans in several generations.³⁷ While this argument, in part demonstrates early “liberal” support in a continuing struggle for the humanization, emancipation and even socio-political equality of African Americans, it is also a reflection of what such “liberals” considered the purpose of schooling and education for African Americans, as well as a growing number of colonized peoples. In the beginning of his speech Holt acknowledges popular sentiments regarding the intellect of African Americans.

It is the popular opinion, both at the north and south, that the negro is inferior in intellect to the white man. This opinion is not, however, founded upon just experience. The African intellect has never been developed. Individuals, indeed, have been educated, whose acquirements certainly reflect honor upon the race. Uneducated negroes have also exhibited indications of strong intellectual vigour. And because, in both instances, the negro has shown himself still inferior to the white man, he is unhesitatingly pronounced an inferior being, irremediably so, in the estimation of his judges, by the operation of organic laws.³⁸

Holt questions popular assumptions that Africans are inherently inferior, by arguing that this is due to underdevelopment of their intellect, rather than some operation of natural law. He supports his claims by pointing out that educated African individuals, have not only shown both the capacity and will to be educated but have done in a manner that has reflected honor” on the entire race. Thus, just as reformation of predestination itself, Ingraham’s observations show that the intellect, of an entire “race” had the ability to be “developed,” and educated. Of course, this did not have any bearing on their inferior economic, political, or even social status, as the outcomes and opportunities this education afforded were only marginally better if at all. What his claims did show was that just as education could be used to make the poor and the immigrant invested and obedient to the republic, so to could education be used to develop “the” African’s intellect.

Ingraham, continues his argument by claiming that while the development of the African intellect would not be immediately equal to that of the European, that through the education of successive generations, an equal intellect could be achieved.

If this theory be correct, there is something more to be done before African intellect can be fairly developed. If culture will expand the intellect of the untutored negro—take one of the present generation for instance—according to this theory, which experience proves to be true, it is certain that he will transmit to his offspring an intellectual organization,

³⁷ Ingraham Joseph Holt (1835) *The South-West. By a Yankee*, in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860* Vol. V. 1953 The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

³⁸ Ingraham Joseph Holt (1835) *The South-West. By a Yankee*, in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860* Vol. V. Knight, Edgar W Ed. 1953 *Educational Theories and Practices*. The University or North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.482

so to speak, superior to that which was transmitted to himself by his parent; the mind of the offspring will be less rude soil for mental cultivation than was his father's; and when his education is commenced, he will be one step in the scale of intellect in advance of his parents at the same period of their lives. His offspring will be superior to himself, and their offspring yet a grade higher in the scale of intelligence, and standing, perhaps, upon the very line draw between human and angelic intellect. His mind will bear comparison with that of the white man; and morally and intellectually, he will stand beside him as his equal.³⁹

This theory of intellectual evolution would become the dominant paradigm used to advocate for the assimilation of colonized communities into the American economic system, without threatening the current political economy much less the social structure. The combination of educational reform and a continuing anti-citizen status was key to the perpetual control over colonized peoples bodies and communities. It created individual accountability on the part of the colonized, to pull up their boot straps for a nation in which they were perpetual anti-citizens, with no rights, no representation, and no way of redress, while simultaneously releasing, state agents and American society from any culpability or responsibility for their economic, political or social status. Access to social or economic mobility thus became something that was in part dependent on individual "success" and intellect, something that could theoretically be achieved by a handful of individuals in the larger colonized community. However, for the majority of the members within these communities who did not assimilate or convert, were not invested in the republic and American society, could not be controlled, and were thus considered a threat due to what was labeled a lack of "intellectual development," only time and reform of their children could provide them mobility. Thus, for over one-hundred and fifty years successive cohorts of reformers repeated the same argument; in a couple of generations...insert colonized community...will be the intellectual equal, possibly a full citizen, but for now, we ...insert colonial agent... the benevolent educators must maintain their ward status as they are not intellectually competent. Of course, such liberal ideas were not present in all places and spaces with in the actual or potential domain of U.S. states, such as the south where there was no beating around the racial and class hierarchy bush. But for all the hidden transcripts and colonial motivations to deconstruct, like charity schooling for poor and immigrant children, analyzing the reasons why the education of African Americans was supported (by non-African Americans) in the new Republic helps to unpack the different ways that education was used as a tool of control, in this case to control and slowly assimilate the anti-citizen into the economic station of reserve and temporary labor.

Although rarer, charity day schools were also found in the south, and similar to the north, southern leaders viewed the purpose of these schools as providing moral and academic training. Moreover, these schools drilled into the students the necessity of being "useful" to society, regardless of actual station. However, unlike in the north, which created the ideological foundations and networks that would eventually form a common schooling movement for all

³⁹ Ingraham Joseph Holt (1835) *The South-West. By a Yankee*, in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860 Vol. V*. Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) *Educational Theories and Practices*. The University or North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.483

students, regardless of class, race, or national origin, the South actively worked to end any attempts to support the same. As educational historian William Reese argues, “in a culture dedicated to preserving both a racial and social hierarchy, the notion of common schools for everyone in the South, even in theory, was repugnant. Southern leaders smirked at the idea that free schools, North or South, would change the hard realities of life. Social class and racial differences, they insisted, would always matter in America”.⁴⁰ This is not to argue that educational institutions for the lower classes or even colonized and/or racialized populations did not exist, but rather that there no common school movement, and education was strictly segregated and even considered dangerous in the hands of African Americans. On the cusp of the policy wave which would eventually ban, all schooling and preaching on the part of African Americans, regardless of individual status as freed or enslaved, a North Carolina paper editorial bore witness to a classroom of African American students, whom several years previous had been forced to attend night school, in order to ensure segregated classrooms and times. On April 22, 1830 an editorial in *The Raleigh Register* discussed the writer’s recent visit to a school opened and operated by the infamous John Chavis, the first African American to graduate from a University in the United States.

To witness a well regulated school, composed of this class of person—to see them setting an example both in behavior and scholarship, which their white superiors might take pride in imitating, was a cheering spectacle to a philanthropist. The exercises throughout, evinced a degree of attention and assiduous care on the part of the instructor. . . The object of the respectable teacher, was to impress on the scholars, the fact, that they occupied an inferior and subordinate station in society, and were possessed but of limited privileges; but that even they might become useful in their peculiar sphere, by making proper improvement of the advantages afforded them.⁴¹

In this piece the writer shows he was thoroughly impressed by the composure, behavior and knowledge of the student body, as well as the message of the instructor that each student, even given their “inferior,” and “subordinate station” could still work to be as useful as possible. But as much as it shows the excitement of the writer for the perceived “successes” of the students and school; it also shows how pervasive the discourse of national responsibility was, as evidenced by the fact that even the most oppressed peoples, those who did not possess rights as citizens, had very little political, economic or social power, and who were not even considered fully human by a large percentage of citizens, were still expected to improve themselves in order to be “useful” to the Republic. While useful could mean any number of things, in this case, the editor, and his audience would have interpreted useful in the context of Christian morals and values, thus useful in this case meant, productive worker and member of society, even if the individual have full social, political and economic rights, as was the case for the students at this school. African American education would be short lived in the south until after the civil war. This was due to state laws which outlawed the both the education and

⁴⁰ Reese J. William (2005) *American Public Schools: From the Common School to ‘No Child Left Behind’*. The Johns Hopkins University Press. pp.43-4

⁴¹.editorial in *The Raleigh Register* (1830) “A North Carolina Editor Praises The School of John Chavis, Negro Teacher and Preacher, 1830” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. V. Educational Theories and Practices. Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) The University of North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.470

teaching of African Americans, both free and enslaved, including the forced closure of the John Chavis school, when North Carolina passed their own African American education ban in 1831.⁴² However, even given these larger circumstances this editorial is a good example of how schooling was used to promote productive and obedient peoples, regardless of citizen or class status, not to foster equality or even provide an avenue for such. Charity schools are essential to understanding the development and purpose of American Indian education, which was created for similar reasons; to control and construct students into productive and obedient non-citizens. However, these urban day schools are only one of several models that Pratt and Armstrong would pull from.

As noted before, charity day schools in the south were few and far between; rather the majority of Charity schools were fashioned on a Manual labor boarding school model. The first plan known MLBS was established in 1796, through the will and testament of John de la Howe of South Carolina. He willed his estate to provide a basic education to twenty-four (twelve boys and twelve girls) orphan children from the surrounding county.⁴³ In the proceeding decades a handful of similar models would spring up in several southern states with the same basic premise; to provide a rudimentary academic education, alongside training in agriculture and industry. The schools themselves were heavily supported by the labor of the children, who worked on a school farm, ranch and in some cases a dairy, in addition to domestic arts such as sewing, laundry, cooking, and gardening. Work done at and for the school constituted a part of their industrial training. The rest of the day was spent on elementary academics including basic math, reading and writing. Similar to their day school cousins these manual labor charity schools were created to produce industrious and obedient citizen-workers from populations deemed dangerous or problematic.

As in the north, the majority of children were educated through tuition-based schools, apprenticeships or at home where the beliefs and values of their families were supported. On the other hand, manual labor boarding-charity schools, like their northern counterparts charity day schools, were created as intercepts and/or replacements for parents, who were unable or unwilling to provide “appropriate” guidance. These schools were not just created to produce future citizens but to reform poor and orphaned children who posed a serious threat on the future stability and growth of society, in the way of their impeding or even existing poverty, crime, and ignorance.

In 1825, Mr. Philip Lindsley, then President of Cumberland Collage of Tennessee, published an essay on his recent visit to the Hofwyl School in Switzerland. In his essay he advocated for the expansion of the Manual labor boarding school model throughout the Southern States. Although he thoroughly impressed with many different aspects of the school Lindsley was most interested in the characteristics, which he considered part and parcel of the new Republic; economic thrift, work ethic, and socio-economic stability. Initially Lindsley focuses his argument on economic thrift;

⁴² “North Carolina Forbids Slaves or Free Negroes to Preach, 1831” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. V. Educational Theories and Practices. Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) The University of North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.470

⁴³ pp.69 Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) “Extracts from the Will of Dr. John De La Howe of South Carolina, 1796” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. IV Private and Denominational Efforts. The University of North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill.

Fellenberg “has contributed, without expense to himself or others, to educate liberally hundreds of the poorest children of Switzerland... At Hofwyl the poor maintain themselves by labour. The rich pay for their privileges. And all are constantly under the eye and control of their teachers.”⁴⁴ Why Lindsley had chosen to visit a manual labor school a world away rather than those that had been established only a state away could have to do with the way charity institutions were perceived. Lindley may have preferred the Hofwyl model because both rich and poor families considered it a respectable institution. Moreover, he highlighted the fact He that students did not receive the same education, as was advocated for common school movements in the north, but rather were “tracked” based on their class status. “There, the poor learn trades, or become practical farmers, at the same time that they are thoroughly instructed in every branch of useful science. The rich are trained to all many exercises, and to various useful arts, while their minds are diligently cultivated by the most accomplished professors”.⁴⁵ By offering an industrial and/or agriculture track for the poor and an academic track for the rich the school provided an education model that could (in theory) simultaneously rid the community of socio-economic instability while maintaining the status quo of the political economy. This stability tradeoff, as it were, was of interest to the elite classes of the south who were concerned about the maintenance of their economic, political, and social domination over the poor and non-citizen classes. Thus, even if Lindsley did not support an elitist system, he could use this example as support to show that this school model, and the students that would eventually come out of it, were in no way a threat but rather added further stability.

That said, Lindsley, was not trying to foster equality, he was well aware of the classist discrepancies of the Hofwyl model, and rather than finding issue, he dismissed it as a normal part of society. “The most startling difficulty in the way of any plan of this kind, would be suggested, probably, by the obvious inequality and apparently invidious distinctions which would obtain among the pupils of the same institution. But does not similar inequality exist among our citizens and youth everywhere in society?”⁴⁶ His statement shows that he was not necessarily concerned with facilitating an opportunity for class equality, as he points out that inequality exists everywhere in society, nor was he interested in the restructuring the current class hierarchy. Rather Lindsey was intent on establishing an avenue for the lower classes to become self-sustaining, morally upright citizens of the Republic. In this instance that translated to an industrial and moral education, centered in their economic thrift and own hard labor.

Allow me to pursue the train of speculation suggested by the Fellenberg system, as applicable to the hardy sons of out honest yeomanry and mechanics—not excluding those of the humblest poverty, wherever the

⁴⁴ Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) “President Philip Lindsley of Cumberland College, Tennessee, On Manual Labor Schools, 1825” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. IV Private and Denominational Efforts. The University or North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.77-8

⁴⁵ Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) “President Philip Lindsley of Cumberland College, Tennessee, On Manual Labor Schools, 1825” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. IV Private and Denominational Efforts. The University or North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.80

⁴⁶ Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) “President Philip Lindsley of Cumberland College, Tennessee, On Manual Labor Schools, 1825” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. IV Private and Denominational Efforts. The University or North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.79

germ of future excellence can be discerned. I have already show how colleges of any kind must or may benefit the middling and poorer classes of the people; and, that, it is their special interest to wish them success. Here, however, a more direct chance for mental culture may be offered them—and for such culture as best befits their previous habits, their present circumstances, and their future prospects. As they cannot be expected to pay as liberally for their privileges as the rich, let them supply any deficiency by their labour—or, when necessary, let them maintain themselves entirely by their own industry, as is done by the poor at Hofwyl.⁴⁷

In this portion of his essay Lindsley shows how the schools would not only be economically beneficial but also encourage key ideals of Republicanism; “discipline, sacrifice, simplicity, and intelligence”.⁴⁸ He initially does this by characterizing the future students and the classes from which they come them as unique American pillars of strength, stability, and honesty. Next he claims that the organization of the school would afford a direct opportunity for the construction or further development of moral aptitude and honor through their own labor. The schools would act as a way to both stabilize and reform the individual toward acceptable republican-Protestant values. As the Christian proverb states idle hands are the devil’s work-shop; idle lips are the devil’s mouthpiece.⁴⁹ Aside from labor acting as an agent of reform, Lindsley again asserts that it would be twice the economic benefit as it would both offset the cost of the schools, while providing access to all “sons,” of the republic, even the poorest of students.

Lindsley did not advocate for a full adoption of Fellenberg’s system but used it as an example to make his case for the establishment of a manual labor -industrial college system. To begin with he argues that different institutions, a Manual labor College on the one hand and a prestigious college on the other (he cited Cambridge and Oxford as examples) would attract different classes of students. “None but youth (poor youth, I mean) determined to have an education, would resort to such an institution...⁵⁰”. After making his case about the recruitment of students he quickly cites the power of the graduates of prestigious colleges “many of whom have filled and are filling, the highest stations in church and state⁵¹”. These two arguments together again show that he was not concerned with class equality as he marks key separations in the motivations behind and expected outcomes between elitist and industrial institutions.

⁴⁷ Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) “President Philip Lindsley of Cumberland College, Tennessee, On Manual Labor Schools, 1825” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. IV Private and Denominational Efforts. The University of North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.78

⁴⁸ Kaestle F. Carl. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780-1860*. Hill and Wang, New York. pp.5

⁴⁹ Living Bible Proverb 16-27 The Living Bible copyright © 1971 by Tyndale House Foundation. Used by permission of Tyndale House Publishers Inc., Carol Stream, Illinois 60188. All rights reserved.

⁵⁰ Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) “President Philip Lindsley of Cumberland College, Tennessee, On Manual Labor Schools, 1825” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. IV Private and Denominational Efforts. The University of North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.79

⁵¹ Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) “President Philip Lindsley of Cumberland College, Tennessee, On Manual Labor Schools, 1825” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. IV Private and Denominational Efforts. The University of North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.79

After arguing for a division of institutions, Lindsley claims that the Manual Labor College is preferred over the “*petits maitres*” because it is based in republican ideals⁵²

Students would in fact be as independent as the richest. How much more truly respectable and republican would be their condition, while thus *laboring* for the food of body, mind, than that of the student who is supported in luxurious ease by the charity of individuals, or the public. How vastly preferable to the situation of a Cambridge sizer or Oxford servitor.⁵³

Here Lindsley argues that the Manual Labor institution, is both respectable and republican, because it does not provide a free ride, of luxury or ease, but instead gives an opportunity for an individual to literally work for and towards an industrious education. According to Lindsley, then the MLBS is an institution of the Republic and for the Republic as it would both create “the *esprit de corps*, which would prevail in the several ranks or classes of students, would serve to keep each other in countenance, and to render them indifferent to imaginary evils.”⁵⁴ Linsley arguing that the socio economic stability, that the school would establish; first through the pride and unification of a common pursuit, and secondly through moral peer pressure that would ensure the utmost respectable behavior, is part of what makes it the quintessential or premier Republican institution. Which is hastened by the fact that it would provide an avenue for students to become:

A regular component part of the establishment. They would be in the fashion. They would conform to established usage. They would have Law and public sentiment on their favour... They would constitute a respectable moiety—perhaps, a large majority of the whole. And they would be respectable just in proportion to their modest, fearless, independent conformity to their actual conditions. A poor youth of talents and becoming deportment, will never be long despised anywhere. But here he would occupy a post of honour, and have every motive and every encouragement to persevere, till he should be qualified to do honour to himself, his friends and his country.⁵⁵

The Manual Labor boarding school, at least, in Lindsley’s argument could become the premier Republican institution of the south, as it upholds those values most near and dear—economic thrift, hard labor, and socio-economic stability, without any disruption

⁵² *petits maitres* Definition: silly, ridiculous, young and elegant with pretentious manners pp.79 Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) “President Philip Lindsley of Cumberland College, Tennessee, On Manual Labor Schools, 1825” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. IV Private and Denominational Efforts. The University or North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill.

⁵³ Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) “President Philip Lindsley of Cumberland College, Tennessee, On Manual Labor Schools, 1825” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. IV Private and Denominational Efforts. The University or North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.79

⁵⁴ Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) “President Philip Lindsley of Cumberland College, Tennessee, On Manual Labor Schools, 1825” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. IV Private and Denominational Efforts. The University or North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.79

⁵⁵ Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) “President Philip Lindsley of Cumberland College, Tennessee, On Manual Labor Schools, 1825” in *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860*. Vol. IV Private and Denominational Efforts. The University or North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. pp.79-80

of elitist politics or economy. Moreover, it supports foundational ideals of the republic including, an ever-expanding yeomanry class, civic responsibility, and a protestant work ethic.

One of the major issues with Lindsley's argument, and the Agricultural or Industrial school model that it advanced was that it didn't actually support the current economic structure, either in the north or south. Accessible and affordable land, in which a self-sustaining farm could be established, was almost unheard of. This is because all farmable land had either been bought up by the plantation class, or was currently under the dominion of Native peoples. In fact, these schools were often founded, because a larger parcel of land and endowment was willed, by a plantation owner expressing for the purpose of establishing said school. Even within Jefferson's own ten year, this yeomanry economic structure was sequentially undermined in support of large land holdings, land speculation schemes, and the rise of an elites class, of which Jefferson himself was part of. This was also the case in the west, where even before larger numbers of people joined westward expansion further invading indigenous lands, land was allocated and parceled out based both on ability to pay for such land and the resources needed to access and ultimately claim that land.

What then of these Manual Labor Boarding schools, which taught agriculture and other supposed economically self-sustaining industries? Well that depended on the class of children that were entering them. By the 1840s, educators of all kinds were interested in the benefits of manual labor on the mind and body of the student. In particular, Theology institutions took a certain interest in how manual labor could help advance the productivity of clergy in training. However, this model was less an agricultural or Manual labor boarding school as it was a way for Christian sects to instill a hardy work ethic and moral uplift.

Manual Labor institutions, seemed, at least in theory, to uphold the very foundations of the Republic; the idea that is the nation would be supported by intelligent, responsible and hardworking citizens. Yet, as I have argued, it was argued that the individuals of certain populations would take generations to educate and/or reform. The schools might reform the poor "White" individual in one generation, but in the case of immigrants and sub-racialized bodies it was often argued that it could take multiple generations to foster an equal intellect and moral aptitude. Moreover, the schools and their founders never claimed that their institutions would foster immediate equality but rather like the education itself, such equality would take generations to provoke. Instead these intuitions were founded to provide the students an education to enter the economy with the same skill set as their poor "White" peers. This had no bearing on either job opportunities or even a substantial shift in life quality, but provided the community a reserve labor force; as the graduates, it could be argued, had only themselves to blame for any lack of opportunity of stable employment, which it was argued, were due to cultural or racial inadequacies still present in the current generation.

Yet, for all that the Manual Labor boarding school had to offer, as the premier institution that could both gradually and consistently reform students for their immediate

economic integration, it was equally if not more appealing to colonial educators because of its perceived ability to isolate, attack, and destroy without disruption of community or culture, any undesirable behavior, including culture, language, epistemology, identity or attachment. In his work *The Birth of the American Manual Labor Boarding School: Social Control Through Culture Destruction 1820-1850*, Jeffrey R. McDade argues that the Manual Labor boarding school model arose out of the same social theories and practices as the Penitentiary and Asylum movements of the early nineteenth century (Auburn Model), which promoted social control and reform through social isolation.⁵⁶ The Auburn system was named and developed out of the newly established penitentiary system in Auburn New York, in which inmates would only be allowed Social “interaction” at specific times of the day, such meals, church, work or school. However, this interaction was not actually communicative, as speaking, or other forms of communication were strictly forbidden, rather it was considered social by the mere fact of sharing space with other individuals. During the rest of the day and usually all night inmates were isolated in their cells.⁵⁷ Because these MLBS relied heavily on routinization and “rationalization” techniques, McDade asserts, “...the MLBS cannot be understood apart from the parallel”.⁵⁸ He further points out, that “the MLBS resembled the Auburn model with its emphasis on collective labor and drills and discipline through routine and rules,⁵⁹” which was used as an “... attempt to achieve cultural transformation through the ritual degradation of the former identity and its replacement with a new identity,... a technique the MLBS shared with the other total institutions of the time”.⁶⁰

Engineers of Citizen Subordination: Rhetoric and Logic of the Industrial School System

Originally founded, 1810 by missionaries working in north eastern Native communities, the ABFM became the leading Missionary organization within the United States, sponsoring missions across the western hemisphere. By the mid-century they, along with many other missionary supported schools “utilized social training and manual labor” as their primary technique to convert Native students to both Christian and American social/economic expectations.⁶¹ Little to no academic (classical) instruction was provided, unless the students were being trained as a missionary themselves.⁶²

Mission schools in Hawaii were developed to train each social class separately for their new roles in a European style monarchy. The first school known missionary school

⁵⁶ McDade, J. R. (2008). *The birth of the American Indian manual labor boarding school: Social control through culture destruction, 1820-1850*. Lewiston, N.Y: Edwin Mellen Press.

⁵⁷ The Auburn Model was one of two main American penitentiary systems developed in the early eighteenth century, the other was the Pennsylvania system.

⁵⁸ McDade, J. R. (2008). *The birth of the American Indian manual labor boarding school: Social control through culture destruction, 1820-1850*. Lewiston, N.Y: Edwin Mellen Press. pp. 148

⁵⁹ McDade, J. R. (2008). *The birth of the American Indian manual labor boarding school: Social control through culture destruction, 1820-1850*. Lewiston, N.Y: Edwin Mellen Press. pp. 150

⁶⁰ McDade, J. R. (2008). *The birth of the American Indian manual labor boarding school: Social control through culture destruction, 1820-1850*. Lewiston, N.Y: Edwin Mellen Press. pp. 148

⁶¹ Breyer, Kalani. “Setting the Record Straight: Education of the Mind and Hands Existed in the United States before the 1800s”*American Educational History Journal*. Vol. 37, Number 1 2010. pp. pp. 153

Berkhofer, Robert F. *Salvation and the Savage: an Analysis of Protestant Missions and American Indian Response, 1787-1862*. New York: Atheneum, 1972.

⁶² Breyer, Kalani. “Setting the Record Straight: Education of the Mind and Hands Existed in the United States before the 1800s”*American Educational History Journal*, Vol. 37, Number 1 2010. See discussion pp. 152-3.

established in 1833, was the Oahu charity school, which was specifically started to provide a school for the children of mixed unions of Native Hawaiians and European parents.⁶³ For the higher born classes along with the children of missionaries, Seminary schools were established to provide a more classical education, which, similar to schools once attended by missionaries back east, prepared students for positions as preachers, missionaries, and politicians. These integrated seminary schools did not last long however, as Dr. C. K. Beyer points out, the system changed due to fears of missionaries who:

having once lost influence over the kingdom, no longer believed that all their “good works” were safe in the hands of the Hawaiian elite. They were reaching the point where annexation to the United States was becoming an option as a way to protect their interests. Thus, the goals for education became Americanizing the Hawaiians and preparing them to become secondary members of an American dominated society.⁶⁴

Instead the seminaries were transitioned to the Manual Labor boarding school education model, which combined social training and manual labor. The first such school was opened in 1837 after missionaries, where given the go ahead in 1834 by the ABFM to establish what they labeled a “boarding Establishment. In his history of the Sandwich Islands, published less than a decade after the opening of the school, Sheldon Dibble urged his audience:

The plan and design of the Female seminary is, to take a class of young females into a boarding school—away in a measure from the contaminating influence of heathen society to train them the habits of industry, neatness, and order, to instruct them in employments suited to their sex, to cultivate their minds, to improve their manners and to instill the principles of our holy religion—to fit them to be suitable companions for the scholars of the Mission Seminary and examples of propriety among the females of the Sandwich islands.⁶⁵

After the Female seminary was transitioned into a boarding school the “Preparatory Boarding School” was established in 1839 by Rev. D.B. Lyman and Rev. Titas Coan. This new generation of missionaries transformed Hawaiian education, by ending academically focused education and instead expanding American social training and manual labor model to all classes of Native Hawaiians.

Armstrong was intimately familiar with the Hilo model, as his father had helped

⁶³ Dibble, Sheldon (1843) History of the Sandwich Islands. Lahainaluna Press of the Mission Seminary. American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions Library. pp. 332
https://books.google.com/books?id=EwqpkYKuXSMC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.

⁶⁴ Beyer, C. K. (February 01, 2007). The Connection of Samuel Chapman Armstrong as both Borrower and Architect of Education in Hawai'i. History of Education Quarterly, 47, 1, pp. 35

⁶⁵ Dibble, Sheldon (1843) History of the Sandwich Islands. Lahainaluna Press of the Mission Seminary. American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions Library. pp. 332.
https://books.google.com/books?id=EwqpkYKuXSMC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.

develop it, and he himself worked at the school. When took the position to work with newly emancipated African Americans at the end of the civil war, he adapted the model to meet the demands of a normal school, infusing manual labor, Americanization, and industrial training in the context of teacher training.

Like the charity schools and Manual Labor boarding schools that Hampton pulled from, the mission of the school was to socially reform and inculcate its student body with the skills necessary to become immediately useful and competent as laborers in the American economic system, without any insight or opportunity of contributing to their full access to American citizenry. The root of this mission is found in General Armstrong's the *First Annual Report (1870)* to his board of trustees in which he frames the debate as to what the appropriate educational institution is for African Americans. The first paragraph of his report however entertains a larger debate; "What should be the character of an educational institution devoted to the poorer classes of the South?"⁶⁶ To which he rhetorically replies "It is useless at present to expect the ignorant whites to accept instruction side by side with the colored race. To a broad impartiality the Negro only responds".⁶⁷ This statement indicates that Armstrong may have considered the economic position of poor whites and newly freed slaves as essentially the same, and further believed that it was only the ignorance of whites and the impartiality of African Americans that kept their education separate. Yet, it is difficult to conceive that Armstrong truly believed in desegregated schooling much less desired it, given his background as both a Colonial missionary, and a staunch believer in a Euro-American social-cultural hierarchy. What it does show is he considered all poor classes of the South regardless of race, as a significant problem for the nation.

After acknowledging the more expansive issue of what to do about the poor classes in the south, Armstrong turns to the issue of why an institution designed specifically to reform "ex-slaves" was necessary.

Plainly a system is required which shall be at once constructive of mental and immoral worth, and destructive of the vices characteristic of the slave. What are these vices? They are improvidence, low ideas of honor and morality, and a general lack of directive energy, judgment, and foresight. Thus disabled, the ex-slave enters upon the merciless competition incident to universal freedom. Political power being placed in his hands, he becomes the prey, of the demagogue or attempts that low part himself. In either case he is the victim of his greatest weakness—vanity. Mere tuition is not enough to rescue him from being forever tool, politically or otherwise. The educated man usually overestimates himself, because his intellect has grown faster than his experience in life; but the danger to the Negro is greater, proportionally, as his desire is to shine rather than to

⁶⁶ General Armstrong's First Annual Report (1870) in Armstrong Education for life. Press of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton Virginia 1913. pp. 44 <https://archive.org/stream/educationforlife00arms#page/22/mode/2up>.

⁶⁷ General Armstrong's First Annual Report (1870) Armstrong Education for life. Press of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton Virginia 1913. pp. 44 <https://archive.org/stream/educationforlife00arms#page/22/mode/2up>.

do.⁶⁸

Through his statement, Armstrong highlights two major issues facing his intended student body. The first issue he emphasized is that which he labeled “the characteristic vices of the slave.” Which included “improvidence”, “low ideas of honor and morality,” “a general lack of directive energy, judgment, and foresight,” ... “vanity... his desire is to shine rather than to do”. Based on his argument, Armstrong is interested in the moral redemption of ex-slaves, who according to him have acquired mannerisms that are not only corrupt, but also dangerous to American society as they both create and support the demagogue. Thus, the reformation of African Americans is not so much an issue of access to opportunity as it is a way for the United States to safeguard their social and political institutions. Whether Armstrong believes these vices are due to the nature of enslavement or inherent quality possessed by African Americans is a mute point, as at this time, black was equivalent to ex-slave and vice a versa. Even in the case of generations of freedmen, the conversation about intellect or vice always returned to notions of blackness and enslavement, they are two sides of the same coin.

The second issue that Armstrong highlights, is the competition that African Americans must contend with. He specifically chooses to use “competition” in the broadest sense, in order to cover the social, economic, political and any-other context for which it could arise. However, he does define it as “merciless” to underscore the possibility that such competition could lead to unrest, motivating the “ex-slave” to be led astray, becoming a “political tool” and as such becoming a danger to American society and institutions.

Based on his first report it is clear that Armstrong built an institution that was central the reformation of the moral character of African Americans, but still leaves unclear why he chose to incorporate the manual labor system into his institution. In the 1870 report, Armstrong claims only that “the poverty of these pupils has required the introduction of manual labor,” making it seem as though its adoption, was an unintended consequence of poverty rather than a central pedagogical tool of the school. However by analyzing his later statements, which advocated the use manual labor education, this 1870 argument is not only out of place, but actually silences the intended purpose of the school to create obedient workers while maintaining their socio-political status as anti-citizens. Thus, even as American schools, in the now growing common school movement in the north had begun to phase out manual labor, Armstrong promoted it on two separate fronts. Firstly, he argued it would be used not only to provide the means for students to support themselves but more importantly the Nation; and second manual labor would reform the character and moral aptitude of the student.

Armstrong viewed manual labor and industrial training as two sides of the same coin, meaning that manual labor was meant to support education in industrial training, not just the ability of the student or school to support itself. He in fact argues that there are two theories about the purpose of manual labor:

⁶⁸ pp.44-45. General Armstrong’s First Annual Report (1870) Armstrong Education for life. Press of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton Virginia 1913. <https://archive.org/stream/educationforlife00arms#page/22/mode/2up>.

The first is that its entire aim should be to give the means to students of supporting themselves, that a profitable farm on a very large scale should enable a large number of students to support themselves by agriculture, and that workshops on a larger scale for the manufacture of some simple fabrics of universal consumption should enable a large number of students to support themselves by mechanic arts; that in both these cases the main theory should be self-supporting industry not educational theory.⁶⁹

Here he shows that he fully understands the self-supporting theory of manual labor and industrial training. That is whether on a large-scale farm or workshop, such work would enable a large number of students to economically support themselves. Armstrong gives no further credence to first interpretation of necessity of manual labor but moves on; “The second theory is that the primary object of manual labor in both departments should be educational; that is, that the work should be first of all done with a view to perfect the student in the best processes, and to make him scientifically and practically a first-class agriculturist and mechanic”.⁷⁰ According to his description of the second theory the main difference between self-supporting and educational theory is the time and patience taken to instruct students to be the most productive laborers, to know the “best processes” and to make them both “scientifically” and “practically” knowledgeable in their industry. This does not mean however, that he was advocating industrial training as a means to become rising entrepreneurs or even middle class managers, supervising large-scale activities, but rather to manage small scale endeavors as teachers within their own segregated communities.

Armstrong was not only interested in the educational aspect of manual labor because it enabled training that on a larger scale would supply cheap labor to the south, but also because it focused their endeavors on racially appropriate economic activities, as laborers, or teachers of agriculture and industry labor.⁷¹ In fact many a time Armstrong argued that too much academic training was dangerous, reflected in his 1880 Annual report in which he argues, “Over-education and lack of personal training are dangers with the weak races. The proper limit of teaching is difficult to settle but is much ignored in the philanthropic work of the day; hence waste of work and disappointment. For the average pupil, too much is as bad as too little.”⁷² Through this statement it is clear that Armstrong viewed certain educational models, especially academically focused or what he terms a classical education, as dangerous, because African Americans are not mentally prepared for such, points that he highlights when he states of the consequences of such education as a “waste” in effort and time, as well as “disappointing” to both the student and teacher. While this may be of no great surprise given the time period of Armstrong’s sediments, it does help to establish the expectations and goals he and other educators of

⁶⁹ General Armstrong’s First Annual Report (1870) *Armstrong Education for life*. Press of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton Virginia 1913. pp.22-23 <https://archive.org/stream/educationforlife00arms#page/22/mode/2up>.

⁷⁰ General Armstrong’s First Annual Report (1870) *Armstrong Education for life*. Press of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton Virginia 1913. pp.23 <https://archive.org/stream/educationforlife00arms#page/22/mode/2up>.

⁷¹ Beyer, C. K. (February 01, 2007). The Connection of Samuel Chapman Armstrong as both Borrower and Architect of Education in Hawai’i. *History of Education Quarterly*, 47, 1, pp. 31

⁷² Armstrong, Samuel (1913) *Southern Workman* October 1880 in *Armstrong Education for life*. Press of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton Virginia pp.22-3 <https://archive.org/stream/educationforlife00arms#page/22/mode/2up>.

the period held for the pedagogy that would be used to mediate those they considered “weaker race[s].”

Armstrong’s heart and the hand model was developed to support the reconstruction of the southern labor market and society, with the least amount of concessions towards equality. To this end he argued that an appropriate educational model should include:

Organized industries, giving the students a chance to meet bills for board and clothing by labor, high standards of discipline, carefully weeding out the unworthy but excluding all corporal or other humiliating punishment whatever, a perfectly fair and firm administration, and the highest order of skill in teaching, these make a nation of influences that will be effective if anything can be, to the production of skillful, persevering teachers, of wise leaders, of peacemakers, rather than noisy and dangerous demagogues.⁷³

Although it might seem as though Armstrong wanted to foster economic independence for his students, in actuality both his personal beliefs and the Hampton model adhered to ideologies of white supremacy, in part by supporting outcomes which would maintain the subordinate position of African Americans in the corporate capitalistic system as reserve landless labors, ensuring the continuation of their economic, political and social domination. Yes he wanted to enable their economic re-incorporation, because to fail to do so could create wide spread dissidence and resistance rather than obedience and stability of the current economic system. But he was not interested in equality; rather he wanted to economic integration to reflect his belief in social-cultural evolution, which put African Americans on the bottom of the ladder. Moreover, his school was creating disciples, community teachers of agricultural and industrial labor, not academics, whom he perceived as noisy and dangerous.

A point he makes several times in his 1872 report arguing that “The temporal salvation of the colored race for some time to come is to be won out of the ground. Skillful agriculturists and mechanics are needed rather than poets and orators.” In this statement, Armstrong describes the appropriate pathway to salvation, as hard work (in the ground) rather than process of bearing witness to the experiences of African Americans. And in doing so conveys the idea that economic actions are louder than socio-political words. Yet he was equally aware, that the words of the poets, orators, and other witnesses of southern brutality and inequality were more dangerous to the maintenance of such, if not louder.

Thus, as a way to divert the conversation away from equality or even brutality Armstrong, argued that it was the victim that was deficient, accordingly salvation was not about rescuing African Americans, but about redeeming their morally deficient character. Armstrong even used the cost of the institution as a means to show “his” financial sacrifice made to ensure this redemption. “Character is the best outcome of the labor

⁷³ Armstrong, Samuel (1913) *Armstrong Education for life*. Press of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton Virginia <https://archive.org/stream/educationforlife00arms#page/22/mode/2up>. pp.20-21

system. That makes it worth its cost many times over. It is not cheap, but it pays".⁷⁴ In his 1876 report, Armstrong argues that the net cost of the school comes back through character development. To which he adds "Real progress is not in increase of wealth or power, but is gained in wisdom, in self-control in guiding principles, and in Christian ideas. This is the only true reconstruction. To that Hampton's work is devoted". For Armstrong manual labor was the educational tool, which enabled Christian morality, self-sufficiency, and character development. All of which were essential to the process of making obedient and invested laborers. That is invested in the corporate capitalist system as obedient and unquestioning workers, who are happy or at least politically distracted by the theoretical economic possibilities of which they have been introduced, to maybe someday be self-supporting, and economically stable if not politically or socially so. Even in the early years of Hampton, Armstrong believed manual labor was a way to temper and control the students:

The plan of combining mental and physical labor is a priori full of objections. The course of study does not run smoothly; there is action and reactions, depression and delight; but the reserve forces of character no longer lie dormant. They make the rough places smooth; the school becomes a drill ground for future work. It sends men and women rather than scholars into the world.⁷⁵

Armstrong's reports addresses criticism of his pedagogical style, industrial training and traditional academics. Refusing to engage in any debate as to whether such pedagogy is better or worse than any other, he chooses to focus on the development of the students in his care. He explains that the education they receive is a difficult course as students experience both "depression" and "delight," possibly referring to the frustration, failure, as well as motivation and achievement that comes with being in a mentally and physically strenuous program. However, according to Armstrong it is these very reactions that shape the student's character and provide the foundation for life after school.

Armstrong's model was appealing to Pratt because it supported many of the same goals he sought for American Indians; Christian morality, self-sufficiency within a capitalistic system, character development and ultimately a second-class Americanization. That is, such an Americanization process would make them obedient to social and economic norms and values of the nation but not necessary the beneficiaries of Republic ideals of liberty and equality.

Pratt essentially had control over Carlisle, but the education model he applied was a fusion of his military experience and the pedagogy he learned from Armstrong. Like many other missionaries of the period, Armstrong believed that colonized peoples, who he deemed "inferior" could only be integrated into American society through an Americanizing education process, which would simultaneously strip them of their

⁷⁴ Armstrong, Samuel (1913) *Armstrong Education for life*. Press of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton Virginia <https://archive.org/stream/educationforlife00arms#page/22/mode/2up>. pp.18.

⁷⁵ Armstrong, Samuel Chapman. (1913). *Education for Life*. Press of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute. Hampton, Virginia. pp.20

“primitive” values while inculcating them with American ideologies, Protestant morals and manual training.

The use of education as a tool of Americanization, is undeniable. From rural to urban, schools across the country incorporated curriculum that supported the new ideals of the republic. This nation building project, and the motivations behind it varied between and even within communities. For instance, many rural communities shaped their schools to instill what has been termed the Protestant Republican millennial view, which combined “free agrarian capitalism and Victorian values.”⁷⁶ Very few communities, outside the implied Republican norm of Protestant-Anglo Americans were able to hold onto their culture, language, or even epistemologies unless they instituted some form of community isolation. For instance, in the case of Pennsylvania Germans, schools were initially created with bilingual language and cultural programs intertwined with nationalist curriculum. But by the turn of the century most of these programs had been removed in order to “emphasize a more nationalistic experience”, yet local language and cultural traditions continued to be represented in organizations, newspapers, and community life.⁷⁷ It was not enough to be politically, economical and socially isolated, but insulated and self-sufficient. Only then could such communities determine the structure and content of their schools to reflect the perceived needs of their children including upholding their own political, economic and social ideologies.

For the majority of students, and the communities from whence they came, this was not the reality. In most urban areas, the common school movement spread in part due to the influx of new immigrant communities who were neither Anglo, nor protestant. For these children and their families, public schools were used by local government as a tool of assimilation, which may not have immediately impacted the social-cultural norms of the home or even the larger immigrant community, but systematically affected the perspectives and identity of the students, who often sought to distinguish themselves from their immigrant parents. Thus even in the case immigrant communities who tried to hold onto their traditions through social isolation, nationalistic-organizations, newspapers and other outlets that both celebrated and continued their language and/or traditions, the public school was developed to be more powerful and pervasive tool of Americanization; an all encompassing enemy. Yet these students, unlike their colonized peers were redeemable through their Americanization process, and the production and/or investment in “whiteness.” That is they were not only being groomed to become American, but treated as pre-Americans worthy of full citizenship. This is not to say that it happened over night, or even with in one or two generations, but that eventually their communities became Hyphenated American communities, which had an ethnic flare, something that was neither politically or racially dangerous.

⁷⁶ Meyer, John W, David Tyack, Joane Nagel and Audri Gordon. (Nov. 1979). “Public Education as Nation-Building in America: Enrollments and Bureaucratization in the American States, 1870-1930.” *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol 85, No. 3, pp. 591-613. University of Chicago Press.

⁷⁷ Donner, William W. (Spring 2008) “Neither Germans nor Englishman, But Americans”: Education, Assimilation, and Ethnicity among nineteenth-century Pennsylvania Germans. *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, Vol. 75, No. 2, pp197-226. Penn State University Press.

While the public schools were busy intervening in the various cultures of their student body, Pratt was at the forefront of the cultural destruction of Native peoples. His pedagogy was developed based, in part, on the tools of political and social suppression that Armstrong along with other philanthropists passed down to him. As in Hampton these educational tools were created to ensure the economic insertion of colonized peoples as landless laborers, trained in the economic, social and political norms and expectations of the nation, without provisions to access the full benefits of citizenship.

Pratt's colonial vision: integration through isolation

The partnership of Pratt and Armstrong at Hampton was brief but gave Pratt, both the motivation and initial tools to campaign for an Indian only school system. Although both men shared similar beliefs in regards to African Americans, historians have argued that coming from Hawaii, Armstrong was more tolerant of certain aspects of "Native cultures" than Pratt. And because of this supposed "liberal" stance Pratt believed that the Hampton model needed to be modified in order to completely remove Native cultures, languages and ideologies.⁷⁸ Yet as much as Pratt disagreed with Armstrong's views, in all actuality they were almost identical. For instance, Pratt's focus on promoting a psychological transformation in which Native children were pushed to remove any ideological vestiges of their Tribal identity, mirrored Armstrong's effort to reform the character of the "ex-slave." Thus, Pratt's pedagogy was similar to Armstrong's in that it sought to destroy the vestiges of Native cultures, character and especially epistemologies in order to create economically and politically obedient individuals. And like Armstrong, Pratt was pulling from colonized communities that were and treated as enemies of the state; anti-citizens. There were two major differences between Armstrong and Pratt. The first was that the Pratt believed African Americas to be a bad influence on Native students, what could be considered as an example of downward assimilation. Rather than taking directives from poor or even middle class white citizens, Native students would primarily be influenced by the actions and characters of an even another ancillary group. Secondly Pratt was willing to usurp the children of Native communities, where as Armstrong chose to focus on training adults to become the missionaries of a colonized Americanization process. The second difference had more to do with the fact that very few Native peoples had gained full proficiency of either the language or ideologies of the Nation, nor were they altogether interested in such, given that they been both outside the direct influence and/or actively at war with the United States.

Again, like the charity schools, and intuitions of the colonized that came before it, the academic curriculum in BIA schools not only focused on providing basics skills in reading, writing, history, and arithmetic but also had a dual purpose of inculcating core American ideologies and narratives of Manifest Destiny, cultural evolution and capitalism. This determination, to fully "Americanize" Native students was stressed throughout his many letters and speeches to U.S. political leaders and societies.⁷⁹ While the motivations vary to some degree, some asking for funding and supplies, while others

⁷⁸ Fear-Segal, Jacqueline (2007). *White Man's Club: Schools, Race, and the Struggle of Indian Acculturation*. University of Nebraska Press.

⁷⁹ While the use of "Americanization" might seem a more recent term to denote the process of assimilation into the American polity, Pratt was well aware of the term and connotation, as he used the term to explain the process of assimilating immigrants into America..

argue for an expansion of his Indian education system, each letter or speech is a window into Pratt's larger vision. In a set of correspondences between Senator Henry Dawes, and himself, Pratt lays out his initial points on the organization and process of Indian education. In the opening letter written April 4th 1881, Dawes questions the practicality and expansion of the Indian education system stating

This is my trouble. We cannot take all the Indian children away from the tribes to educate them in such schools as yours. Why would it not be better to attempt their general education among the tribes themselves on the ground where they are to live, and employ such as you educate for that work, opening schools of practical industry in every tribe and employing the educated of that tribes as teachers.⁸⁰

It is hard to know exactly why Dawes does not fully agree with separation, whether it was an economic, cultural or all together independent disagreement. However, given his position as the architect of the infamous Dawes act, it was more likely an economic and political argument on the grounds of practicality; the ability to send all or even a large majority of Native children to boarding schools, and also the enormous cost of such facilities, especially given the debt the civil war had caused the country. Although the 1887 Dawes Act, and the Curtis and Burke Act that would follow, were not past for another six years, its purpose, like the boarding schools, was to destroy tribal communities, in order to assimilate its members into the American economy. The boarding school model, while working to economically assimilate a handful of children from each community it had less of effect on the larger community. A point that Dawes was adamant about in, as he wanted to create a method to imbed American ideals and morals into the entire community, what he refers to as a "general education," not simply to acclimate some of them to the American labor system but to move the entire community into the American economy.

I want to see every Indian child taught at least this much-first to work; next to know that what he earns is his. That nobody can take it away from him, and that he has a permanent abiding place because he has earned it. After that I would push the education of the young Indians as far as I could; but I am impatient that every young Indian of the present generation should have implanted in him so much that makes up a man as I have indicated.⁸¹

The portion of his letter shows that to him the most pressing educational principles were the practical introduction and integration of Native peoples into capitalism. That is, to teach Native youth how to labor and comprehend the basic concepts of capitalism, so that they will 1. Know what is economically and socially expected, and 2. Be placed into the economic and social structure of the United States.

⁸⁰ Pratt, Richard Henry (1964) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Yale University Press. pp. 264

⁸¹ Pratt, Richard Henry (1964) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Yale University Press. pp. 264

Pratt's response to Dawes outlines his vision. He initially agrees with Dawes that it was not "practical" to remove all Native children their tribes,⁸² but adds that "There should be now on the reservations together with those off, a large enough number of industrial boarding schools to provide for *all* Indian children... Day schools on the reserves are generally impractical and a positive injury because they beget expectations of quick and large development that cannot be realized".⁸³ Here Pratt shows the future of Indian education as being one in which all Native students attend Industrial boarding schools, in part because he views day schools as incapable of providing the kind of educational development expected of them. This was not the first time that Pratt was in the defensive position on where the schools should be located. As early as 1878, a year before Carlisle would open its doors, the board of Indian commissioners used Pratt's commentary to argue for schooling closer to Indian communities.

Captain Pratt states that he could with ease have secured three hundred children for the school, so anxious are the parents to have their children educated. One Indian woman would not let her daughter go alone and she therefore accompanied her, and remains at Hampton to watch over her. The anxiety displayed by the Indians to have their children educated, suggests the establishment of industrial schools of like character more convenient to the Indian population of the country, where their education might be carried forward on a more extensive scale.⁸⁴

The commissioner, does not question the model of education Native students would receive (Industrial schools), but rather believes that their distance is a problem, and that the schools would be more convenient, even well attended, if they were built closer to Native communities.

Pratt, argued this point numerous times throughout his career, but especially in the early years of Hampton and Carlisle, when Federal Indian education was still being shaped. In his speeches and reports he often used testimony, like that above to rebuttal naysayers and critics about the interest in off reservation Industrial schools. However, in an effort to gain funds, support and expand the Carlisle model he targeted his most powerful arguments towards government officials involved in Indian affairs. In a letter to the Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin, Hon. Thaddeus C. Pound, Pratt argued why Indian Industrial training schools should be located within "white" communities and far from Native ones. Pound was not only important to Pratt because he sat on various Indian Committees of Congress, but also because he was involved in lumber operations in Wisconsin, which included his seat as the President of the Union for the Union

⁸² Pratt, Richard Henry (1964) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Yale University Press. pp. 265

⁸³ Pratt, Richard Henry (1964) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Yale University Press. pp. 265

⁸⁴ Long, Hon. John D. (1880). *The Indian Question*. Report of the committee. Frank Wood, Book and Job Printer.

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hyd.32044019791441;view=1up;seq=5>, pp 31

United States. Office of Indian Affairs (1878) *Annual report of the commissioner of Indian affairs, for the year 1878*, Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., v.: fold. maps; 23 cm. <http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/History.AnnRep78>.

Lumbering Co. and of the Chippewa Falls & Western Railway Co. the significance of for Pratt was that he had multiple connections within large industry.⁸⁵

It is pressed upon me here continually that it would not be a difficult task to gather into school training all the children of these tribes.⁸⁶ Partial effort invites partial failure. All educational work for the Indians is a good thing; I believe that the system of removing them from their tribes and placing them under continuous training in the midst of civilization is far better than any other method. In an Indian school at an Agency the civilizing influences are limited to the to the instructors with perhaps a few examples of agency employees, with a tremendous pull against what they may do in the persons of the fathers and mothers and all the members of the tribe. In fact, such an effort might properly be called theoretical, while here, or removed from their tribes and placed in the midst of civilization, the teaching is all practical, all the surroundings help.⁸⁷

Here Pratt argues that schools located within and/or close to family and community are only able to provide a glimpse of the assimilation transition students are expected to exemplify or aspire to. He even goes as far as to argue that this model creates a theoretical assimilation, rather than a practical one given the fact that they are never fully exposed to non-Native communities, industries, or economics; what he terms “civilization.”

After condemning the on-reservation model as impractical, he argues in detail how the off-reservation method works to inculcate and acclimate students to “American” society and economy.

The industrious farmer and mechanic is in sight daily. The evidence that man must obtain his living by the sweat of his brow is constantly before the children and it becomes an easy matter for them to join with the sentiment of the community in that direction. We had difficulty at first to get our boys and girls to work but now I am frequently asked by the students to be permitted to work more than our school regulations require.⁸⁸

Pratt’s comments show that he believes that the relationship between the display and practice of continuous industry, whether in the form of agriculture or industry that normalizes appropriate positions of labor for the students. Moreover, by placing the students into work “internships,” the students learn American economy and the value of

⁸⁵ *History, Art & Archives, U.S. House of Representatives*, “POUND, Thaddeus Coleman,” <http://history.house.gov/People/Detail/19870> (October 05, 2017).

⁸⁶ Pratt is referencing the treaty stipulations, that include educational privileges for all the children of the Sioux, Cheyenne, Arapaho, Kiowa, Comanche, Pawnee, Navajo, Ute, Shoshone, Bannock and several other tribes. pp. 258 Pratt, Richard Henry (1964) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Yale University Press.

⁸⁷ Pratt, Richard Henry (1964) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Yale University Press. pp.259

⁸⁸ Pratt, Richard Henry (1964) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Yale University Press. pp.259

their own labor, an issue that Dawes brought up in his earlier letter. While it may seem that Pratt was a man obsessed on the minor detail of the location of schools, this aspect of the school was actually part of a larger motivation to destroy Tribalism. The manual labor boarding schools would expedite the Indian individual's adoption of American values and norms along-side their integration into corporate capitalism as laborers. He argues this point in his 1881 letter to Dawes.

I suppose the end to be gained, however far way it may be, is the complete civilization of the Indian and his absorption into our national life, with all the rights and privileges guaranteed to every other individual, the Indian to lose his identity as such, to give up his tribal relations and to be made to feel that he is an American citizen. If I am correct in this supposition, then the sooner all tribal relations are broken up; the sooner the Indian loses all his Indian ways, even his language the better it will be for him and for the government and the greater will be the economy to both.⁸⁹

Pratt has a specific vision of the future for Native peoples. He believed that in order to accomplish Americanization they had to be divested of all tribal connections, including language.

Neither Pratt nor Armstrong would have been able to maintain or even promote the spread of the Industrial labor boarding school model, had they not had a larger group of policy and philanthropic supporters to spread their message. Such support, was significant not simply for monetary or political support but in providing further or even more in-depth arguments relating to the schools. For instance Pratt, often spoke about the larger apparatuses of American Indian boarding schools or reform, such as funding, recruitment, supplies, and de-tribalization, but his speeches and letters rarely described any in-depth processes of such. This did not mean that Pratt was not involved or care about the minute details, but rather that for what-ever reason he did not elaborate on them. Yet the curriculum and teachers were as important, if not more so than the educational model of the Manual labor boarding school. Even if Pratt, failed to provide in-depth details about the process, he was not alone in the movement to reform Native students into ancillary-citizens as by the late nineteenth century this process, as seen throughout boarding school literature, speeches, meetings, newspapers and the like, was being championed from all sides of the American public. At the 1885, annual meeting of the Friends of the Indians, Superintendent of Indian schools, John H Oberly, did just this, arguing what smaller process of reform were, and what they were meant to do.

“To teach an Indian pupil to ‘read, write and cipher’ is not sufficient. He must be taught many things that need not be taught to a white pupil. He must be taught to unlearn many things that he has learned; to discard prejudices that were impressed upon his mind in his infancy; to rise superior to the conditions under which he lived in the Indian camp to which he must return; to abandon the religion of his fathers, and accept a

⁸⁹ Pratt, Richard Henry (1964) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Yale University Press. pp.266

new faith; to cast off the social conditions of his own people and receive those of another people.⁹⁰

Through the first part of his speech Oberly argues that the first part of the reform process, needed to focus on the deconstruction and destruction of the identity of the student. He does not expect this process to simply be put into the hands of the students but argues that they must be “taught” to “discard”. In fact, he puts the majority of this assimilation process in the hands of the teacher by claiming that it is they that need to provide more than sheer guidance to change their Native students. The students must be “impressed”, that is either tricked, forced, and/or awed to “unlearn” the only cultures, languages, and epistemologies that they had known up till this time, had grown into, and had shaped their entire world. Thus, assimilation was not a simple process in which students would simply let go of their very identity, nor would in be labored out of them in the fields, shops, or work-rooms. Rather it was a combination of isolation, time and the effectiveness of the teachers to somehow make student discard their values, beliefs, and languages what Oberly labels as “prejudices.

This point is made clearer when Oberly states that the student’s must be taught to “abandon the religion of their father’s,” which not only meant their spirituality and any deities or practices pertaining to such, but their entire belief system, values, norms, and behaviors. He was part of the many who believed that once the individual discarded their former identity they would be become empty vessels, a process he describes as the need to “cast off” in order to “receive.” Of course, his statements show, both his and the audiences prejudices as ethnocentric, self-indulged, and misguided do-gooders. But it also shows, they understood that they were advocating or actively engaged in the destruction of cultures, languages, and communities who they viewed as a threat to their own. Even if they did not call it genocide, they knew they were in the business of killing. Yet Oberly, claims that students would not only accept their new beliefs but would be able “rise superior,” because of them.

Like, Armstrong and Pratt, Oberly not only infers that these children have been incorrectly taught; but that their epistemologies, their very life ways are inherently deficient. Yet like the children incorporated into the charity schools, their teacher can be the intercept between the students and their communities. Accordingly, in the second part of his argument, He continues outlining the assimilation process by elaborating on how their transformation was in the hands of their teacher.

He is a prickly thorn that must be made to bear soft roses; he is a twig bent out of the perpendicular, and he must be straightened so that the tree will stand erect, inclining no way; he is a vessel of bronze that must be made bright by constant rubbing. To be a teacher of these things to a pupil of this kind requires that patience which makes the heaviest burdens light.⁹¹

⁹⁰ Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian. (1886). *Proceedings of the ... annual meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*. [S.l.: s.n.], pp. 62

⁹¹ Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian. (1886). *Proceedings of the ... annual meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*. [S.l.: s.n.], pp. 62

In his speech the teacher is not only an intercept but becomes an artist, pruning, straitening and polishing their pupil. The teachers can take someone who is misshapen or even dangerous (in the case a rose thorn) and turn them into someone that is soft, straight, and beautiful, and most importantly domesticated to the desires of the American gardener.

He as Oberly argued the significance of the teacher, Pratt continued to center his efforts on the larger significance of their work. In his letters to prominent political leaders he not only promoted the assimilation of Native peoples for their benefit alone, but like Armstrong, Lindsley, and highlighted the value of using education for the United States. In his letter to the Hon. Thaddeus C. Pound Pratt claimed:

There is no doubt but that a well directed effort for the education and training of all Indian youth of suitable age can be made successful and certainly nothing will tend more to save us from a large pauper and vagabond population. I know that Indian children of nomadic parents, properly trained, can be made self-supporting men and women. They can learn to speak the English language, they can take on a fair education, and be trained industrially in civilized pursuits, they can be made self-supporting and industrious...⁹²

Similar strategies, of arguing that a particular policy was the most economical pathway for the American government have been employed again and again by Indian policy makers in their venture to further remove Native peoples from their lands, cultures and languages. Only the institution had changed. Instead of George Washington's fight for treaties, Jefferson's civilization board, or Adams, Monroe and Jackson's removal policy, economical thrift in the colonization of Native peoples now depended on how fast the schools could fully Americanize and immerse students into the American economy.

In short it was the scale of assimilation that had changed. Where there had once only been a handful of schools and missionary organizations arose a complex and widespread educational system. Pratt was not interested in just any school model, as seen in his various letters and reports to Dawes and others. He wanted to use and expand an industrial boarding school network. Although it might seem as though Pratt's ambition to provide Native students access to industrial education was progressive for his day, as kind-hearted or genuine as it may have sounded, as I have shown it was part of a larger practice by U.S. educators address what many U.S. leaders and citizens perceived as threats to their national security⁹³.

Of course, as in the case of Manual labor charity schools, Hilo and Hampton, the use of manual labor in the boarding schools served multiple purposes. For one it enabled a severely underfunded BIA to stretch its already tight budget by utilizing the children's

⁹² Pratt, Richard Henry (1964) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Yale University Press. pp.258

⁹³ Pratt cites the Indian problem later in the letter stating "To end our "Indian troubles the Indian must have intelligence enough to manage himself and his own affairs and be able to do that in competition with his white neighbor" pp. 266 Pratt, Richard Henry (1964) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Yale University Press.

labor. Second it isolated children from their communities, an issue that Pratt was concerned with. Third it promoted the essential principles of agricultural and industrial labor which was meant to ensure Native peoples, like their African American counterparts occupy an inferior status within the larger U.S. racial and socio-economic hierarchy.

In addition to the manual labor industrial education, which was used to reform the social identity first of the individual and then the larger community, Indian educators and philanthropists touted similar social evolutionary rhetoric in order to justify industrial training for anti-citizens. Through the combination of a focused American social and economic transformation, Native students would be easily integrated into the lower segments of the American labor classes, regardless of their ward status as anti-citizens, thus fulfilling the economic and social duties of citizens, without actually possessing the political rights of citizens. In his 1883 *annual report of the Principle of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute*, Armstrong reflected on the work done in Indian education since admitting the first cohort of Native Students; seventeen Cheyenne prisoners, who had been held at St. Augustine up until their transfer to Hampton in 1878. “This hospitality to a few red men has resulted, not only in an increase to one hundred and nine Indians, but the great work of Capt. Pratt, at Carlisle, Pa., to which was an essential stepping-stone; in a new and hopeful public sentiment, a fresh departure in Indian education, and in a new demonstration of the Indians’ capacity, with proper opportunities, to become good citizens”.⁹⁴ Here Armstrong argues that Hampton and Carlisle have led to a change in the direction of Indian education, referring to missionary schools and possibly even earlier manual labor boarding schools. Although these institutional models were reform projects in their own right, both their methods and outcomes differed drastically. For instance, they were often located within or next to Native communities, taught in the Tribal language and even engaged in some tribal traditions. Moreover, the most important outcome for these schools was conversion to Christianity. On the other hand, this new generation of American Indian boarding schools, were located far from Native communities, adopted English only policies and banished Native practices. It was believed that all of these smaller methods enabled what Indian education reformers, such as Armstrong, felt was the most significant part of the Indian education transformation, a slow steady track to model the behavior of citizens. Citizen was not used to promote citizenship, but rather to show the ability of his program and programs like it to reform Native peoples into “good” American laborers, instead of the national threat they represented. Like the rhetoric and reality of African American citizenship, there was considerable distance between the idea of Indian citizenship and its actuality.

In order for citizenship to be a possibility, reformers like Armstrong and Pratt believed that it was their job to transform Native peoples to adhere to the American economic and social systems. To this end Armstrong argues that Native people are primed to learn the responsibilities of American citizenship. “Whatever their failures,

⁹⁴. Armstrong, S. C. (1893) Concerning Indians: extracts from the annual report of the principal of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, for the School year ending June 30th 1883. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.31175035167066>. pp. 3

they are found to be not from innate causes but from surrounding influences. So hopelessly seem the latter against them, that many despair of success, but is it not a little gain to feel that the red race is capable, in itself, both mentally, morally, and physically, of the duties of citizenship”⁹⁵. Here Armstrong elaborates on his initial argument on the “citizenship” of Native Americans. He first points out that their position is not inherent, meaning that there is nothing to support a biological inferiority, but that their “failures” are rather from things that surround them. Given claims he made elsewhere about the so called Indian problem this statement can be taken multiple way, but points to two of his fundamental beliefs about the failures of Native peoples. First the unyielding attachment to their culture/society (which he believes is singular) keeps them in an inferior state, and second; policy makers and BIA agents have kept them ignorant of both the possibilities and opportunities for Americanization. Either way, he is signifying that there is nothing inherent, natural, or biological about their current inferior state. Rather he points out that Native peoples are capable of learning how to behave like citizens, what he specifies as “duties of citizenship.” It is important to underline that he is not calling for their political incorporation or even for citizenship, but arguing that they can take on the responsibilities of citizenship, two very different things.

By claiming that racially colonized groups were culturally inferior, Euro-American theorists and practitioners rearticulated the colonial discourse of slavery and conquest and in doing so were able to maintain their colonial status as benevolent paternalists. These theories were not only used to justify the central role of manual labor (coupled with a substandard academic curriculum) with the BIA educational institutions. They became self-fulfilling as this educational model, designed for racially and culturally inferior students, ensured their entry into the lowest socio-economic sectors, which in turn served to maintain their inferior status and perpetuate existing colonial ties and oppression. As Brenda Child asserts, “Indian students in government schools were constantly bombarded with the notion that they were best sited for menial labor. This message was reinforced daily in classroom lessons, by limited vocational training, and during endless hours of labor in the gardens, dairies, kitchens, and laundries of the schools”.⁹⁶ Whether by intent or merely implementation the BIA education system effectively restructured the subjugated position of its students to conform to a wage labor economy, that is to normalize their new position of ancillary-citizen, having neither full access to or participation in the capitalistic system, yet still being subject to it.

⁹⁵ Armstrong, S. C. (1893) Concerning Indians: extracts from the annual report of the principal of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, for the School year ending June 30th 1883. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.31175035167066>. pp. 3.

⁹⁶ Child, Brenda. (2001). *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900-1940*. University of Nebraska Press. pp. 81

The New Battlefield: How the Outing Program became an unintentional pilot program for Relocation era policies

Although the boarding school administrators continually promoted Americanization as their end goal, there were major differences in the ways in which the first Boarding school policy makers/philanthropists and later bureaucrats envisioned what Americanization meant for Native children. The changing definitions of Americanization centered on the level of assimilability of Native peoples based on perceived racial, cultural and class status within the United States. This transition of Americanization and in turn, function of the Boarding school system is best highlighted through an analysis of BIA's outing program, a program that I will argue was an unintentional pilot program for the later relocation program of the mid 1950s.

Although mid 19th century philanthropists, policy makers and educators believed that Native peoples were culturally inferior, they also held that with a proper western education they could be assimilated into the position of ancillary-citizens. This of course meant stripping away any unsafe or unwarranted Indian cultural beliefs/practices in the place of western norms/values, the process of which is nicely wrapped up in Pratt's infamous saying; "Kill the Indian, Save the Man."⁹⁷ This initial model of benevolent educational colonialism concentrated its efforts on what Robert A. Trewnert describes as an "evangelical crusade to save the Indian [which] centered on making him into a version of what they imagined Americans should be—God-fearing individuals who worked for a living within the capitalistic system."⁹⁸ Although Armstrong's Heart and the Hand educational model already addressed many aspects of Americanizing Native students through classroom curriculum and domestic/industrial training, Pratt realigned the manual training program to further promote the Jeffersonian model. This model advocated for a country of self-sufficient "Yeoman" farmers. He was not the only advocate of the Yeoman model as being ideal for Native students, "most authorities assumed that Americanization meant becoming a farmer."⁹⁹ But as I argued in chapter one this assumption did not uphold the colonial logic that taught agriculture as a way to earn a wage, not become a farm owner, but a farm employee. Trewnert's argument that Native peoples were made in the vision of an American, highlights the fact they were not considered as such, but something else, not fully invested or reflective of either American ideals or racial completion. Yet the rhetoric of a Yeomanry class, the reality of which had long passed for American citizens, was useful to the colonial logic as it addressed the present conundrum in which Native peoples still had title to land, even if federal land policies were ensuring the slow and systematic erasure of such.

In his 1885 speech to the Friends of the Indians, John Oberly, exemplifies the colonial logic that perpetuated an idealized future of yeoman Indians. However, rather than beginning with agricultural or industrial training, Oberly frames this transformation also dependent on a political education. "In addition to lessons in morals, in religion, in

⁹⁷ The concept of unsafe is a reference to the concept of the Cultural Safety Zone. Lomawaima, K Tsianina and Teresa L. McCarty. (2006) *To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education 1928-1940*. Teachers College Press.

⁹⁸ Trewnert, Robert A. (August, 1983) *From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930*. Pacific Historical Review. Vol. 52, No. 3. pp. 268

⁹⁹ Trewnert, Robert A. (August, 1983) *From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930*. Pacific Historical Review. Vol. 52, No. 3. pp. 270-271

literature, in history, the Indian pupil should be taught politics in the higher sense of their word. he should be instructed in our theory of government, and in our ideas of property and business.”¹⁰⁰ Oberly emphasizes that assimilation efforts were not directed at economic integration alone, even if it was believed by many to be the only immediate outcome of industrial education, but that it also included an education in the ideologies and institutions that upheld the economic and political ideals of the nation. This shows, a benevolent effort, on the part of Oberly, at least, that Native peoples had both the ability and right to a political education. Of course, this did not translate into actual power, through full citizenship or acknowledgement of sovereign rights because of such knowledge. Moreover, it shows the expectation that no matter what their status, Native peoples needed to adopt the political norms and values of the colonizer, in order to be seen as successful by them.

In his speech Oberly outlines what such a political education should entail, beyond the general concepts of business and property that he mentioned in his introduction. “He should be taught that he may own lands and sell them or transmit his rights in them to his children¹⁰¹”. Although he touts the need for a political education his description of property only includes the most basic understandings of American property laws, that land could either be sold or passed down. This statement highlights the contemporary reality in which individual ownership of land was neither connected to Native epistemologies nor the present system of landownership used by the BIA on reservations or other Indian communities. Rather at this time land was primarily held communally, that is until the passage of the Dawes Severalty Act (also known as the General Allotment Act), two years later. This does not mean, however that Native people did not understand European /American forms of land ownership in either a broad or more detailed way. Neither did this mean that they were unfamiliar with the concept of landownership, as they had their own systems of land stewardship, although not acknowledged by non-Native peoples, because it was tied to opposing ideologies. However, the most important part of this description is what is missing; education in value, equity, capital, accounting, taxes and the like, all of which are key elements of land ownership. Yet these concepts would have integrated Native peoples with the tools necessary to understand the economic system, none of which was essential to become laborers or sell and/or lease their lands. That kind of education, the education of power, was reserved for full citizens not ancillary ones.

The last section of his speech, in regards to a political education, takes a predictable turn towards appropriate industry.

He should also be taught how to work. He should be taught how to cultivate the soil after he has been taught how to own it, and how to manage flocks and herds... The Indian boy pupil should also be taught all the trades that the farmer and the herdsman patronize. He should be taught

¹⁰⁰ Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian, (1886). *Proceedings of the ... annual meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*. [S.l.: s.n.].

¹⁰¹ Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian., (1886). *Proceedings of the ... annual meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*. [S.l.: s.n.]. pp. 62

how to build houses; how to make wagons, harness and saddles; how to shoe horses; how to make clothing and boots and shoes.¹⁰²

For many, turning Native students into able-bodies “farmers,” was much more than just teaching them agriculture. Dawes made a similar argument to Pratt only four years prior. At the core this colonial logic promoted an American-democratic responsibility of self-sufficiency that was intertwined with BIA paternalism and control, in which, the ideals of the republic, that a man not only understood the value of his land and his labor, but could use both to establish a wholly American livelihood, were not fully accessible to Native peoples. Instead, these ideals boiled down to labor, industry and individualism, exemplified in the list of trades that Oberly counts off for each “Indian boy.” This is further enforced in Oberly’s statement that “the girl pupil should be instructed in household ways—should be taught how to cook; how to wash and iron clothing; how to handle the needle; how to nurse the sick; how to be a good wife and a good mother¹⁰³.” That Oberly, and his audience, believed Native girls needed their direction in how to both interact in their community and setup a household shows the distance between paternalism and benevolence. Benevolence is kindness, goodwill, support, generosity. While this curriculum might have been taught with a smile it was in no way benevolent, even if those that created it, supported it, invested in it believed it to be so. It was patronizing, cruel, and inherently colonial not only because it did not acknowledge the traditional roles of women as successful, meaningful or appropriate. But also because it worked to destroy Native epistemologies that maintained the power and sacred position of Native women in their own communities, while simultaneously degrading, dehumanizing and transforming the role of these women to focus on the needs of the American economy. Accordingly, they were trained to become the next wave of domestic workers, the maids, laundress, and nannies of white America, which would include appropriate Victorian conduct. Not the next generation of knowledge keepers, healers, mothers, or leaders. The real irony of the curriculum was that they were teaching these children how to survive in their own homelands as though they were next generation on the American “frontier.” The front line of civilization.

The Yeoman ideal, was a central part of the Indian colonial paradigm. It was used to terminate the reservation system, as it supported the contemporary cultural evolution rhetoric, fit within the existing federal Indian Policy of forcibly dividing reservation land base into individual plots through the General Allotment Act (also known as the Dawes Severalty Act) and ultimately enabled the seizure of more Native lands. Pratt and his contemporaries argued that removing the communal land base was a way to eliminate U.S. paternalism. In his chapter the Carlisle Outing he compares his experiences working with Native peoples in Indian territory and African Americans in the south to explain his aversion to the reservation system:

¹⁰² Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian. (1886). *Proceedings of the ... annual meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*. [S.l.: s.n.], pp. 62

¹⁰³ Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian. (1886). *Proceedings of the ... annual meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*. [S.l.: s.n.], pp.62

In one case my government used me in war to end a system which had forcibly transformed millions of primitive black people by transferring them from their torrid zone homes and life across a great ocean and compelling them to live with, and make themselves individually useful in, our temperate national family and by abandoning their own meager languages and adopting the supremely prolific language, life and purpose of America.¹⁰⁴

While it may initially seem as though Pratt completely ignored the oppression that both enabled and maintained slavery in the United States, he does acknowledge that the transformations that took place under this system were “forced”. This is not the same as condemning the system, or practices therewith in, but it does show that Pratt perceived slavery as an involuntary position. Moreover, he argues that it was these transformations that were forced and not just the larger system of enslavement. Pratt’s emphasis on “transformation” can be read several ways. First it shows that Pratt believed social-cultural assimilation was inherent to the institution of slavery. He further emphasizes this process of assimilation by arguing that African Americans replaced their own languages, ideals and purposes, with American ones. Second, Pratt described the consequences of assimilation in an overtly positive way. Aside from the fact that it was forced, he still argues that it was a blessing in disguise. For instance, he described their former lives as part of “a million primitive blacks ” from a “torrid zone”, which he then contrasts with their American lives as “individually useful” in a “Temperate National family”. This contrast is meant to support the idea that before they came to the United States, African Americans were part of a larger primitive horde that lived in stifling conditions, but that because of the slave trade, they were able to become individuals that were useful in a comfortable and moral Nation. He continues this logic by claiming their languages were “meager” while promoting “American” languages, life and purpose as “supremely prolific”. Again, arguing that slavery enable African Americans the opportunity to learn and be versed in and committed to supreme languages, ideals and purpose, as opposed to their inferior ones. Thus, because of the colonial paradigm from which Pratt operated, he framed slavery as something that allowed African Americans the potential to become useful in the Nation, even if it was within the confines of enslavement. This does not mean that he believed slavery was humane, as that was another conversation altogether. He was interested in the processes of assimilation, not emancipation. The line of logic that he was trying to make clear was that it was not just that African Americans transformed and took up American ideals but that they were forced to do so, and in turn were better for it.

Like the detribalization that Pratt promoted for American Indians, he similarly argued that the enslavement and hence the assimilation of African peoples had been an opportunity to become an individual that was useful in and to the Nation, an opportunity, that had not yet been fully given to Native peoples.

¹⁰⁴ Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964. pp. 311-12

In the other case, in obedience to the same behest, I was used in wars to enforce my county's exactly opposite scheme of a supremacy worse than slavery over the 300,000 native aborigines, which compelled them in their own native land to live apart from the American family, amenable to a tyrannous un-American system which forces them to become dependents on a remote Bureau control, potentially engaged in perpetuating and enlarging itself by restraining them from participation in our American civilized life.¹⁰⁵

Pratt perceived the primary abuse incurred on Native peoples as their containment onto reservation lands by the BIA. Which according to him had the dual effect of creating dependency and stripping them of their participation and possible usefulness in American life. He considered this a greater "scheme of supremacy" than slavery itself. Pratt's statement can help to unpack his ideas about assimilation. For Pratt assimilation was liberatory because it enabled primitive people to be incorporated and useful in American society, but to be clear this was not how the majority of Native peoples viewed it. Rather than use evidence to show that Native peoples wanted to assimilate however, he often cited his debate with Brulé leader Spotted Tail. Pratt claims that that his debate was prompted when the Brulé community decided not to send any of their children to Carlisle as it was felt that it was far away. At this time he claims that he "insisted" on meeting with them and forty attendees including "their foremost chiefs, Spotted Tail, While Thunder, Mild and Two Strike", came to this impromptu meeting.¹⁰⁶ At the meeting, Pratt maintains that he:

said that the Government was about to adopt a new policy with the Indians; that it was believed the Indian youth capable of acquiring the same education and industries out white youth had and this would make them the equals of our youth...The purpose in establishing a school so far east was to bring them near Washington, where all the people could see the improvement and where members of Congress and the administrative officials of the government could visit and witness their progress and their ability to learn.¹⁰⁷

Pratt organizes his argument according to what he thinks might persuade his audience of Brulé parents, to send their children to his school. He does so by hiding both the actual purpose of the schools to assimilate students to maintain American beliefs and values, as well as the discourse ancillary citizenship, which would prepare students for economic integration at the lowest rungs of the economic ladder. Instead he reasons that this program would provide the "same education" as American students, which would make them the equals of

¹⁰⁵ Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964. pp. 312

¹⁰⁶ Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964. pp. 221

¹⁰⁷ Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964. pp. 221-222

America's youth. He never specifies which community of American youth he is speaking about, but it is clear from his many writings and speeches that he viewed racialized communities and immigrants as less "competent" or even motivated than white American youth. But even given this vague, argument around equality, he knew that social or political equality was not possible. Equality in this sense meant the ability to labor in, and be useful to the Nation. Pratt's claim that the education these students would receive is motivated by his own selfish desires to retain students rather than the actual facts or intended consequences of his program. Moreover, he frames the reason for location of the school as a way for Washington to "see the improvement" of the students, even as he has argued many times that the purpose of the location was to aid in the process of assimilation itself. Pratt does eventually elaborate on other reasons for the schools' location in the east.

They [the Federal Government] must surely see that being divided into so many languages, and living in small tribal groups away from these opportunities, was a great disadvantage to them; that eventually in some way the Indians must become a very part of the people of the country and that each Indian must be capable of living among our people and taking care of himself and his own affairs, and so relieve the Government of the expense of special tribal supervision.¹⁰⁸

Again Pratt, does not speak frankly about the full intentions of the Carlisle program or even the U.S. government, but frames schooling as a means to do away with BIA oversight. To this end he does argue that the U.S. "must" see that segregating tribal peoples has been "disadvantageous" as it has kept them both isolated from and unaccountable to the Nation for their own economic stability. The only point that he makes towards assimilation is that individuals Indians need to be "capable of living among" American citizens as well as supporting themselves, which is not the same as arguing for their full or even partial social integration, but an argument which could be construed by his audience as a mutual acceptance of diverse communities.

While Pratt's arguments show that he over marketed Carlisle, and Indian education in general, as institutions that could provide equality, this is not necessarily what Native peoples were interested, that is equality in a society they did not belong to, nor want to join. This sentiment is exemplified through Spotted Tail's reply. "The white people are all thieves and liars. We do not want our children to learn such things. The white man is very smart. He knew there was gold in the Black Hills and he made us agree to give up all that country and now a great many white people are getting out their gold."¹⁰⁹ Spotted Tail, not only had a clear perception of Euro-Americans as "liars" and thieves", based on his own experiences in the removal of the Black Hills from the Sioux peoples. He doesn't just speak for his family but states that they, as in the entire community, does not want their children to learn these behaviors. His answer shows that Native peoples were not

¹⁰⁸ Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964. pp. 221-222

¹⁰⁹ Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964. pp. 222

interested in learning the behaviors or values of American society, much less assimilating into it. What then would have led Spotted Tail to allow his children leave with Pratt? Pratt was a good sales man, and he used this to his advantage. In response to Spotted Tails citation of the illegal seizure of the Black Hills, Pratt infamously stated

you cannot read or write. You cannot speak the language of this country. You have no education. You claim that the Government has tricked your people and placed the lines of the reservation a long way inside of where it was agreed they should be. You put your cross-mark signature on the treaty which fixed the lines of your reservation. That treaty says you agreed that the lines of your reservation should be just where these young men now out surveying are putting posts and markers. You signed that paper, knowing only what the interpreter told you it said. If anything happened when the paper was being made up that changed its order, if you had been educated and could read and write, you could have known about it and refused to put your name to it.¹¹⁰

Pratt uses English literacy, as the key to colonial empowerment, arguing that it was Spotted Tail's absence of this knowledge that led to the seizure of the Black Hills through concealed treaty articles. This argument covered up the over one hundred years of inequitable treaty dealings with Native leaders who were not only literate in English but in American policies, ideals, and behaviors. Moreover in making this claim Pratt tried to cover-up that treaties were used as tools of colonization.

Pratt follows up his argument about the power of schooling by turning the question back on Spotted Tail.

What you have always need is the same education, the same industry, and the same opportunity the white man has. Spotted Tail, do you intend to let your children remain in the condition of ignorance in which you have lived, which will compel them as you have to do? Cannot you see it is far, far better for you to have your children educated and trained as out children are so they can speak the English language, write letters, and do the things which bring the white man so much prosperity, and each of them be able to stand for their rights as the white man stands for his?¹¹¹

Pratt again uses an argument of Indian ignorance to explain the prosperity of "white men", which deflects any questions about honor or accountability on the part of the American government or its citizens in their inequitable dealings with Native peoples. He goes further to argue that an American education will give Indian children the means to stand up for their rights, just as white men have stood up for theirs. In this argument Pratt is not too far off, however he never intended for English literacy to enable Native peoples to speak against the boarding schools or BIA. That was the unintended consequence of the schools, which the colonial logic of their founders could neither anticipate nor

¹¹⁰ pp. 222-23 Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964.

¹¹¹ pp. 223 Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964.

understand, as they felt the to be educated was intertwined with a “desire” to assimilate. This is that assimilation and education were the same, to be educated meant to be at least partially assimilated, and yearn for the further assimilation of yourself and your people.

Whatever Pratt’s argument, appeal or power play was at the Rosebud agency, Spotted Tail sent his children to Carlisle. This only lasted for a short time as he removed them only three months later. According to Pratt this removal had to do with a dispute about the employment of Spotted Tail’s son-in-law at the school. However, in George Hyde’s book *Spotted Tail folk: A history of the Brulé Sioux*, he argues “Spotted Tail was angered by letters from his so-in-law, Tackett, at Carlisle School, for Tackett told him that the Episcopalian had baptized all the Sioux children at the school and given them Christian names. The chief regarded this as a mean action. He had sent his children to the school to be taught English and writing not to be turned into imitation whites.¹¹² Although there was several months in-between the letter from Tackett and Spotted Tail’s visit to the school, once there he took the time to investigate the claims made by Tackett, by visiting with his children and other boys from their community. It was based on these talks that Hyde claims Spotted Tail found out that

most of them [boys] were miserable and home sick. They were all in uniform and under stiff discipline. A system of courts martial had been set up, with the older Indian boys sitting as judges and condemning small offenders against the rules of the school to the guardhouse and to menial tasks. All the boys had to work at framing or in the carpenter or other shops... None of them had learned English or to read or write.¹¹³

The separation between Pratt’s account and that written on behalf of the Brulé community could not be much further apart. In Pratt’s account of what transpired, only Spotted Tail was angered, but in the Hyde account even Red Cloud and American Horse, two leaders who generally disagreed with Spotted Tail were also outraged, and the majority of Sioux students, or at least the children of these leaders were removed from the school after the party’s return from Washington D.C.¹¹⁴¹¹⁵ This account not only shows the tactics of Pratt in trying to recruit students but also the agency and care of Native peoples over their own children. This is also the precursor to later Indian compulsory laws, as well as the practice of excluding visitations from family at the schools.

Pratt not only used his dealings with Native leaders as a form of advertisement for his schools but also utilized student “success”, whether at Augustine, Hampton or Carlisle as evidence for the advancement of assimilation work. As, Fear Segal argues in her article *Man on the band stand* argues, stories of student success or assimilation often

¹¹² Hyde, George E. (1961) *Spotted Tail’s Folk: A History of the Brulé Sioux*. The University of Oklahoma Press, Norman. pp. 318

¹¹³ Hyde, George E. (1961) *Spotted Tail’s Folk: A History of the Brulé Sioux*. The University of Oklahoma Press, Norman. pp. 320

¹¹⁴ Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964. pp. 238-39

¹¹⁵ Hyde, George E. (1961) *Spotted Tail’s Folk: A History of the Brulé Sioux*. The University of Oklahoma Press, Norman. pp. 322-25

appeared in the Carlisle Arrow, the school newspaper run and edited by Pratt himself.¹¹⁶ Thus these stories were chosen and even manufactured for the specific purpose of advertising the work of the school, in some cases these stories were written by school staff. While these stories had the underlying message of Indian assimilation it is difficult to separate the intentions of the school administration from the actual feelings of the students themselves.

By analyzing publications which were independently founded, funded and run by former students, it is possible to get a much fuller view of how students felt about assimilation and the schools. One of Pratt's his most famous students including Zitkala-ša, argued against the boarding schools and assimilation policies. One of her most sorrowful responses to the individualism that the schools tried to enforce is present in the first half of her poem *The Indian's Awakening*,

I snatch at my eagle plumes and long hair.
A hand cut my hair; my robes did deplete.
Left heart all unchanged; the work incomplete.
These favors unsought, I've paid since with care.
Dear teacher, you wished so much good to me,
That though I was blind, I strove hard to see.
Had you then, no courage frankly to tell
Old race-problems, Christ e'en failed to expel?

My light has grown dim, and black the abyss
That yawns at my feet. No bordering shore;
No bottom e'er found by hopes sunk before.
Despair I of good from deeds gone amiss.
My people, My God have pity on you!

The learning I hoped in you to imbue
Turns bitterly vain to meet both our needs.
No Sun for the flowers,--vain planting seeds.

I've lost my long hair; my eagle plumes too.
From you my own people, I've gone astray.
A wanderer now, with no where to stay.¹¹⁷

Zitkala-ša *The Indian's Awakening* possesses five central criticisms of the boarding school system, including the removal of identity, the inculcation process, the maintenance of racism and inequality through White-American benevolence, and the consequences of isolation and loss. She first condemns the forced removal of her outward identity through

¹¹⁶ Fear-Segal, Jacqueline (2006). The Man-on-the-band stand at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School: What He Reveals about the Children's Experiences. In: *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences*. University of Nebraska Press. pp. 99-122

¹¹⁷ Zitkala-ša. (January-March 1916) *The Indian's Awakening*. *The American Indian Magazine: A Journal of Race Ideals* Ed. Arthur C. Park. The Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians Vol. 4 No. 1-4. pp.57
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=nyp.33433081688529;view=1up;seq=7>

her mournful remembrance of being stripped of her long hair and regalia, eagle plumes and robes. She ties the physical removal of her hair and clothing to the colonial ideology of benevolence by labeling the process as “favors unsought”. By initiating the poem with the first moment of forced disrobing, it immediately confronts the reader with the narrator’s feelings of vulnerability and anger over both the actions and ideologies of those involved in the Indian education system.

After showing their anguish of being disrobed the narrator begins to refute a full investment in ideological inculcation by pointing to her “unchanged heart” which is still Indian. She further emphasizes these failed assimilation attempts by labeling it “incomplete work”.

The narrator also pushes back on the motivations of the teachers, challenging the narrative of equality by arguing that the teacher knew that even Jesus could not end “racial problems”. Which ties into the second stanza when the narrator doubts the benevolence of those within the system, arguing that it was their “good deeds gone amiss, that has caused the narrator’s “despair”. The narrator’s calls into the question the true intentions of the system by using the analogy of no sun for the flowers; as a way to argue that growth and opportunity were not the primary intentions for the Indian student. These initial critiques of the Indian education system are used to show the actual consequences of the system, isolation and despair, in which the narrators have not only lost her material culture, but the connection to her community.

The emotional despair of this poem is a good example of how some former students felt about their experiences in the boarding schools. It is also a testament to the fact that even after their schooling they neither felt they had been allowed opportunity or equality, but as the poem attests despair, pain and anguish for an insurmountable level of individual and communal loss.

The responses of Native peoples to assimilation programs and his school in particular did not deter Pratt from pushing forth his assimilation agenda as he continued to use his forced assimilation of African American to advocate his cause.

These experiences plainly showed that, through forcing Negroes to live among us and become producers, slavery became a more humane and real civilizer, Americanizer, and promoter of usefulness for the Negro than was our Indian system through its policy of tribally segregating them on reservations and denying this participation. It is impossible that any man entering any national family can become acceptable therein unless made useful to it.¹¹⁸

According to his colonial logic slavery was “more humane”, then the reservation system because it forced African-Americans to become producers in the Untied States, and once a part of its economic system they were then given the opportunity to become

¹¹⁸ Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964. pp. 312

assimilated. This was not a new colonial bargain, as the same had been touted by King Charles of Spain, William Starkley, and a long list of other colonial agents, which argued that the colonized traded their land and labor for civilization. However, in this example, Pratt argues that Native Americans had been neither economically nor geographically integrated into American society, but were forced to live apart from it, thus not receiving their end of the colonial bargain.

In the previous quote he refers to America as a “family” in order to highlight the problems that distance and separation have created for Native peoples in so far as them becoming part of this larger family. In this quote he again uses the National “family” label to underscore that in order to be accepted to the National family, one must first be useful to it. Pratt believed that Native peoples would only be accepted into American society when 1. They were divested of all their lands and cultures and 2. Transformed into producers for the Nation. Doing so he imagined would enable them to achieve their individual destinies, as Americans.

It was the transformation side of the argument where Pratt was able to put into practice his key ideas about the process and goals of assimilation. This meant teaching Native students not only mainstream expectations of gender, work, and individualism, but to invest in the colonial logic expressed by himself, Indian Superintendent Oberly, Henry Dawes, Samuel Chapman Armstrong and a whole list of other assimilation advocates.

Pratt used the location of Carlisle to take advantage of its German-American neighbors, which in rural Pennsylvania included a substantial farming class. “Pratt, already a strong advocate of the idea of environment as the central determination in a man’s life, suggested that students might profit by spending their summers ‘among our farmers to gain practical knowledge for managing their own farms’.”¹¹⁹

To this end, Pratt redesigned the Carlisle outing program he and Armstrong created at Hampton, to train self-sufficient farmers and homemakers. As Pratt explained himself, “the Outing was instituted to gain this essential quality for the Indian. Both the American citizen and the noncitizen Indian must learn that Indians quickly gain this quality when permitted participating experiences.”¹²⁰ Outing was not simply a labor-training program, but in Pratt’s view a way to give Native students access to a practical experience in social assimilation with the American family, on both an individual and National level. This essential quality was learning how to behave on both an economic and cultural level. In his article *From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930*, Robert Trennert argues “As a result, Carlisle consistently refused to send students to city jobs or place them in locations where they might fall into menial occupations.”¹²¹ Yet, the labor and industry that they were being parceled out to perform on local family farms was still a form of cheap menial labor for the families they

¹¹⁹ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) *From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930*. Pacific Historical Review. Vol. 52, No. 3. pp. 270-271

¹²⁰ Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964.

¹²¹ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) *From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930*. Pacific Historical Review. Vol. 52, No. 3. pp. 267-29

went to. Although Pratt claimed otherwise there is little evidence to prove that students were treated as part of the family, or able to gain economic stability because of the program. Pratt was neither concerned with the “industries” accessible to students, or even employment equity, he was following BIA orders.¹²² Yet Trennert asserts that Pratt expected that living and working in the white community would encourage the pupils to ‘enter the organized industries of the country’ on a level equal with whites’. He envisioned his system as producing full equality”.¹²³ Trennert’s argument highlights the distance between colonial rhetoric and colonial logic.

The colonial logic of BIA administrators and educators assumed that Native individuals would someday be fully assimilated into American society, but this was framed as an unspecified date. First it depended on the assimilation rate of the individual, and second because assimilation was not simply having an understanding of American civics and economy, but to be racially invested as well. The assimilation rhetoric on the other hand, gave the short hand version of this process, often making broad claims about the ability of Native students to assimilate on an equal level as their white counterparts. The purpose of the rhetoric was to justify the overarching project, but the actual process came through piecemeal policies, laws, and individual attempts to assimilate one Indian at a time. Pratt argued that the purpose of Carlisle; “to overcome these conditions and conduct the Indian into civilized environment and open a way to his rightful place as a co-equal man and fellow citizen, Carlisle labored from the very start¹²⁴”. The purpose of his argument was not to give an assimilation time line, or concrete steps to equality but to provided a ideal, a framework in which Native students, like their African counterparts would become part of America, as ancillary citizens, then useful in it, and finally could work to become full citizens of it. Thus, the purpose of Carlisle was to counter separation and tribalism by forcing Native students into a space where they would be thoroughly Americanized. Such a space, according to Pratt’s logic, would initiate the process and provide the means towards an eventual and undetermined equality.

While touting “equality” as his end goal, Pratt was more concerned with the dual processes of Detribalization and Americanization. He understood that was not in complete control of what the Americanization process, as it had been set-up long before he adopted it. For one as he argued in his autobiography, that he did not initiate the idea or need for a Native Yeoman class; “As our Indian system contemplated that all Indians should become farmers, I urged that during vacation they have privileges among our farmers to gain practical knowledge for managing their own farms”.¹²⁵ The belief that Native individuals to should be trained to manage their own farms, was not a common curriculum outcome for most students in the late nineteenth century. Rather the educational programs that were offered in the majority of Industrial school that catered to students from problem populations whether Indigenous, African, poor, orphaned or

¹²² Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964.

¹²³ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) *From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930*. *Pacific Historical Review*. Vol. 52, No. 3. pp. 275

¹²⁴ pp. 273 Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964.

¹²⁵ Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press. 1964. pp. 193-4

immigrant was training in agricultural and industrial labor, not management, or ownership. Pratt's argument harkens back to assimilation effort of early nineteenth century, in which the U.S. partnered with domestic missionary groups towards the goal of training Native communities in western farming techniques alongside conversion. Yet the same rhetoric was also common after the development of American Indian Boarding schools, as seen in numerous meetings of the Friends of the Indians, Political Speeches and endless correspondences between agents of the Indian service. Pratt was not simply following the federal government's lead or falling back on an already commonly held assumption, but using it to his advantage by helping to support the ideal of the Indian farmer, even as he knew that this was unlikely for the majority of his students. Moreover, his supporters and a century's worth of American educators had already deemed agricultural education as an acceptable way to reform and American all sorts of students. Thus, just as equality was an ideal, so to was farming, the reality in the meantime being an agricultural laborer.

American agriculture was not instilled to Native communities solely to teach Native peoples how to grow food, as many tribes were already agricultural societies, evidenced by the earliest interactions with Europeans. American farming techniques, just like indigenous techniques, were attached to larger epistemologies about land, gender, spirituality and political economy. Thus, although the farming model may not have been Pratt's idea or even preference he was able to use it to shape a program that fit his first objectives to detribalize and Americanize.

When Pratt did speak about incorporating Native peoples into the labor market, which, he did quite often, he focused less on the actual industry, whether farming or mechanical work, and more on its intended purpose and outcome. For example, in a discussion held at the, 1894 12th annual meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference, Pratt elaborated on labor;

My way of getting the Indians to work would be simply to follow the same methods we do with all others and give them work where the work is, not to try further to keep them together, and continue thinking we are somehow going to accomplish great things by continuing the tribes. The system is not American. I do not believe it is Christian. I do not believe the Lord ever intended it that way.¹²⁶

In this excerpt, Pratt shows his determination to break apart the tribes. First, he argues that getting Native people to work is "simple," almost making it a non-issue by claiming that the process should be the same with them as with "others," (presumably recent immigrants and/or racialized communities). This deflects any concerns that his audience might have about the issue while leaving room for him to focus on what he perceives as the real problem; tribalism. Pratt was not just seeking equality; he was interested in an equality that held up specific epistemological boundaries that promoted American

¹²⁶. Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian. (1887-1904). *Proceedings of the ... annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*. [New York: Lake Mohonk Conference]. Internet Archive pp. 69-70 <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=wu.89066407420;view=1up;seq=5> HathiTrust Digital Library. April 16, 2016.

Christian morals/views. This is well expressed in the last portion of his speech where he condemns the tribal system, claiming that it is not American, not Christian, and finally invoking the intentions of the “Lord” to sway his audience.

The act of Colonialism is messy and unpredictable but almost always complicated. In this instance of Pratt’s colonial development, he believed he was an advocate of Native peoples humanity, even while trying to strip them of their cultures, and thus he also had the gravest concern for their health and treatment. For example, when he first established Carlisle he worked diligently to procure sufficient food rations, after the BIA tried to give him rations which he felt were “wholly inadequate”. Pratt explains in his autobiography; “it would be impossible for me to conduct a school of hungry children with any hope of success, and requested that I be authorized to use the army ration table”¹²⁷. Based on his actions to procure adequate food rations for his students, it is clear that he at least was aware of the basic nutritional needs of the students. However, Pratt’s concern was not solely attached to the needs of the students but rested in his apprehension for the success of the school and its larger assimilation ideology. Pratt took a patriarchal approach, in which he saw to the basic necessities of his students as well as trying to ensure their equal treatment as “Americans,” while at the same time policing their behavior and progress.

This patriarchal treatment of Carlisle students carried over in many ways but especially to the Outing Program. During a student’s placement, Pratt claimed “each patron in charge of a pupil was required to send in a monthly report and at the close of the outing a final brief of the student’s worth and conduct”¹²⁸. These monthly and/or final reports were far from careful attention to the well being of outing students. These reports tracked the student’s behavior and conduct, ensured they were enrolled in near by schools, and collected any money earned. What they did not ensure the safety or respectable treatment of the students; much less equal pay while they were in the program, nor equal opportunity once they entered the labor market on their own. Students were told to return home and implement their education but were not provided the tools or means necessary to recreate or build a farm the same on their own allotment.

The outing program, considered the capstone to the Carlisle School experience was more realistically a short-term necessity to Pratt’s long-term assimilation goals. From the start he argued for the integration of Native students into local public schools and continued provide some academic curriculum, at the most basic levels. Before students were allowed to apply for an outing position they were required to complete at least two years of coursework at the school. But this course work was focused on preparing them to enter American society, to communicate in English and maintain American morals and social customs, not to prepare them for secondary school. Once they had been accepted into the Carlisle outing program they were expected to continue their studies at the local public schools, where it was believed they would be further indoctrinated in Americanization.

¹²⁷ Pratt, Richard Henry. (1983) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Ed. Robert M. Utley. University of Nebraska Press 1964 pp. 233

¹²⁸ Pratt, Richard Henry. *Battlefield and Classroom: Four decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. University of Nebraska Press 1964. pp. 312.

By no means was this a perfect system. There was criticism from all sides and neither Pratt nor the majority of his students made much headway in actually achieving any kind of real equity in employment or training, much less broad social or political equality, but that was never the actual immediate intention. The Carlisle and Hampton models as well as later BIA schools prepared students to enter the labor market as ancillary citizens, with an eventual goal and possibility of equality through racial and cultural erasure. It is clear the part that Pratt and many others played in the assimilation trajectory as a key founder of federally funded Indian education, what is less recognizable is his role, alongside Armstrong, as the founders of the first short-term relocation programs, the outing program, which was a precursor to later relocation programs.

Although Carlisle, Hampton and every other Indian school was unable to provide equality for all any of its students it did foster Indian advocacy from within. One such change was the development of a continental wide form of pan-Indianism, in which students no longer perceived themselves as only belonging to their tribe/Nation, but a larger body of Indians whose, experiences, histories, and beliefs they recognized as similar to their own. These movements also saw the rise of a new cohort of Native American intellectuals. A handful of individuals were able to use the skills they developed at the schools, whether academic, artistic or athletic, to create nuanced strategies which they used to navigate the American socio-political system in order to advocate for both their own communities and Native Americans more generally. Thus, if nothing else, Carlisle and Hampton laid the foundation for new forms of activism, advocacy and navigation, centered on pan-Indianism and a repertoire of intellectual underpinnings. Including western and non-western theories and/or world-views. Moving into the twentieth century all pretenses of providing a space for social-economic mobility were dropped, even at Carlisle and Indian education shifted to sheer exploitation.

Westward Expansion: adoption of outing program in the west

The outing program had been a part of the boarding school system for well over a decade when it was expanded into western Indian boarding schools. “The first actual use of the outing system in the West came in 1889 when William Beadle of the Chemawa (formally Forest Grove) School sent a dozen boys to work on neighborhood farms.”¹²⁹ However, other western schools were not far behind Chemawa’s example, as Phoenix, Sherman, Stuart and many other federal boarding schools in the west established their own programs. According to some these western institutions turned the outing program inside out; “what had been created as an apprentice device to incorporate Indian children into American society became a child labor system intended primarily for the benefit of the non-Indian community.”¹³⁰ Yet, the western transition, maintained all if not most of the same elements of their Eastern counterparts.

While the western institutions preserved in tact the fundamental elements of the outing program in the western schools expanded the program in ways that the eastern

¹²⁹ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. Pacific Historical Review. Vol. 52, No. 3 pp. 267-291. pp. 276

¹³⁰ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. Pacific Historical Review. Vol. 52, No. 3 pp. 267-291. pp. 277

schools, only dreamed of. The BIA transition of the boarding school institution was threefold. First BIA rhetoric and policy changed to focus on job “training”, second the locations were either within or connected to larger urban areas and third the economic needs of surrounding non-Native communities prevailed over the social and economic integration of Native children.¹³¹ It is this transformation, based on the eastern outing program that motivated and organized the BIA employment agency model that would later be utilized during the Relocation era.

While all three components were necessary for the transformation of the outing program and BIA schooling with it, it was the changing rhetoric, policies and educational practices of its administrators that created the social-political climate necessary for this next step in ancillary-citizenship. “By 1900 most of the humanitarian reformers who had directed Indian policy were being replaced by professional bureaucrats as the civil service system came into full operation. They held ideas in dramatic contrast to Pratt.”¹³²

Unlike Pratt and his counterparts, who these new “professional bureaucrats” no longer spoke of equality or incorporation as they argued Native peoples did not possess the capability to assimilate either at the rate or status that Pratt had envisioned. With these arguments they sought not to dismantle the educational system, but to streamline its purpose. Instead of dividing the students time between rudimentary academics and industrial training this new cohort of professionals “tended to support local programs that seemed to train Indian students for menial jobs or a return to the reservation”.¹³³ Through this transformation Littlefield points out that the process of incorporating indigenes into the wage labor force accelerated and the schools became even more subordinate in the process.”¹³⁴ Her argument that western schools accelerated the integration of students into the corporate capitalistic system highlights how these school developed the outing program into employment agencies. However, the assertion that the schools became “even more subordinate in the process”, takes away from the fact that earlier models, such as Hampton and Carlisle, used the same practices with similar outcomes, even if they did not use employment agencies as their central employment base. The western schools illuminate the process and development of BIA employment agencies.

Industrial training had been a key component of Indian schools for nearly twenty years, but the leaders of the BIA moved to make it the central outcome. This transition can be seen in the 1903 Report of Superintendent of Indian Affairs, in which then superintendent W. N. Hailmann, asserted:

¹³¹ Jacobs, M. (2007). Working on the Domestic Frontier: American Indian Domestic Servants in White Women's Households in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1920-1940. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 28(1/2).

--Littlefield, Alice. (1993) “Learning to Labor: Native American Education in the United States, 1880-1930.” *The Political Economy of North American Indians*. Ed. John Moore. Norman University of Oklahoma Press, 43-59.

--Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. *Pacific Historical Review*. Vol. 52, No. 3 pp. 267-291.

¹³² Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. *Pacific Historical Review*. Vol. 52, No. 3 pp.283

¹³³ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. *Pacific Historical Review*. Vol. 52, No. 3 pp.283

¹³⁴ Littlefield, Alice. (1993) “Learning to Labor: Native American Education in the United States, 1880-1930.” *The Political Economy of North American Indians*. Ed. John Moore. Norman University of Oklahoma Press, pp. 51

...there can be no doubt that the stress of work on the part of the schools should be placed upon industrial and manual training rather than upon literary advancement. It is chiefly through the industrial arts and manual skill that the Indian is to be brought to that degree of self help which shall render him independent of Government support in the work of self preservation and of maintenance of a family.¹³⁵

Through his speech it is clear that the superintendent was interested in industrial and manual labor to foster a basic self-sufficiency that would lead to the end goal of ending governmental support of Native peoples. For him, schools only needed to teach children to work and maintain a family. This was not a new argument, what it was a new rhetoric, which opened and uncovered of the intentions of the schools, which did away with the frame that schools were part of a benevolent mission of civilization He goes on to explain how academics could be used in order to support this training,

Of course he is to acquire the arts of reading and writing, inasmuch as these are indispensable in his daily intercourse with others, and inasmuch as the practice of these arts will enable him to acquire the garnered knowledge of the race concerning things of nature, of human art, of history, and of political and religious life.¹³⁶

The argument that the students would need academics to learn about nature, art, history and political and religious life, is a clear example of how BIA staff disregarded the cultural knowledge of the children as either non-existent or a deficit to their education. In either case, it was necessary to inculcate Native students with American beliefs dubbed “knowledge” by the superintendent.¹³⁷ Just as they had been used in earlier Boarding Schools basic academics were useful for the moral and cultural messages they proselytized to the students, especially in regards to the position of their communities within the larger framework of U.S. conquest.

Advanced academics on the other hand were unnecessary, as they neither helped to support work, family or inculcate moral beliefs. The Superintendent explains:

But advanced literary training is not needed for these purposes, and in Indian schools it may become relatively a hindrance rather than a help by drawing away the pupil’s attention from things which are indispensable to him, while at the same time he is incapable of deriving from these studies any real benefits. So-called higher education should be confined to those

¹³⁵ United States. Office of Indian Affairs. Superintendent of Indian Schools. *Report of the Superintendent of Indian schools*. Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1903. pp.10

¹³⁶ United States. Office of Indian Affairs. Superintendent of Indian Schools., . *Report of the Superintendent of Indian schools*. Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1903 pp.10

¹³⁷ See Adams, D. (1995). *Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas. Which has a long discussion about the use of “history” in Indian boarding school classrooms to both inculcate Native children with American beliefs, while also showing them their inferior status.

who can derive real benefits therefrom, both as students and in subsequent life purists.¹³⁸

Ultimately the schools were in a business of the government, working to assimilate Native students, in mass, to enter the American economic system. This work was not focused on the variety of education received, but on providing an education suitable to the labor positions these students would enter. Neither, the process of learning new morals and values, nor learning to labor, for yourself or for others, required higher learning or advanced curriculum. As Hailmann spouted, higher education in this space was not beneficial, but rather a hindrance to the transformation being sought by the BIA. Mr. Charles Doxon echoed this connection between socio-economic place and education, during his speech on industrial training at the 1904 Lake Mohonk conference.

White boys and girls take up the higher branches of industrial education with enthusiasm, fascination and a firm hope which helps them to rise rapidly to that standard of knowledge that secures them the reward for which they seek. But in the case of the race found on this continent, those permanent habits are so different from yours; we cannot suppose that it will succeed quite as fast...the reservation system became established and we are allowed to live in barbarism even to this day; and in some parts of the country where the tribes were supposed to be in the midst of civilization, we have gone into even worse than barbarism, because having lost our primitive virtues and being in our infancy, we can reach only the lowest fruits on the tree of civilization; the best grow on the higher branches beyond our reach.¹³⁹

What initially makes this speech stand apart from Hailmann's, or any other policy maker, is the position of the oration. Doxon uses first person tenses, such as "we," and "our," throughout his piece to underscore his position within a larger Native community. What makes his arguments significant, is his internalization of cultural inferiority as he relies on the popular 19th century theory of cultural evolution, which situated Native peoples, at the lower stages of civilization. Using this theory, he argues that it is because his people, live in a status of barbarism (or worse) that they are unable to achieve either higher training or life outcomes at the same pace as his [their] white counterparts. Thus, using this step-ladder approach he explains to his audience that Native students can only learn so much.

The arguments made by Hailmann and Doxon were not new, or even nuanced; "racism" had always been a major obstacle facing BIA school graduates. Prior to this proposed transition even Native students in the "private" schools of the east, such as Carlisle and Hampton, were not able to achieve the equal status or employment opportunities that the school's founders had anticipated.

¹³⁸ United States. Office of Indian Affairs. Superintendent of Indian Schools. *Report of the Superintendent of Indian schools*. Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1903. pp.10

¹³⁹ Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian. (1904-1907). *Proceedings of the ... annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*. [New York: Lake Mohonk Conference]. pp.33Internet Archive <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=wu.89066407420;view=1up;seq=5> HathiTrust Digital Library. April 16th 2016.

The “failure” that seems almost inevitable given the “task” of forcing a whole other worldview onto students as well as European Americans. Just because Pratt argued that Native peoples had the capacity to be “equals” did not take away the pervasiveness and/or benefits of racism.

Moreover, in order to be on equal footing with their “white” counterparts, aspiring Native employees, entrepreneurs, and professionals would not only need an adequate training/education in the physical techniques of their particular trade but also a thorough understanding of the worth and necessity of their labor. Lastly, once they had been educated on labor, they would have needed access to capital, which aside from the conundrum of land allotments that tied up any capital they may have “possessed,” they simply did not have.

Late nineteenth century BIA agents continued to further the work of their predecessors, by openly advocating for the containment of Indian education to create an underclass of ancillary citizens; laborers and domestic servants. This open colonial discourse did not change the purpose of education, which had always been to regulate Native students to the socio-economic position of the labor force of full citizens. But it did allow room for BIA agents to prop up one of the largest federally funded domestic and menial labor employment services as “education.”

This is not to argue that Indian education could have been better, more responsive to the needs and desires of Native peoples, or even able to understand what these were. Most Native peoples and/or communities did not want incorporated into the American mainstream and/or capitalistic system, much less without their languages, beliefs/morals, religions and cultures in tact. However, given the complicated and diverse reasons that children were sent to “school,” both parents, and students wanted to ensure they received an education that would allow for them to improve the economic and political position of their communities, as is evidenced through the Spotted Tail example.

Through his comparison of the Carlisle and Phoenix outing programs Trennert creates a clear picture of the how the other components of the BIA transformation helped shaped the organization and purpose of these western institutions. The location, of the schools, near or in urban setting further motivated administrators to place “heavy emphasis on the outing system from the beginning.” The Phoenix school, actually located inside Phoenix, enabled it to ultimately [develop] a program second in size only to Carlisle.”¹⁴⁰ Second, the surrounding Anglo community, which “in contrast to their Quaker counterparts in Pennsylvania, ... were not interested in providing Indian students with an educational experience. Their concern was for cheap menial labor, and school administrators went along with local demands because they needed public support.”¹⁴¹

¹⁴⁰ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. Pacific Historical Review. Vol. 52, No. 3 pp. 273

¹⁴¹ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. Pacific Historical Review. Vol. 52, No. 3 pp. 291

Both public and internal BIA reports of the period, reflect the anticipation of Native labor from schools. As early as 1903, the Report of superintendent of Indian Schools adopted several resolutions including:

Resolved that we deprecate the present indiscriminate returning of trained children to reservations, and its enforced idleness and attendant evils, instead of urging them to become self-supporting citizens by finding employment away from the tribe, and further urge that the various boarding schools in connection with the associations interested in the Indian education establish bureaus of employment to assist such young people in finding employment and to live moral, upright lives.¹⁴²

Within this resolution there are several assumptions being made about the connection between employment and moral aptitude. But underlying this Christian moral rhetoric is the idea that schools should facilitate employment agencies. This shows the desire of BIA officials to be in control of the employment placement of Native students. Which both extends the period of surveillance over these students and also changes the purpose of the schools from education to one of employment agency.

The Pima Indian agent Cornelius W. Crouse excitedly reported that ““The farmers and fruit growers in the vicinity of the school are ready to employ these boys and girls as soon as their labor becomes sufficiently skill full to pay them” while, Hardwood Hall superintendent of the Phoenix school, to which Crouse had been referring, assured that ““an education can be given hand in hand with practical work which enables a living to be made from the start. The school can thus serve as an employment agency, whereby the deserving Indian pupil can secure employment as soon as qualified.””¹⁴³ Unlike his predecessors, which, promoted the “heart and the hand,” pedagogy, Hall and his counterparts were by and large interested only in the labor aspect of the schools, even referring to it as an “employment agency.” Hall’s motives were not simply a reflection of BIA rhetoric surrounding manual training but a reflection of the surrounding community which he himself pointed out when he described their feelings; ““the hiring of an Indian youth is not looked upon the people of this valley from a philanthropic standpoint. It is simply a matter of business””.¹⁴⁴

The belief that Native youth could be part of the labor force rather than philanthropic wards was held throughout America, whether on the western frontier or in the east. While the schools were opened under the assimilation policy, ushered in by Ulysses S. Grant’s Peace Policy of 1869, the American government vis-a-via the cavalry and other federal officials continued to operate under a policy of containment and open hostilities throughout much of the west. There is no direct timeline for these policies, as individual colonial agents, such as game wardens, Indian agents, and local law officials,

¹⁴² United States. Office of Indian Affairs. Superintendent of Indian Schools. *Report of the Superintendent of Indian schools*. Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1903. pp. 83

¹⁴³ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. *Pacific Historical Review*. Vol. 52, No. 3 pp. 280

¹⁴⁴ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. *Pacific Historical Review*. Vol. 52, No. 3. pp. 280

continued to enforce strict reservation/Indian boundaries well into the twentieth century. In his book *Indians in unexpected Places*, Philip Deloria argues that the American public felt Indian pacification was completed with the Massacre of Wounded Knee in 1891 (at that time named the battle of wounded Knee).¹⁴⁵ Although military pacification operations were carried out by federal agents, vis-a-vi the U.S. Calvary, they were habitually initiated and/or exacerbated by local Euro-American settlers who still viewed the extermination of Native peoples as the best course for American policy. While these open hostilities, at least those that were visible to the general public, lessened over time, these conflicts were still fresh in the memories of most western patrons who viewed themselves and American society in the middle of a complex battle over race, nation and space.

The view of unpacified Native peoples as a threat to American society, helps to explain both the Indian removal and assimilation policies, but it still does not explain the rapid expansion and support of western communities, who were willing to not only support boarding schools but allow Native children into their homes and businesses. Unlike cities in the East where the majority of domestic and manual labors came from newly emancipated African Americans in the South and Eastern European/Irish immigrants in the north. Such readily available labor forces were not found in West.

Because of the rapid expansion of western communities and the lack of cheap, reliable, manual labor, demand considerably outweighed supply. For instance, even as late as 1930s “The superintendent of Carson Indian School noted... , that in the Bay Area, there were ‘more applications for girls to assist in families than there are girls.’”¹⁴⁶ The Phoenix community “tended to view the institution as reservoir of cheap labor. Valley housewives, faced with a shortage of domestic servants, expected school authorities to provide them with “properly instructed and trained” girls. Fruit growers took and even more active interest in Indian boys.”¹⁴⁷ This readily accessible cheap labor provided by The Indian schools, not only filled an economic void but was viewed as a vital part of the economic growth for area businessmen and as a necessary luxury for middle and upper-class housewives.

Leading up to this transition, BIA agents and their advisories had used the rhetoric of American nationalism to support it. But as the programs expanded, they like the communities that surrounded them, began to both utilize the techniques and terminology of capitalism. According to Jacobs in 1929, A BIA administrator, described the “boarding schools as factories that were turning raw material-Indian Children-into useful goods...” stating... ‘we must labor with a more definite aim in these schools to fashion this human material into something for which there is a demand,’ “he wrote. ‘Until we have done this we can hope for great success in finding location for our products.’”¹⁴⁸ Describing the students as “human material” and “products,” both dehumanizes them and shows that for

¹⁴⁵ Deloria, P. (2004). *Indians in unexpected places* (Culture America). Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas. pp166

¹⁴⁶ Jacobs, M. (2007). Working on the Domestic Frontier: American Indian Domestic Servants in White Women's Households in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1920-1940. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 28(1/2), pp.166

¹⁴⁷ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. *Pacific Historical Review*. Vol. 52, No. 3 pp. 278

¹⁴⁸ Jacobs, M. (2007). Working on the Domestic Frontier: American Indian Domestic Servants in White Women's Households in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1920-1940. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 28(1/2), 165-199. pp.171.

this administrator at least their “worth” was measured in their ability to labor. This was not an unusual belief as Littlefield points out:

The necessity for Indians to work is one of the most common themes in policy statements of the period. To be sure, some educators may have assumed that their graduates would work for themselves as independent farmers or artisans. Nonetheless, the Indian education program was repeatedly defended to the public in terms of its ability to teach Indians to work for others.¹⁴⁹

It was not enough, then for this new BIA to unabashedly advertise the exploitation of Indian youth through their labor. But as Littlefield argues to use it to defend the program as a whole, by also advertising its ability to provide a newly trained servant class, for western Americans to draw from.

The schools themselves were either changed or built to accommodate the creation of this new domestic class, by focusing on industrial training and developing their own employment agencies. The Phoenix school was close enough to the urban population of Phoenix to handle both the training and employment of its students similar to Pratt. As before, girls were trained in domestic arts, while boys labored in the farming industries. In the East coast Pratt was forced to send some of his students to factories and resorts, in addition to the domestic and farm work he had initially set up.¹⁵⁰ The western schools utilized the same model, sending their students to farms, orchards, factories and personal homes to be domestic workers. However, unlike Carlisle or Phoenix, which had a large demand for local placements, many western schools such as Stewart, Chamouwa and Sherman, relied on BIA employment agencies, rather than the actual school to place students. These employment agencies did so well in their placements that in 1928 the Annual report of the Board of Indian commissioners argued “there should be two distinct employment service activities—one for reservation Indians and the other for school graduates and students, but cooperating with each other where joint action is possible”.¹⁵¹

The San Francisco Bay Area office, established in 1918, was the largest and longest running the BIA employment agency on the west coast. Bonnie Royce, “wife of the superintendent of the Stewart Indian School in Carson City, Nevada” was hired as the first outing Matron and served...until the early 1930s.¹⁵² Jeannette Traxler, who was hired as Royce’s assistant in 1929 took over when Royce left, but was replaced by Mildred Van Every only a few years later in 1934 and “worked in the post until 1946” when the agency was closed down.¹⁵³ The office itself moved around the Bay area. It was

¹⁴⁹ Littlefield, Alice. (1993) “Learning to Labor: Native American Education in the United States, 1880-1930.” *The Political Economy of North American Indians*. Ed. John Moore. Norman University of Oklahoma Press. pp. 53

¹⁵⁰ Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. *Pacific Historical Review*. Vol. 52, No. 3 pp. 275

¹⁵¹ United States. Board of Indian Commissioners (1928). *59th Annual report of the Board of Indian Commissioners to the Secretary of the Interior*. Washington: Govt. Print. Office. pp.7

¹⁵² Jacobs, M. (2007). Working on the Domestic Frontier: American Indian Domestic Servants in White Women's Households in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1920-1940. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 28(1/2) pp. 173

¹⁵³ Jacobs, M. (2007). Working on the Domestic Frontier: American Indian Domestic Servants in White Women's Households in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1920-1940. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 28(1/2). pp. 173

initially established in Berkeley, moved to Oakland, and finally to San Francisco.¹⁵⁴ Although the office initially placed students and alumni through the efforts of reservation agencies, outing matrons and simple word of mouth the program expanded to offer placements for Native adolescents not affiliated with the schools.¹⁵⁵

Unlike most employment agencies, the BIA outing program viewed those it placed as their wards. Matrons and other agency employees kept detailed records on each placement, including their family background, work history, payment history and behavior. Many women were able to assert some agency related to their employment, such as salary, duties, and even placement. This was not the case with social activities. Their whereabouts, friends, and romantic relationships, were heavily monitored by employers and matrons, who tried to force a strict Victorian code on the women. Because the consequences of being found guilty of “improper” behavior could be severe, and the temporary manner that the majority of women viewed their placement “—as part of the patchwork of economic strategies and perhaps as a youthful adventure-before returning to their reservations and Rancherias,” they tried to navigate the constant surveillance as discretely as possible.¹⁵⁶

Even with the strict boundaries a large majority, as high as thirty percent according to the San Francisco Bay office records, either ran away or were found in contempt of the Victorian code. While punishment depended on the supposed offense some of the more severe cases included being forcibly placed in mental institutions for non-compliance, and having ones’ children adopted out to non-Native families.

Conclusion

Whether sent to a nearby day school or a boarding school thousands of miles from home, the purpose of BIA Indian schools remained the same; to transform Native peoples into ancillary citizens. There was an unwritten exclusion clause attached to this citizenship, as Pratt describes in his lecture, “not full, complete citizenship, but possible-probable—citizenship, and on the highway and near to it”. Of course, Pratt was using African Americans as an example, who at the time of his speech had been granted emancipation and citizenship. Yet he, among many other educators of his day were fully aware of the stark inequalities this citizenship granted, even if for them it seemed natural. Unfortunately as African American scholars, community members, organizations, and activists have pointed out time and time again, many of these inequalities persist while a space for their full citizenship still appears an ambiguous and often strenuous goal. By using this example Pratt was trying to show that although Native peoples would not initially be granted full citizenship or rights as American citizens, they could achieve this goal in due time. However, in order to achieve the full citizenship Pratt spoke of and advocated for, Native peoples not only had to fully assimilate, but detach themselves of

¹⁵⁴ Jacobs, M. (2007). Working on the Domestic Frontier: American Indian Domestic Servants in White Women's Households in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1920-1940. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 28(1/2). pp. 173

¹⁵⁵ Jacobs, M. (2007). Working on the Domestic Frontier: American Indian Domestic Servants in White Women's Households in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1920-1940. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 28(1/2). pp. 175

¹⁵⁶ Jacobs, M. (2007). Working on the Domestic Frontier: American Indian Domestic Servants in White Women's Households in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1920-1940. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 28(1/2). pp. 167

any vestiges of Indianness, including their relationships with community, land, spirituality, and race. Most however were either unwilling or unable to make such a transition, thus they were groomed for a second-class citizenship. As K. Tsianina Lomawaima argues

Blacks have long known that US citizenship has not meant rights to vote, and Indians before and after 1924 have seen that citizenship does not mean exemption from wardship...Supreme Court rulings from 1908 to 1916 declared that citizen status did not exempt Indians from federal guardianship. The need to block off access to power, economic development, and private property ownership, coupled with need to preserve domesticated Indianness, directed US construction of a distinctive citizen-but-ward status for American Indians.¹⁵⁷

In this sense the BIA and larger US government agents not only wanted to strip Native children of their own epistemological power and inculcate them with the morals and values of American conquest, but gain control over their economic and political agency. Part of this control came in the expansion of the BIA Boarding school system and employment agencies in the late nineteenth century, in which, American Indian children were prepared to enter the lowest sectors of the new industrial capitalistic system. Thus, regardless of their individual educational pursuits, each child had at the very least learned to labor for the benefit of first class American citizens.

Even as the “Assimilation” era came to an end, along with dozens of Boarding schools, the process of turning Native children into American laborers persisted becoming more widespread and systematic in the early twentieth century. The next chapter examines many of the ideas that fueled the transition of federally supported Indian education and labor through an in-depth analysis of the 1928 Merriam Report.

¹⁵⁷ Lomawaima, K. Tsianina. (Summer 2013). “The Mutuality of Citizenship and Sovereignty.” *American Indian Quarterly*. Vol. 37 Issue 3. pp330-351. pp. 338

Chapter 2

“The transition must not be pushed too fast”: Will Carson Ryan and the BIA’s View of the Transition of Native Students to Public Schools

As the outing program expanded on the west coast, so too did the criticisms of how the program was changing. In his article *From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian outing system 1878-193*; Robert Trennert argues “the deviation became so acute that by 1908 Pratt himself had become a critic of the western application of the outing system,” showing that even the founder and biggest supporter of the outing system held issue with its expansion.¹⁵⁸

By closely examining Pratt’s criticisms it becomes clear that they were as much about the location as they were about the application of the outing system at these new western schools. Although he may not have expressed his views in open until 1908, the reasons for his critique was apparent much earlier. In his 1908 article “The Indian Industrial School: Its Origin, Purpose, Progress, and Difficulties Surmounted he gives a scathing review of the schools outing program stating “Not in one of these [western] schools,¹⁵⁹ however, did they carry out with any zeal the outing system which was the main and by far the most helpful feature at Carlisle, and the one great reason in favor of non-reservation schools.¹⁶⁰” He continues to explain that this lack of zeal is due to the location of the schools, the major issue being that they were too close to the reservations of the students they serviced. Moreover, Pratt asserts that these locations were not chosen by accident but as he argues

The Indian Bureau began early to militate against the non-reservation schools. Its first efforts were largely exerted to have new non-reservation schools located as near the reservation as possible and very many of the later schools were so placed. This feature practically eliminated the out at such schools, for it was much easier for pupils to run away from their outing homes and go to their reservations, and such schools became scarcely better than reservation boarding schools.¹⁶¹

One of his top concerns was the ineffectiveness of the western outing programs due to location, which he clearly believes were an intentional slight against non-reservation schools and programs, including his own. He does however applaud the fact that like the eastern schools, these western counterparts also accept students from multiple tribes

¹⁵⁸ Trennert, Robert A. (1983). *From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1879-1930*. University of California Press Pacific Historical Review, Vol. 52, No. 3 pp267.

¹⁵⁹ pp22-3Pratt specifically references Chemawa, near Salem Oregon, Haskell Institute in Kansas, Genoa in Nebraska and Albuquerque New Mexico.

-- Pratt Brig. Gen. R. H. (1908) *The Indian Industrial School: Its Origin, Purposes, Progress and Difficulties Surmounted*. The Hamilton Library Association Carlisle, Pennsylvania. University of Texas Repository Library pp23

¹⁶⁰ pp23 Pratt Brig. Gen. R. H. (1908) *The Indian Industrial School: Its Origin, Purposes, Progress and Difficulties Surmounted*. The Hamilton Library Association Carlisle, Pennsylvania. University of Texas Repository Library <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/23472/059171660224380.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y>.

¹⁶¹ Pratt Brig. Gen. R. H. (1908) *The Indian Industrial School: Its Origin, Purposes, Progress and Difficulties Surmounted*. The Hamilton Library Association Carlisle, Pennsylvania. University of Texas Repository Library <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/23472/059171660224380.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y>.

“which broke up tribal clannishness and hastened the acquirement of English.”¹⁶² Showing that he did not completely reject the western institutions.

It is not until after his death that any concerns he had, had, about the actual organization or application of the western schools was brought to light. In her biography of Pratt entitled *Pratt: The Red Man's Moses*, Elaine Goodale Eastman argues that he was a proponent of the expansion of the outing system stating “Pratt believed, [the system] should be made to reach practically all Indian youths eligible for training.”¹⁶³ In his own words: ‘it enforced participation-the supreme Americanizer’.¹⁶⁴ His statement should come as no surprise given his extensive work in the outing system. But she used it to set the stage for her second argument, by showing that Pratt whole heartedly believed and advocated for the outing program because he thought it ensured the assimilation of Native youth into American society.

After establishing Pratt's position on the outing Program, Eastman deviates from it. What makes her description of Pratt's relationship to the outing system differ from any remarks he made during his life, is her assertion that he may or may not have understood the full repercussions of this expansion stating “No other non-reservation school was as favorably situated as Carlisle to press the plan, and abuses may have crept in later, in connection with industrialized agriculture in the far West”.¹⁶⁵ There is no doubt that Pratt believed Carlisle's location, far from reservations made it the best situated to the outing program. Moreover, it is clear that Eastman, and possibly her colleagues within the Friends of the Indians viewed the placing of BIA students as farm laborers for industrialized agriculture as an abuse of the outing system. Especially given that many of these Eastern philanthropists purported that students in the west were not given the same support/regulations as students from Carlisle, which included finishing at least two years of BIA school before applying to the program, close supervision of outing families and the mandatory placement of students in the nearest public school. As I argued in chapter two, however Eastman's argument is a case of difference in rhetoric not practice. Pratt argued that he provided opportunities that the western schools did not. Nevertheless, students in both the eastern and western BIA schools were provided very little preparation, education or oversight before being placed in the outing system, and were subject to the same outcomes as ancillary citizens. Regardless of where a student was placed, whether factory, large agricultural companies or small family farms, they were there to produce labor.

What makes this statement significant is not what Eastman or others felt about the system, but the question as to whether Pratt, the architect of the system, actually perceived these as abuses of outing in light of his starch beliefs on detribalization. Especially when we consider the fact that he viewed slavery of African-Americans as a legitimate pathway to civilization.¹⁶⁶ The only reply or support that Eastman provides in

¹⁶² Pratt Brig. Gen. R. H. (1908) *The Indian Industrial School: Its Origin, Purposes, Progress and Difficulties Surmounted*. The Hamilton Library Association Carlisle, Pennsylvania. University of Texas Repository Library University of Texas Repository Library <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/23472/059171660224380.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y>.

¹⁶³ Eastman, Elaine Goodale.(1935) *Pratt: The Red Man's Moses*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman. pp.223

¹⁶⁴ Eastman, Elaine Goodale.(1935) *Pratt: The Red Man's Moses*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman. pp. 223

¹⁶⁵ Eastman, Elaine Goodale.(1935) *Pratt: The Red Man's Moses*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman. pp. 223.

¹⁶⁶ For further discussion on this see chapter 1.

this vein is her statement that “for that matter, Pratt seems to have distrusted the future of the great open spaces and habitually reversed Horace Greeley’s famous maxim.”¹⁶⁷ For Eastman then, Pratt was distrustful of the west, hence her reference to a once well-known cry to “Go West, young Man, and grow up with the country”.¹⁶⁸ But again it is uncertain to what degree if any, Pratt actually believed “his” outing system was ineffectual or even abusive and whether this was because of the location of the schools themselves or the application of the program.

The significance of this question is two-fold, one it continues to support that fact that the outing system had become problematic for at least some of the eastern educators, in the sense that it was appropriately “Americanizing” students, but rather only used them for cheap labor. Along the colonial rhetoric of Eastern schools, Indian educational institutions were initially set up to both socially and economically Americanize in order to push Native students into American society as equals; but somewhere in that process it was argued that western institutions moved away from social education in order to provide cheap labor. That said, this was not an issue for either the Western schools themselves or the BIA, given that they only continued to expand the outing program into a full employment program for both graduates and students in the 1920 and 30s. In short it shows that there were competing rhetoric not competing desires between economy and education. Which resulted in a different framing of the same educational outcomes.

Secondly, this conversation at least shows that Pratt was at odds with both the western non-reservation outing system, as well as the larger BIA system, as it had ramped up its day school and on-reservation programs. This along with Pratt’s undying advocacy of the Carlisle model is key to dismantling the once common held assumption that the Meriam report and the Collier Administration brought a new liberal agenda to the BIA. As I will argue in this chapter the new architect of BIA school agreed with the assessments of both Pratt and Eastman¹⁶⁹, and would work to bring back and expand the Carlisle outing model, in order to make the BIA education more effective and efficient. But the BIA was not interested in going back to its roots in totality, but fusing the foundational elements that Carlisle established with a more expansive view on the reach of Indian schooling. Through the leadership of William Carson Ryan Jr., the BIA education department would devise a blueprint to set up a school to industry pipeline. Which meant schools would no longer compete for students, but be organized in a way that put Indian children, their families, and larger communities on a fast track to ancillary assimilation.

The Meriam Report

While others, including Pratt and Eastman had critiqued the BIA for its ineffective policies and ill treatment of Native peoples for decades, it was not until after

¹⁶⁷ Eastman, Elaine Goodale. (1935) Pratt: The Red Man’s Moses. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman. pp. 223

¹⁶⁸ Eastman, Elaine Goodale. (1935) Pratt: The Red Man’s Moses. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman. pp. 223

¹⁶⁹ Whether Eastman knew or even pointed out these “abuses” in the Western schools before or after the Meriam report is unknown, given the fact that her book was published seven years after the Meriam report.

the first world war that the competing criticism of Eastern liberals and Native American advocates would become loud enough to sway Washington in to action.¹⁷⁰

Contracted by Secretary of the Interior Hubert Work and the Board of Indian Commissioners the now infamous Meriam Report of 1928, also known as *The Problem of the Indian Administration*, was an investigation to address these mounting criticisms directed at the BIA as a whole. The Brookings Institution, under the direction of principal investigator John Meriam, issued the report; Dr. William Carson Ryan was the lead investigator of the Indian education section. As a whole, the Meriam report condemned the BIA for its negligent and deplorable treatment of Native peoples; in the education section this translated into a critique about ineffective and inefficient staff, curriculum, and organization.

Some of the mounting criticisms were directed at the assimilationist pedagogies, and under realized political and economic results of Indian education, especially by former Native students, such as Zitkala-Sá and Angel DeCora, among others. But these criticisms did not fully carry over into the report, particularly in the case of Americanization.¹⁷¹ Instead the majority of the educational section actually supported BIA educational policies and ideologies by concentrating on how reorganize to make them more efficient and effective. In fact, the report pushes to incorporate the entire community into the larger educational assimilation project, not just the children.

The misinterpretation and overuse of this report as an example of liberal Indian policy has had severe consequences. Regardless of how it was viewed when it was first published, it has become a moment of resituating colonization, in which the rhetoric of liberal activists has been compounded with the report, making it, and the policy it helped motivate seem more liberating than it ever was intended to be. The inaccurate analogy of the pendulum, in which Federal Indian law and policy sways back and forth from assimilation to self-determination silences the consistent trajectory of BIA education, that has been demonstrated from the inception of the Indian program at Hampton, one that held vocational training and assimilation at its core. And in doing so has made the connection between assimilation era boarding school discourse and later assimilation policies, such as BIA vocational ed. and relocation, seem as though they are separate conservative swings rather than part of a longer pattern.

This is not to argue that all scholars have been misled by the report, evidenced by a handful of critiques of the report, but rather that it has been misrepresented for so long and by so many that it has become solidified into a larger narrative about a progressive swing further entrenching the notion that the BIA was pro-tribal(ism) and anti-

¹⁷⁰ For more information See:

Eastman, Charles

-- Eastman, C., & Blumenschein, E. L. (1902). *Indian boyhood*. New York: McClure, Phillips &

-- Eastman, C. (1971). *The soul of the Indian* (Series in American studies). New York: Johnson Reprint.

-- Eastman, C. (1915). *The Indian to-day: The past and future of the first American*. Doubleday, Page & company.

--Eastman, C. (1931). *From the deep woods to civilization*. Boston: Little, Brown, and.

La Flesche, F. (1901). *The Middle five: Indian boys at school*. 2d ed. Boston: Small, Maynard & company.

Montezuma, Carlos, 1866-1923. Carlos Montezuma papers, 1890-1922.

Zitkala-Sa (1921) *American Indian Stories*. Washington: Hayworth Publishing House.

¹⁷¹ Waggoner, Linda M. (2008) *Fire Light: The Life of Angel DeCora*, Winnabego Artist. University of Oklahoma Press.

assimilation. As Donald T. Critchlow argues, “Historians, as well as Meriam’s contemporaries, have missed the central message of the report: conditions among Indians could be improved through better administration and better personnel in the Indian Service”.¹⁷² This argument is significant, because it moves beyond the principal rhetoric, to analyze the actual recommendations the report made; recommendations that had little or nothing to do with a shift in ideology or pedagogy. As Critchlow states, “Meriam and his associates were less interested in changing current governmental Indian policies than with ensuring that existing policies were implemented efficiently through a properly organized administration run by well-trained specialists.”¹⁷³ This mismatch between the actual report and the rhetoric surrounding it, has not only had the effect of burring the trajectory of assimilative policies, and the relationship of the BIA with Native peoples, it has cloaked progressive education as Tribally-centered education, rather than the broad-based program, that the authors advocated for, to ensure that both Americanization and economic development were central to the mission, rather than competing missions.

Nowhere is this clearer than in The Meriam Report Chapter on *Education*, where Ryan covers almost every aspect of BIA education including teaching methods, personnel salary schedule; as well as the different institutions within the larger Indian education system: mission, off-reservation; on-reservation, day schools and even public schools. The central theme throughout the educational report is the mismanagement of programs and students’ due to the lack of qualified personnel. There is little discussion in the report on shifting either the educational focus, namely industrial/vocational education, nor the ideological foundations of Americanization, capitalism and Christianization.

For instance, in the section *Chief Changes Needed in Personnel Provisions*, non-“strictly ‘teaching’ staff,” (including vocational staff) are severely chastised along with the administration in charge of these employees for their inadequate training.¹⁷⁴ It is through this critique however, that the authors continue to uphold one of the cornerstones of previous BIA education models. Stating “The most promising feature of Indian educational policy, namely, the determination to provide an educational program that will include as an integral factor industrial and other activities, falls down almost completely as a result of the low standards of training”.¹⁷⁵ The focus on the ineffectualness of the industrial program is essential to understanding the ideals motivating the authors of the report.

The intent, of this critique, at the time it was published was to emphasize the degree to which inadequate training had completely compromised the effectualness of industrial and other unnamed programs. As stated before, this critique is central to the whole of the report. The fact that industry is the one and only identified program, and is highlighted as “the most promising feature” of BIA schooling, shows that they had more in common with contemporary BIA administrators, and in turn government policy makers than most historians are willing to admit.¹⁷⁶ The report “was far from

¹⁷² Critchlow. T. (May 1981) “Lewis Meriam, Expertise, and Indian Reform.” *The Historian* Vol. 43 No. 3. pp. 327

¹⁷³ Critchlow. T. (May 1981) “Lewis Meriam, Expertise, and Indian Reform.” *The Historian* Vol. 43 No. 3. pp.337

¹⁷⁴ this is a sub section of the larger section *The Educational Personnel of the Indian Service*. pp.367

¹⁷⁵ Number five of a list of Six.

¹⁷⁶ Elsewhere in the Meriam Report industry is defined as vocational industry

recommending a radical shift in Indian policy”, as instead of reshaping Indian education, the report continued to keep it within the confines of an Americanized vocational education.¹⁷⁷

While in theory, vocational education seems to accommodate students by providing them with the skills necessary to enter the labor market, the kind of vocational training that students received was low-skill at best, but the majority of the programs taught out of date skills and confined students to the lowest paid labor. The continuation of this kind of vocational education, accessible to the majority of Native students, shows that the authors along with many others, saw low level vocational training, as well as the manual or entry level work, low economic status, and the little social mobility it implied, as a pathway that was suitable for Native students.

Expanding the Assimilation Project through Progressive Education

Given that the Education section both opens up with and is consistently referenced throughout the rest of the education report, it is clear that one of the most significant issues was the locality of federal Indian education. Unlike Pratt who viewed the closeness of the reservations to the schools as a damper on the outing program and the assimilation process, the authors of the report saw an opportunity to expand their programs into the community. In the first several sentences of the first section, “Fundamental Needs”, the authors argue,

The most fundamental need in Indian education is a change in point of view. Whatever may have been the official governmental attitude, education for the Indian in the past has proceeded largely on the theory that it is necessary to remove the Indian children as far as possible from his home environment; whereas the modern point of view in education and social work lays stress on upbringing in the natural setting of home and family life.¹⁷⁸

In this small section the authors put forth what they perceive as the essential changes necessary to revamp Indian education, a shift in pedagogy towards progressive education. The authors do this by claiming that it is a “change in point of view, that is the “most fundamental need in Indian education”. Even as the authors do not mention it by name, the reference to removing Indian children from their homes and instead advocating for local schooling shows that the phasing out of the BIA Boarding School Model is central to this pedagogical shift.

The “modern” education and social work that the author’s reference is none other than the Progressive education movement, best represented by the Progressive Education Association. In his article Progressive education and Native American schools, Joseph Watras argues that in making its criticisms of the Indian Service, the Meriam report

¹⁷⁷ Critchlow, T. (May 1981) “Lewis Meriam, Expertise, and Indian Reform.” *The Historian* Vol. 43 No. 3 pp. 328

¹⁷⁸ Meriam, Lewis (1928) *The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version*. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp 346

followed the views of the Progressive Education Association.¹⁷⁹ This is because Ryan was both a member and later became president of the Progressive Education Association. Therefore, Ryan, among other researchers working on the report ascribed to the principles of progressive education, which as Watras cites, were adopted in 1919 PEA “to permit children to develop naturally, to allow students to choose their own studies so they would be interested in them, to consider teachers as guides, to build the curriculum in accord with scientific studies of child development, to attend to children’s health, and to build cooperative relationships with the children’s homes¹⁸⁰.” While the majority of these principles are referenced throughout the report, most of them ultimately depend upon the ability of American educations to work within the child’s home community. Hence it is the Boarding school that is singled out as the most problematic part of BIA schooling.

That Progressive education was at odds with the current structure of Indian schooling, is obvious, given that the majority of students attended institutions hundreds if not thousands of miles away from their home. However, as several scholars have argued, this did not mean a complete end to BIA boarding schools¹⁸¹ Instead they would be incorporated into the larger system as industrial training schools, rather than general K-12 schools. First off, the BIA did not have the resources to quickly replace boarding schools, and second, the authors, like their predecessors argued for the value in training Native students in vocation and industry.

In the section *The Real Objectives of Indian Education*, the report begins to construct the argument used to justify an industrial education track, i.e. non-academic, as the most promising feature of BIA schooling. The section begins with a brief overview of conflicting views on teaching methodology; “subject matter transmission or mainly experiences¹⁸². The report does not clarify which method or combination thereof, given that it was authored by progressive educators it was most likely preferred to incorporate hand-on and education through experience; rather this short discussion is used as a lead into the larger philosophical question about the definition and purpose of education:

it is historically a mistake to say, that ‘from primitive times reading, writing and arithmetic have formed the foundation of education.’ They have been tools, undoubtedly, but long before they were used as tools there was education of the most important sort. The real goals of education are not ‘reading, writing and arithmetic’- not even teaching the Indians to speak English, though that is important-¹⁸³

¹⁷⁹ Watras, Joseph. (Summer-Fall, 2004) Progressive Education and Native American schools, 1920-1950. Educational Foundations. pp. 85

¹⁸⁰ Watras, Joseph. (Summer-Fall, 2004) Progressive Education and Native American schools, 1920-1950. Educational Foundations. pp.85

¹⁸¹ Watras, Joseph. (Summer-Fall, 2004) Progressive Education and Native American schools, 1920-1950. Educational Foundations. pp. 85

¹⁸² Meriam, Lewis (1928) The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. The Problem of Indian Administration. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp 373

¹⁸³ Meriam, Lewis (1928) The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. The Problem of Indian Administration. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp373

This statement rewrites the historical use and definition of Indian education under the control of colonial agents (from Missionaries to current BIA teachers). It does this first by assuming that the purpose of Indian education had solely been to teach academics, namely reading, writing, and arithmetic, within the confines of English; completely negating the main objective: assimilation. Missionaries taught reading (and to a lesser degree) writing so that Indian children could convert to Christianity including reading and writing Bible verses. English was not taught so that they could understand the worth of their own land within the American economic system, or how political ideologies, which aimed to take their land. Under the BIA English became the exclusive language, not only in reading and writing but speaking, which was done to detribalize, stripping students of their tribal epistemologies, histories and sense of tribal worth.

Secondly by claiming that the 3 R's are "tools" rather than the foundations of education, the authors indicate a shift in mainstream educational pedagogy, which advocates schooling through environment situational learning. While this might be a new pedagogy, the colonial logic of cultural superiority and ethnocentrism had not changed. Native students would still learn how to labor, and they would still have little access to "traditional" academics.

Lastly, by claiming that before these "tools" were applied, education was fundamental, elementary, and basic, is a lead in to an explicit kind of education that is neither concerned with academics or equality. The investigators claim that Indian education needed to focus on the "most important sort" of education, a precursor to these tools (3 Rs), was a clear assertion that Indian education needed to be centered in human development, code word for assimilation... "sound health, both mental and physical, good citizenship in the sense of an understanding participation in community life, ability to earn one's own living honestly and efficiently in a socially worthwhile vocation, comfortable and desirable home and family life, and good character. These are the real aims of education".¹⁸⁴ The descriptions of what the authors define as the actual purpose of education were not just convincing, but music to their ears of their almost exclusively non-Native audience. Of course, American liberals were concerned about the physical, mental and civic development of young, impressionable Indian boys and girls. Of course, they wanted these children to have a stable, self-sufficient, home and family lives. But on whose terms? Who is defining what each of these goals mean? What has to be done to accomplish them? What is the cause and effect relationship here?

The adjectives used to describe the education of Native children give insight into process envisioned by its authors. They are not just concerned with mental and physical health, it must be "SOUND," they must create "GOOD" citizens who can earn an "HONEST" and "EFFICIENT" livelihood in a "WORTHWHILE" vocation, and have a "COMFORTABLE" and "DESIRABLE" home and family life and most importantly a "GOOD" character! When the adjectives are emphasized it becomes quite apparent that the educational model that is being supported is attached to a specific moral and social compass.

¹⁸⁴ Meriam, Lewis (1928) *The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version*. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp 373.

By claiming the transformation and creation of character traits are foundational to “real education,” the authors are subtly promoting assimilation by holding up their own morals and values as the baseline while simultaneously, albeit, indirectly, stating that these children are lacking a proper moral directive. All of which can be remedied through a character centered education, even though these children and their communities have neither sought out such massive transformations nor have such transformations been successful for previous and current BIA educational systems. This argument is significant not only because it continues to support already established methods and pedagogy of BIA schools and staff, but more so because it feels a need to justify its own significance. That this is the true way, this time BIA educators will get it right, because they will not have to focus on “tools” that these children are not ready for, never mind that academics were never a central part of the BIA system.

With the goal of social-cultural development clearly defined as the preferred education model, the report moves on to the section entitled *A Special Curriculum Opportunity* to address what the BIA curriculum should constitute.

Curriculum

This *Special Curriculum Opportunity* section uses the rhetoric of progressive education to promote environment and culturally responsive curriculum while also advocating for the continuation of BIA assimilation practices. Far from promoting tribally based curriculum the report instead advocates for a highly regulated and sanitized version, which has stripped all epistemological value. The report starts “The special curriculum opportunity in Indian schools is for material based upon the ascertained needs of Indian boys and girls and adapted to their aptitudes and interests.”¹⁸⁵ This statement is a partnership of progressive rhetoric and ambiguous guidelines, developed by utilizing seemingly benign and tolerant terminology. In effect, this rhetorical strategy gives enough leeway, to provide staff the opportunity to develop a BIA curriculum that is socially/culturally/ and economically relevant to the lived experiences of Native children. One does not need to work hard to place clear and definite values on the terms at use. Therefore, the needs, aptitudes and interests of Native children, are just as easily used to push tribally centered curriculum, as they are to promote Americanization, a reality that becomes altogether apparent by the end of the section.

Rather than explain what is meant by needs, aptitude or interests the report provides vague suggestions for BIA staff. “Such excellent opportunity exists for community civics based upon both Indian and white community life instead of old-time ‘Civil Government,’ long since abandoned in better American public schools and especially meaningless for the Indian, who needs to have his own tribal, social and civic life used as the basis for an understanding of his place in modern society”.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁵ Meriam, Lewis (1928) *The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version*. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp 372

¹⁸⁶ Meriam, Lewis (1928) *The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version*. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp. 372

Similarly, this statement appears to advocate for Tribal contexts in Indian education, as it calls for the use of “tribal” life, as part of the ways a Native student can understand their role in American society.

However, the authors of the report were unable take into account the destruction that conquest and colonial policies had on Native communities, as they were blinded by their own colonial paradigm which had initiated and supported these actions. In fact it is not until 30 pages later, in the *Adult Education* section that reporters even point out that the U.S. government had any impact on Native communities. The discussion is not focused on the actual destruction, either in a sense of rebuilding Native communities or even taking the time to acknowledge the multiple levels of loss. Instead the authors casually comment “The government has in effect destroyed Indian tribal and community life without substituting anything valuable for it”.¹⁸⁷ This comment quickly mentions the destruction of Native communities by the government, only to argue that it is a problem because this same government has not replaced it with anything valuable. They are not concerned with the physical genocide, removal and containment, much less problematizing governmental attacks on Native social-political systems including law, political organization, and leadership. The only problem they can see is the absence of western institutions, not even control as they had already instituted and maintained paternal dominance over almost every aspect of Native peoples’ daily lives.

Therefore, the very notion that the BIA schools and staff would be allowed, much less have the understanding of Native epistemologies or critical frames to teach anything other than a stripped down version of what the BIA considered “safe” is not only a manipulation of the progressive educational model, it is a cover-up of the colonial aims to reshape Native ideas, histories, and spirituality to align and support the morals, values, and desires of a white protestant American experience.¹⁸⁸

This so-called special opportunity that the authors are arguing for is part of a larger theoretical discourse K. Tsianina Lomawaima and Teresa L. McCarty have defined as the safety zone, which “traces the ‘swings’ of Indian policy-including educational policy-to an ongoing struggle over cultural difference and its perceived threat, or benefit, to a sense of shared American Identity”¹⁸⁹.

Safety zone helps unpack why the report can infer that the proposed curriculum development is progressive; taking into account tribal life, as well as the “past or future of their own people”. While actually working to subdue, de-contextualize and replace Native knowledge with a “safer” Americanized version. This is best exemplified by the report’s discussion of Pueblo arts; “The possibility’s of Indian arts would make a book in themselves; already in one or two places, notably among the Hopis, Indian children have given a convincing demonstration of what they can do with color and design when the

¹⁸⁷ Meriam, Lewis (1928) *The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version*. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp. 400.

¹⁸⁸ Lomawaima, K Tsianina and Teresa L. McCarty. (2006) “How to Remain an Indian: Power Struggles in the Safety zone” in *To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education 1928- 1940* Teachers College Press.

¹⁸⁹ Tsianina Lomawaima and Teresa L. McCarty (2006) *How to Remain an Indian* discuss authenticity and Tribal art in more detail in their chapter “How to Remain an Indian: Power Struggles in the Safety zone” in *To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education 1928- 1940* Teachers College Press. pp.6

school gives them a chance to create for themselves”.¹⁹⁰ Support for southwestern Indian arts by the authors of the Meriam report should come as no surprise, as Southwestern tribes, especially the Pueblos, had been continually held up as the one and only “authentic” Indians, by both policy makers and academics alike. Pueblo art, most notably, basket weaving and pottery, was sought after by American and International collectors for its aesthetic beauty.¹⁹¹ Although Pueblo people were still considered childlike and primitive by these same collectors and policy makers, the consumption of their art by westerners based on an aesthetic value made it safe for production. Meriam reformers, saw this as an opportunity for students to make an enterprise out of the “traditions” of Native students, as part of a pathway to economic self-sufficiency. This did not mean that students would be practicing tribally centered art however, as once these cultural programs were put into place, BIA officials argued that by using “anthropological texts, [they] could produce a finer array of design possibilities than Native students, and federal control was assumed essential to the continued life of Native crafts production”.¹⁹²

The production of tribal art was in name only, as the BIA had complete control, stripping the art of any tribally centered meaning. Their belief in their design superiority dismissed tribal, family, and clan rules surrounding the use of certain basket and pottery designs. Such dismissal is exemplified by the reports focus on the ability of the students to create their own designs, as well as non-Native control over design, without, any discussion on how this would change the student’s position in their community or even how it could affect their spiritual and psychological well being. The special curriculum is a way to exploit and Americanize Native practices in order to fit within the desires of American policy makers to force Native people into the Capitalistic structure. In short it was a foreshadowing of what progressive educators envisioned for Indian education, as it was democratic and culturally competent for in the context of Americanization.

It is in the last recommendation of the special opportunity discussion that the progressive rhetoric becomes transparent; through the explanation of what kinds of educational topics and materials define Indian modernity.

There is such a chance to build up for the Indian schools reading material that shall have some relation to Indian interests, not merely Indian legends, which are good and susceptible of considerable development, but actual stories of modern Indian experiences, as for example, the success or failure of this or that returned student; how this particular Indian handled his allotment; how So –and--So cleaned up his house, what he did in the ‘five-Years’ Program. These are real things that Indians are experiencing and that have everyday significance for them.¹⁹³

¹⁹⁰ Meriam, Lewis (1928) The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. The Problem of Indian Administration. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp 372

¹⁹¹ For discussion on authenticity and Tribal art in more detail see K. Tsianina Lomawaima and Teresa L. McCarty (2006) “How to Remain an Indian: Power Struggles in the Safely zone, in *To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education 1928- 1940* Teachers College Press.

¹⁹² For discussion on authenticity and Tribal art in more detail see pp82. K. Tsianina Lomawaima and Teresa L. McCarty (2006) “How to Remain an Indian: Power Struggles in the Safely zone, in *To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education 1928- 1940* Teachers College Press.

¹⁹³ Meriam, Lewis (1928) The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. The Problem of Indian Administration. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp 373.

Similar to the previous arguments the authors imply Indian friendly education, in this case by arguing the “reading material shall have some relation to Indian interests...” And again, like the argument around incorporating Indian arts, the authors make no mention of community involvement in the discussion of what is considered to be relevant and/or part of Native interests. Instead the reporters quickly assert what they think such materials should include. Not only is their process problematic because it silences the voices of Native peoples, but does so in order to elevate the authors to a position of supreme authority on what Native people need.

The reading topics that the authors provide would have made Pratt and Armstrong proud as the authors deemphasize the use of Indian legends while emphasizing the “actual stories of modern Indian experiences.” What are defined as “modern experiences” of Native students read like a playbook for assimilation era discourse, including “the success or failure of this or that returned student; how this particular Indian handled his allotment; how So –and-So cleaned up his house, what he did in the ‘five-Years’ Program.” The only topics provided by the authors through the modern experiences lens, include the anecdotal stories on how to achieve Americanization (what they defined as success). For the investigators Modernity is synonymous with American, Christian, and capitalism.

Of course promoting Americanization through BIA reading materials was nothing new. A similar technology of power and surveillance was adopted by Armstrong and Pratt, in their school newspapers; *The Southern Workman*, established in 1872 and *The Indian Helper* established in 1885. The latter of these two newspapers is the subject Jacqueline Fear-Segal chapter Man-on-the-band-stand in which she argues that the newspaper was a way to control both current BIA students, as well as returned students through the unsolicited advice and stories that made up the paper. She states the newspaper “allows us to witness the intense level of scrutiny to which the children were subjected as they went about their daily lives. This mimicked and parodied a system of surveillance pioneered in prison and was intrinsic to Carlisle’s mission to destroy native cultures”.¹⁹⁴ Because it was a weekly newspaper, the editors were able to surveillance and respond to students in a relatively quick manner. The voice of this response came in the form of the Man-on-the-Bandstand, a voice whom Fear-Segal explains “combined characteristics of God, Uncle Sam, and grandfather with those of prison officer, spy, and dirty old man, was created as an active component in Carlisle’s program, working to substitute *his* creed and code for values and beliefs the children learned at home.”¹⁹⁵

The paper was not only designed to discipline the children on campus but to create “a new ‘imagined community’ of educated Indians, with Carlisle at its center”. According to Fear-Segal the Man-on-the-bandstand “tried to draw the children into a world no longer shared by elders and relations. Reading the *Indian Helper*, whether at

¹⁹⁴ Fear-Segal, Jacqueline (2006). The Man-on-the-band stand at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School: What He Reveals about the Children’s Experiences. In: *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences*. University of Nebraska Press. pp. 107

¹⁹⁵ Fear-Segal, Jacqueline (2006). The Man-on-the-band stand at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School: What He Reveals about the Children’s Experiences. In: *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences*. University of Nebraska Press. pp. 107

school, on “outing,” or back home on the reservation was meant to provide a line between each subscriber, Carlisle, the Man-on-the-bandstand, and a broad-based Indian world very different from the one embraced by tribal affiliation.”¹⁹⁶ Ultimately *The Indian Helper*, and other boarding school papers like it tried 1. Surveillance students, whether on campus, in the outing program, or returned home 2. Create a sense of community between Alumni and 3. Subvert Tribalization for Americanization.

Thirty years later Meriam investigators simply replaced the-Man-on-the-bandstand with anecdotal stories from former students, however, the same process of surveillance, alumni affinity, and subversion are at work. That students would read about the success and/or failures of returned students is part of a process to internalize the surveillance and discipline once practiced by BIA officials, such as outing Matrons, Indian agents and even Pratt himself, who openly spied on returned Native students. Surveillance was not created by Pratt or even eighteenth-century prison systems, but had been a key part of colonization and conquest. Surveillance was a tactic used by missionaries, the military, surveyors, scientists, prospectors and many other agents, for a variety of reasons that supported the larger colonial project of removal. In BIA schools, whether boarding schools, day school or later public and community schools surveillance was used by teachers, social workers and BIA employees to measure the level of adherence to assimilation policies that both the children and their larger community member illustrated.

Once the authors had established their vision for the academic curriculum they turned to Vocational /Industrial education. Unlike the other areas of Indian education, Vocational education was not critiqued as a pedagogical problem. Rather the argument was that it has been mismanaged making it ineffectual for students.

Vocation Education and the Outing Program

In the section *Industrial and Agricultural Education* “*The outing program,*” William Carson Ryan the head education investigator, condemns the current system stating “whatever it may have been in the past, at present the outing system is mainly a plan for hiring out boys for odd jobs and girls for domestic service, seldom a plan for providing real vocational training”.¹⁹⁷ Although this is only a smaller piece of his larger report, in these few sentences Ryan exposes the Outing system as an educational fallacy. By pointing out that the system is a “plan for hiring,” he separates it from any educational development, as does his description of employment as “odd jobs” and “domestic service.” While Meriam investigators argued that the current system was not beneficial for students, they also argue “vocational training might be found in some modification of the outing system, if it could be administered as part of a coordinated program of education and placement by trained vocational people.” In short it is not the program that is the problem but the way in which it has been managed.

¹⁹⁶ Fear-Segal, Jacqueline (2006). The Man-on-the-band stand at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School: What He Reveals about the Children’s Experiences. In: Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences. University of Nebraska Press. pp. 119

¹⁹⁷ Meriam, Lewis (1928) The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. The Problem of Indian Administration. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp 389

The argument that the outing program could somehow be reconfigured to create a schooling to employment pipeline is an erasure of the outing process itself as the schools did in fact, train students to then send to BIA employment agencies, such as the BIA office in Berkeley. What is interesting about this section, as compared to previous ones, is that the investigators cite Carlisle as being a good model for the outing system. It is not just the Carlisle model that is given credit, but rather its ability to provide development towards assimilation, which according to the investigators “aid the Indian to overcome the personality handicaps that interfere seriously with his employment possibilities”¹⁹⁸. These so-called personality handicaps are not discussed further, but seem to indicate the author(s) believes that Native students are either unable or unwilling to advocate for their own employment. The best clarification that is given is through the further explanation of the Carlisle program stating “the old Carlisle plan... was especially strong in this, that it brought Indian boys and girls into touch with better types of whites and gave them confidence in their ability to get—along with other people out in everyday life.”¹⁹⁹ For the authors then it is not simply a matter of reconfiguring the program, but changing the attitude and/or personality of the students themselves. The argument that students could use some kind of introduction or trial period with America, what the authors term “everyday people” shows that they see the failure of Indian employment as both a symptom of poor education as well as a failure of the Indian themselves. In order to address the latter, Meriam investigators, like Pratt and Hampton before them, believe that Native students must not only be taught a vocation but social competence within the American workforce.

This discussion of the future of the outing program and vocational education eventually leads to a larger chapter, within the Meriam report on the urbanization of Native peoples. The push for urbanization by the BIA was not new, however as I have discussed through this chapter there has been little connection by scholars between early boarding school era programs and termination era educational/employment programs. Although these programs were different in scale, the ideological basis for them remained the same. By lining up the discourse and arguments of Indian policy makers, both inside and out of the BIA, the trajectory of Indian education becomes clear as one major goal, to assimilate Native peoples into the lowest sectors of the American Capitalist society. Historians in a multitude of fields have established that during the boarding school era this meant training students to do menial and domestic work, to which they would then be hired out through either BIA employment agencies and/or outing programs such as Carlisle and Hampton. What has been missing is how the Merriam report, and BIA policy makers continued this work by advocating similar programs for the next generation of students.

Public Schools

¹⁹⁸ Meriam, Lewis (1928) *The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version*. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp 390.

¹⁹⁹ Meriam, Lewis (1928) *The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version*. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp 390.

In this section I analyze the early concerns of BIA officials surrounding the transitioning of Native children to public schooling. These concerns are important to highlight given that twenty years later, during the initial phases of relocation, a discussion with similar concerns was noticeably absent within the BIA, even though the public-school systems that these later generations of Native children would attend were arguably worse than local and/or reservation public school of the 1930s and 40s.

Although Henry Richard Pratt was the founder of the American Indian boarding school system, he was also a proponent of eventually transitioning Native students into American mainstream school systems. As Pratt states in an article to the Friends of the Indian in 1892

Indian schools must, of necessity be for a time, because the Indian cannot speak the language, and he knows nothing of the habits and forces he has to contend with but the highest purpose of all Indian schools ought to be only to prepare the young Indian to enter the public and other schools of the country.²⁰⁰

He does not provide specific details for how or even when such a transition would take place, but instead addresses the topic by focusing on the role of “Indian schools” in preparing Native children, which according to him are currently hindered by the dual barriers of “language” and “culture.” While there was some truth to his argument, given that some Native children were unaccustomed to the language and/or cultural habits of Anglo/Saxon America, such concerns had not stopped the expansion of standardized education among new immigrant populations or Americanization in the Boarding school. More than anything else his argument perpetuates the significance of current Indian education structures in two ways, first it provides an ambiguous and thus ample timeline for such a transition while advocating the boarding schools as the premiere institutions to enable this transition. In short, without the boarding school system there could be no transition.

This same issue of when and how Native children would be transitioned into public schools continued to be undefined, until the BIA was confronted with the Meriam Report in which William Carson Ryan advocated for such a transition. Like Pratt, Ryan and other BIA officials did not completely embrace the idea of making this transition, nor did they lay out a decisive time line. However, they were aware that Public school attendance had risen in the early decades of the twentieth century. According to the 1929 Annual report to the Commissioner of Indian affairs “35,000 Indian children [relied] upon the State public schools for their education”.²⁰¹ More than simply stating a rough number the section *Education and Civilization of the American Indians*, argued that this was a trend. “The endeavors of the service thus directed still continue and the next few years, it is believed, will witness a material increase in the number and a future elimination from the Federal Indian schools of those who can, to advantage, attend the public schools”. After claiming the public school trend would continue to increase, the

²⁰⁰ Pratt, Richard H. [1892] 1973. “Official Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Correction.” *Americanizing the American Indians: Writing by the ‘Friends of the Indian’ 1880-1900*, pp. 260-273. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. pp.7.

²⁰¹ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1928/1929). *Annual report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior*. Washington: The Office. HathiTrust Digital books online, Original. University of Michigan. pp. 5

author explains the significance of such a transition...“the government schools may be relieved of those who do not require their aid and should attend their local public schools and also those who should rightly be considered white persons by reason of their a small degree of Indian blood, the available financial resources, if not reduced in amount by legislation, will enable the service to perfect the vocational courses as well as to provide more liberally for all education needs of the institution.”²⁰² Thus, they were interested in this trend because it provide “a material increase” in the funds available for the boarding schools. There is no further discussion in the report as to what role public schools would take in Indian education, nor how children might be transitioned to local public schools; rather there is an implied relief over the release of the financial burden of so many Indian students. For BIA officials public schools were important because of the shift in the financial burden of educating Native students from the federal government to the states, especially in the case of those students who the BIA claims should be considered “White.” As the report cites a 1918 law

“That hereafter no appropriation, except appropriations made pursuant to treaties, shall be used to educate children of less than one-fourth Indian blood whose parents are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they live and where they are adequate free-school facilities provided (Act of May 25, 21918, 40 St. L., 564)”²⁰³

Ryan and other Meriam authors also aware of the handful of public school districts at this time that were equipped to take on large numbers of new students. In some cases, especially more rural locations like Navajo Nation, public school districts did not even exist. However, It is unclear as to whether the authors believed that the rate of transition to public schools was hindered by the students themselves, by school districts, other factors or a combination of all of the above. What is clear is that that they were uncertain of the public-school system’s ability to provide what they deemed an adequate education for Native students. This can be seen on the first page of the Education chapter where the authors argue, “the methods of the average public school in the Untied States cannot safely be taken over bodily and applied to Indian education. Indian tribes and individual Indian within the tribes vary so much that a standard content and method of education, no matter how carefully they might be prepared, would be worse than futile”²⁰⁴.

In this statement the authors argue that a blanket adoption of the standard teaching methods and/or curriculum of public schools would be ineffective. But their reasoning, that it has to do with the diversity of Native peoples themselves supported the arguments of progressive educators that education should respond to the local condition. However, what and who decided what this local condition was remained an open-ended question with out much context other than the claim that a specialized curriculum and possibly even a new pedagogy would be necessary to make a safe transition.

²⁰² United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1928/1929). *Annual report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior*. Washington: The Office. HathiTrust Digital books online, Original. University of Michigan. pp. 5

²⁰³ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs. *Annual report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior*. Washington: The Office. 1928/1929 HathiTrust Digital books online, Original University. pp. 5

²⁰⁴ Meriam, Lewis (1928) *The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version*. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp 346

It is not until the section *Danger in too Rapid Extension*, four/fifths through the report, that the authors begin to untangle the complex issues involved in transitioning Native Students into public schools. They begin by questioning the motives for the rising trend in directly transitioning Native students into public school stating:

that the government will put Indian children too rapidly into public schools is a real danger, or at least it may fail to follow them up properly when the change takes place. Small though the per capita for Indian boarding schools is, even this is a larger amount than the cost for tuition in a public school. The temptation is therefore a very real one for the government to save money and wash its hands of responsibility for the Indian child.²⁰⁵

It is almost as if the authors read the commissioners report before they wrote this section, as it is a perfect rebuttal to the cost saving arguments laid out by the BIA. In this statement it is clear that the authors see the danger of the public schools as being used as a cost saving measure for the BIA and larger federal government. But they also point out their underlying concerns about the transition, mainly that Native children will not be properly supported after the transition has taken place. This issue is further explained through the example of California schools:

In California alone, the government officer's estimate, nearly four thousand Indian children have been put into public schools in the past five years. This is excellent, of course, especially in a state which furnished as good educational facilities as California does, proved care is taken to see that the children thus enrolled are actually getting the advantages of such schooling as the community affords; and provided, also the health and other needs of the Indian child are looked after.²⁰⁶

Through this statement the authors' vision of the transition to public schools becomes more contextualized. For them, the numbers of children transitioning are "excellent," only when connected to schooling systems which have the means to provide appropriate facilities, as well as social welfare support, highlighted as "health" and "other needs." Returning to the ambiguity of the first argument, it is still unclear, if this social welfare aspect is what the authors mean when they argue that it is the "variety" of Native peoples that would make a blanket adoption of public schooling sure failure.

The significance of social welfare for the authors is supported both by the placement and name of the second section; *School Social Workers*. In this section the authors make it clear that they see social workers and social welfare as an integral part of the public school system. In their opening argument they claim "Although supervisors or attendance officers are needed, especially at certain states, what is even more necessary

²⁰⁵ Meriam, Lewis (1928) *The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version*. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

²⁰⁶ Meriam, Lewis (1928) *The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version*. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

in the public-school situation is the school social worker of the visiting teacher type, who with the public health nurse, can visit the homes and make the essential contact between home and school²⁰⁷. Here we see that the authors envision the social support aspect as providing a regular home visitation system, which would bring together school and home. The authors explain further,

An important by-product of both school nurse and family case work is, of course, the educational effect in the home. Instead of being isolated from the changes that take place, as with the boarding school children, the Indian home from which the children go daily to the public school tends to change with the children, especially if the nurse and the school social worker are skillful in making the connection between school and home, homes and families.²⁰⁸

The idea that Indian families and homes were isolated from the “changes” of the local schools and even the boarding schools point to the assimilationist motivations for such a system. The connection of home and school are not so much about how the children are doing, but what the children are doing, and in turn what their parents are doing. In this way the public school transition, as the authors view it, continues the assimilationist ends of the boarding school by bringing the family into the process. The connection to such is seen in their next argument “This is only one of many kinds of adult education that need to go on in an Indian community even if the ordinary schooling for the children is proved in a public school.”²⁰⁹ Buried within the Social Section the authors finally take a stance on the transition of Native Students to public schools stating

The policy of the national government should continue to be to get Indian children as rapidly as possible into public schools, but the government should make certain at the same time that the fundamental needs of health care, home betterment, agricultural and industrial instruction, and other kinds of community education are met. Public schools in remote Indian jurisdictions are likely to be lacking in just these newer kinds of child care and community education that better localities provide and are especially necessary for the Indians.²¹⁰

For Ryan and the other members of the Education section, Public school was something that was inevitable, but that should not be without support services attached. Unlike the BIA who had the desire to limit enrollment to save money, the Meriam reporters saw an opportunity to expand the boarding school project to the home communities of the children they were educating. Ryan would soon get the chance to explore this community

²⁰⁷ Meriam, Lewis (1928) The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. The Problem of Indian Administration. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

²⁰⁸ Meriam, Lewis (1928) The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. The Problem of Indian Administration. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp.418

²⁰⁹ Meriam, Lewis (1928) The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. The Problem of Indian Administration. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp.418

²¹⁰ Meriam, Lewis (1928) The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. The Problem of Indian Administration. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. pp. 418

schooling vision in his first years as the new Indian education director for a newly organized and governed BIA.

In the next chapter I will analyze how post-Meriam policies continued to move Indian education towards Indian incorporation into American society, through two main goals. Transitioning Native students into public schools and building up vocational education within the BIA education system in order to push students to relocate into more urbanized areas.

Chapter 3 After the Meriam Report

In 1933, the newly appointed director of Education for the Indian Service, Dr. William Carson Ryan, the director of Extension and Industry, A.C. Cooley, and R.M. Tisinger, State Supervisor of Indian Education of Arizona, took a tour of four Mexican States on behalf of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.²¹¹ The reason for their trip was to assess the school systems the Mexican government had been implementing in rural indigenous communities. It was especially enticing for these progressive educators, given that the director of the program was none other than Dr. Moises Saenz, a student of John Dewey. In the report, the men offered later, they had nothing but rave reviews of the Mexican programs.

Our visit convinced us more than ever of the importance of the Mexican experience. We believe that what Mexico is doing in its rural schools is of tremendous significance, not only for Mexico and the rest of America, but for all the world. Mexico is almost the only country, so far as we can see, that has undertaken, on a rational scale, an intelligent, comprehensive, well-planned program for the upbuilding and dignifying of rural life and people.²¹²

Given the impassioned tone of the report, and claims that the program was of “tremendous significance...for all the world,” it is odd that, it did not go down in history as the Great Mexican breakthrough, but rather has become an obscure moment in history which only a handful of educational practitioners and researchers have taken note of. What was it about this rural school program that was so enticing to these three men? As lead investigator of the educational section of the Meriam report, Ryan had advocated for a more progressive form of education, one that would utilize the child’s surrounding community and environment as a integral part of the learning process. However, just as Indian educational models had in the past, progressivism, as it would be used for Native students as well as racialized minorities and newly arrived immigrants, was deeply entrenched in liberal protestant American values, norms and beliefs.

In order to understand the trajectory of progressive education as it was thought to apply to Indian students, it is important to gauge the dialogue and rhetoric surrounding the transition. In 1932, the magazine “Progressive Education” produced a special edition on Indian education, in which Carson Ryan and Rose K. Brandt discuss “Indian Education Today”.²¹³ The article starts out quoting the 1931 report of the United States Commissioner of Indian Affairs:

²¹¹ Hidalgo, Oaxaca, Morelos, and Tlaxcala

²¹² United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (1933). *Indians at work*. Washington, D.C. pp. 10
<https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000058924/Cite>

²¹³ Rose K Brandt was supervisor of elementary education for American Indian Affairs worked very closely with Carson Ryan. One of her main objectives during this time was to “work on exclusively on the preparation and publication of a series of primers for Indian children. The first of these, *Feast Day in Nambe*; *Shaker, Our Monkey*; and *Shakers’ Health Book...*” were completed and printed as student projects by the Haskell Institute and Chilocco printing departments in 1936. pp.174. United States Department of the Interior (1936) Annual Report of the Department of the Interior.
https://books.google.com/books?id=h8JgAQAAIAAJ&pg=PA173&lpg=PA173&dq=Rose+K+Brandt+supervisor+of+elementary+education&source=bl&ots=hqCFzoVTG7&sig=0_uI-

The purpose of education for any indigenous peoples at the present day is to help these peoples, as groups and as individuals, to adjust themselves to modern life, protecting and preserving as much of their own way of living as possible, and capitalizing their economic and cultural resources for their own benefit and as their contribution to modern civilization.²¹⁴

Although Brandt and Ryan use the commissioner's statement as a way to frame their later arguments about the future of Indigenous peoples, in its original context the commissioner's statement laid out a road map to "modernity" for Native peoples, via education. More specifically, they saw this as a transition *away* from their traditional economies and/or lands, in order to push them into "modernity", i.e. the contemporary capitalistic system of wage labor and landless individuals. This is highlighted in the tone and rhetoric the piece takes, calling for Indigenous peoples world-wide to "adjust" to modern life, as though they had never been a part of it, much less helped to shape it. Such a perspective defines modernity as something that is both alive and inescapable.

For instance, in the same breath that the commissioner calls for protecting and preserving indigenous culture, he also calls for capitalizing on economic and cultural resources. While these aims could be mutually supportive in capitalist societies (possibly, although in some instances when one "sells" their traditions, especially material or spiritually oriented it could be perceived as cultural exploitation or in some cases appropriation), this is not necessarily the case in Indigenous societies, as protecting and preserving are often at odds with mining and/or capitalizing on community knowledge, as well as natural and cultural resources. This is because, as I explained in chapter one, there is a wholly separate epistemology that is integral to all parts of society: where the economic, political and social spheres are intertwined with the spirituality of balance. Such organizations and epistemologies often demand protection of beliefs and skills from external pressures, including those of "modernity". Of course, every culture and community is dynamic and will likely incorporate certain economic, social, and even cultural practices from those around them. For example, Jill Norgren points out that during the late 18th century the Cherokee Nation used "selective incorporation and adaptation of non-Cherokee ideas and institutions. But these adaptations were far from assimilation policies, rather they were acculturation strategies meant to... "fashion[ed] a course that allowed them to sustain many of their traditions and beliefs."²¹⁵ Additionally, these strategies of survival were not meant to reconfigure Cherokee arts, songs, dances, and beliefs for the consumption of an American market, but to maintain economic and political sovereignty.

[YtFtuUGEPovfknrP4tBZ4&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwih39zLievTAhVV0mMKHV0qBG4Q6AEIPDAD#v=onepage&q=Rose%20K%20Brandt%20supervisor%20of%20elementary%20education&f=false](https://www.eric.gov/fulltext/ED020000/brandt%20supervisor%20of%20elementary%20education&f=false).

²¹⁴ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). "Indian Education Today." *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 pp81-86. <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>

²¹⁵ Norgren, Jill. (2004) *The Cherokee Cases: Two Landmark Decision in the Fight for Sovereignty*. University of Oklahoma Press. p.33

The process that Norgren describes is far from the “adjustment” that progressive educators had in mind. In their article, Ryan and Brandt use the commissioner’s statement to highlight what they consider a “World Wide Problem”. Explaining that

Though the words happen to refer to the educational activities of an organization administering Indian affairs in the United States, the objective here stated is certainly not applicable to education in the conventional sense only, nor to America alone. It applies to all activities that have to do with the task of adjustment and to a world-wide problem, for adjusting racial minorities, especially indigenous groups.²¹⁶

For the authors then, this is not just an issue of education, or a problem that can be addressed by education alone. Nor is it specific to the United States. Their broadening of this so called indigenous problem, shows that they are interested in all the processes and/or policies that other countries are using to “adjust racial minorities,” with a special emphasis on indigenous populations. It also shows they have a more expansive notion of indigeneity than Native Americans controlled by Indian affairs. As they argue, “Those of us who are concerned with the specifically American phases as presented in continental United States, in Alaska, in Hawaii, in the Philippines, need constantly to be reminded that other nations have the same problem²¹⁷ . . . “In short Ryan and Brandt are preparing the ground for an introduction to the “adjustment” process used by another Nation— Mexico-- which they can then apply to Native American’s as well as the rest of what the Friends of the Indians refer to as America’s “dependent peoples”, better known as Native Hawaiians, Alaska Natives, Puerto Ricans. and Filipino’s to name just a few.

It is not just any Nation, or even a list of Nations that the authors are concerned with, but rather they are alluding to what might seem as the least likely of National candidates, Mexico. This is not the first time that Mexico’s educational work had been cited by progressive educators. John Dewey, often considered the father of progressive education, went to Mexico in 1926 at the urging of his former student, Moisés Sáenz. Sáenz had studied under Dewey at Columbia, and then taught for several years at Lincoln School in New York, before returning to Mexico. At the time of Dewey’s visit, Sáenz, held the position of the sub-secretary of Public Education in Mexico,²¹⁸ and was instrumental in shaping the rural schools he once lectured about²¹⁹.

Dewey was so impressed by his visit that he published his analysis under the title *Mexico’s Educational Renaissance*, which praised the work being done in the Mexican educational programs.²²⁰ In his article he provides a brief history of schooling in Mexico,

²¹⁶ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 pp 82. <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>.

²¹⁷ pp 82 Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 pp81-86. <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>.

²¹⁸ Schoenhals, Louise (Feb, 1964). *Mexico Experiments in Primary Education: 1921-1930*. The Hispanic American Historical Review. Vol. 44, No 1 Duke University Press.

²¹⁹ In his article *Mexico’s Educational Renaissance* Dewey cites that Sáenz gave a lecture at the University of Chicago in about rural schools in Mexico.

²²⁰ Dewey, John (2008). *Mexico’s Educational Renaissance* in John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953. Vol. 2: 1925-1927: Essays, Reviews, Miscellany and the Public and its Problems. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press. First Published in *New Republic* 48 (22 September 1926): 116-118.

and then quickly moves on to what he feels is “the most interesting as well as the most important educational development...rural schools.”²²¹ Dewey argues that the Mexican rural school “signifies a revolution rather than a renaissance. It is not only a revolution for Mexico, but in some respects one of the most important social experiments undertaken anywhere in the world.”²²² But the question remains as to why these schools would be so important to Dewey, much less later progressive educators such as Ryan and Brandt. Moreover, given that Mexico had recently come out of a political revolution in what way does Dewey considered these schools revolutionary? Dewey explains;

It marks a deliberate and systematic attempt to incorporate in the social body the Indians who form 80 percent of the total population. Previous to the revolution, this numerically preponderant element was not only neglected, but despised... This educational revolution not only represents an effort to incorporate the indigenous population into the social life and intellectual culture of Mexico as a whole, but it is also an indispensable means of political integration for the country.²²³

Although he does not directly cite the schools as such, based on his statement, these schools are revolutionary because they are part of a larger nation-building project that will “incorporate” and “integrate” the indigenous. His excitement about Mexico’s growth towards the social and intellectual incorporation of a historically disregarded and/or even “despised” majority, which would according to him enable an “indispensable means of political integration for the country,” shows that this is where his interests lay. In a sense, it is a revolution of National unity. The fact that Dewey ignores that this “revolution” was both developed and perpetuated by the ruling Spanish minority shows both his theoretical limitations and possibly more so his positionality as Eurocentric, social/cultural evolutionist. and above all, an assimilationist.

In the piece Dewey emphasizes that the indigenous peoples of Mexico have up until this period been both “neglected” and “despised,” exhibiting his understanding of the low political, economic, and social position of Indigenous peoples within Mexico. But a closer look at the program that Dewey is advocating shows that the incorporation of Indigenous peoples into a larger Mexico is in reality an assimilation movement in which indigenous peoples were re-educated to conform to Mexican-Spanish morals and values. Much like American Indian boarding schools, Indigenous children would be taught the colonial language (Spanish), their role in a colonial economy (Industrial and agricultural capitalism), European political systems (republics and democracy),--the assimilation list goes on. As Rosa Bruno-Jofré and Carlos Martínez Valle argue:

The School of Action became a technology for acculturation and was seen as an instrument for forcing "modernization" through immersion in

²²¹ Dewey, John (2008). *Mexico’s Educational Renaissance* in John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953. Vol. 2: 1925-1927: Essays, Reviews, Miscellany and *the Public and its Problems*. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 200.

²²² Dewey, John (2008). *Mexico’s Educational Renaissance* in John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953. Vol. 2: 1925-1927: Essays, Reviews, Miscellany and *the Public and its Problems*. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press. PP 200.

²²³ Dewey, John (2008). *Mexico’s Educational Renaissance* in John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953. Vol. 2: 1925-1927: Essays, Reviews, Miscellany and *the Public and its Problems*. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 200-01

experiences conducive to "higher stages of culture." This type of education offered the justification for the expansion of educational control to the whole environment and the penetration in vital areas previously reserved to the family or the individual, such as hygiene and sexuality, to model the new Mexican.²²⁴

Like the architects and administrators of the action schools, Dewey supported social/cultural "evolution", based on a western European standard. This is evidenced by his writing about "savages," race, and immigration. Within the trajectory of his own writing, Dewey first mused over the savage/civilized binary. In the chapter "Education and Growth", in his *Democracy and Education*, he uses the binary to strengthen his claims about the difference between habits and education:

A savage tribe manages to live on a desert plain. It adapts itself. But its adaptation involves a maximum of accepting, tolerating, putting up with things as they are a maximum of passive acquiescence, and a minimum of active control, of a subjection to use. A civilized people enters upon the scene. It also adapts itself. It introduces irrigations; it searches the world for plants and animals that will flourish under such conditions; it improves, by careful selection, those which are growing there. As a consequence, the wilderness blossoms as a rose. The savage is merely habituated; the civilized man has habits, which transform the environment.²²⁵

Dewey's argument establishes the ideas that: 1. There was a clear division between savage and civilized; 2. This division is based on levels of intelligence (Dewey distinguishes between intelligence and inherent intellectual inferiority/superiority); 3. These levels of intelligence translate into levels of adaptation, i.e. education; and 4. foster the difference between habituated versus habits, in this case the ability of the Civilized peoples to consciously alter their environment, while Savage ones simply tolerate it. This example shows that, while he may not have been a proponent of scientific racism i.e. or eugenics, he though in terms of the prevailing evolutionary paradigm at the time that "civilization" was a better state than "savagery". It is however, more difficult to pin down exactly what Dewey believed regarding race, racial injustice, and Native Americans as he wrote sparingly on the first two subjects and never wrote explicitly about the latter. This in fact, was part of the prevailing evolutionary paradigm prior to the 1930s—"race" was unspoken and not explicitly excluded.

By analyzing a paper Dewey read before the Chinese Social and Political Science Association, we get a clearer understanding of how he both viewed race and racism as well as how he felt it should be dealt with. Dewey starts the paper by framing his argument: "Too often we try to discuss race prejudice morally before we have dealt with it scientifically..." "showing that he believes there are specific ways in which race and

²²⁴ Bruno-Jofré Rosa and Carlos Martínez Valle (2009) *Ruralizing Dewey: The American Friend, internal colonization, and the Action School in post-revolutionary Mexico (1921-1940)* Encuentros sobre Educación Volumen 10, pp. 43-64.

²²⁵ Dewey, John (2008) *Education as Growth* in John Dewey The Middle Works, 1899-1924: Vol. 9 1916 Democracy and Education. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 52.

racial prejudice operate, and it is only until we separate them that we can begin to understand them.²²⁶ He explains further

In the case of racial prejudice we are still largely under the influence of moral superstition. We fancy we can get rid of moral evils by vigorous condemnation and by preaching to people about how evil they are... What is needed is the destruction of the thing itself. This will not occur until we can remove the causes which produce it. ...and we cannot deal with cause until we have made a study of the thing itself free from moral emotion.²²⁷

In order to provide a scientifically objective analysis, Dewey actively detaches the causes of racism from the histories that have created and continued to shape it. “Dewey claims that the basis of racial prejudice is ‘the generic fact of prejudice,’ which is ‘the instinctive aversions to what is new and unusual, to whatever is different from what we are used to, and which thus shock our customary habits.’”²²⁸ In doing so he is tries to make racial prejudice seem as though it is only one of many forms of prejudice that are developed over time, based on one’s own notion of normalcy. He then emphasizes the regularity of this “instructive aversion” by using an example of a traveler’s reaction when returning to Europe:

Livingstone, records that, when he returned to Europe after spending many years in Africa, the sight of white faces was repellent to him. Although a white himself, white faces seemed sickly to him and the sickness struck him not simply as a physical matter but as a kind of unnatural morbidity which aroused disgust and dislike...it was doubtless wholly unanticipated by him for it went much deeper than his conscious wishes and though.²²⁹

Here he is arguing that an individual’s sense of “normalcy” can be changed over time, to the point that what was once normal now “aroused disgust and dislike.” Dewey does not believe that Livingston’s experience is an example of racial prejudice, but mentions it “because it seems to give a good illustration of the effect of unconscious habit even when it is concerned with such a superficial matter as seeing people’s skins.”²³⁰ In this instance Livingston is only reacting to what has become “strange” or “unusual”, what we might today call the shift in one’s social experience of racial diversity or representation. Therefore, Livingston, is used as an example to explain the psychology behind prejudice. In a way Livingston is an anomaly who according to Dewey “was as much surprised as anyone else could have been in discovering this reaction in himself;” because he recognized that he had developed prejudice. Dewey believes that for most societies and/or individuals, racial prejudice is both created and exacerbated by physical, religious,

²²⁶ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6 Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp 1.

²²⁷ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp 1.

²²⁸ Sullivan, Susan. (2003) *Reconstruction Zone* in In Dewey's Wake: Unfinished Work of Pragmatic Reconstruction Gavin, William J., ed. 2003. Albany: State University of New York Press. Accessed July 16, 2017. ProQuest Ebook Central. pp. 113

²²⁹ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp. 4-5.

²³⁰ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp. 4.

and social/cultural differences, part of which can only be dismantled through a scientific examination. Difference in and of itself, in other words, breeds prejudice in this view.

Dewey developed his theories and school (the University Primary School), within an era in which the majority of western political and religious leaders, teachers and scholars and mainstream citizens countenanced ideas about fundamental racial differences and racial superiority/inferiority (as well as eugenics). Yet his approach to what he terms “racial prejudice” seems more progressive for the time period, at least on the surface. As John Wesley argues, “in Dewey’s time the question of race really was a scientific one for most scholars. The challenge at the time was to overcome the naturalistic fallacy of the scientific racists, the ideas that if Blacks and other races could be proven to be somehow inferior to Europeans then this was justification for their subordinate position in society.”²³¹ Given the fact that Dewey rarely discussed, and did not theorize “race”, per se, this was an opportunity for him “to throw his support behind the position claiming the irrationality of the question of the biological reality of race.”²³² For Dewey racial prejudice was simply a part of natural human emotions towards difference, which were over-reactive and simplistic. Dewey reasoned with his audience that “Race is an abstract idea; according to science it is largely a mythical idea, according to science all peoples now powerful in the world are highly mixed. But mankind requires something concrete, tangible visible, audible to react against. Race in its popular usage is merely a name given to a large number of phenomena which strike attention because they are different”.²³³ His conclusion that race is simply an abstract idea, clearly shows that he landed squarely on the side of anti-scientific racism. And as Jones attests, this “was a victory in itself.”²³⁴ It almost seems a noble talk indeed.

Yet to completely dismantle racism to a psychological reaction to surface biological difference, a scientific absurdity if you will, strips away all social cultural references to power, and exploitation. It ignores that racism is not just a “moral” reaction or a biological inaccuracy, but is part of a larger network of ideological justifications to demean, dehumanize and exploit, meaning race is not just an abstract idea; but a *social* reality that has concrete consequence. Race was created as part of a vast Colonial empire, it was intentionally built and continues to be closely guarded. And as such, “It is critical that we question expectations and explore their origins, for they created—and they continue to reproduce—social, political, legal, and economic relationships that are asymmetrical, sometimes grossly so.”²³⁵

This is not to argue that Dewey was completely ignorant of injustice, inequality, or discrimination. He does argue that although “Scientifically, the concept of race is largely a fiction”. He also understands that race “as designating a whole group of actual

²³¹ Jones, John Wesley (2012). *John Dewey and Cultural Racism*. Master Thesis. Master of Arts in Educational Policy Studies. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Urbana Illinois. pp. 43

²³² Jones, John Wesley (2012). *John Dewey and Cultural Racism*. Master Thesis. Master of Arts in Educational Policy Studies. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Urbana Illinois. pp. 43

²³³ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp.12-13.

²³⁴ Jones, John Wesley (2012). *John Dewey and Cultural Racism*. Master Thesis. Master of Arts in Educational Policy Studies. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Urbana Illinois.

²³⁵ Deloria, Philip Joseph (2004). *Indians in Unexpected Places*. culture America. Lawrence, Kansas. University Press of Kansas. pp. 4

phenomena it is a practical reality”²³⁶. This is not the same as admitting that exploitation and colonialism are inherent to racism or even that racial prejudice is in its self is *racism* a systemic world view, not a mere prejudice. But it does show that he had a more nuanced understanding of race than most of the same time period. Thus, Dewey realized the importance of the social and political aspects of race, and even addressed these questions a few times, he did not however, connect them to what we, in the 21st century would acknowledge as connected to colonialism or even nationalism.²³⁷

After dismantling the “popular usage of race”, what he considers a natural aversion to the strange, Dewey moves on to “consider the other factors which complicate the anti-strange feeling,” that is the factors which confound the ability of people to overcome or “get used to what was strange and it is strange no longer.”²³⁸ The first factor Dewey takes up is “the political factor.” During this portion of his talk he shares several examples that indicate he is on the cusp of articulating the economic and philosophical processes of colonialism, but never directly use the terms colonialism, conquest or the like.

I was much struck by the remark made to me by a Chinese to the effect that if it had not been for negro slavery in America and for British domination in India, prejudice based upon differences of color would not be at the present time a very influential force. There is I am sure great truth in the remark. It illustrates force of the political factor mixed of course as it always is with the economic.²³⁹

Here Dewey argues that the political factor of racial prejudice is “mixed up” with the economic factor of racial prejudice; that the economic and political exploitation of a people or nation go hand in hand. In the case of both African Americas and Indian Nationals, skin color became both a marker of political and economic status as well as the justification for racial prejudice. In connection to this example he continues to explain his own belief about the psychological processes of political domination arguing; “The political factor works in two ways. In the first place, the fact of political domination creates the belief in superiority on one side and inferiority on the other. It changes race-prejudice into racial discrimination”.²⁴⁰ In this excerpt he breaks his explanation into two parts, the first being the creation of the superiority/inferiority complex, which he argues is produced by the act of political domination itself. To use his example, the political domination of owner over slave naturally begets a belief of superiority by owner, and inferiority by the slave, but the same logic could just as easily be used to understand the capitalistic order in the relationship between owner and laborer. In short, the mere

²³⁶ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp.12-13.

²³⁷ Jones, John Wesley (2012). *John Dewey and Cultural Racism*. Master Thesis. Master of Arts in Educational Policy Studies. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Urbana Illinois. pp. 43

²³⁸ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp. 6.

²³⁹ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp.6.

²⁴⁰ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. PP8.

existence of political dominance of one group over another produces *racial* discrimination.

Once political domination is in place he argues;

“This situation then produces conditions, which justify the belief in respective superiority and inferiority. For of course any people held in subjection and at great disadvantage economically and politically is bound to show the consequences. It is kept back while the other people goes ahead. Then the dominant group finds plenty of facts to quote in support of their belief in their own superiority²⁴¹²⁴² .

According to Dewey, once a superiority/inferiority complex is created, it becomes both self-perpetuating and self-supporting as it actively works to maintain political dominance by disadvantaging the dominated. Moreover, it provides a frame for which the advantaged can compare and condemn the deficiencies of the disadvantaged, as though these deficiencies were not actively and precisely cultivated by the dominating group but rather inherent markers of inferiority, which justify their politically disadvantaged position.

Dewey goes on to argue that it is not just the dominated that are affected in the process but the dominant as well. “The other consequence concerns the psychological effect of rule upon the dominant political group. Arrogance and contempt are fostered. Moreover, we also hate those whom we have wronged.”²⁴³ Here Dewey shows that he understands that it is not simply a psychological effect of superiority that is developed by political domination, but also the emotions of arrogance and even hate. It is clear that Dewey was on the cutting edge of understating the psychology of dominance, yet he is bound by his time, trapped in the paradigm of active colonialism in which he was able to point out *racial* discrimination against African Americans, Indian Nationals, and even women, but is unable or unwilling to take it any further, by questioning nationalism or even capitalism, both of which are in part by-products of colonialism. In part he does this by leaving out either the original or continuing motivations for either political or economic domination. In fact although he acknowledges that “I think we may safely conclude that the political factor is the one chiefly responsible for converting antipathy to the foreign into definite racial friction”. He goes on to argue that;

The matter is complicated by the fact that nationalism has spread until now antagonism is reciprocal. That is to say; the less advanced nations politically speaking those with the least degree of former political self-consciousness, have now become nationally conscious and are identifying their national consciousness with what purports to be a race

²⁴¹ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. PP8.

²⁴² Dewey goes on to explain the second factor which “the psychological effect of rule upon the dominant political group. Arrogance and contempt are fostered. Moreover, we also hate those whom we have wronged.” PP 9

²⁴³ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp. 9.

consciousness. Hence, they are adopting and employing the same measures of dislike and hatred from which they had themselves suffered.²⁴⁴

In these two statements he simultaneously acknowledges and refuses the histories and psychological effects of political dominance on “less advanced nations,” (what he defines at this point as having less national awareness). For one, by claiming that these new political nations have equated their nationalism to racial pride, he is also ignoring that United States, and every other western nation used similar processes in molding a national awareness. In the case of the U.S. citizenship was reserved for “white” males who owned land, later changed to include landless “white” men, and later to second class citizenship of women, racialized minorities, and those with disabilities. Thus in his claim that such “arrogance” is only found in “politically less advanced” nations he refuses to acknowledge how nationalism has been attached to race, racialization and racism, much less colonialism.

Secondly by claiming that the politically less advanced nations have confused national consciousness for race consciousness, he is also insinuating that such nations are politically incompetent, as though it is only they do not understand the difference between nation and race. When in reality, the U.S. is just as guilty, if not more so, of a national-race conflation. Moreover, he misses the larger detail that both, race and nationalism, are socially constructed and as such arbitrary notions of peoplehood. As Sharon Sullivan points out in her article *Reconstruction Zone* according to Dewey, it is “when the ‘instinctive,’ dislike of the strange combines with people’s different physical features, languages, and religions and with political and economic tension between nations, then racial difference and racial fiction occur. Eliminate the political and economic tensions, and Dewey thinks that racial friction will also disappear as people become familiar with what formerly seemed strange.”²⁴⁵ This is significant because it shows that he understood the psychological processes of dominance, exploitation and even racism to a certain degree, but was unable to recognize its roots in imperialism, colonialism, and even his own ethnocentrism. Which as I will show, made him unable to perceive that his cure for prejudice, assimilation, is in itself another form of political racial/cultural domination.

Although Dewey does spend some time discussing his beliefs on racial prejudice and discrimination, as evidenced by the above discussion, less than one third of the way through his paper he brushes it aside to argue his own points around nationalism and social/cultural evolution. To read Dewey’s breadth of work, is to understand that he is a staunch supporter of the Nation and Democracy as Western political concepts. But this investment also shades his understanding of race. That is that Nations are homogeneous political units, without internal stratification or significant cultural differences. Yet this contradicts the position of racialized minorities (African Americans, Asian Americans,

²⁴⁴ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp.6

²⁴⁵ Sullivan, Susan. (2003) *Reconstruction Zone* in In Dewey’s Wake: Unfinished Work of Pragmatic Reconstruction Gavin, William J., ed. 2003. Albany: State University of New York Press. Accessed July 16, 2017. ProQuest Ebook Central. pp. 113

Latino Americans) who although were technically citizens of the United States, were barred from the rights of full citizenship. Moreover, at the time of his talk, Native Americans were still considered wards of the Federal state, and therefore were non-citizens. Thus, it over simplifies the process of Nationalism, just as he did Racism, in order to ignore what race or even nationalism has meant for, and/or how they have been used against, the disenfranchised, exploited, and colonized groups within the boundaries of contemporary Nations. This is significant because it begins to untangle his viewpoints about Nationalism. Beliefs that support the idea that Nation, Race, and Citizenry, were natural for some, full citizens, but had to be learned and/or intellectually achieved by “less advanced” others, racial minorities and new immigrants.

Dewey uses the theory of Social-cultural evolution to frame his argument to retard the immigration of the “masses.” He begins building his case by claiming that it is the economic factor that both motivates and complicates immigration;

“Modern immigration is mostly due to economic causes. This means of course that immigrants believe they can better their condition by removal to another country. This fact means, in turn that as a rule the economic standard of living is higher in the country of new residence. The immigrants thus bring with them the lower standard of living developed in the county of origin. Only slowly does this standard arise.”²⁴⁶

Dewey does not address what he believes constitutes a higher standard of living, beyond the statement that there are “industrial advanced nations” as opposed to undeveloped ones. Nor does he discuss who created and maintained the political/economic conditions that have lead to the difference in standards. It is not surprising that he refuses to push on what created this geo-political situation, given his over generalization of Nationalism, but it is clear that he is interested in how standards of living effect National and international relationships. Even as he sidesteps any dialogue or argument about the causes of contemporary immigration, as well as colonialism, imperialism, and other forms of political-economic exploitation, in his some of his earlier papers he briefly discusses his ideas around social-cultural evolution adding some much-needed ideological transparency to his seemingly opaque stance on race, nationalism and immigration.

Returning to his 1916 book *Democracy and Education*, Dewey posits the question “Why does a savage group perpetuate savagery, and a civilized group civilization? Unlike many academics at the time Dewey argues that “savages” are not “beings of low-grade intelligence and perhaps defective moral sense... careful study has made it doubtful whether their native capacities are appreciably inferior to those of civilized man.”²⁴⁷ In this argument Dewey challenges the conception that “savages,” are intellectually inferior and morally defective by pointing to unnamed studies, a move that is intended to decisively position him against inherent biological inferiority. After explaining what the answer is not; inherent biological inferiority/superiority, Dewey begins to answer his own question based on a social evolutionary reasoning.

²⁴⁶ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp.11.

²⁴⁷ Dewey, John. (1916) *Democracy and Education* in *The Middle Works, 1899-1924* Vol. 9: 1916. Ed. Jo Ann Boydston. 1980. Southern Illinois University Press. PP 41

In a sense the mind of savage peoples is an effect rather than a cause, of their backwards institutions. Their social activities are such as to restrict their objects of attention and interests, and hence to limit the stimuli to mental development. Even as regards the objects that come within the scope of attention, primitive social customs tend to arrest observation and imagination upon qualities which do not fructify in the mind.²⁴⁸

Again this argument distances him from the nature side of scientific racism debate by placing him squarely on the “nurture” side. Dewey believes that “savage peoples” do not have the stimuli or objects necessary to expand their minds, as their “social activities” have not challenged them to develop their mental capabilities past basic habitation. For Dewey and his followers this means that “due to occupations which shape the mind into patterns, the explanations each culture would offer for natural or social phenomena would be a result of a conscious, rational process, yet due to a limited ability to think analytically about such phenomena, the resulting explanations offered by ‘savage’ societies would in turn be somewhat limited and deficient, conditioned by the mental patterns resulting from their chief ‘occupations.’²⁴⁹ For Dewey then, mental capabilities i.e. intelligence, are connected to environment, more specifically the ways in which people interact with or on their environment. The more “stimuli” or activity that people engage in, within the environment, the more their social customs, observations and imagination will be challenged. In short, the “social activities” and occupations that Native peoples have attended to, have not challenged them to develop their mental capacities, hence their intellectual capabilities continue to be limited.

Dewey’s contribution to the nurture argument, that people’s intelligence is based on their socio-economic patterns, was nothing new, but rather part of a much older theory. Social-Cultural evolution gained popularity in the scientific community with the 1877 release of Lewis Henry Morgan’s book *Ancient Society: Or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery Through Barbarism to Civilization*. Morgan, known as one of the most influential scientist in the burgeoning discipline of Anthropology, “helped American ethnography emerge[ed] as a vital and influential field of study, a powerful new lens through which mainstream Americans could view Indian people.”²⁵⁰ More specifically Morgan, and those “scientists” that followed him developed Salvage anthropology, where scientist would “record ancient Indian lifeway’s, already corrupted by the European presence, before they disappeared. To salvage ethnographic detail on the “Vanishing Americans,” all of which supported the notion of a vanishing Indian culture, that would lead to the inevitable assimilation of Native peoples into

²⁴⁸ Dewey, John. (1916) *Democracy and Education* in The Middle Works, 1899-1924 Vol. 9: 1916. Ed. Jo Ann Boydston. 1980. Southern Illinois University Press. PP 41-42

²⁴⁹ Jones, John Wesley (2012). *John Dewey and Cultural Racism*. Master Thesis. Master of Arts in Educational Policy Studies. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Urbana Illinois. PP 43

²⁵⁰ Thomas, David Hurst. *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity*, 44-51. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2000. Accessed July 23, 2017. pp. 46
http://search.alexanderstreet.com/view/work/bibliographic_entity%7Cdocument%7C1680485.

American society.²⁵¹ The act of claiming the authority and expertise to separate a single ancient-historical culture from the experiences of contemporary Native Americans continued to play a significant part in the development of Morgan's Anthropological praxis. He first "refined his kinship data", from his earlier research on ancient Iroquoian culture, in order to create "a whole new theory of social evolution..." in which "he traced the history of the human family, government, private property, and technology through three sequential stages...savagery to barbarism to civilization..." and "arranged both contemporary and ancient societies along a kind of development ladder". Thus Morgan established a way to rank both contemporary and historical societies based on western concepts, while simultaneously keeping the authority to do so, within western science. Moreover as Yael Ben-zvi points out "each 'ethnic period'—a term that Morgan often used to differentiate among what was later termed various racial groups—reflects 'a marked advance upon its predecessor...in the variety and amount of property.'²⁵²" Within Morgan's evolutionary theory then, the major indicator of advanced social-cultural intelligence were American notions of property and economic engagement. Even if Dewey had not read Morgan's book from cover to cover, his claim that the social activities of "savage peoples" limited their mental capabilities, could have been lifted verbatim from Morgan thirty years prior.

Dewey continues to follow the Morgan play book by delving further into how social activities are connected to using and/or developing the environment; Morgan economics 101.

Lack of control of natural forces means that a scant number of natural objects enter into associated behavior. Only a small number of natural resources are utilized and they are not worked for what they are worth. The advance of civilization means that a larger number of natural forces and objects have been transformed into instrumentalities of action, into means for securing ends. We start not so much with superior capacities as with superior stimuli for evocation and direction of our capacities.²⁵³

Dewey believes that Civilization is indicated by the "larger" use and exploitation of natural resources. And like Morgan, he does not account for the various ways that Native peoples had both altered and exploited their environments. Instead he perpetuates western epistemologies, which invented a hierarchy of Man over nature, and Christian over non, to justify the mass exploitation of natural resources and the accumulation of property. Epistemologies that were adapted by adding Narratives about effective use of land and resources, in order to justify colonization and manifest destiny, as forms of progress and civilization. Dewey is simply updating the colonial rhetoric of the scientists that came before him by advancing the same narratives about virgin lands, primitive economies,

²⁵¹ Thomas, David Hurst. *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity*, 44-51. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2000. Accessed July 23, 2017. pp. 46

http://search.alexanderstreet.com/view/work/bibliographic_entity%7Cdocument%7C1680485.

²⁵² Ben-zvi, Yael. (2007) "Where Did Red Go? Lewis Henry Morgan's Evolutionary Inheritance and U.S. Racial Imagination." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 7, no. 2 pp. 201-29. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41949556>.

²⁵³ Dewey, John. (1916) *Democracy and Education in The Middle Works, 1899-1924* Vol. 9: 1916. Ed. Jo Ann Boydston. 1980. Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 41-42

and simplemindedness that have been used to describe Indigenous peoples for over three hundred years.

By connecting his beliefs about social-cultural evolution and opening remarks about difference in the standards of living between nations, it becomes clear that Dewey saw political and economic stratification as a natural process in which some peoples/nations were more intellectually and technology advanced, while others lagged behind. But why is this important? Why call out Dewey for beliefs that were not only popular, but hegemonic in his day? In the context of the speech he gives it shows that he was not concerned about laying out social evolutionary theory, because he thought it to be obvious. Instead, he uses the theory as a backdrop to argue that immigration threatens the economic and political well being of advanced Nations. In the context of colonialism, and the U.S. nation-building project it shows that Dewey did not question the hegemonic assumptions of his time which, indeed, served the interests of people like him.

Dewey argues that immigration is a threat, rooted in the economic factor; meaning that it is a problem because it creates animosity over the perceived social, political, and economic burden put onto the citizenry of advanced nations. Citizens who believe that they are simultaneously tasked with raising the standards of immigrants, while competing over the future of their position within the political-economy. In his speech he first describes the economic motivations, hardworking character, and lower standards of immigrants, which creates competition for the native-born:

Modern immigration is mostly due to economic causes. This means of course that immigrants believe they can better their condition by removal to another country of new residence. The immigrations thus bring with them the lower standard of living developed in the country of origin. Only slowly does their standard rise. Industrial competition on the part of factory employees, small shop keepers, and land owners in agricultural products tends to arouse the antagonism of those previously on the ground who were already hard put to it to make their livings. When the competition comes from those who persistently maintain a lower standard of living, who save rather than spend and who are willing to work longer hours, the feeling against the immigrant is much increased.²⁵⁴

After arguing that the lower standards and economic competition, “arouses the antagonism,” of “those previously on the ground”, he connects these individual rivalries to the second part of his argument, the reaction of the larger native-born community, who “revolt against whatever threatens the standard of living attained by the community and against whatever menaces economic opportunity in land and trade is converted into anti-racial sentiment. . . . differences of color, of religion, of customs and manners and of political allegiance are added to this economic cause of antagonism racial friction becomes acute.” According to Dewey then, the larger community, turns individual economic animosity into anti-racial sentiment when social-cultural differences are

²⁵⁴. Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp.11

present between native and foreign born. He claims that the anti-racial sentiment is then elevated to an international level;

...the friction which is thus generated is utilized for political purposes. The country of the foreign nationals believes that domestic politicians stir up strife for the sake of an issue and for the sake of getting votes. The native country, as in the United States, believes that a foreign government keeps alive the issue of racial discrimination in order to make capital for military preparations, and in order to secure a grievance which may be utilized for diplomatic trading in order to secure concessions on some other point, say in China or Siberia. And naturally each party sees only its own side of the case.²⁵⁵

Hence, for Dewey immigration was dangerous not only because it caused individual animosities or economic burdens but because it could also quickly escalate into international tensions or incidents. Given the fact that World War I was still relatively recent at the time of his speech, Dewey's assertions and warnings about the dangers of immigration probably sounded reasonable to his audience, even if immigration was neither a cause nor effect of the war. But even if, as Dewey asserts, immigration caused international tensions at both the individual and international level, his description of its supposed effects, were more of a justification for exclusion than a call for equality.

Moreover, the larger rhetoric of anti-immigration silenced the complexities of class, colonization, and the exploitation of the masses. It was a contemporary version of the "White Man's burden". That Dewey positions immigrants as a peril, who economically and politically threatened the livelihoods of the citizens of the western world shows his inability to think outside a cultural-evolutionary paradigm.

As I have demonstrated previously he was not a classic racist, if biological racism can be deemed as such, nor did he necessarily feel animosity towards, immigrants, racialized others and/or Indigenous peoples, even as he argues that many did. Rather he believed that these others were either less socially-culturally advanced, held lower standards, or were a combination of the two, which in all cases created a problem for the nation. But Dewey had an answer for all these situations; assimilation. His answer is not straight forward, as he delves and dives, twists and turns around the issue, even as he uses the term, but as I will show through the connections of his various works, assimilation was his end game.

Starting with his answer to the immigration problem, in his speech Dewey suggests several different approaches, including cultural evolution, the understanding of foreign cultures, and "assimilation from both sides"²⁵⁶. Based on the way Dewey's essay is written it is unclear if he views cultural evolution as a way to better understand foreign cultures, if cultural evolution must take place in order for national and foreigners to get

²⁵⁵ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp.12

²⁵⁶ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp.13

along or something wholly separate. But regardless of the exact connection, the processes that lead to wide spread cultural understanding, beyond tolerance, neither include cultural evolution nor assimilation as we think of them today. So what exactly is he advocating for? By again stepping away from this particular speech and incorporating Dewey's other writings, his argument about immigration, as well as his larger perspective will become more transparent.

In his essay *Education as a Social Function* Dewey describes what he believes is the situation which has lead to the need for national schooling; a conversation which sheds light on his perception of the processes of assimilation and cultural evolution.

In the olden times, the diversity of groups was largely a geographical matter. There were many societies, but each within its own territory, was comparably homogeneous. But with the development of commerce, transportation, intercommunication, and emigration, countries like the United States are composed of a combination of different groups with different traditional customs. It is this situation which has, perhaps more than any other one cause, forced the demand for an educational institution which shall provide something like a homogeneous and balanced environment for the young.²⁵⁷

Although he has not directly stated it, Dewey's insistence on the need to bring together and standardize different peoples through schooling shows that he is interested in education as part of a larger nation-building project. His word choice is precise as he pairs "homogenous" with "balance" to describe the school environment such an endeavor would create. Yet one hundred years down the line, we must be careful about interpreting what he considered standard. For instance the kind of homogenous society he envisioned, or who he viewed as not only having the power, but the right to deem what was standard and if, and this is a big IF, if he believed that people had a right to decide whether they wanted to be involved, to have the choice of acceptance or denial of such standardization.

Not surprisingly Dewey does not expand on his aims or the implications of the standardization of schooling in a way that would help us understand them today. He does, however continue to discuss the political need to homogenize diverse groups through schooling:

only in this way, can the centrifugal forces set up by juxtaposition of different groups within one and the same political unit be counter acted. The intermingling in the school of youth of different races, different religions, and unlike customs creates for all a new and boarder environment. Common subject matter accustoms all to a unity of outlook upon a broader horizon than is visible to the members of any group while

²⁵⁷ Dewey, John. (1916) *Democracy and Education in The Middle Works, 1899-1924* Vol. 9: 1916. Ed. Jo Ann Boydston. 1980. Southern Illinois University Press. pp 25

it is isolated. The assimilative force of the American public school is eloquent testimony to the efficacy of the common and balanced appeal.²⁵⁸

Based on this argument Dewey would have us believe that diversity is, and has been a part of this standardization, as he speaks of a range of differences including race, religion and customs. All of which he contends will lead to new and broader possibilities underlining a “new and broader environment”, “broader horizon”, and the “assimilative force of the American school.” However, recalling his earlier discussions about the lower intelligence of “savages”, and his hesitation about immigrants from less “advanced” nations, it is unlikely that he believed or even desired diversity out-side of a predetermined safety-zone. In this zone languages, religions, epistemologies, would not be maintained through their incorporation into the nation as it was argued that they were not beneficial to this new broader environment, but rather dangerous and possibly even destabilizing to the new nation.

What then does he mean by standardization, new environments and horizons? In short he is advocating, the melting pot, i.e. Americanization. Dewey evokes American schools as the premier example of assimilation as though, the schools, teachers, and curriculum are the culmination of some great diversity inclusion project, where all peoples are represented. But as history has shown, American schooling has bluntly ignored, demeaned, stereotyped and even punished diversity and diverse bodies. As Sullivan points out “The problem with Dewey’s description of education thus is not its appeal to the idea of assimilation, understanding assimilation as a process that transitionally remakes everyone involved in it. It instead is the ‘mere’ fact that Dewey took American public schools as eloquent testimony to such transactions when in 1916 they most definitely were not. Nor had they ever been.”²⁵⁹ In short, up to 1916, American schools had not been in the business of supporting diversity, but rather indoctrinating U.S. nationalism, which was grounded in protestant Anglo-Saxon morals and values, corporate capitalism, and the of illusion of democracy. The assimilation project and the environment Dewey sought were all to further support a certain kind of America. A melting pot that was epistemologically, morally, culturally, politically, economically and ethnically “white.” As George Lipsitz argues the possessive investment of whiteness has a very long past. “The long history of the possessive investment in whiteness stems in no small measure from the fact that all subsequent immigrants to North America have come to an already racialized society”.²⁶⁰ It is not just that whiteness, and the investment in the whiteness project had long been established by the time that Dewey was theorizing progressive schooling. But as Lipsitz points out, Whiteness is everywhere in U.S. cultural, but is very hard to see. As the unmarked category against which difference is constructed, whiteness never has to speak its name, never has to acknowledge its role as an organizing principle in social and cultural relations²⁶¹”. Dewey, didn’t have to argue

²⁵⁸ Dewey, John. (1916) *Democracy and Education* in *The Middle Works, 1899-1924* Vol. 9: 1916. Ed. Jo Ann Boydston. 1980. Southern Illinois University Press. pp 25

²⁵⁹ Sullivan, Susan. (2003) *Reconstruction Zone* in *In Dewey's Wake : Unfinished Work of Pragmatic Reconstruction* Gavin, William J., ed. 2003.. Albany: State University of New York Press. Accessed July 16, 2017. ProQuest Ebook Central. pp. 117.

²⁶⁰ Lipsitz, George. (2005) “The Possessive Investment in Whiteness” in *White Privilege: essential readings on the other side of racism*. Paula S. Rothenberg, ed. 2005. 2nd Edition. Worth Publishers, New York, NY. pp. 68.

²⁶¹ Lipsitz, George. (2005) “The Possessive Investment in Whiteness” in *White Privilege: essential readings on the other side of racism*. Paula S. Rothenberg, ed. 2005. 2nd Edition. Worth Publishers, New York, NY. pp. 68

for Whiteness, because it was already implied, expected even. To broaden the student's horizon, meant to remove most if not all vestiges of difference at the social-cultural level, not just because they were undesirable or different, but because they were politically and socially dangerous. Thus the American standard was designed to silently uphold current regimes of power. "The school system of Dewey's day thus tended to aim for non-transactional assimilation of all students to white habits of life... The habits of white students generally were strengthened and enforced, not changed, while the habits of nonwhite students were forced to become more like those of white people, with the pain of failure in the school system a threat if this did not happen²⁶²." Of course this was nothing new, the United States had been in the business of forcibly stippling Native children of their religions, languages, cultures, economies, epistemologies, etc., for over thirty-five years before Dewey made these marks. Not to mention the hundreds of years in which protestant Anglo Saxon settlers and their American decedents, worked to assimilate all other "European" immigrants, to an exclusive Anglicization.

Dewey's beliefs surrounding schooling and assimilation connect directly to his opinion about immigration. Like many American politicians of his day he wanted to control not only who became American, but when and how. What makes him different from these same politicians is his belief that everyone, regardless of race, religion or creed could become American, given enough time for them to be properly assimilated. Moreover, like earlier statesmen, such as Henry Knox, Thomas Jefferson²⁶³, and Andrew Jackson, who advocated for Native peoples to be assimilated within the boundaries of their soon to be created reservations, removed from mainstream American society, he advocated for political and economic change in the home nations of immigrants before they could be incorporated into the Nation.

But without political and economic changes these factors will not go far in solving the problem... With a rise of standards of living there will come a lowering of birth rate so that the menace of numbers will not be felt as it is now. Then a surplus population will not be used as it is now as a cause and justification for an expansion which brings with it a threat to the standards of living and the political integrity which have been attained by great effort to the industrially advanced nations.²⁶⁴

It is clear that he views immigration as a serious problem given his ominous rhetoric which paints immigrants as a "menace," and a "threat," which would undermine the "integrity" of the nation. For Dewey, social-cultural assimilation is not simply an individual choice, but a call out to all developing countries that their political economy must conform to the democratic industrial model, what he terms the industrially advanced nation. This in turn would he believes create a situation in which their citizens will be

²⁶² Sullivan, Susan. (2003) *Reconstruction Zone* in In Dewey's Wake: Unfinished Work of Pragmatic Reconstruction Gavin, William J., ed. 2003. Albany: State University of New York Press. Accessed July 16, 2017. ProQuest Ebook Central. pp. 117

²⁶³ While Jefferson initially advocated for the incorporation/assimilation of Native peoples into the United States he only did so because the Nation was bounded to east of the Mississippi, and therefore this was the most economic policy he could envision. However, after the Louisiana purchase Jefferson and Know advocated for the removal of Native peoples to the West, or order that they be slowly assimilated without the temptations or corrupting influences of lower-class unchristian behavior.

²⁶⁴ Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp.13.

less likely to leave, and not in so many numbers. This is significant when we think about how he viewed schooling, as it shows that although he seemed to advocate for diversity, in reality he wanted to identify and isolate diversity so that it could be assimilated in a more manageable way, whether that assimilation took place domestically or internationally.

His need to control what is considered socially-culturally acceptable for the United States is further demonstrated in the closing statements of his speech to the Chinese Social and Political Science Association, in which he sums up his ideas about the way nations react to diversity and inclusion.

Racial discrimination is a bad thing, but an indiscriminate reaction against it may also be a bad thing. For, as I have tried to bring out, the question is not primarily one of race at all, but of the adjustment of different types of culture to one another. These differences of culture include not only differences of speech, manner, religion, moral codes, each one of which is pregnant with cause of misunderstanding and friction, but also differences of political organization and habits and national rivalries. They include also economic and industrial differences involving differences in planes or standards of daily life on the part of the masses...²⁶⁵

That Dewey was on the wave of progressive educational thinkers is clear, but what is less noticeable is his investment in the National project of an Anglo America. Thus, just as he is able to argue that racialized minorities and savages are intellectually lower, without attaching it to a biological inferiority, but attributing it to racial friction, he too argues that the Nation is not ready for the lower standards of immigrants. Moreover he all but condones the discrimination that had and would continue to sanction the disenfranchisement of non-white immigrants all the way through the present day. His discussion of standards, environment, horizon and assimilation all revolve around the process of Americanization, which would maintain white supremacy with the changing political, economic and cultural landscape of the United States.

All of which connects back to his excitement about the community action schools in Mexico, which were doing the same work that Dewey wrote about in his *Democracy and Education* book. They were taking students who were “racially”, politically, economically, linguistically different from the Spanish minority and assimilating them to become laborers and citizens within a “new” Mexico. Yet the only thing that was new was that they were tapping the labor and investment of the largest communities. Communities that just happened to be Indigenous, a fact that did not escape Ryan, even as Dewey rarely makes mention of the connection between the two groups.

It is only in reference to other issues, such as in his in-article *Mexico's educational renaissance* that he discusses Native Americans. In this particular paper Dewey, evokes the relationship of the United States with Native Americans in an attempt

²⁶⁵. Dewey, John. (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association. pp.15

to urge patience, on the part of Mexico, in order to provide for the social-cultural evolution of Indigenous peoples:

We in the United States who have pursued such a different policy with our Indian population are under an obligation to understand and to sympathize. The policy of incorporating the Indians into modern life is of such extraordinary difficulty, its execution demands so much time, peace and tranquility, that any action on our part which puts added obstacles in its way is simply criminal.²⁶⁶

This statement reveals Dewey's belief that Native peoples should be incorporated, not only into the national society, but also into "modern life." A belief that was also held by the earlier cited commissioner of Indian affairs who made the same inference about the United States bringing Indians into modernity. Dewey uses the term incorporation to describe the relationship between Native peoples and the United States, similar to his use of the term when he described the purpose of the action schools in Mexico, and immigrants. This idea that the nation must control the process of incorporation of Native peoples is further supported when he claims ownership over Native Americans, calling Native Americans "Our Indian population". These statements taken together show that he believes that Native Americans along with Indigenous peoples are not independent, sovereign or even self-determining but rather under the control of the larger Nation.

Like many policy makers, academics and philanthropist of this time he both changes modernity from a noun (person, place, or thing) into a verb (describes action) to underscore that it is active and as such, the United States is actively modernizing Native peoples, while also actively silencing his Eurocentric beliefs by implying assimilation through the use of the term incorporation. By claiming that it is "modern life" that Native Americans/Indigenous peoples lack, he invokes the civilized/savage binary and positions them as ambiguously primitive, backwards, and savage. "Dewey never uses the word 'race' in connection with the term 'savage', but he need not do so for his account to be raced. Because 'savage' is not a racially neutral term. Dewey's discussion of savages is racially coded. Savagery represents the wild, dark non-European, in contrast with the civilized, white-European²⁶⁷." In the colonial context, Indian and savage were used interchangeably to denote Native peoples. All of which is extremely important in understanding his last comment that the incorporation is "extraordinarily difficult" and therefore requires time and patience. His argument regarding the extraordinary difficulty in incorporating Native Americans into modernity raises several questions. Firstly, what does he consider to be the underlying factors or reasons for this difficulty of incorporation. Secondly, why does he consider the level of difficulty so astonishing and/or unusual? Are there cases in which Native peoples have been easily "incorporated" or self-incorporated into the colonizing nation? And lastly, but certainly not least, has he considered the possibility that Native peoples may not want to be "incorporated"?

²⁶⁶ Dewey, John (2008). *Mexico's Educational Renaissance* in John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953. Vol. 2: 1925-1927: Essays, Reviews, Miscellany and *the Public and its Problems*. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 205

²⁶⁷ Sullivan, Susan. (2003) *Reconstruction Zone* in In Dewey's Wake: Unfinished Work of Pragmatic Reconstruction Gavin, William J., ed. 2003. Albany: State University of New York Press. Accessed July 16, 2017. ProQuest Ebook Central. pp. 119

Based on his other discussion about “Savages”, assimilation and immigration, he viewed this incorporation as extraordinarily difficult for at least two reasons. First, he believed savages were of a lower intellect, if only due to their lack of social engagement with the environment. Therefore it would take more political and economic effort on the part of the nation to make up for this intellectual deficiency, and in doing so raise the living standards of Native peoples. In short they were a burden just as Dewey argued immigrants would be a burden. Moreover, they continued to be a threat, to individual citizens, (not simply because of the threat of violence, which by this time was a fading memory), but because, just like immigrants, their political and economic standards were lower, contradictory even. For instance, many Native peoples did not strictly adhere to corporate capitalistic system as landless laborers, nor did they invest in the political, or social-cultural norms of the United States.

Within the article itself he does not elaborate about incorporation, modernity or the difficulty of such in the context of Native Americans, but as I have argued it all revolves around the issue of national stability. An issue he moves on to explain, with the context of non-citizen rights over those of the nation. While it may not directly answer the questions raised above, it does show his continued investment in Nation building.

One can sympathize with foreigners in Mexico who find that their legal rights are not assured; yet from the standpoint of business in the long run as well as from that of human development, vested legalities are secondary to the creation of an integrated people. Foreign interference in any and every form means immediate increased instability and this unsettlement means in turn the prolongation of those internal divisions, which have been the curse of Mexico; it means a deliberate cultivation of all seeds of turbulence, confusion and chaos.²⁶⁸

For Dewey, “human development,” stability, and unification of the country outweigh the legal rights of foreign businesses. Based on his earlier remarks, he also believes this is the case for individuals or communities, that is that, National stability and unification outweigh individual or communal rights. Moreover, his stance on community education; that is the progressive mantra that education should reflect the realities and experiences of a child’s environment i.e....community are actually only reflective of one community. And here is the heart of the progressive dilemma or rather contradiction, as they do not see it as such. On the one hand Dewey argues that:

Mr. Saenz, the first sub secretary of education (who once taught in the Lincoln School in New York), stated in a lecture recently at the University of Chicago that ‘nowhere have I seen better examples of a socialized school than in some of the rural school in Mexico.’ I am willing to go further and say that there is no educational movement in the world which

²⁶⁸ Dewey, John (2008). *Mexico’s Educational Renaissance* in John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953. Vol. 2: 1925-1927: Essays, Reviews, Miscellany and the *Public and its Problems*. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 205

exhibits more of the spirit of intimate union of school activities with those of the community than is found in this Mexican development.²⁶⁹

In the larger context his reference to Saenz, shows that it was because of him that he was aware that rural Mexican schools used a socialization model That is a structure that would both indoctrinate national values and expectations, while simultaneously silencing any discourse or ideology that oppositional or contradictory to these values. But it was not until he went to see them himself, did he learn the degree to which the rural schools of Mexico were good examples of the socialized school model. However, by looking deeper into the text it becomes evident, especially for the non-educational historian that Mexican rural schools are important because of their connection between school activities and community, they are the epitome of socialized or assimilation schools. Meaning that they not only assimilate the children, but the community as well.

This ties back to a previous discussion Dewey has about the complications of National unity in Mexico given the diversity and isolation of indigenous peoples:

the difficulties in creating a moral and political entity out of Mexico are so enormous that they often seem insuperable; one most readily pictures the general state of the country by thinking of early colonial days in the United States, with a comparatively small number of settlements of a high civilization surrounded by Indian peoples with whom they have but superficial contact. The fact that the Mexican Indians have a settled agricultural life, a much higher culture and greater resistance than our own Indians but increases the difficulty of the situation. Add to this fact that the Indian are anything but homogeneous among themselves, divided into some thirty different tribes, intensely self-centered, jealous of their autonomy, prizing isolation which is accentuated by geographical conditions, and we begin to have a faint ideas of the problem which the revolutionary governing is facing as systematically as all previous regimes dodged it.²⁷⁰

Here Dewey argument about the complications surrounding indigenous incorporation into the larger nation further support his Nationalistic prejudices. Similar to his earlier argument he stresses that the nation is both a political and moral entity. The problem, plaguing Mexico is not the Nation as a political organization, or even the process of assimilation that must be forced in order to “incorporate” indigenous peoples, among other heterogeneous communities, but rather it is the issue of opposition. He is confounded over what he calls a seemingly “insurmountable” task of creating a politically and morally unified Mexico. While he does little in the way of describing the Mexican administration directly, it is unnecessary as the entire article is a combination of his sympathy and praise for the Mexican government in connection with “the problem” of Indigenous incorporation. On the other hand Dewey argues that part of the problem of

²⁶⁹ Dewey, John (2008). *Mexico's Educational Renaissance* in John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953. Vol. 2: 1925-1927: Essays, Reviews, Miscellany and *the Public and its Problems*. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 202

²⁷⁰ Dewey, John (2008). *Mexico's Educational Renaissance* in John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953. Vol. 2: 1925-1927: Essays, Reviews, Miscellany and *the Public and its Problems*. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press. pp. 201

Indigenous incorporation is that they are “divided”... that he understood that Native peoples did not necessarily want incorporation. However, rather than accepting or even questioning that this might be due to their own desire for self-determination he claims that this is in part due to the hold that “country priests,” have over the communities;

Because of the absence of rural schools, the only common force which touched the life of all the people was the church; and it is putting it moderately to say that the influence of the clergy did not make for social and political integration. The fact that the country priests have used their enormous influence over the souls of their parishes to oppose the establishment of rural schools has been at least one factor in causing the drastic decree for the laicizing of all primary school.²⁷¹

This statement shows another contradiction in his argument about the incorporation, as he claims that the church was the only thing that “touched the life of all the people”, (influenced the people) and yet “did not make for social and political integration,” meaning that it was a keeping the people separated. The fact that the church both influenced the daily lives, including their epistemologies and ideologies although he does not specify such, of all the people, yet kept them separate needs further explanation to be supported. But by putting his claim into the context of Nationalism and sovereignty, it begins to make sense. He is not concerned with the level or rate of Indigenous assimilation into Christianity, but rather how Christianity and the bureaucracy it has established has actively worked to slow or even stop the integration or better put, investment into a Nation. He is invoking the fifteen-century battles between the Church and State, and clearly arguing for the side of the state. Which means that he is arguing over which colonial epistemology is better. Not whether, if or why, Indigenous peoples should or could be sovereign or self-determining, which circles back to the whole idea of the “socialist” school. These action schools for all intensive purposes are assimilationist schools, perpetuated by a colonial and/or assimilationist regime. Put another way, Dewey does not question, connect, or care that the function of the schools were central to the assimilation of Indians into a Spanish-dominant Mexico. This is because he is driven by the narrative of nationalism and nation building, which is attached to western notions of superior intellect, which have led to the creation of advanced industrial Nations. Dewey sympathizes with the Mexican state precisely because they are going through the same processes as the United States. Only, based on his article he thinks they are doing a more effective job of incorporating indigenous peoples. The United States separated Native children from their communities in order to forcibly assimilate, and in doing so created a whole other set of issues, the most significant for Dewey was the partial assimilation of children which led to Native people never being fully incorporated, never being forced to raise their standards and never being forced to conform to American norms. This was due to the fact that their communities were not educated, only their children.

The Mexican action schools were revolutionary, not only for Dewey, and BIA agents including Ryan, Brandt and the like, but to all Colonial Nations who were

²⁷¹ PP 201 Dewey, John (2008). *Mexico's Educational Renaissance* in John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953. Vol. 2: 1925-1927: Essays, Reviews, Miscellany and *the Public and its Problems*. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press.

interested in incorporation because they addressed the problem of partial assimilation. With the help of Lewis Merriam, and John Collier, Caron Ryan would embark on a “massive” overhaul over the BIA education department. It was not a departure from content, as the aim was still the full incorporation and investment of Native peoples into the United States as landless laborers, but rather a shift in pedagogy, which would put the assimilation of the whole community at the forefront. Using the Meriam report as a Guide, Ryan went to work developing his own version of the action community school, at the core of which was labor and vocational education.

Chapter 4

The Rhetoric of Change: Racial Salvation and Assimilation

In 1933 John Collier declared to BIA employees “The possibility—nay, the probability of racial extinction is still a fact...Racial salvation for the Indians is a possibility. And that possibility is enough. The greatest efforts of the human spirit and will have been efforts in the pursuit of the improbable but the possible. Possibility is enough”²⁷² Although Collier’s message was meant to motivate BIA employees, possibly even Native people themselves, one hundred years later it does more to highlight the rhetoric and frame that Collier used to usher in a new era of Indian assimilation policy. Collier was not alone in his sentiments about the future of Native peoples, as BIA administrators, philanthropists, educators and politicians propagated the racial extinction narrative, the idea that the end was looming for Native peoples in the early twentieth century. These extinction “facts” were a combination of population statistics, the continued quasi-ward status of Native peoples, the closing of the frontier mixed with the rhetoric of modernity. Taken all together it created a picture of myriad hopelessness where dependency, economic plight, political disorganization, starvation, and social incompetence shackled the future of Native Americans.

Given this outlook, it is not surprising that Collier and his administration would use this seemingly “rock bottom” situation as a talking point towards salvation. And not just any salvation, but a full on Racial salvation in which Native peoples could, could, could...? And here is where the rhetoric gets murky. What exactly did Collier mean by racial salvation? What and who did he deem important enough to be rescued, as the concept of Native America is neither homogeneous nor stagnant How did he envision this salvation process and who would implement it? In short, in order to understand the racial salvation that Collier envisioned we must first reconstruct not only where Collier stood, but also how those in his administration interpreted the call.

On the surface, his approach, as Commissioner of the BIA was a blatant departure from previous BIA administrations, which along with Congressional policy and Supreme Court rulings continued to chip away at any previous acknowledged sovereignty of Native Nations, culminating in an assertion of the Plenary Power doctrine. While it is debatable when the Plenary Power Doctrine was first declared, the purpose of this assertion was to justify the Sovereignty of the United States over Native peoples. As the international legal scholar Natsu Taylor Saito argues:

The Supreme Court upheld the Act in *United States v. Kagama*, saying that the United States could exercise such authority over Indians and that constitutionally such power resented with the federal, not state, government. The *Kagama* Court first declared that Indian nations had not been truly sovereign since the *Cherokee Cases* of the 1830s, but were

²⁷² United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp. 3

“semi-independent” with limited authority over their “internal ad social relations. Acknowledging that the Constitution did not explicitly delegate jurisdiction over Indian affairs to the federal government, the Court fell back on the notion that such power must be inherent, relying on cases that dealt with Congress’s power to regulate territories that had not yet become states, and drawing on Justice Marshall’s earlier pronouncement that “[t]he right to govern may be the inevitable consequence of the right to acquire territory.”²⁷³

Regardless of which nineteenth century court ruling was the first the out come, was that by the early twentieth century, it was believed by both governmental officials and the layman that the United States held sovereignty over Native peoples, if only for the right to acquire territory. Yet even, Collier was not interested in fully repealing the plenary power doctrine, so why was he so interested in the salvation of Native peoples?

As many other scholars have pointed out, Collier was grounded in a larger reform movement of Progressive community organizers. Before joining the BIA in 1933, Collier developed a career in community organization, first working with the People’s Institute in New York City and then moving onto California at the beginning of WWI²⁷⁴. Like many community reform workers of the Progressive era, Collier was dismayed by what he perceived to be the alienation of society due to the many social ills of modernity; including mass industrialization, Americanization, and individualization.

However, rather than analyze the root causes of this alienation, for instance how the political-economy of industrial capitalism had led to an unjust class structure, urban slums and individualization, Collier focused all his energies on the social-cultural symptoms of alienation. For Collier and his brethren, the only way to deal with the social ills of modernity was to reorient urban society to a pre-industrial past, which they believed would reintroduce traditional community practices leading to increased community engagement, commitment and control²⁷⁵. Such a notion was neither new nor unique, as Stephen Kuntiz argues “one of the strands running through the Progressive Era was a ‘conservatively radical impulse toward a recreation of a way of life that was seen to have existed in the past and that had been smashed by the Industrial and Democratic Revolution beginning in about the beginning of the nineteenth century’²⁷⁶. So unlike his predecessors, Collier was interested in supporting a certain degree of community control, in part because he like other “reformers and academic sociologists were interested primarily in the idea of community, and its implications of people linked together by their awareness of mutual and reciprocal obligations, in this they differed from the more radical thinkers who viewed society as made up of conflicting classes²⁷⁷”.

²⁷³ pp.440 Saito, Natsu Taylor (2002) “Asserting Plenary Power of the ‘Other’: Indians, Immigrants, Colonial Subjects, and Why U.S. jurisprudence needs to incorporate International Law. Yale Law & Policy Review Vol. 20: 427.

²⁷⁴ Kuntiz, Stephen. (Summer, 1971) *The Social Philosophy of John Collier*. Ethnohistory, Vol 18, No. 3. Duke University Press. pp. 223

²⁷⁵ Kuntiz, Stephen. (Summer, 1971) *The Social Philosophy of John Collier*. Ethnohistory, Vol 18, No. 3. Duke University Press --Daniel Perlstein (2016) Collier paper. Unpublished University of California-Berkeley

²⁷⁶ Kuntiz, Stephen. (Summer, 1971) *The Social Philosophy of John Collier*. Ethnohistory, Vol 18, No. 3. Duke University Press. pp. 223

²⁷⁷ Kuntiz, Stephen. (Summer, 1971) *The Social Philosophy of John Collier*. Ethnohistory, Vol 18, No. 3. Duke University Press. pp. 219

Given his previous work, and his commitment to the Indian Reorganization Act it is safe to say that Collier advocated for some measure of community control. However, given his convictions about modernity, it is important to question how much this community control was based on the actual needs of the community as opposed to some fantasy of an idealized past. Moreover this raises the question of how his views on community control translated over to Native communities; both in the sense of what he viewed as an appropriate amount of control as well as the model he envisioned. Kuntz helps clarify Collier's vision of community by pointing out "what Collier wanted was that folk cultures and local communities persist and be strengthened and at the same time that they be able to cope effectively with the inescapable fact of changing technology"²⁷⁸ This did not mean, however, that he believed in tribalism, self-determination, or an actualized community control.

Aside from community centers, community schooling became a popular way to establish a progressive reorientation program. One of the most well know of these, was the Arthurdale School located in West Virginia. Set up as part of the broader social reform movement, during the New Deal era, Arthurdale was a community resettlement program for former West Virginia miners and their families after the collapse of the coal industry. Similar to Collier's assertions about a pre-industrial past, "American intellectuals and reformers extolled rural life as a shield against economic and social disaster," as "Arthurdale reflected their vision of a new bureaucratized manifestation of America's pioneer spirit"²⁷⁹. This pioneer spirit, didn't just come in the form of some off hand uplift speech or motivational testimony, but in the case of Arthurdale's community school program, students actually re-enacted the political, social, and economic life of West Virginias "white" pioneers:

Studies of pioneer life centered on an old log cabin on Arthurdale site. There children learned to dye wool with pokeberries, walnuts and acorns, to dip candles, and to cook pioneer style. They built fiddles and other instruments as they studied Appalachian history, music, and culture. With the help of high school students and adults from the Mountaineer Craftsman Cooperative, they made split-log benches, tables, a cradle, and a churn. Pioneer diaries served as texts for reading instruction and inspired the creation of dramas about pioneer life; though their 'flax notebooks,' students developed their writing.²⁸⁰

Aside from recreating a sanitized version of the Virginian frontier, the administrators of the Arthurdale community used this idealized pre-industrial past to deflect both the social-economic realities of its residents, as well as their own experiences. As Daniel Perlstein points out "Arthurdale's creators were familiar with the political economy of

²⁷⁸ Kuntiz, Stephen. (Summer, 1971) *The Social Philosophy of John Collier*. Ethnohistory, Vol. 18, No. 3. Duke University Press pp.10

²⁷⁹ Perlstein, Daniel. (2016) *Class in, Miseducation: A History of Ignorance-Making in America and Abroad*. A.J. Angulo Ed, John Hopkins University Press. pp 127

²⁸⁰ Perlstein, Daniel. (2016) *Class in Miseducation: A History of Ignorance-Making in America and Abroad*. A.J. Angulo, Ed, John Hopkins University Press. pp 129

coal, but in their commitment to revitalizing refugees from the coal fields they both overstated the degree to which homesteaders had been incapacitated by life in the mining camps and obscured the causes of their dispossession....” likewise, he adds “Arthurdale’s curriculum also left students ignorant of the state’s role in enforcing corporate domination”.²⁸¹ Therefore, in a time in which, revolutionary education was addressing the myriad of conflicts that plagued modernity; class, race, gender, Arthurdale, and progressive educators actively worked to cover-up them up in the hopes of creating a pioneer utopia. One of the many inherent problems of trying to recreate the past in the present, the issue that stands out in each case, is how the narrative is controlled and who is silenced in the process. As Michel-Rolph Trouillot argues in his book *Silencing the Past*: “the value of a historical product cannot be debated without taking into account both the context of its production and the context of its consumption²⁸²”. In the case of Arthurdale, the value of the production of the homesteading villages, for both the federal government and big business far out weighted any value for the homesteaders, who were wedged into a re-imagining of the frontier. The pioneer skill set that was a part of this vision, was not only out of place in the early twentieth-century modern corporate capitalist economy but kept the residents from gaining modern industrial or academic skills that could be used to re-enter the labor market at a better advantage.

Moreover, the Arthurdale’s Pioneer model illustrates that “the Past often diverts us from the present injustices for which previous generations only set the foundations²⁸³”. Thus, rather than focus on the economic, political and social injustices that both caused and continued to perpetuate their powerlessness, residents were distracted by the amusement of playing pioneer.

In the case of Arthurdale, the act of silencing was not only extant in the recreation of the past or the cover-up of the present, but also the possibilities of the future. As Daniel Perlstein points out

While progressive educator envisioned children making meaningful lives in the resettlement community, parent envisioned schooling that would open up the world to their children. As residents’ hopes grew, their notion of connecting learning to life included their children having access to college, a stance requiring traditional, academic discipline-based courses and not idiosyncratic community-focused curriculum.²⁸⁴

But this is not what the U.S. educational system is based on. Education does not create economic or political equality, any more than a reorientation to the past can, especially when that past is as racist and classed as the present. To say that Arthurdale was an educational experiment gone amiss is too miss the point. Like most forms of education, Arthurdale was an attempt to subdue a distraught population of surplus workers. To

²⁸¹ Perlstein, Daniel. (2016) *Class* in, *Miseducation: A History of Ignorance-Making in America and Abroad*. A.J. Angulo Ed. John Hopkins University Press. pp130-31

²⁸² Trouillot, Michel-Rolph (1997) *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. 1 ed. Beacon Press. pp. 146

²⁸³ Trouillot, Michel-Rolph (1997) *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. 1 ed. Beacon Press. pp. 150

²⁸⁴ Perlstein, Daniel. (2016) *Class* in *Miseducation: A History of Ignorance-Making in America and Abroad*. A.J. Angulo, Ed John Hopkins University Press. pp. 134

create a historical distraction, a stroll through American's memory lane. Except that as most contemporary historians will argue there is no such thing as the good ol' days, just nostalgia for what could have been.

The degree to which individual teachers and administrators were aware of the impracticality of the project is debatable, but does not take away from the fact that this program, and the myriad of reform projects after it, have never dealt with the root causes of political and economic plight. This is because these projects, like the educational system itself are tied to the cooperate capitalistic system that demands the creation of laborers to be integrated in an inherently unequal system²⁸⁵. As Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis argue in their book *Schooling in Capitalist America* "education helps defuse and depoliticize the potentially explosive class relations of the production process, and thus serves to perpetuate the social, political, and economic conditions through which a portion of the product of labor is expropriated in the form of profits²⁸⁶. Arthur Dale was not going to produce equality or even jobs for that matter, because it never possessed the political or economic power to restructure mining or other industries in a way that would buffer against a future labor "crash." But in all truth, it was never meant to. As Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis argue "the politics of education are better understood in terms of the need for social control in an unequal and rapidly changing economic order...²⁸⁷" where "the problem is too fix up not to change the economic structures which regulate their lives. This, indeed is the meaning of the "social power" of school to promote equality."²⁸⁸

But what did such progressive projects like Arthur Dale mean to Collier? Although it is hard to know what he personally felt about the project, the BIA did provide a short report on what they dubbed the *Subsistence Homestead under Public works began*, in the 1933 November issues of the emergency conservation Newsletter *Indians at Work*. The initial report mostly provides general facts about the project such as funding sources and budget, the number of intended homesteads and residents, layout and price per home. It then goes on to include the rationale behind the project stating "the purpose of the project is to furnish ties and means of subsistence to families now without these necessitates and without the likelihood of obtaining them in the future, due to the permanent evanishment of opportunity for employment in the industries from which they are accustomed to derive support."²⁸⁹ Within the description of the Homesteading plan is a sharp absence of any substantial political and economic context. Rather than explain, in any detail, the root causes of mass unemployment, dislocation, or even an indication of how this program would generate sustainable jobs, the author simply states that employment in certain industries has "evanished" (the act of vanishing), as though the jobs and the security they provided simply disappeared into thin air. But as noted above, this program was

²⁸⁵ Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life* 2011 ed. Haymarket Books Chicago, Illinois. PP 11-12

²⁸⁶ Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life* 2011 ed. Haymarket Books Chicago, Illinois. PP. 11

²⁸⁷ Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life* 2011 ed. Haymarket Books Chicago, Illinois. pp. 27

²⁸⁸ Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life* 2011 ed. Haymarket Books Chicago, Illinois. pp. 26

²⁸⁹ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.33

about distraction, trading economic and political water, and thus any governmental report about the project would be encouraged to do the same.

The report does attempt to give a quasi warning about the extent of the current labor climate by paraphrasing Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes,

Secretary Ickes, in a statement to the press, has pointed out that in many industries the unemployment problem is more than temporary. In coal mining alone there are, according to reliable estimates, 2000,000 or more men accustomed to eaning their livings by mining who are no longer needed in the industry. Under the subsistence homesteading plan an effort will be made to care for human beings so uprooted.²⁹⁰

Aside from giving credence to the fact that unemployment is widespread with no end in sight, the report does little else. Moreover, the fact that this statement ends with the assurance that the plan is an attempt to care for those displaced by mass unemployment makes it seem like a natural disaster, with emphasis on natural, meaning that no individuals or corporations are made even slightly responsible.

One month later, BIA land Expert, Ward Shepard, followed up on the initial report to explain the significance of the Homestead Program to the BIA. In his article *Subsistence Homestead Project*, Shepard first lays out what he views as the intention of the program stating:²⁹¹

Under the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Government is specifically authorized to lend money to establish subsistence homesteads, (that is, small farms primarily for direct family support rather than for commercial crop-growing) in order to get people out of the congested city areas, where unemployment is acute and social conditions unsatisfactory...²⁹²

Here, Shepard points out what he perceives as the three main underlining reasons for the program, that is; the congested cities, rampant unemployment and unacceptable social conditions. All of which read like the progressive reformers checklist, overcrowded cities: check, widespread unemployment: check, deplorable social conditions: check. But again, like the first article there is no political or economic contexts provided to explain the creation of these circumstances. Instead it is just a reiteration of progressive “facts.”

After summarizing the purpose of the program he goes onto include some general information about how the Homesteads will be setup: “The subsistence Homestead Division is working in general along the line of establishing subsistence farming villages or communities rather than isolated homesteads. These villages, while dependent mainly

²⁹⁰ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.33

²⁹¹ Cohen Felix S. (2006). On the drafting of Tribal Constitutions. University of Oklahoma, Norman Ok. pp.xxi

²⁹² United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 15,1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 9Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.7

on small-scale farming, will also develop subsidiary, small-scale industries, such as handicrafts, etc.”²⁹³ Although he does not provide specific details as far as what the industries and/or handicrafts will be, his statement is a clear echo of previous BIA educational policy, especially in connection to the “arts and crafts” movement in the Boarding and later community schools. In this sense the Homesteaders Act is right up the BIA alley, in that it provides an “education” that allows its graduates to tread economic water. Meaning that they are only given an education that keeps them from becoming an economic burden on the state, as opposed to an “education” that would give them the tools to achieve economic, political and social stability. In fact, these villages are more about removing laborers from the market, then about preparing them for future markets. This is because, as the decade long West Virginia Coal wars exemplifies, the early 20th century corporate capitalistic system was on the verge of a violent revolution due to the unequal distribution of wealth, power and property, not to mention the overwhelming size of its reserve labor force. The homesteading program was an attempt to redistribute a small amount of property, with out redistributing wealth or power.

In the case of Native peoples, the program was not important so much for the redistribution of land, as it had been re-distributed during the allotment era, but to provide homestead villages for urban Indians and possibly those that lost their allotments. In this sense Shepard argues:

This plan fits in closely with the new Indian land policies being developed by this Administration, and for that reason we have made proposals to the Subsistence Homestead Division for a grant of funds to develop a few experimental subsistence villages among the Indians, especially certain stranded groups living in, industrial centers.²⁹⁴

This is not to say that the Homesteading projects had no significance for allottees back on the reservation. In the February 1934 issue the article Indian Legislation: The Bill for Land and Self-Government briefly notes in the Main Provision section that

In the economic field, the bill proposes to repeal the notorious allotment law of 1887, through which the Indians have lost two-thirds of their lands to the whites; to prevent any further alienation of Indian lands outside of Indian ownership; to put allotted lands, especially grazing and forest lands, back into community ownership; to prevent overgrazing; to place the Indian forests, of which there are over eight million acres, on the basis of continuous productive forestry management; and to develop Indian farming, livestock raising, and other land use along the lines of the subsistence homestead projects now being developed by the Government for white communities.²⁹⁵

²⁹³ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 15, 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 9 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.7

²⁹⁴ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 9 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.7

²⁹⁵ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 13 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.5

As this article demonstrates the larger National Subsistence Homesteading project was not just important to BIA policy but central to it, as it would help shape the programs and policies that the BIA took up. Moreover, it shows that Indian policy was a reflection of National progressive reform; where what was being used to subdue and contain landless white laborers was also used to subdue, contain and slowly incorporate the dependent-citizen into the corporate capitalist system on a permanent basis. Hence, if subsistence homesteading was an effective way to economically suspend White laborers in the past, it was an equally efficient way to “integrate” Indians into the “present”.

Both the economic salvation that Artherdale and other Homesteading projects like it promised, as well as the Racial Salvation sought by Collier, were based in practical fantasy. Practical in the sense that they further advanced the agenda of the Nation and Corporate capitalism; fantastical in that they neglected both the root causes leading up to and the future consequences of progressive economic and political reforms. Thus, like the reform efforts of his progressive contemporaries, racial salvation was a rhetorical diversion from a capitalistic assimilation design. However, unlike the unskilled white laborers who were being diverted to be “revitalized” in the past, Collier and his kin upheld the conviction that Native peoples, like other “folk communities” could hold onto and even further support their tribal traditions, while incorporating labor skills to successfully navigate modernity. The actual implementation of this reform movement would later reveal the assimilation intentions in which only the traditions that were economically, morally, and socially safe to middle America would be supported.

Accordingly, reform programs created for Native peoples did not so much uphold a re-orientation to a pioneer past, but rather were argued to provide an increased in support of traditional tribal customs and community relationships. However, like Arthurdale, Colliers reform vision was based on an idealized perception of the past, specifically a fetishized utopia of Pueblo and other southwest Indian communities, which, like many representations before it, bound Native peoples to an unrealistic and romanticized past. While it did fulfill some desire to reject the negative outcomes of modernity and Corporate capitalism on the part of the reformers it was neither representative of the experiences of Native communities, past nor present, and thus not perceptive to the actual needs of Native peoples.

The Policy of Envanishment: How the population was parceled up and lost

To call for the self-determination of Tribes, or even a return back to Colliers idealized traditional communities was not only a ideal based on inaccurate representations of all Native peoples, but even more complicated given the actual experiences of Tribes which continued to be at the economic and political mercy of the federal government. Moreover, as with any Nation or Peoples, the social-political organizations and economies of tribal members and communities continued to be dynamic often changing in ways they felt were best suited to navigate the effects of colonialism, whether for the gain or detriment of those involved. In short, John Collier’s

Indians never existed, except in the minds and hearts of Collier and his team of progressive educators.

But by advocating for Racial Salvation Collier was able to maintain a purpose for Bureau, to fight the good fight, in which the “White man” would take up the burden of Indian dependency, lifting them up in order to encourage and guide them to self-sufficiency. Or so he would have us believe:

The Government can remove obstacles. It must do so. It can extend material aid—at the utmost, a small fraction of the material aid which the Indians (if they are to win) must supply to themselves through their individual and group effort, sacrifice and faith. The Government cannot do the decisive part. It ought to be this way, and it is. No people which must depend on a government to save it can be saved at all.²⁹⁶

Collier frames the U.S. government, as a benevolent supporter of Native peoples. Accordingly, their intentions to provide moral and material support are straightforward and well meaning. Yet, this description silences the inherent paternalism, as well as the larger colonial motivations, at work. Collier not only demands that Native peoples invest their “effort,” sacrifice”, and “faith”, but also subscribe to his colonial logic. All in all his statement both distorts the power disparity between tribes and the government given the fact the BIA had almost full control over every aspect of the lives of Native peoples, while also leaving enough political room to blame them if and when they were unable to achieve the demands of his colonial logic. In short, the BIA, and more specifically Collier were not interested in what “Indians” thought was necessary for the survival of their communities, rather wanted to continue to foster the transition from ward to ancillary-citizen.

Like all of the Indian commissioners before him, Collier did not take the time to listen to what Native peoples needed in order to become economically and/or politically viable as Nations. Instead he and his cohort were more interested in playing Captain assimilate an Indian, through the rhetoric of tribal revitalization. Rather than give any credence to how Native peoples were impoverished, on multiple levels, through the actions of the U.S. government and other European nations before them, or even acknowledge that the government had an obligation to assist Native peoples, Collier and his cohort demanded political and economic action through the programs they designed. Programs, which, provided little support, whether cultural or political, beyond integrating them into ancillary-citizens which would be economically and politically dependent on the U.S. corporate capitalistic system as surplus laborers. Thus, Collier’s base policy of “community building” actually worked, in part, to transition Native peoples from government wards to wards of capitalism, dependent on the labor system.

In his case for salvation, Collier even goes so far as to claim, that racial extinction is an unrecognized crisis, stating: “Enduring courage is needed. And among the Indians,

²⁹⁶ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. PP.1-2

where hundreds are now aware of the crisis—of the supreme possibilities—thousands much become aware; and the awareness must become organized for sustained action on the slow beating wings of that old courage which never failed the Indians in the long past”.²⁹⁷ One of the clearest instances of Collier’s colonial imaginary towards the experiences of Native peoples shows up in the later half of his racial salvation sermon. Collier declares that racial extinction or salvation “depends on the Indians. And only on them”²⁹⁸,” showing that he is unable to grasp that Native peoples had been actively working to protect, benefit or simply persist through colonization, and in doing so were in a constant cycle of adaptation. When he maintains, “it is needed that the Indian in their tribal groupings shall vigorously-clear-mindedly and experimentally—attack the problem of their own organization—their political, civil, cultural and industrial organization”²⁹⁹. He again refuses to acknowledge that tribes actively negotiated colonization and in doing so had inherently gone through multiple courses of political, economic and cultural reorganization. The idea that he can hand over the keys to the reservation, so to speak, in which Native people “... are now free to attack this problem,” does not recognize the reality that Native peoples had always attacked “the problem,” yet were not “free” in any sense of the word. In fact, the problem was never a question of inaction or freedom on the part of Native peoples. It was a case of colonial, policies, laws and discourses that effectively worked to rid the colonial government of their Indian problem. Such practices slightly differed during each reform era, ranging from physical genocide to social-cultural genocide, but still continued to advocate racial and/or cultural extinction. Nuanced practices that continued under the Collier.

What happens when the colonial government is unable to see its own hegemony, when it’s leaders simultaneously reinforces cultural, political and linguistic extinction, while advocating for racial salvation? What happens when the rhetoric of benevolence, justice and self-determination are actually justifications for a nuanced colonial agenda? This is when, and it happens often in colonial regimes, we find out that policy was neither intended nor crafted to address anything but the desires of the larger colonial project.

If we look past the smoke and mirrors, of extinction-salvation rhetoric that the BIA perpetuated, we begin to see a different picture emerge. Even given the “fact” that population numbers had dipped, were still wards of the state, contained to their reservations, being transformed into ancillary-citizens, and so forth and so on, in reality Native peoples were not on the brink of extinction, either physically or culturally. Yes they were refugee populations; yes they were dependent upon the Federal government in various ways; yes they were struggling, yes they were discriminated against; yes they were exploited; but they were not on the edge of extinction.

By deconstructing the vanishing Indian assertions made about Native peoples, by BIA officials in the early 20th century, a different story emerges, one that peels back the

²⁹⁷ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.3

²⁹⁸ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.3

²⁹⁹ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.3

layers of community organization rhetoric to reveal a hidden piece of the assimilation puzzle. The hidden bridge from Boarding schools to relocation, in which, the BIA used an apocalyptic projection, in contrasting ways and for different groups, to initiate a more effective assimilation program. A program of community development and immediate incorporation for others, both of which would actively accelerate the ancillary-citizen transformation, laying the foundation for the eventual removal of Native peoples from their Tribal communities to the position of landless laborers.

Although there are many pieces to the assimilation puzzle one of the most entrenched Narratives held up in American history is the story that Native peoples were on the decline in the early part of the 21st century. Yet the tools that have been used to “track” the population size of Native Americans are inherently flawed. Take for instance the U.S Censuses. Established in 1790 it was not until 1860 that Native Individuals were even included in the data. Even at this early date the problems of tracking individuals is clear given that the census rules stated “Indians *not taxed* are not to be enumerated. The families of Indians who have renounced tribal rule, and who under state or territory laws exercise the rights of citizens, are to be enumerated” as though Indian agents would have had either the time or energy to document every such case.³⁰⁰ This is not to say that Indian agents never did so, but that the practice was uneven at best, and therefore cannot be counted on for accurate population numbers.

Because the system is based on self-reporting it is rife with inaccuracies. For instance, up through the 1970s, it was considered embarrassing or even dangerous by many to mark Native American, which caused individuals and their households to check a different racial category or to completely opt out of the Census. As evidenced by the 1860 census, which only included enumerated Indians, the categories, used in the census, were in themselves either constructed or perpetuated by the Federal government in order to promote a larger national agenda. In the case of Native Americans, that agenda included at one time or another, the physical and/or or cultural erasure of their populations. Lastly, while it is widely accepted that any decrease in Native American populations over the last three to four centuries has been due to systematic physical genocide, pestilence, and starvation, all of which have been used to argue for the assimilation of Native peoples; this narrative has also led to the erasure of one of the most prolific culprits of Native American population decline of the 19th and 20th century. One that is has become the most pressing issues for the majority of Native communities everywhere, reservation mathematics.

The Christian European binary of disciple versus heathen has had a long legal history in the justification for the seizure of lands. The application of this Christian legal framework became one of the most important tools in the conquest of the Americas. As legal scholar Robert A. Williams’s Jr. argues

The archives of Western colonialism in the Americas reveal a profusion of laws that were drafted, enacted, obeyed, ignored, or defined in pursuit of

³⁰⁰ pp. 14. United States Census Bureau (1860) *Eighth Census, United States—1860. Instructions to U.S. Marshals* <https://usa.ipums.org/usa/voliii/inst1860.shtml>.

Europe's will to empire in the New world. While the colonizing nations of Europe interpreted and applied their presumed mandates in the New World in radically divergent ways, each assumed that law was an appropriate instrument of empire in imposing its particular vision of truth on the American Indian.³⁰¹

One way in which "colonizing discourse" and law was manifested was through the legalization of an Indian race. Thus, from the categories of heathen and wild men, the "red" Indian became racially designated and then legally bound to a biological ancestry. To put this into perspective, at the same time Europeans were confining Indianness to biological ancestry, they were expanding their own notions of peoplehood to the social-cultural categories of Nation and citizenship, which by no means was inclusive, but was also not necessarily attached to ancestry exclusively. Even the category of whiteness was expanded over time. Meaning that Europeans could both become a citizen in any number of nations through the process of naturalization, as well as "racially" reclassified.

Through the legalization of Indianness and the implementation of the hyper decent system³⁰², better know as the blood quantum, that followed it, "literally hundreds of thousands³⁰³" of Native peoples have been effectively divorced from their tribal communities. While on its own, the legalization of Indianness has negatively impacted the expansion of Native communities; one act in particular has arguably done more damage than any other policy in U.S. history. The 1887 Dawes Act, also known as the allotment act, was created to breakup the Tribe's communal land holdings in hopes of speeding up the assimilation process. While there were many different facets to the larger policy, which included the transformation of ward to ancillary-citizen, including forcing individual property ownership, and a push towards a total incorporation of the capitalistic system, the way in which allotments were parceled out was based on the ad-hoc quantification of each tribal member. However, "because the act failed to define the meaning of 'Indian,' determining the eligibility of individuals manifested in various ways³⁰⁴." That is, it failed to ask Native peoples what their understanding of tribal membership was, because the United States had specifically defined it as a biological relationship, the *United States v. Rogers*. Thus by the time the allotment act was passed "qualifying mostly depended upon the perspectives of local Indian agents appointed by the president... and thus "enrollment eventually alienated thousands of American Indian from their respective tribes"³⁰⁵. Untold thousands lost or more rightly never obtained what Dawanna Roberts terms American Indian Legal Identity. All told it is estimated that over sixty percent³⁰⁶ of allotment applicants were denied. Even as some of these

³⁰¹ Williams, Robert A. (1992) *The Indian in Western legal thought: The Discourse of Conquest*. Oxford University Press.

³⁰² For more information on this subject see Biolsi, Thomas. (2007) *Race Technologies in "A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics*. Eds Nugent, David and Joan Vincent. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. pp. 6

³⁰³ Robertson, Dwanna L. (2013) *A Necessary Evil: Framing an American Indian Legal Identity*" in *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* Vol. 37 No. 5.

--Prucha, Francis Paul. (1984) *The Great Father: The United States Government and the Indians*. University of Nebraska Press.

³⁰⁴ Robertson, Dwanna L. (2013) *A Necessary Evil: Framing an American Indian Legal Identity*" in *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* Vol. 37 No. 5.

³⁰⁵ Robertson, Dwanna L. (2013) *A Necessary Evil: Framing an American Indian Legal Identity*" in *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* Vol. 37 No. 5.

³⁰⁶ Robertson, Dwanna L. (2013) *A Necessary Evil: Framing an American Indian Legal Identity*" in *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* Vol. 37 No. 5.

applicants were no doubt fraudulent, that still does not account for the percentage of those who were denied a legal Identity, due to tribal corruption, miss-classification, tribal factions, distrust of the BIA, physical absence during the allotment process and any other number of situations.³⁰⁷

Thus, Collier's argument that the Indian population was rapidly declining was administratively accurate, but in reality was exacerbated by the multi-faceted political maneuvering of tribal enrollment, coupled with Indian removal and their confinement to desolate reservations. It was neither a physical, nor cultural death, or anywhere near the brink of extinction. In many Native communities, language, spirituality, culture, and organized political structures were still in use. Some were struggling, most had changed over time, but that was directly related to colonial survival strategies, not some inherent dysfunction on the part of Native peoples.

Which brings us back to Mr. Collier, who seemingly wanted Native peoples to "flourish" via racial salvation. Yet, like his predecessors, he measured the success of Tribes on his own perceptions and experiences, refusing to let go of his paternal control long enough to learn what Native communities, and peoples saw as their needs and wants. For instance, while he advocated for the end of allotment, and created a buy back program, neither he nor anyone else in the Bureau mentioned the over fifty percent of Native peoples that had their Indianness legally exterminated, in the thirty plus years that the Allotment act was in effect.

Nowhere is his benevolent blindness better demonstrated than in the closing statement of his racial salvation sermon, where he uses the Navajo Nation as his shining example of progress. Proudly stating "The Navajos have gallantly led the way, in the their recent undertaking to regulate their own range (at a good deal of voluntary sacrifice and of shock to precedent) as the means toward improving together land and toward putting an end to soil erosion. But for the Navajos, like all the Indians, it is a long journey which is ahead³⁰⁸". The irony in this statement is that it covers up the experiences of the Navajo's who witnessed and experienced the Collier administration's actions of progress, a mass slaughter of thousands of livestock. It erases, the legacy of anger and betrayal that is so deep and far reaching that it is still felt by the contemporary generations of these communities. Moreover, Collier's statement works to change the narrative of own Native people felt his policies, and legacy. His statements shows his paternalistic blindness, given that he was unable to fully comprehend the political backlash he received for erosion policies, when less than a year later the Navajo Nation refused to pass the Indian Reorganization Act, simply to spite him. It should come as no surprise that Collier was blinded to the nuanced colonial violence he enacted, as he experienced it through the lens of a paternalistic guardian. Like so many of BIA agents that came before him, he was colonial-blind; intoxicated by his ambition of benevolent paternalism to the degree in which he was only able to understand the past experiences and effects of colonialism,

³⁰⁷ Robertson, Dwanna L. (2013) A Necessary Evil: Framing an American Indian Legal Identity" in American Indian Culture and Research Journal Vol. 37 No. 5.

³⁰⁸ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.3

including the National narrative of the vanishing Indian, to support or fit with his own colonial logic. Given his early blunders what else was he unable to clearly see or acknowledge. How far would his administration be willing to go to achieve their goals? I have shown what community-organization meant for Collier, but what did it mean for others in his administration, how did they view the road to Racial salvation?

To Be or Not To Be: How the scale of Indianness informed Progressive educational Policy

In the last chapter I showed that both Carson Ryan and John Dewey believed in the potential of progressive education to seemingly modernize and assimilate all Native students into mainstream America, a goal they both adamantly supported, for most students. But the implementation of progressive education was a stratified process, as key educators and policy makers alike, believed that Native Americans constituted two separate groups. And here is where Racial Salvation becomes a fork in the road, so to speak. The pathway on the left for those Tribes or individuals who possessed little Indian “blood” while the fork on the right was for “fullbloods.” Both pathways would of course eventually lead to assimilation, but in the 1920s these courses would diverge for a short time in order to assimilate these two populations in the most efficient and inexpensive way.

In 1931 Ryan described these so called “*Two Main Groups*” stating “Indian education has to deal with two main groups of Indians—a larger group of comparatively little Indian blood and culture, and a smaller group, mainly in the Southwest, with really significant survival.”³⁰⁹ The fact that Ryan, and other policy makers, not only thought they could measure Indianness in a “racial” and cultural context, but compare the Indianness of one Tribe to another, shows how their colonial imaginary both catalogued and generalized the vast experiences and survival strategies of Native peoples.

Yet such beliefs were not only common during this period, but continue to be part of the U.S. Indian narrative today. That is, the idea, that there was some kind of ideal Indian population(s), usually referenced in the past tense, that could be used to measure authenticity of either individuals or Tribes. Such a narrative is part of what Robert Venables calls a “collective amnesia” on the part of settler America, which refuses to engage in the ways that colonialism both affected tribes, beyond genocide and reservations, as well as acknowledge the varied strategies of survival that Tribes used to navigate it.

This piece of the vanishing Indian narrative has been used to do many things, in the progressive era it was used to further entrench the idea that blood quantum was not only connected to culture but was by definition the conclusive measurement of Indianness, and entrance into ancillary-citizenship. Going back to Ryan’s description of the *Two Main Groups* helps to make this narrative clearer. He begins by expanding on his description of the first group, those he calls “part-Indians”.

³⁰⁹ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 pp81-86. <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>. pp. 82

To the many of us the first group seems to have lost almost everything that is Indian...this is a group with certain treaty and other rights and a long history of suppression, both cultural and economic, that has about run its course, leaving a rural situation not greatly unlike other backward rural situations in external appearances, but curiously complicated by racial element and the attitudes of whites.³¹⁰

Ryan's statement is both a wealth of insight and confusion into how he and other policy maker's viewed this "first group". His initial statement that this first group seems to have essentially lost "almost everything that is Indian," demonstrates his belief that there are definite Indian markers, yet he does little to explain what these are. His second assertion that the treaties and rights of Native people have "about run its course" supports the idea that they are culturally and economically integrating to the "backwards" (non-progressive rural American model), and will therefore no longer need to maintain their special trust status. He then adds that they essentially appear as "backwards" rural communities save for the presence of racism, which he finds "curious". The fact that Ryan would find the "backwards" rural situation "curiously" complicated by racism perpetuated by a rural white America, again shows how he perceived Indian experiences through a nuanced colonial lens. Not only does he refuse Tribes the right to be socially/politically dynamic, he refuses to understand the depth of frontier racism. Especially given that the majority of these ethnically "white" settlers were only a generation or two apart from those, possibly even family members, who were active in the processes of conquest and genocide. That Ryan essentially dismisses the racism and violent acts that often followed, shows his own nuanced progressive colonial logic which was out of touch with the beliefs of many rural white communities, which continued to perpetuate the colonial logics of conquests and extermination. His statement is analogous to claiming that the rural situation of the South was curiously complicated by the racial element of Jim Crow. Racism, was neither curious nor abstract during this period. It was the rule in America, in both rural and urban America, yet he frames the racism of Rural America as though it were something exceptional, which leads me to believe that Ryan held that rural "part-Indians" and rural whites were becoming culturally and economically homogenous. In the terms of assimilation theory, this is to say that Ryan believed that "part-Indians" were downward assimilating into rural America. I say downward, as opposed to upward given the fact that Ryan himself describes rural America as backwards/non-progressive. Moreover, his statement shows the similar motivations of diverging colonial logics, the latter a perpetuation of conquest, to rid the land of Native peoples through intimidation and physical violence, while Ryan's progressive colonial logic worked to rid the land of Native peoples by economically incorporating, or even fully incorporating them into larger white rural populations, through the seemingly near complete the cultural, linguistic, ideological and racial assimilation.

Ryan was not the only policy maker that held such sediments about Native peoples. In 1931 Lewis Meriam himself, best known for the report that bares his name, the infamous 1928 Meriam report, elaborated on this Indian binary at his talk *State and*

³¹⁰ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). "Indian Education Today." *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 pp81-86. <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>.

Local Cooperation with the National Government in Social and Educational Work for Indians before the Committee on the American Indian of the National Conference of Social Work. In his opening statement entitled *Statement of the Problem* he described a trip he took to an unidentified mid-west reservations by first comparing the assimilability of different Indian groups; “This morning we are to visit an Indian reservation. We are not going to the so-called full blood area of the semiarid southwest, fascinating as such a trip would be. We are not taking the widely advertised Indian detour on the Santa Fe, so we shall not pile into sight-seeing automobiles...”³¹¹ His depicts the southwest, in the joyous and over excited tone of a child. His enthusiasm about the possibility of exploring the villages of full blood Indians is present in his wording, and shows that such a trip would be more like an adventure. Taken together it is clear that in some way Meriam views the peoples and villages of the Southwest as something to both be explored and researched; the last real Indian frontier.

Meriam continues with the description of the tribes he will not be visiting in the southwest.

...we shall not pile into sight-seeing automobiles and visit rather hastily the pueblos of New Mexico, nor shall we visit those other delightful villages dwelling Indians, the Hopis and Zuni of Arizona. Omitted from out itinerary is the great homogeneous, seminomadic tribe of Navajos tending their sheep over the vast, almost barren deserts of Arizona and New Mexico. We shall not see the farm-famed old Indian raiders, the Apaches, in their wikiups on the Arizona desert nor those peace loving agriculturists, the Pimas of Arizona, whose boast is that they have never fought against the white man. We shall not visit their close relatives, the Papagoes, down on the Mexican border...³¹²

Through his description it is clear that Meriam would much rather be in the southwest enjoying an epic adventure exploring old time raiders, sheep herders and peace loving villagers. Through the tone he applies throughout the description of each Tribe, he shares with the reader a sense of childish grief and self-pity; as though it is not only he that is being stopped from going on his favorite ride, but the reader is as well. Based on his descriptions, what early twentieth century researcher wouldn't want to go on this Trip of famed, exotic Indians?

After delivering his enthusiastic list of southwestern Tribal destinations, Meriam generalizes southwestern populations as a way to compare to the tribes that he actually visited; “Almost all are fullbloods. The economic basis of their existence has not been destroyed by the advent of the whites or else, as in the case of the Navajos, they have found a new means of existence not inconsistent with their old culture and their Indian

³¹¹ Meriam, Lewis. (June 1931) *State and Local Cooperation with the National Government in Social and Educational Work for Indians* in Cooperation in Indian Administration: Federal, State, Country, AND Local. Four papers presented before the Committee on the American Indian of the National Conference of Social Work. Minneapolis, MN. pp. 1

³¹² Meriam, Lewis. (June 1931) *State and Local Cooperation with the National Government in Social and Educational Work for Indians* in Cooperation in Indian Administration: Federal, State, Country, AND Local. Four papers presented before the Committee on the American Indian of the National Conference of Social Work. Minneapolis, MN. pp. 1

solidarity.³¹³ Meriam's description reads like a traditional Indian check-list, fullbloods: check, economic base still in tact: check: maintenance of "old culture": check. This list is not only shows that Native peoples were specifically being categorized based on outward perceptions but also highlights the profound sense of authority that non-Native researchers, such as Meriam, Ryan and Collier claimed over Indianness in the early twentieth century. Which is a significant factor in the transformation from ward-citizen to ancillary-citizen and the case of the "most culturally-racially assimilated" even full citizenship. It was not enough to quantify Native peoples, now they were dividing them into more definitive categories of Indianness, based on economic and/or cultural activities. This categorization was coded to signify the social-cultural position of each tribe on the evolutionary scale. Which was then used to develop the most effective policies, institutions, and strategies to force each individual in the Tribe into the position of ancillary-citizens. For instance the belief that Southwestern tribes, were the real noble-savages who had "not yet" strayed too far from their authentic past, translated to mean that they were not just the least assimilated or most primitive, but more importantly, that the majority of their members operated outside of the U.S. economic system and thus the government would need the most forceful or disruptive policies, to reform these populations into ancillary citizens. Hence, the use of Lewis Henry Morgan's half a century old evolutionary scale was still significant because it provided a general colonial tracking system.

The colonial tracking system, racial categorization and social-cultural evolutionary scale were all part of the same colonial imaginary, which was only able to interpret Native peoples experiences, both historical and contemporary, through the desires of the colonizer, i.e. a colonial lens. Meaning they only saw change or adaptation as a one-way process, that is either moving towards or away from Americanization, rather than comprehending that change, at any level, is complicated, messy, uneven and a non-sequential process. Native peoples in every Tribe whether federally recognized or not, transformed in drastic ways due to colonization. They transformed politically, economically, socially, culturally, spirituality, epistemologically, linguistically; navigated and negotiated new alliances, trade networks, and even material objects. Most changed in everyway possible, but the point is that they all changed. There are no Tribes, which are authentic, because as Trouillot reminds us there is no such thing as the authentic³¹⁴. In the case of Native peoples however, "the authentic" has continued to be a useful technology of colonialism, even within the disciplines of history. As Ned Blackhawk argues,

understandings of Indian history, culture, and identity remain historically determined located not in essential cultural traits but in the violent post contact time and space of American history. No timeless ethnographic categories or political definitions characterize these Native peoples...Hybridity, adaptation, and exchange more clearly characterize

³¹³ Meriam, Lewis. (June 1931) *State and Local Cooperation with the National Government in Social and Educational Work for Indians* in *Cooperation in Indian Administration: Federal, State, Country, AND Local*. Four papers presented before the Committee on the American Indian of the National Conference of Social Work. Minneapolis, MN. pp. 1

³¹⁴ Trouillot, Michel-Rolph (1997) *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. 1 ed. Beacon Press. pp. 148

these histories than do fixed ethnographic categories, let alone the convenient dichotomies so common to narratives of American Indians.³¹⁵

Secondly, to claim that the tribes of the southwest are somehow more authentic than other tribes, not only disregards the varied forms and implementation of colonial violence that transformed all tribes, including those of the southwest, it inadvertently promotes the survival strategies and outcomes of southwestern tribes over all others, as if to claim that only these Tribes were able to appropriately and authentically withstand “contact” unchanged. But that is what makes this statement so disingenuous as no single tribe, remnant of a tribe, or newly formed tribes survived unscathed.

Even as Meriam’s descriptions of tribes are entrenched in both the noble/ignoble Indian binary and a quantification of Indianness they still hint at a violent transformation. For instance, Meriam’s use of the adjective “Raider” to describe Apaches both points to a violent past while simultaneously naturalizing these characteristics, making them seem inherent to the Tribe they are attributed too. Which brings us to the third point that most tribes were forced to develop militaristic and raiding strategies in order to protect themselves from slave raiders, military attacks, and maintain their own economic survival. Including the Pueblo and Pimas, who Meriam refers to as “delightful” and “peace loving”, both of which, like their Apache and Navajo neighbors were forced to engage in the Spanish economies of raiding and slavery, aka economies of violence, in order to survive. Thus, by attributing “raiding” to Apaches not only supports “convenient dichotomies” but also removes the history and consequences of these waves of violence that reshaped the entire North and South American continents. Lastly, such misrepresentations actually help to cover up current and future actions of the BIA.

Ultimately Meriam’s comments misrepresent southwestern Tribes as being settled, stable and simply going about traditional life as usual, by covering up their turbulent and dynamic past. For him they are an exciting attraction of ancient communal ways. This perspective is important in deconstructing his ideas about the economic, political and social future of both “groups” of Native peoples. Meriam argues that the southwestern Tribes “do not now face, as their only way ahead, assimilation into the economic and even the social life of the white civilization. We are not immediately concerned with them in the subject we are discussing at this conference.³¹⁶” The significance of this claim, doesn’t lie in the argument that the southwestern tribes are neither the immediate concern of the conference, nor faced with immediate assimilation as their only way ahead, as the BIA did both disrupt and work to assimilate southwestern tribes as laborers of the nation, a process that I will discuss later. But rather is embedded in his comparison of an unknown group. If they do not now face assimilation as their only way ahead, who does? And why is economic and social assimilation into white civilization the only way forward? Moreover, what do the southwestern Tribes possess that all other Tribes do not, other than blood quantum?

³¹⁵ Blackhawk, Ned. (2006) *Violence over the Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge MA. pp. 8.

³¹⁶ Meriam, Lewis. (June 1931) *State and Local Cooperation with the National Government in Social and Educational Work for Indians* in *Cooperation in Indian Administration: Federal, State, Country, AND Local*. Four papers presented before the Committee on the American Indian of the National Conference of Social Work. Minneapolis, MN. pp. 1

Meriam begins to untangle his assertions by clarifying where “they” are going. “We are going instead to an Indian reservation where the impact of white civilization, almost, if not completely destroyed the old Indian ways of making a living. With the destruction of their economic life necessarily went much of their primitive culture and their tribal government authority”.³¹⁷ In his account of the place he will be visiting there is no detailed description either of Tribes or territories, but a generalization of the people and situation. He uses the word reservation to describe their home, rather than the more cheerful terms of community or village he used for southwestern Tribes. This removes any notion of homeland, ancestry or solidarity while also making it feel desolate, impoverished, and isolated. If his tone were not somber enough his claim that the economic, social and political traditions and/or authority have been completely destroyed by white culture perpetuates the Vanishing Indian narrative. Extending that these are not the Indians of old, but rather the sad remnants of a long-forgot people, already entrenched in the ancillary-citizen process. He continues to describe the unnamed reservation stating, “For these Indians the only road ahead is absorption into the economic and even the social life of the white communities that have engulfed them. There is no alternative³¹⁸”. Again, he declares their situation as the clear opposite of the southwestern tribes. According to Meriam, the only road forward was assimilation; they had nothing else, because everything had been destroyed, with out pointing out the fact that it had been the policy of the United States to destroy every aspect of tribal life.

Meriam never provides his audience with an exact location but instead argues

It is not essential to name the state in which our reservation lies. It might be here in Minnesota or the neighboring states of Wisconsin, Nebraska, or the Dakota, the great state of Oklahoma, or Washington, or Oregon. In a few years from now it might be Montana or Idaho, California has no large Indian reservations and therefore our description does not apply here.³¹⁹

In this statement Meriam essentially includes every single reservation that was effected by allotment, as though this was the deciding factor for which Indians were “traditional” and which ones were closer to “assimilation.” The distance between his descriptions of “fullblood” and “part-Indians” is almost unfathomable; that tribes could be broken into a simple dichotomy where one group could be the epitome of Indianness while the other is its anti-thesis poses the question: for what? Why work so hard to perpetuate a false binary?

³¹⁷ Meriam, Lewis. (June 1931) *State and Local Cooperation with the National Government in Social and Educational Work for Indians* in Cooperation in Indian Administration: Federal, State, Country, AND Local. Four papers presented before the Committee on the American Indian of the National Conference of Social Work. Minneapolis, MN. pp. 2

³¹⁸ Meriam, Lewis. (June 1931) *State and Local Cooperation with the National Government in Social and Educational Work for Indians* in Cooperation in Indian Administration: Federal, State, Country, AND Local. Four papers presented before the Committee on the American Indian of the National Conference of Social Work. Minneapolis, MN. pp. 2

³¹⁹ 2 Meriam, Lewis. (June 1931) *State and Local Cooperation with the National Government in Social and Educational Work for Indians* in Cooperation in Indian Administration: Federal, State, Country, AND Local. Four papers presented before the Committee on the American Indian of the National Conference of Social Work. Minneapolis, MN. pp.

In the immediate timeframe Meriam used the dichotomy, to advocate assimilation through the economic efficiency of local, state and federal cooperation. In the closing remarks of his paper he argues:

Why some people assume that the federal government would be powerless to prevent state and county officials from making an improper use of federal money appropriated for cooperative work with Indians is difficult to understand. Cooperation between the federal government and the states is not unprecedented. It has existed for years.³²⁰

According to Meriam's statement, it would seem that the three were having a difficult time working together. However it wasn't just that it was more economically efficient, but essential in a time in which all levels of the government were struggling to put the United States "back together again." By calling for local, state and federal governments to work together, was a nonchalant way of arguing for the phasing out what Meriam viewed as an overdue dependency and ward-ship. Not that this belief should come as a big surprise, and yet, that tiny bit of de-colonial hope makes it seem out of place in the era of the Indian New Deal where allotment was repealed and self-governance advocated.

No Meriam wanted state, federal and local governments to work together, in order to finally absorb Indians along with their federal appropriations. In as much as he claimed "Let us develop an efficient and economical transition form of government in harmony with the social and economic evolution that is taking place. We could not stop that evolution if we would. We can make our intelligence develop a cooperative system that will make the transition safe alike for the whites and the Indians³²¹." Again, Meriam's rhetoric not only perpetuates the belief that assimilation is the single road ahead, but was according to him already taking place at its own pace. Accordingly, it was the different levels of government that were lagging behind this "economic evolution." But was it really an economic evolution? Were Native peoples assimilating in droves as Meriam and Ryan suggest? Or was this part of their colonial imaginary in which they were simply arguing what the colonial government had always desired? That is the erasure of Native peoples, in order to gain access to Native lands and resources. Oh course erasure during the New Deal, as in the assimilation era no longer meant physical genocide but social-cultural and racial destruction in tandem with their economic integration. It seems odd that the man behind a report that is often cited as the end of the assimilation era would in fact be an assimilation advocate, again not a big reveal, but none the less a silenced part of the Indian New Deal narrative, where the pendulum analogy is finally put rest as it never applied. Just as in the assimilation era, in the New Deal era, progressives and assimilation go hand in hand. As shocking as Meriam's perspective might seem, he was

³²⁰ Meriam, Lewis. (June 1931) *State and Local Cooperation with the National Government in Social and Educational Work for Indians* in *Cooperation in Indian Administration: Federal, State, Country, AND Local*. Four papers presented before the Committee on the American Indian of the National Conference of Social Work. Minneapolis, MN. pp. 10

³²¹ Meriam, Lewis. (June 1931) *State and Local Cooperation with the National Government in Social and Educational Work for Indians* in *Cooperation in Indian Administration: Federal, State, Country, AND Local*. Four papers presented before the Committee on the American Indian of the National Conference of Social Work. Minneapolis, MN. pp. 11

clearly not alone in his assimilation assertions, in fact he along with many other progressives were grounded in them.

Chapter 5

The New Face of Indian Education: Continuing Construction on the Bridge to Relocation

How did call for the reorganization of assimilationist policies translate to educational institutions, given that Meriam Lewis, Carson Ryan, John Dewey and many others were grounded in various forms of progressivism. For one it is clear that most advocated to phase out the boarding school system, or at least reorganize it as an option rather than the rule of Indian education. Simultaneously the Meriam report warned of too fast a transition of Native Students into public schools, but instead called for community schooling. An assertion that echoed arguments made a decade earlier by Dewey. In light of these progressive statements, it might seem as though the New Deal Era was a swing to the left, moving away from a larger assimilation goal. But as with all history that is reclaimed from the linear trajectory, the categorization of eras, the chronological timeline, that phases out context while affixing simplistic labels or events, the actions of New Deal educators was based not on a pendulum of liberal or conservative sways, but on a nuanced progressive colonial imaginary. Their policies, and more specifically educational policies were no less assimilative, colonial, or genocidal than their predecessors, the distinction of their colonial imaginary came in their belief that previous assimilation had been more or less effective in certain Tribal communities, and thus their policies should be organized to reflect these differences.

The assimilation binary rhetoric of New Deal educators reflected two key arguments. The first purported that the majority of Tribal peoples had downward assimilated to a degree in which they could be educated along with the other poor, rural populations. The second argument professed a deep commitment to maintenance of the cultural, social and language practices of those tribes deemed “Traditional.” However, by refusing the binary of assimilation rhetoric, a less obvious assimilative motivation emerges, that of economic and social integration. New Deal educational practices were a continuation of reform efforts established half a century. That is, the reforms created to transition wards into ancillary-citizens were argued to have worked for the majority of Native individuals. They had not been perfect, had not even created economic opportunities, jobs or employment, but that had never been the intended outcome. Rather it was to normalize and enforce a capitalistic structure of wage labor onto Native peoples. So that they would have the skill set to be reserve labors, utilized when necessary. In short, they had become for all intensive purposes ancillary-citizens; economically attached and/or dependent on a corporate capitalist wage labor system. What then of the Traditional Tribes; the minority, peripheral, isolated few that remained dependents of the state, outside of the capitalist control? They would be coaxed into educational systems that seeming held up their practices, whilst actually training them for ancillary citizenship and economic relocation.

Thus, in the wake of these beliefs two different schooling systems emerged to efficiently and economically confront the linear course towards citizenship, whether ancillary, or classed. In general, community schools were to be used as a full frontal attack on “real Indians,” while public schools were deemed more appropriate for “part-

Indian” students. In either case though, schooling was a means to not only accelerate assimilation efforts, but see real time assimilation results.

The absolutely True progressive discourse on schooling part-time Indians³²²

In the 1932 *Indian education today* article, then president of the Progressive Education association, W. Carson Ryan, argued that “progressives” felt that the immediate assimilation of part-Indians would be enabled through public schools. “For these part-Indians the Government has felt the best it could do was to encourage rapid commingling with the rest of the population; hence the public school attendance of 50,000 children of Indian blood this year, more than half of all Indian children attending any school³²³”. According to the progressive colonial logic, Part-Indians were far enough along of the assimilation course that by attendance at local public schools, would enable their assimilation into non-Native populations. This is essentially the same argument that Meriam made the year before at the Social work conference, when he argued that economic integration was already taking place, further reinforcing the idea that assimilation was the only road ahead. The label Ryan uses, “Part-Indians,” highlights that this is a key component to the progressive colonial logic, that assimilation was not only being economically achieved but was believed to be taking place at a racial level. That is that the United States government, was achieving its goal of racial erasure, “diluting” what were perceived as Indian racial markers with each successive generation. Thus, when progressives cited assimilation they were equally interested in economic assimilation, as well as whiteness.

Ryan was a bit more conservative in his enthusiasm for the educational aspects of this assimilation transition, heeding his own advice from the Meriam report that it should focus on the needs of the children, rather than the economic desires of the BIA. To this end Ryan argued “the federal government has not to any extent attempted to fix standards or dictate the kind or quality of education: the result being, of course, that the Indian children take pot-luck with other Americans, suffering under typical rural school conditions a little more than their white neighbors, perhaps, and profiting correspondingly when an enlighten local community makes a really good provision.”³²⁴ Although Ryan raised similar concerns in the Meriam report about the rapid transition of Native students into public schooling here he shy’s away from the cultural, linguistic or even financial needs he previously brought up. Instead, of engaging in the special needs of Native students, the focus of this argument is placed on the quality of education they would be afforded³²⁵ in public schools, what he refers to as the “pot-luck”. Thus, this argument emphasizes problems with rural education in general, not the education of Native peoples specifically, which again highlights the progressive logic that Part-Indians were engaged in assimilation beyond ancillary-citizenship. In short, this argument assumes that they were currently involved in classed-assimilation, downward assimilation

³²² Alexie, Sherman (2009) *The Absolutely True Diary of a Part-Time Indian*. Little Brown Books for Young Readers

³²³ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>. PP.82

³²⁴ pp.82 Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>.

³²⁵ Meriam Lewis (1928). *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. pp. 872.

in this case, which was wholly due to the populations that lived around them, not any inherent biological deficiencies.

The colonial logic supporting the ability to assimilate to a classed status highlights its connection to racialization. The belief that whiteness showed a measureable degree of political and social investment in the United States; said another way this colonial logic assumed that European racial markers indicated divestment in Native cultures, languages, and epistemology(s). The “oh you don’t look Indian” argument, which imagines that racial markers are equivalent to social-cultural identity. Thus while, Ryan and Merriam argued that Native peoples were integrating into rural America, they were also upholding the larger argument around progressive pedagogy. This was after all the progressive era, in which students, it was argued, should learn from the environment around them. The idea that they were only racially part Indian, equated to the belief that they also had very little Indian culture, or language left to support. To which, Ryan proclaims:

in practical terms, therefore, the task in relation to this first group becomes that of saving what we can of the Indian heritage, and reviving as much more as possible. We concede at the outset that not much can be done in this direction; the most one dares to hope is that occasionally an observant teacher may rescue some of the forgotten elements. In other respects, however we can do much; we can at least help the Indian stand on his own two feet and learn to get along with his neighbors.³²⁶

His statement is an echo of the arts and crafts “revival” implemented in the boarding schools during this period, which as I discussed in chapter one, was more of an interpretation of “Native” designs and traditions by anthropologist and artists than an actual revitalization movement. This means that any reviving of Indian heritage or traditions, by either teachers or administrations, would go through a Eurocentric cleansing, in order to fit within the “safety zone” of acceptable morals and values.³²⁷

This is not to say that Native peoples did not have much culture or language to revive, in some cases they lost entire religions and epistemologies, and even whole nations. But by looking at colonization solely as a process of loss is to miss the significance of change, which is present in every culture, every nation, every community. In her book *Colonial Entanglement: Constituting a Twenty-First-Century Osage Nation*, which details the process of the 2006 rewriting of the Osage constitution, Jean Dennison provides an in-depth discussion about the significance of change for the Osage Nation. “Instead of creating an identity based on the maintenance of a certain way of life, many Osage have built an identity on a willingness to embrace change³²⁸.” While this identity based on change, may seem confusing to some, given the mainstream representation of an essential Indianness, passed down from generation to generation; it is indicative of the

³²⁶ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 pp81-86. <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>.

³²⁷ Lomawaima, K Tsianina and Teresa L. McCarty. (2006) *To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education 1928-1940*. Teachers College Press.

³²⁸ Dennison, Jean (2012) *Colonial Entanglement: Constituting a Twenty-First-Century Osage Nation*. The University of North Carolina Press.

lived realities of Native nations and peoples. More than anything, the different eras of Colonialism have meant change. Change in economics, political systems, social structures, eco-systems and landscapes. While this change may have been initiated by myriad consequences of colonialism it is by no means a one-way process, as Native peoples have always been active in their own story. To this end, Dennison points out a particular conversation with Kathryn Red Corn, director of the Osage Tribal museum, in which Red corn explains “most things were not done because they had some deeper spiritual meaning, but because they made sense at the time...if spiritual meaning does exist, it could rarely be separated in such neat ways from the functionality of the practice³²⁹”. In the context of the 2006 Osage constitution this meant “it did not make sense to many Osage to imagine older governing structures as a possibility for the future because of the long colonial history that separated the majority of Osage from these practices”³³⁰.

Regardless if the discussion revolves around Native communities from 1606, 1836, or 2006 the fact remains that they are, and always will be dynamic. Unfortunately the colonial paradigm from which progressive education operated and ordered the world around it meant that Ryan, along with the majority of his predecessors and even his successors, were unable to acknowledge, much less accept this aspect of Native peoples and cultures.

The argument that Public schooling was now appropriate for the majority of Native peoples was rooted in this same progressive colonial logic. A logic that both silenced cultural and linguistic change as inherent to all peoples, and instead placed any and all noticeable changes (that is noticeable to the colonial government) within an assimilation paradigm. That in part relied on racial-cultural indicators to measure whether a particular group was moving towards or away from Americanization. Moreover, Americanization was the only racial salvation that could be recognized through this paradigm, the only diversity within the system was a classed assimilation, that is either downward or upward assimilation. Oh course as argued above Americanization for the majority of Native peoples meant a downward rural assimilation, given their proximity to these communities, but this was not the only possibility, individuals (not communities) could begin to upward assimilation based on this colonial assimilation paradigm, as in the case of Carlos Montezuma, Gertrude Bonnin, Charles Eastman, and many others. Oh course even they were not full-citizens given their racial hue, but in several generations their decedents might be able to, based on their racialization. Thus, because progressive educators operated from a colonial logic that argued part-Indians were close to Americanization, they used Public schools as the final push to assimilate the ancillary-citizen into American society where they would continue to racially vanish, just as their unique epistemologies, cultures and languages already had.

This colonial vision for the this first group of Indians seemingly goes against what John Collier stood for, community control and a return to traditional beliefs? Which begs

³²⁹ Dennison, Jean (2012) *Colonial Entanglement: Constituting a Twenty-First-Century Osage Nation*. The University of North Carolina Press.

³³⁰ Dennison, Jean (2012) *Colonial Entanglement: Constituting a Twenty-First-Century Osage Nation*. The University of North Carolina Press.

the question if Collier was operating from a different worldview than that of progressive educators. Is this a story of how the promises of the leader were lost in the implementation of policies, or was it that the rhetoric of the leader became divorced from the reality of the situation, or something wholly different?

Collier was in position in which it is unlikely that his own colonial logic did not at least partially intersect with that of progress educators. That said he was not a necessarily interested in the details of education reform at either the primary or secondary levels, as his previous work experiences focused on community organization, which was geared towards adult education. While he was caught up in his own colonial logic, in which Pueblos, along with other Native peoples, were the epitome of communal aspirations, this belief does not indicate that he also operated from an assimilation colonial binary. His remarks in the 1935 annual report of Commissioner of Indian Affairs sheds light on his own perception of Native peoples, in which he chooses to describe Native peoples in a general sense, not dividing or parceling up either their racial or cultural character. When he does describe their cultural attributes, he does so to emphasize their Tribal identity. “The Indian is not a ‘rugged individualist’; he functions best as an integrated member of a group, clan, or tribe. Identification of his individuality with clan or tribe is with him a spiritual necessity. If the satisfaction of this compelling sentiment is denied him—as it was for half a century or more—the Indian does not, it has been clearly shown, merge into white group life.”³³¹ Collier’s statement pushes back on the assumptions of the Progressive education colonial logic, which argued that Native peoples were in the process of downward assimilation into rural white communities. In fact he claims that even when Native peoples were denied their Tribal identity they still did not “merge” or assimilate “into white group life”.

What can be made of this obvious disjuncture between the logic of New Deal general reform and progressive educational reform? While Collier’s interests may not have been focused on educational reform, or even centered in the exact same assimilation paradigm, he still operated from a word view, which was imbedded in a larger colonial logic. For one he used rhetoric of racial salvation as a means to dismantle tribal centric political organization and epistemology, through the adoption of the IRA government. Although he cites the significance of tribal identity, the program that his administration adopted further broke apart tribal connections of responsibility and reciprocity by replacing these traditional forms of political balance, with the promise of an American version of political self-determination, which was neither communal nor tribal. This colonial logic perpetuated political assimilation, not through the integration of the individual into a classed citizenship, but through the epistemological assimilation of the whole community. In this colonial vision, individuals would remain ancillary-citizens, which in part included assisting in the salvage efforts to recover only traditions deemed “appropriate”, while also continuing efforts integrate individuals into the modern industrial system as reserve labor. The colonial rationales that progressive educators and

³³¹ Collier, John (1935) Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Defends the Indian New Deal. Excerpt from Collier, “Annual Report,” Bureau of Indian Affairs Washington D.C.: GPO. <https://www.colorado.edu/AmStudies/lewis/issues/collier2.pdf>.

Collier were on parallel assimilation tracks; not so far apart that they could not be reconciled. If anything, Collier's leadership allowed a space in the BIA for "progressive" educators to revamp the Indian education program in a way that was consistent with his larger reform efforts, which focused on only one way forward for Indians; racial salvation.

The disjunctive between rhetoric and colonial logic: How the BIA Education program tried to recast itself as an advocate of the Indian

Public schools were the assimilation answer for "part-Indians," but did not fit in with the rhetoric of southwestern and/or "full-bloods." As hard as the BIA pushed public schooling, they pressed even harder for community schooling into what they perceived as more Traditional communities. But why? What would community schooling do, that public schooling could not. Was it actually an intentional design to uphold traditions, as the rhetoric of the key players in the BIA administration, including Ryan, Collier and even Meriam seemed to advocate? What did the BIA envision as an appropriate education process for this so-called second group? It is this story, over any other in the BIA educational program that shows the distance between rhetoric and policy. The architects of the boarding schools clearly advocated assimilation; this new public-school transition was another example of assimilation advocacy; the community schools however were supposed to be something different.

On the surface at least, Ryan advocated for a different kind of education for southwestern tribes. Stating "it is with the second group, that of the full-blood or nearly full-blood Indians of the Southwest, that the special education lies. Our task here is to help the Indians to capitalize to the full their contribution and to educate the rest of the United States to an intelligent rather than a merely sentimental appreciation of the value of this contribution³³²". Although Ryan honored the traditions and values of southwestern people, he was too entrenched in progressive American values and morals to support the dissemination of Native American epistemological wisdom(s), like his counterpart Collier, whether real or imagined. Collier believed that the Southwestern communities could not be duplicated by western societies³³³, which made their salvation that much more important. So what was Ryan referring to when he argued that the contributions of these Tribes be both "capitalized" on and recognized? He is highlighting how progressive education could ensure that these more "traditional" Indian communities could be engulfed into the transformation from ward to ancillary-citizen, just as their part-Indian counterparts had.

Neither the boarding schools, nor any day school had up to this time been able to penetrate these communities in any substantial way. Ryan excitedly argues, "One can only wonder why we have been so slow to recognize what a significant educational opportunity this is in terms of a modern philosophy and practice of education. If there really is a new way in education, certain Indian groups offer the best possible place to

³³² Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). "Indian Education Today." *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>. pp.83

³³³ Kuntz, Stephen and John Collier. (Summer 1971) "The Social philosophy of Collier" *Ethnohistory* Vol.18 No. 3. Duke University Press. PP. 217

apply it”.³³⁴ For Ryan the southwestern communities provide a sort of laboratory where progressive education techniques and theories can be tested. The progressive laboratory is the special educational opportunity, not a shut down of the boarding schools as a means to support and/or advocate for Native traditions, values or languages. For instance, unlike his counterpart Collier who was entranced by Pueblo morals and values, Ryan was intoxicated by their community organization. He explains that

...the Pueblo’s for example, have an ideal setting for a new-type of school of the progressive sort, with which the whole community would be involved. A mere ‘three R’s’ type of education is sufficiently absurd anywhere, but nowhere more so than among the Pueblo’s, where life itself provide genuinely the elements that many progressive schools can only reproduce artificially.³³⁵

Here Ryan references the community-schooling model as a “progressive-sort”, tying it in a generalized way to the progressive school model. His argument that among the Pueblo “life itself provided genuinely the elements many progressive schools can only reproduce artificially,” loosely upholds progressive pedagogies, by emphasizing life in the communities as a learning tool. In this sense Ryan uses the rhetoric of the progressive educational movement which often focused on pedagogical tools, such as learning through hands on engagement, and a connection to the child’s environment. But another side of many progressive education programs and educators were larger ideologies colonial/national agendas it operated from which used education as a tool of suppression and assimilation. In short, even while progressive educators touted the pedagogical advancements of their model, in most cases it was no less colonial than the educational models that came before it. The significance of progressive education for the Indian education program was that it encompassed the entire community, rather than simply the children, as boarding and day schools and done previously. Which begs the question to what end? What type of education would community members need and/or desire from these BIA schools?

Roughly two years after he wrote about the special educational opportunity Pueblo community schools had for progressive educators, Ryan laid out his vision in the 1933 December issues of *Indians at Work: An emergency Conservation New Sheet for Ourselves* [BIA]. He starts his report by explaining the reason for a focus on day schools:

Community day schools, in touch with the life of Indian people, constitute the present emphasis in Indian education, and all-important developments recently have been in this direction. Drastic reductions in the operating budget coupled with a timely release of funds for the construction of schools and roads under the Public Works Administration, have speeded

³³⁴ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 pp81-86. <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8> pp.83

³³⁵ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 pp81-86. <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>.

up our day school program to an extent hardly considered possible a year ago.³³⁶

Ryan's opening remark that community schools are in touch with the life of Indian people, is left for the reader interpret, as there is no further explanation provided. One could impart that he is referring to progressive values, which touted schooling as a "reflection" of the community. This description, relies on the basic knowledge of the reader to assume that community schooling was in touch because Native peoples were communal, and therefore community orientated. In reality this statement does more to mediate the details of this new pedagogical "direction", i.e. community schools, than actually explain how it was in touch with Indian lives, beyond community organization. As other than the word "community", Ryan and the rest of the educational division of the BIA had yet to show how they would support Native communities.

Rather than providing a detailed expatiation of pedagogy, Ryan instead turns to the economic factors involved in the transition from boarding schools to the implementation of public and community schooling. He then goes on to provide some attendance statistics to highlight the transition process.

By Jun 30 1933 the elimination of pupils from some boarding schools and the reduction of enrollments in others had brought about a decrease of approximately 2,000 pupils in these schools as compared with the year before, and the programs adopted before July 1, 1933 provided for a still further reduction of over 3,000 in the boarding school enrollment in the present autumn... The increase in day school and public-school attendance more than compensates for the boarding school reduction³³⁷.

These statistics help setup the trajectory of this transition, by showing how quickly the number of students had decreased in the BIA boarding schools. Unfortunately it only claims that those decrease in numbers are represented in community day and/or public schools, without providing any local data, such as areas with higher or lower transitions rates. One could possibly argue that this was due to uneven data collection, especially given that the BIA had only recently formerly adopted this policy. Yet at this point in BIA tenure they should have had a decent idea as to which Native students were going where.

After briefly touching on the fact that the boarding school transition was in progress he shifts back to discuss the purpose of community schooling for the community. "So far the chief values have been in reestablishing the integrity of the Indian home and the wholesome atmosphere of a normal family life as the bases for Indian community life, much of which had been destroyed under the system of boarding

³³⁶ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs, *Indians at work*. Washington, D.C. pp.7
<https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000058924/Cite>.

³³⁷ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs. *Indians at work*. Washington, D.C. pp. 7
<https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000058924/Cite>.

schools for young children.³³⁸ That Ryan and BIA staff believed they had the ability much less the awareness to bring “normalcy,” back to Indian families, highlights the both paternalistic discourse and colonial logic that they operated from. It was not only the boarding schools that destroyed the “normalcy” of Indian families, nor was it only Indian families that were destroyed by the boarding schools, it was the entire community. As argued earlier Native peoples had been in a refuge status for at least a hundred years, some for hundreds of years. Generations of families had experienced the horrors of genocide: spiritual genocide, eco-genocide, cultural-genocide, linguistic-genocide and all the physical and psychological consequences of such; starvation, disease, imprisonment, containment, enslavement, addiction, rape, abuse... etc. But Ryan seems to argue that the community schools will create a healing process, bringing Native families back together, and producing stability in the community. But the kind of “normalcy” that Ryan could advocate or implement beyond bringing their children home was neither sufficient, nor supportive of the larger ideological desires of Native peoples. Native peoples were not going to be healed by BIA controlled community schooling, any more than a colonial supported institution or ideology actually intended to heal Native communities.

What Ryan and his counterparts intended to do was create ancillary-citizens who would be productive laborers in the American corporate capitalist system and to uphold Christian-American morals and values. Ryan’s colonial vision is further revealed in the way that he half-heartedly advocated for Native traditions while simultaneously promoting progressive curriculum. Going back to his 1931 article in *Progressive Educator* magazine it is clear that Ryan came from a colonial logic that walked a fine line between the rhetoric of support and the discourse of ensuring the survival of for Native traditions. For instance, Ryan continued to perpetuate “cultural,” activities that had monetary or economic value in non-Native markets, just as the boarding schools educators had fifty years earlier. Such behavior was part of the larger paternalistic colonial rationale that enabled the BIA to not only claim the power to normalize Native families, but which recast the BIA as the agent of revitalization, of tradition rather than the peoples themselves. “Today, instead of teaching that ‘everything Indian is bad,’ we instead try to help the children, and through them the parents, to understand something of the precious nature of the heritage they have as Indians”³³⁹. His declaration that progressive educators tried to help Indians understand the significance of their own heritage shows both the extent of psychological damage brought on by boarding schools as well as his colonial paternalism. That it was not until he and other Progressive educators came along to help Native peoples began to recover and understand the value of their own heritage, or how important it was to their future. The most obvious critique of this colonial logic is that it ignores the thousands of Native peoples, communities, scholars and political activists that tirelessly worked to shut down the boarding schools for these very reasons. They did not all internalize the idea that everything Indian was bad, they fought to keep their traditions alive. Yet by making such a proclamation he silences the long history of advocacy on the part of Native peoples. But it also shows how many progressive educators, were unable to step-outside of their own colonial paradigm,

³³⁸ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs. *Indians at work*. Washington, D.C. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000058924/Cite>. pp. 8

³³⁹ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>. pp. 84

to see both the inherent paternalism as well as nuanced forms of cultural and linguistic destruction involved in the programs they advocated.

After casting progressive educators as Tribal cultural activists, his description of the current work being done in Native schools begins to complicate this narrative. He explains to his audience “while we do not attempt to use the local languages as the medium of instruction (the practical difficulties are probably insurmountable) some of our teachers do understand the Indian’s language...” In this statement alone, Ryan shows the lack of real support that progressives are willing to provide.³⁴⁰ They will not learn or use Native languages, because it is not practical, insurmountable in fact, according to Ryan. But, he adds, they do have some teachers that know the language, as though teaching in the language and having a handful of teachers that understand language are even close to the same thing. In effect the community schools would continue the boarding school English only policy, even if they didn’t name it as such. And in doing so, they indicated to the students that neither the teachers nor the United States valued their language(s), much less the epistemologies these languages supported.

Ryan goes on to include a vignette covering the different cultural activities included in a handful of BIA day schools,

Teachers like Mrs. Clark, are beginning to draw upon Indian poetry and music. At several schools, notably Jemez and McCarty’s in New Mexico, an adult from the village comes to supervise and instruct the children in native dances. . . .at San Juan, a native octogenarian has been coming to the school every week to teach the children some of the old songs of the tribe. Native Navajo rug weavers teach their craft in every Navajo boarding school, and silverwork is making its appearance in the schools.³⁴¹

Ryan again tries to show how far the BIA has come from its boarding school days. Yet, all of these examples could have been part of a story about Hampton, Carlisle or Santa Fe. Again, very little, if anything had changed, save for the site of the schools and a half-hearted attempt at allowing appropriate cultural practices. Yes, Native children were learning their dances, songs, traditional stories, and the artistic traditions of their tribes, but this was not a new concept in American Indian schooling as it had been incorporated into the schools as early as the late nineteenth century. Initially alumni such as Angel DeCora and Zitkala-ša incorporated, or even strictly taught traditional arts and language in their classrooms. By the early twentieth century, as Lomawaima and McCarty have shown, “Indian” curriculum was found throughout the BIA system as a way to prepare children to enter into the capitalistic market as artisans, as many Native Arts and crafter were aesthetically pleasing to non-Native buyers.³⁴²

³⁴⁰ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>. pp. 84

³⁴¹ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). “Indian Education Today.” *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8> . pp. 84

³⁴² Lomawaima, K., & McCarty, T. L. (2006). *“To remain an Indian”: Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education* (Multicultural education series (New York, N.Y.)). New York: Teachers College Press.

Yet Ryan's statement implies that progressive educators were part of the first wave to acknowledge the "value" of Native arts. Rather than actually creating an educational system that was culturally supportive to Native traditions, Ryan as head of the BIA educational program was establishing the idea of "progressive education". By claiming boarding schools were backwards and out of touch with Native peoples, Ryan could then assert that the work progressive educators were doing was all in the interest of Native peoples. Of course the boarding schools were problematic, but the public and community schools that would replace them were just as corrupt, for many of the same reasons. Ryan's rhetoric, about helping Indians is still entangled with the ultimate goal of economic assimilation as shown in his comment about a Midwestern Indian school.

...at Lac du Flambeau Wisconsin, and Pine Ridge, South Dakota, well outside the recognized area of present day distinctive arts and crafts, our people are finding they can renew an interest in beadwork and leather that means much both economically and culturally, restoring something of that pride of craftsmanship which is particularly necessary for Indians of today.³⁴³

He again tries to make progressive educators the advocates of Indian peoples as they are the ones who are helping to "restore" not only the traditions of these communities, but the "pride" in their craftsmanship. According to this narrative they are empowering a beaten down and depressed people. But by looking beyond this feel good narrative, this statement also includes the significance of these traditions for the economic integration of those producing the materials. He is not too far off in this regard, in that there was not only a large market for southwestern, Indian pottery, rugs and jewelry, but also Indian regalia. In fact several colleges purchased such regalia to use for their school mascots³⁴⁴. But more to the point, these were neither dying arts, nor were they a way to make a stable living for the majority of students. What this statement outlines was the processes of reforming students to both sell their goods and labor in American markets, a way to further invest Native peoples in the capitalistic market.

³⁴³ Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). "Indian Education Today." *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 <https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>, pp. 86

³⁴⁴ for more information on Indian mascots see Ed. C. Richards King and Charles Fruehling Springwood (2001) *Team Spirits: the Native American Mascots Controversy*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln Nebraska. Spindel, Carol (2002). *Dancing at Halftime: Sports and the Controversy Over American Indian Mascots*. New York: New York University Press. Deloria, P.J., 1998. *Playing Indian*, New Haven: Yale University Press. Rosenstein, Jay (1997). In *Whose Honor?* Written and produced by Jay Rosenstein. Ho-ho-kus, New Jersey: New Day Films.

Chapter 6

Schooling the Community: How the New Deal Era policy expanded assimilation surveillance to everyone

If these community schools were not providing a culturally conscious or even “progressive” education for Native students, as the rhetoric of the BIA would have the audience believe, what was their purpose? In order to answer that question it is vital to first understand what Ryan, as BIA educational director envisioned as the purpose of the schools. It is in the sections entitled “The Results of the Program So Far” and “Next Steps” that he outlines what and why the BIA had done thus far to build the community schools, and what they foresee for the near future.

The first section “Results of the Program” gives some insight into the way the BIA positioned the transition of children from boarding schools back to their communities. Ryan states

Attendance in most places has been high and the children have been coming to school clean, happy and generally in good physical condition. This successful outcome of what some observes considered a dangerous experiment has been materially assisted by the staff of well-equipped social workers in the Indian Service whose members have now increased to seventeen. These social workers, or ‘visiting teachers’, as they are sometimes called have helped the Indian parents to adjust with minimum difficulty to the new responsibility of care for their own children.³⁴⁵

This section of the report reads like a social welfare account describing the well-being and cleanness of the students, as well documenting the assistance of social worker in the “new” responsibility of child care, for the parents. These are all value-laden statements, what Ryan and the social workers might consider to be clean, happy and in good physical condition, may not be the same for their parents or larger community, and visa versa. Moreover, the fact that social workers are being used to transition children back into the homes of their parents adds another layer of surveillance and control over the community, as they are able to keep tabs on the parents themselves. There are hundreds of incidences documenting the use of social workers as control agents in Indian communities, not least of which includes the long history of removing Native children from their families, for value infractions such as being incompliant with American middle class values and practices or not having access to American middleclass amenities such as electricity and/or running water.³⁴⁶ By using Social workers in the transition of the students shows that Ryan, and the BIA are still not simply invested in the welfare of the children but in surveilancing the social behavior and values of the parents and larger community. Ryan like many in the nation-wide community school movement, were similar to their Boarding school predecessors, in that their first concern was not the academic

³⁴⁵ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs. (December 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000058924/Cite>. PP 7

³⁴⁶ Indian child Welfare Act: Resource Educational Video. (2013) Native American Rights Fund. <https://youtu.be/VJCqeauLvY8>.

development of children, but the social development of the larger community, in this case the assimilation of Native communities into American norms and values.

After he explained the social aspect of the transition Ryan described the design and proposes of the school plants themselves, In the *Next Steps* section of the report.

The next steps involve setting up a real community program, participated in from the start by the Indian people themselves, and with a closer tie-up between the schools and economic and social life. How the day schools are to carry on a more fundamental task than anything that has been done in the past is indicated in the following directions given to the architects in planning the now day school plants now under way.³⁴⁷

The significance of these new days schools rests, not just in the connection between school and home, economy and society, but what Ryan refers to as a “closer tie-up”. This statement highlights the desire that, economy, society, home life, and education will be connected to the school, which advocates for more sustained changes than simply schooling Indian children in their home community. In this sense boarding schools were not simply shut down, but were brought to the community, assimilation became “a real community program.”

Ryan goes on to give six specific directions or steps as to how the schools will be designed, operated, and utilized by community members. First, he highlights community involvement;

The schools are to be community schools of the activity type, for the use of all members of the community, adult as well as children, and the buildings are to be adapted to local needs rather than conform to any conventional school plans. The simplest possible construction is to be used with local materials and Indian labor, not only for the usual reasons inherent in the Public Works program, but as part of the Indian participation in school and community work.³⁴⁸

As Ryan has indicated before, the schools are for use by all members of the community. In the first step he also argues that the schools are to be built by the community as well, which he emphasizes will ensure their participation. This is, in no way a departure, from the ways that the BIA had generally operated on reservations up to this point, as many of the structures, including forts, BIA buildings, and even the homes of BIA agents were built by community members. The latest manifestation of this was the Indian corps programs, similar to New Deal programs which “hired” Native labors to engage in reservation conservation projects, better known as economic development and cultural intervention.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁷ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.8

³⁴⁸ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs. (December 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000058924/Cite>. PP 8

³⁴⁹ Williams, Carol Ed. (2012) *Indigenous women and work: From labor to Activism*. University of Illinois Press.

So how might this plan be different from its predecessors? Was it even intended to be? Or was this plan, just another form of BIA exploitation, masked in the words of progress, in which the BIA expected community members to “contribute” without explicitly saying participation actually meant providing the materials and labor, free of charge? As argued above, the BIA was not interested in community schools as spaces of liberation, or even neutrality. Yes they supported some shallow cultural aspects, such as art, music, and crafts, but these were all within the same “safety zone” boundaries that the Federal schools had already established as benign and/or beneficial to the introduction of a labor market. More to the point, these community spaces were not created to manifest or support the self-determination of Native governance, spirituality, culture and language.

These community schools were built for one specific purpose: Americanization. Not just social integration, which was being done in part through the English language only policy and integration of American ideals such as democracy and individualism, but by training the children and adult community members the skills necessary to enter the capitalistic labor force. The fifth step of the program elaborates on the physical organization of the school, which highlights the subjects that will be taught there.

In schools above the elementary grades (junior and senior high schools) the program will emphasize agriculture, industrial training, arts and craft, rather than conventional high school subjects, and the buildings should be planned accordingly, with less classroom space than is customary, and with more room for laboratories and work shops.³⁵⁰

Once again, the school program resembles that of the boarding school with an emphasis on industrial, agricultural, and arts and crafts training while academic subjects only play a minor role. This places Native students in the position of becoming laborers in the larger capitalist system, as they are not taught the skills necessary to become entrepreneurs, office workers or anything other than unskilled or semi-skilled laborers. Just as the Charity schools had done one hundred years prior with poor and orphaned white students in the south, these community schools would ensure certain economic outcomes based on the only track available industrial/agricultural. Just as the outing program before it these schools supported a track that only worked to strengthen and expand the bridge to an eventual relocation, as at this time and even twenty years down the road there were not sufficient employment opportunities on or near reservations, given that the majority of them were rural. Similar to the case of Hampton or Carlisle graduates, there was an agricultural component to the schools the majority of Native peoples did not have the means or land sufficient to make a living and instead ended up as ranch hands for white farmers that either bought or had leased Native allotments. But one of the most exciting elements of community schooling for Ryan was the adult component.

³⁵⁰ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp. 9

It was no accident that Carson Ryan, A.C. Coolery and R.M. Tisinger went on a tour of the “Mexican Rural Schools.” They were interested in an educational model that could penetrate and effectively economically integrate those communities they deemed “traditional full bloods”. This racial-cultural measurement translated into the notion that these peoples were not only less assimilated but less reliant on the American capitalism. Meaning that it would take more educational work within the larger community to ready them for integration into the larger American economic system. If Arthurdale was a way to isolate and distract white labors, “Traditional” community schools were a way to open up Native communities to intensive assimilative work.

Ryan knew about Mexican action schools even before he toured them in 1933, as evidenced by his 1931 Indian education today article. His familiarity with the schools is not surprising given that he ran in the same academic circles as John Dewey and Dr. Saenz. But he was not the only BIA official with high regards for the schools. In the November Issue of *Indians at Work*, Collier announced “The Coming of Dr. Saenz,” director of the Mexican rural schools’ program. Collier excitedly opens his address stating

The coming of Doctor Moises Saenz from Mexico to be consultant to the United States Indian Service may prove to be a landmark of Indian History. Dr. Saenz’ Government can release him for only two or three months: from out Indian reservations he will go to become the Mexican Minister to Ecuador. But, in their fullness of time, events are moving swiftly now, and Dr. Saenz’s brief Journey here may mark, if not make history.³⁵¹

It is clear by his tone and rhetoric that Collier is enthralled with the addition of Dr. Saenz as consultant for the Indian Service. So much so in fact, that he predicts it will “mark if not make history.” But what exactly did he expect from Dr. Saenz in the capacity of consultant? In his address Collier slowly unfolds his expectations in two capacities. First, he describes the work being done in Mexico, via the larger Mexican Indian policy and the local ejida, which stresses the skill set he believes Saenz to possess. He then moves onto a brief description of what the Indian Service is trying to accomplish in the United States, which is a presentation on how Saenz, and the Mexican model can be of the best assistance.

In the first part of his description of Mexico’s Indian policy Collier suggests two main areas of emphasis, including land policy and community organization. He argues, “Mexico’s Indian policy of today (in which Dr. Saenz has been a creative leader) is to increase the land holding of the Indians. And to guard these increments through Indian organizations—cooperative societies of mutual aid, which practically are land holding and land-using corporations³⁵².” Through this introduction, Collier shows that he is particularly interested in cooperative land holding and use. However, he does not return

³⁵¹ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. PP.1

³⁵² United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.1

to the idea of cooperative land holdings until the end of his four page address, where he ties it into his ambitions for Native peoples in the United States; “Here in our United States Indian Service, we are trying to revise the land laws and policies—from dwindling land to increasing land, from Indian land used by whites to Indian land used by Indians, from individualized land to corporate land”. It has been well documented that even before his tenure at the BIA, Collier fought to protect and even expand Native land holdings. But in this particular address he veers off from his previous work, with the Pueblos and allotment. Instead, of simply working to end allotment, buy back treaty lands, or impart conservation policies, in this statement he shows an interest in large-scale economic development. Not just shifting ownership/control of the land back to Native peoples, but shifting it from individual ownership to corporate possession. This shift might be part of his utopian community, but it also demonstrates his investment in the corporate capitalist system, where corporations not individuals rule the American economic system. Such rhetoric is also a foreshadowing of the way the United States designed its relationship with Alaska Native Tribes, as corporations rather than solely based on a political one.

After touching on the issue of land use, Collier discusses Tribal life and culture that is reminiscent of the way Dewey described it ten years earlier. “Indian tribal life re-born, if one ill-facing toward ancient values and ideals and facing toward the most modern and experiential forms of rural endeavor and rural living³⁵³.” This statement seems out of place given Collier’s previous support of ancient values and beliefs, due in part to his disillusionment with urban modernity. Yet in this speech he turns away from the “ancient” in the name of modernity and experimentation of rural living. Like his land discussion this portion of his speech shows a clear transition in Collier’s position on Native peoples, at least in the way that Historians have read it. Could this be where racial salvation meets assimilation?

Although he touches lightly on the subjects of land use and culture, Collier’s main focus is on Tribal independence through Tribal economic responsibility and accountability, which is neither sustained nor restricted by the larger National government. Similar to his earlier arguments he starts by describing Indian communities in Mexico.

These Indian cooperative groups, and not the Mexican Government, stand in loco parentis to the individual Indians. Mexico’s guardianship over, or service to, the Indian, reaches to the group, by preference, and is thence relayed by the group to the individual. This is “indirect government”—and has always been, and must always be, the liberalizing, the democratic, and the economical and productive government. The world’s experience down many ages is proof of the fact.³⁵⁴

Collier puts emphasis on the fact that the Indian cooperative groups have formed a system of self-support, where “guardianship” or “service” are relayed from the national

³⁵³ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. PP.1

³⁵⁴ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.1-2

government, through the cooperatives and then finally reach the individual. This form of “indirect governance” he claims is liberalizing, democratic, economical and productive. Yet, such a system often refuses to acknowledge the many differences of those it is indirectly governing, as proof of the long history of struggle between National governments and their citizenry, especially minority populations and/or populations that are oppressed, exploited, and devalued. In short, indirect government and self-governance are two wholly separate concepts and come with different outcomes, as the first is more indicative of self-administration not self-determination.

Collier continues to defend the organization of the Indian Cooperatives, through a brief comparison with the United States.

All that Mexico possesses—of resource for technological aid, of anthropological science, of community art technique and inspiration, of economic guidance—is at the service of the ejidas—being the local groups which are the integers of Mexican Indian administration. But there is in Mexico no authoritative Bureau of Indian Affairs. Indian Service in Mexico is coordinated locally—within neighborhoods of Indians—not centrally at the capital.³⁵⁵

This description stresses the most significant organizational feature of the ejidas, localized Indian services that includes access to a multitude of educational resources and economic guidance, without the need for a central Indian Affairs office. Collier wasn't simply offering praise to the Mexican government or the ejidas, but used his report as an advertisement for Tribes in the United States, which had neither local control nor access to educational resources. But Collier's account of local and decentralized work promoted and guided by the community, is also shaded by his own colonial rational, which failed to recognize the colonial power dynamic in which ejidas were not only under the political control of the Mexican government, but were designed, financed and supported with a very specific colonial trajectory in mind. Through his colonial perception Collier was persuading his readers that these Indigenous cooperatives were both liberating and democratizing, with out recognizing that political models like western democracy were as foreign a concept, as English, Capitalism, and Christianity had been before it.³⁵⁶ That is to say that like all colonial concepts whether adopted or imposed, democracy could be used to the benefit or detriment of each individual Indigenous community depending on the context and purpose of its use. Thus, although Collier commends the Mexican effort as democratic, democracy in the western sense was not necessarily liberating and was certainly not traditional.

Continuing his description of the ejida's, Collier emphasizes the idea that they are not only localized but financially independent as well.

³⁵⁵ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.2

³⁵⁶ Watras, John (Summer 2004) Progressive Education and Native American Schools, 1920-1950. Educational foundations. pp. 82, 89

The choosing agency is the local ejida; the authoritative agency is the local ejida; the agency that does most of the work, makes most of the sacrifice and pays most of the bills is the local ejida—and with them, the race of Indians in Mexico, and Mexico itself whose destiny is Indian—march with practical armament and with flying mystical banners toward the conquest of the future...³⁵⁷

Collier's statements illustrated a key feature of the ejida's as one of fiscal and administrative independence. The fact that he underlines "pays most of the bills" further demonstrates his vision for Native peoples, one in which they are not "reliant" on the government, but still subject to them, similar to the State, county and even city governments. The inherent problem with this vision is not simply a mismatch in cultures and values, but that it is embedded in colonial rational. Thus, although Collier rallies the ejida's with the banner that their destiny is Indian, his larger argument doesn't actually support an indigenous future. But as he earlier argued it assumes that an Indian-tribal life reborn was for all practical purposes a mirror image of the Western Nation state model, regardless if the Indian community was in Mexico or the United States.

As part of his rhetoric on community responsibility and independence, Collier highlights the role of the school as the center of the community. "At the ejida's center is the school, but the school is the business headquarters of the cooperative buying society—of the credit union—of the local road building and telephone construction activity. The school is the clinic. It is the community theatre. The school is the community."³⁵⁸ In this description the school is not merely a tool to inculcate children or adults through classroom instruction; but was a multi-dimensional institution of assimilation. The school became a space that included the establishment of key capitalistic economic organizations along side traditional educational methods. However, this model's purpose is not solely benevolent, to familiarize Native peoples to capitalist practices and intuitions, but to ultimately integrate them into the capitalist system while maintaining a low overhead. Hence, Collier's description of the Mexican ejida did not support a tribal centric trajectory for self-determination, but provided a brief glimpse into his colonial logic which promoted the introduction of central economic and political institutions and ideologies, an epistemological assimilation, not solely a material one. The significance of this colonial paradigm is that it gives the appearance of self-determination, through a federal acknowledgement of Tribal government entities, whether economic or political. However, such entities are only acknowledged when they are established by and uphold American institutions and ideologies, such as individualism, corporate capitalism, wage labor, republicanism and citizenship.

This colonial paradigm is not only shown through the features that Collier chooses to emphasize, but also how he frames the costs associated with the program, as a guardianship cost to assimilation profit ratio. "The neighborhood's voluntary work done through these schools is often manifold the professional paid work. The per capita costs

³⁵⁷ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.2-3

³⁵⁸ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.3

of schooling are well-nigh incredibly low—less than \$20 per child-year, with all the adult education charged against the child-year. And the responsible posts are overwhelmingly filled by Indians³⁵⁹”. The cost to profit ratio is not simply a matter of money spent or recouped by the BIA, but also the longer trajectory of Indian fiscal accountability and responsibility. This program was priceless, not just because it relied on Indian labor as a cost saving tactic but because it created a program to make Indian peoples dependent on American institutions and ideologies in order to become autonomous. As the popular visa commercial asserts; School supplies: \$50, Text books: \$300 a set, World Maps: \$20, Head Teacher: 10,000 annually, Construction of School: 15,000, Financial Independence: Priceless, Integration into labor market: Priceless, Indirect Governance: Priceless.

Collier’s conclusion frames his agenda for Native peoples as one of independence and liberty, but continued to support programs and models that fostered colonial control.

Here in our United States Indian Service, we are trying to revise the land laws and policies...And we are trying to revise the social policy; from the warring against tribal and community life to the valuing and fostering it. And from centralized arbitrary control to decentralized service. And from boarding schools and standardized day schools to a new kind of institution which the Mexican ejidas and their schools perfectly exemplify. But more than any of these, we are trying to help release the Indians’ own powers and ambitions, that they may go on to conquer their own future—like Mexico’s Indians ‘with practical armament and with flying mystical banners³⁶⁰.

Through this statement, Collier’s outlines how the BIA of the present is not that of the past, an institution where “arbitrary control,” centralized services, and boarding schools are no longer a mainstay of the federal government. But the laws, policies and institutions that he put forth were imbedded in a colonial rationale that continued to support the colonial desires of the United States. What was different in Collier’s administration was the rhetoric, and techniques, not the actual intended outcomes. At every policy juncture, the BIA had thrown the most progressive and/or cutting edge democratic rhetoric to uphold Indian policy. Yet the majority of BIA activities and programs were simply revised versions of earlier theories around integration, removal, and control. Just because New Deal era policies were more obscure and complicated, did not make them any less coercive or colonial. They were both based on and operated from a colonial paradigm. What they were not, was supportive of the actual needs and/or desires of the majority of Native peoples. Collier’s call to practical armament, is an appeal for Native peoples to integrate beyond the ancillary citizen; economically integrated and dependent on wage labor. A call to a classed status in which they are not only economically integrated, but invested in the ideals that support the economic, social and political systems. Collier saw the community school as the main way to make this transition from BIA dependency to

³⁵⁹ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.3

³⁶⁰ pp.3 United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>.

indirect governance. The community schools were the bridge to racial salvation, one in which the race would be reborn under his flying mystical banners, a future where Indianness would no longer be a political designation, but an ethnic heritage; that never had to address Native peoples desire for self-governance, cultural revitalization, language maintenance, bilingual education, community/economic/ecological stewardship and above all self-determination, as they would all be erased and forgotten through the coercive processes of being reformed into citizens.

The Bridge to Tomorrow: building the new assimilation infrastructure

If Community schools were the pathway to Racial salvation for Collier; they were the bridge to the economic and cultural incorporation of “Traditional” Indians for Ryan. The children had never been the problem, the boarding schools had done a decent job at introducing students to the American political economy, and day schools would have been a sufficient replacement. The problem was in trying to affect the larger community on a more profound scale. The community schools were the perfect colonial technology as they seemingly supported the culture and values of the community, while also gradually introducing and then normalizing American ones. By returning to Ryan’s 1931 report on his recent visit to the Mexican schools, the same schools Collier described above, provides invaluable insight into his own colonial logic. After explaining the generalities of the program, Ryan takes the time to argue why they are significant to Native peoples in the United States.

Of the special importance of the Mexican experience for our Indians, particularly in the Southwest, there can be no doubt. Mexico is, in the first place, overwhelmingly Indian, and the record of what the Indian race can do under any and all circumstances is there to read. But the main point is that in its national rural school program Mexico is making a valiant effort to give rural people—rural Indians for the most part—a real opportunity.³⁶¹

Ryan are that the Mexican programs are a useful example for the southwest, because of similar demographics; rural, isolated and mostly Indian. He is not only interested in this comparison on a statistical level but also uses the Mexican example to advocate for the abilities of what he labels “the Indian race”. There is no mistake as to what kind of abilities and opportunity Ryan is alluding to. He is interested in the way that the schools are working to integrate rural Indians into the Mexican state as ancillary citizens.

In the entirety of his report, he does not once speak about supporting language or tradition but only briefly mentions the use of ancestral language as part of his description about a school “plant” in Oaxaca. “The plant is being literally built and made over by the students themselves—there is a tannery, shop, newly-constructed dormitories—all the actual work of the students and faculty. The students are all Indian—many of them still

³⁶¹ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.13

using the language of their Zapoteca or Mixteca forefathers³⁶². In this text he focuses his observations on the labor of the students and faculty. The comment on Zapoteca and Mixteca language is used as a way to show that even though the students are speaking their traditional languages they are also still capable of building their own schools. In short, it is used as an example of ability, in spite of possible language barriers.

Throughout the article Ryan emphasizes the organization of the plant as a way to showcase the kind of education that is interested in adopting for Native communities in the United States.

“Class-rooms there are, to be sure, but they are only a part—a comparatively small part—of the total educational program. There is a school garden; there are chicken houses, rabbit runs; one or more teacher’s cottages... Sometimes the plant includes a considerable community house, separate from the school, but in any case, the adults are found using the school quite as much as the children—a question as to the number attending school almost always brings the answer in terms of so many children during the day and so many adults at night...³⁶³

In each of these observations, the garden, rabbit run, chicken houses, and teacher cottages Ryan is presenting his vision for southwestern community schools. His emphasis that classrooms are only a small part of the larger facility shows his desire to steer away from a purely academic offering. Instead the description sounds similar to an American charity school, where children along with community members are trained in western agricultural techniques and crops while also being introduced to American values of individuality including individual property ownership. Like Collier, he highlights the community aspect of the school where both children and adults are trained by the school.

It is not only the description of the schools or community that Ryan is interested, but also the organization of educational staff.

A technical staff of six or seven persons working out from a central school, includes well-equipped specialists who carry on the difficult and necessary task of in service training—helping the teachers in these rural school to do better the literally multitudinous duties they have—an educational man as general organizer, an agricultural man to help with the farming, a woman organizer for social work and home improvement, a doctor or nurse for health work, a recreation leader, and a ‘research’ person.³⁶⁴

³⁶² United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.13-14

³⁶³ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.13-14

³⁶⁴ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.14

The fact that Ryan emphasizes the need for a support staff beyond teachers and custodians illustrates his assimilationist purpose for community schooling. Not just the general organizer or even agricultural and recreational teachers, which were often present at BIA boarding schools. But also, the incorporation of social and health workers, as well as a research person. In his colonial vision, social workers are not solely part of the boarding school-reservation transition but would have permanent placement in the schools, where they would work to introduce and normalize American customs, habits and values to the community as a whole. Moreover they would continue the domestication work of the boarding schools by providing education on “home improvement;” an recognizable code word for Americanization of the home, from design aesthetic to the way food was prepared and served in the home. As mentioned before, American home economics was forced in the boarding schools, but with the addition of the social worker, the school staff and BIA could surveillance and enforce proper American etiquette and consumption within the home as well.

Health workers, usually a nurse or nurse’s aid, were also used in the boarding schools, but usually to “aid” the sick and dying. But according to Ryan’s colonial logic once placed inside the community they would have a larger impact on the way that Native peoples viewed physical health, as well as inculcated to American perspectives of body self-awareness, gender, sexuality, interpersonal relationships, medicine, and a whole host of “health” related ideologies that were not congruent to American values.

Lastly, Ryan includes a researcher staff position. Although he does not provide any context for this station beyond the title, it takes very little stretch of the colonial imaginary to understand the multitude of ways this position could uphold the policies and/or work of the BIA. On the very surface of the colonial imaginary such a position was tasked with collecting data and statistics who was in and involved in community development, but, as their BIA/industrial predecessors, the recruitment officer had done before them, they would observe, track, and provide the overall surveillance of the communities. This included tracking the languages and traditions that the schools were working to replace. But the point is that the schools would not need a researcher if they were simply trying to educate Native children.

Ryan emphasized the scale and organization of the Mexican school staff in order to connect it to his own colonial rationale, which placed community schooling at the center of the new assimilation policy. In response to the Mexican school staff he argued, “this constitutes a frontal attack on the chief weakness of rural schools nearly everywhere—a systematic effort at a thoroughly prepared rural school teaching force”³⁶⁵. Given his critiques about the effectiveness and qualifications of boarding school staff it should come as no surprise that he would be interested in a fully functioning school staff. But this particular “teaching force” as he describes them, are more than simply educators, they are the front line offensive line up, reading to make an all-out attack on Native epistemologies and languages. If the BIA was going to do what priests, missionaries, Indian agents, and settlers could not, incorporate them as ancillary-citizens, at the very

³⁶⁵ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp.14

least, they would have to come fully equipped, not only with new tools but more power techniques that could infiltrate the community like never before. Not an assimilation war, not even a removal, but a kind of soft war that would take place under the guise of community development.

It would not take long for the rhetoric of community schooling to spread, but spread it did like wildfire, with every new issue of *the Indian at work* were updates of old schools, the opening of new ones, and testimonials to the effectiveness and efficacy of community schools at work. But the very first, was a half page narrative about a boarding school club, championing the spirit of adult education. What's most interesting about this particular program, was that it was neither a community school, located in the southwest nor even run by school staff. In fact, the article highlighted the fact that this was an Indian organized and run club; Wakpaipaksan. It was a colonial vision, a dream scenario where "the club's educational and activity program is integrated with that of the school... Adult Indians may elect any course in the school, either day or night classes³⁶⁶". Even though it did not meet the criteria set out by Ryan, it was still used as an example of the possibilities for the community schools, in as much as it showed the potential for adult education, run by and motivated by the adults themselves. The article glosses over the fact that many of these adults were themselves either former or current boarding school attendees, as it seemed beside the point. Instead the article was positioned after Ryan's *Community Day Schools for Indians* piece with the direct intention of showing adult education in action. That it was successful, even before it started. In the case of Flandreau Indian school, superintendent Byron J. Brophy attests:

The night school program has been quite successful in some respects. Men have made use of the school shops to gain knowledge and skill in the various trades taught at the school, such as auto mechanics, welding, carpentry, cabinet making, plumbing and so forth. In addition they are free to carry on hobbies of their own. Women, old men as well as young have interested themselves in home economic programs. Some younger people have taken commercial courses.³⁶⁷

Regardless of the fact that Flandreau was a boarding school, Brophy's comments show that Native adults were utilizing the school space to gain skills which it was assumed would help gain further access to the labor market. Moreover they are "interesting themselves" in home economics, most of which focus on domestic service and proper Victorian etiquette. In this way the Wakpaipaksan club was the perfect example because it was an example of self-motivated students, of all ages and genders, who were interested in acquiring skills, possibly for their own entertainment or more importantly to enter into the capitalist markets as productive workers. In either case it supports a future in which Native people invest in American education, to become more productive and hopefully financially independent from the BIA, either as Individuals or communities. Of course, like Ryan and Collier's previous articles, this vignette, never once discusses job acquisition, possible avenues into the American labor market, or actual full citizenship;

³⁶⁶ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp. 9

³⁶⁷ United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 8 Washington, D.C. <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>. pp. 9

but like earlier classed and racialized educational institutions, they did not have to, because employment and/or equality was not the most important outcome, instead it was as Pratt once said “it is close to and on the road to full-citizenship”.

Conclusion

Even as Meriam and Ryan argued that they were most concerned with what they termed “part-Indians” the majority of the BIA educational division was directed at community schooling projects in the southwest and other so called “full-blood” communities. This was not by accident, but by design, as the BIA ramped up its assimilation efforts on all sides in order to strengthen the relocation bridge the Boarding school outing programs had initiated. Progressive education and the larger Indian Reorganization act were not a pendulum swing towards cultural and governmental sovereignty, as they have so often been described. Of course, the bridge would take time to strengthen but by the beginning of World War II, Native peoples were more than prepared through public and BIA educational institutions to integrate into American society as fully functioning ancillary citizens. This did not mean that they were equipped to get stable employment, good housing, or even live in decent and safe neighborhoods, as that was something they would have to earn as American individuals. What relocation did mean was that the position of laborer within a larger capitalist economy was familiar, even expected as the natural course of life. In short they were primed to be the next wave of reserve labor.

Silx^w? Spu?ús³⁶⁸: The perpetual, unyielding, although often small and uneven, sensation of HOPE

From the inception of the Indian Affairs Office, federal officials have touted the strategies of physical removal and ideological inculcation in an effort to rid themselves of their active legacy of genocide. While often cited as opposing swings of an assimilation pendulum, they are more correctly described as parallel and at times interesting approaches to colonization, one is neither better nor less violent than the other. No-where is the better exemplified than in the development of American Indian education institutions, the focus of which was placed on how to efficiently and effectively assimilate Native students into the larger systems of the United States. This was viewed as a long-term project with many internment steps involved; the establishment of the boarding school system being one of the first steps in the longer process. Of course similar attempts had been made earlier by both the federal government and individual missionaries, but none were as expansive or as systematic as what would become the Bureau of Indian Education. The first boarding schools were loosely based on previous educational reform efforts in which educators argued they were the intercept between student and family, where values, norms and beliefs were torn down, along with the identity of the student. In their place educators believed they could inculcate the ideologies and institutions of the newly formed Republic. The main goal of these early institutions, including charity schooling and manual labor boarding schools, was to mediate the perceived threat that these children could potentially pose in the future, as vagabonds, criminals, and marauders, neither dependent on the Nation nor accountable to it. Thus, while some institutions only hoped to inculcate the rhetoric of citizenship, some like the manual labor boarding school actively worked to make their students dependent on the economic system in an effort to benefit the elite classes while also imposing an investment in the social and political ideologies of the nation, even if they neither were the benefactor nor had the opportunity to benefit from the rights of the landed and owner class(s). In short, graduation from these educational institutions did not actually translate to equal economic access or opportunity, nor were they meant to. Instead these institutions, as well as the Colonial Manual labor institutions that arose out of post-civil war policies, including African American and BIA Industrial Boarding Schools, were intent on creating second-class citizens. In the case of colonized peoples, the proposed outcome was to create a class of ancillary citizens that were both dependent on and bounded by the American corporate capitalist system, as reserve labors. While such an argument might seem hasty given that at the end of the civil war many Native peoples were still communally tied to government issued Indian territories, the passage of the General Allotment Act in 1887 ensured the further removal of Native peoples from their community and lands. It was a systematic detribalization effort in which over sixty

³⁶⁸ Translation Brave-Heart in Colville-Okanogan Interior Salish.

percent of the population was immediately disenfranchised, refused enrollment and/or allotments for a myriad of reasons. Thus while, Native peoples still held lands, the trajectory of Indian policy was motivated by their elimination, with the intended consequence of integrating Native individuals into the economic system, as landless laborers. Yet the boarding schools are only one of many chapters in the perpetual story of colonial educational institutions.

While it is often assumed that Boarding schools were the only total assimilation intuitions, their geographical and ideological influence only laid the foundation for a more expansive trajectory of assimilation schooling. To be sure the consequences of the epistemological, physical, and psychological violence these American institutions forced into the lives of their students and the communities from which they came is still felt by their decedents today. The cycles of violence have been passed down, generation to generation and have fostered the almost unfathomable rates of rape, homicide, child molestation, suicide, domestic violence, depression, PTSD, substance abuse, poverty and so forth and so on.

The preferred schooling institutions of progressive educators, public and community schools continued the assimilation work of the boarding schools before them. These educational programs were divided into two separate pathways that would eventually lead to the same assimilation goal, full integration. On the one hand progressive educators worked to accelerate the downward assimilation process they already believed was taking place in Tribes labeled part-Indian. These communities were treated as ancillary citizens, that is already dependent and economically integrated, if only partially, into the American corporate capitalist system. As ancillary citizens, the rate of individual absorption into the classed structure of American society was intensified through the deliberate push into public schools. Absorption in this context meant their complete racial, political, social and economic assimilation into the United States, with only a handful of ethnic markers kept intact, deemed safe for the consumption of all Americans.

On the other had progressive educators also devised a new educational institution, based on progressive ideals and pedagogies, to infiltrate Indian communities that had been deemed Full-blood and were argued to have more than just a semblance of intact traditional/ancestral practices and lifestyles, even as many of these practices and traditions had also been influenced by the hundreds of years of colonial violence these communities had experienced and internalized. Using the rhetoric of cultural and language friendly policies, these community schools worked to reform and assimilate entire communities to at least an ancillary position, within American society. That is, given their often-remote geographic locations, to make individuals responsive to if not dependent on the American economic system, while normalizing American values and beliefs.

These two educational programs not only increased the number of students in the Indian education system, whether directly through BIA community schools or indirectly through Johnson O'Malley contracts with public schools, but also amplified the intended

consequences of assimilation. Not only through immediate economic integration which was uneven at best, given that the majority of Native communities were still located in rural and/or isolated locations and thus had little access to stable employment. Moreover, the jobs that Native individuals did obtain were congruent with the training, un-skilled, seasonal, and/or domestic employment. What was established was a foundation for the bridge to mid-twentieth century policies of Relocation and Termination, where the BIA was able to utilize the previous reform efforts to finally rid the United States of its Indian problem once and for all. Thus, the progressive educational policies of the BIA established the foundation for the later mobilization of the reserve labor, exemplified in both the first and second world wars in which a high percentage of Native peoples took part in the American war effort through the enlistment of the military and laborers of war industries.

The story of U.S. attempts at Indian economic integration is an example of the how the Nation-state not only acts as a colonial and imperial agent, to harness the untapped labor, land and resources of colonized populations. But an example of how a the settler states tries to come to terms with the active legacy of conquest, that is both the past and present policies, rhetoric, and consequences of colonization. A colonial conundrum that attempts to justify and stabilize its existence, through the systematic incorporation of colonized peoples, even if the citizens of that Nation are adamantly against this enfranchisement, if only due to the racialized exterior.

The parallel strategies of conquest and assimilation are not where the story of Native peoples ends. Even in these systematic and widespread attempts at genocide, whether physical or epistemological, there has always been resistance, not by everyone, and not all at once, but there has always been resistance. Ninety-nine percent of our story is the intergenerational experience of pain and loss; profound, immeasurable, and untold. In which generations of children have grown up in, normalized, and committed the same acts of violence that were enacted on the bodies and minds of their xaxa, antatupa, antupa, astemtima/nqacina, ankikawa/sxapa, antum/skuy, anleu/mistum³⁶⁹. Families that can no longer speak, sing, pray or even understand the language of their ancestors. Whole tribes that have buried their bundles, their medicine, their ceremonies or no longer have access to their spiritual center because the knowledge, the connection or the space has been removed.

Yet in a sea of loss and pain there is decimal amount of hope. This hope is neither shared nor felt by everyone, but it is growing in the revitalization of our languages, practices, and epistemologies It is in the fight for self-determination, for community control over the education of our children. An education where we support the future of our children, not simply in the context of access to higher education, or professional development as the doctors, lawyers, and accountants or other commonly cited examples of successful obtainment of the American dream. Our communities want more, we want control of our Indigenous dream, not an unrealistic return to some ill perceived concept of the olden-days, but a present where we prepare our children for a future immersed in

³⁶⁹ translation: ancestors, great great great grandparents, great great grandparents, grandmother (mothers/fathers side), grandfather (mothers/fathers side), mother (boy/girl), father (boy/girl).

their traditional practices, languages, and epistemologies of our communities without limiting their access to economic stability, academic achievement, and a critical engagement with the world. The best part about this dream is that it has begun to develop in thousands of indigenous communities across the nation, places, spaces, initiatives, revitalization efforts where we as Indigenous peoples do not only dream but are in control of our own time and processes of healing the wounds that are twenty-five hundred and one generations deep.

Bibliography

Adams, D. (1995). *Education for extinction: American Indians and the boarding school experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

Armstrong, Samuel (1913) *Armstrong Education for life*. Press of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton Virginia
<https://archive.org/stream/educationforlife00arms#page/22/mode/2up>.

Armstrong, S. C. (1893) Concerning Indians: extracts from the annual report of the principal of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, for the School year ending June 30, 1883. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.31175035167066>.

Ben-zvi, Yael. (2007) "Where Did Red Go? Lewis Henry Morgan's Evolutionary Inheritance and U.S. Racial Imagination." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 7, no. 2 pp. 201-29. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41949556>.

Beyer, C. K. (February, 2007). The Connection of Samuel Chapman Armstrong as both Borrower and Architect of Education in Hawai'i. *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 47 No. 1.

Biolsi, Thomas. (2007) *Race Technologies in "A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics."* Eds Nugent, David and Joan Vincent. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Blackhawk, Ned. (2006) *Violence over the Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge MA.

Blauner, Bob. (2001) *Still the Big News: Racial Oppression in America*. Temple University Press. Philadelphia.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life* 2011 ed. Haymarket Books Chicago, Illinois.

Breckenridge, James. (1876). *Predestination a sermon*. Presbyterian Print House. Toronto. HathiTrust: <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/aeu.ark:/13960/t5db8jp1f>.

Breyer, Kalani .(2010) "Setting the Record Straight: Education of the Mind and Hands Existed in the United States before the 1800s" *American Educational History Journal* .Vol. 37, Number 1 2010. pp. 149-167.

Breyer, C. K. (February 01, 2007). "The Connection of Samuel Chapman Armstrong as both Borrower and Architect of Education in Hawai'i." *History of Education Quarterly*, 47, 1, 23-48.

Bruno-Jofré Rosa and Carlos Martínez Valle (2009) *Ruralizing Dewey: The American Friend, internal colonization, and the Action School in post-revolutionary Mexico (1921-1940)* Encuentros sobre Educación Volumen 10, pp. 43-64.

Cohen Felix S. (2006) On the drafting of Tribal Constitutions. University of Oklahoma, Norman Ok.

Collier, John (1935) Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Defends the Indian New Deal. Excerpt from Collier, "Annual Report," Bureau of Indian Affairs Washington D.C.: GPO. <https://www.colorado.edu/AmStudies/lewis/issues/collier2.pdf>.

Critchlow. T. (May 1981) "Lewis Meriam, Expertise, and Indian Reform." *The Historian* Vol. 43 No. 3.

Deloria, P.J., (1998). *Playing Indian*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

-- (2004). *Indians in unexpected places* (Culture America). Lawrence, Kan.: University Press of Kansas.

Dennison, Jean (2012) *Colonial Entanglement: Constituting a Twenty-First-Century Osage Nation*. The University of North Carolina Press.

Dewey, John. (1916) *Democracy and Education* in The Middle Works, 1899-1924 Vol. 9: 1916. Ed. Jo Ann Boydston. 1980. Southern Illinois University Press.

-- (1921) *Racial Prejudice and Friction*. The Chinese Social and Political science review. Vol. 6. Peking, China. First read at The Chinese Social and Political Science Association.

-- (2008). *Mexico's Educational Renaissance* in John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953. Vol. 2: 1925-1927: Essays, Reviews, Miscellany and *the Public and its Problems*. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press.

-- (2008) *Education as Growth* in John Dewey The Middle Works, 1899-1924: Vol. 9 1916 *Democracy and Education*. Boydston, Jo Ann Ed. Southern Illinois University Press.

Dibble, Sheldon (1843) *History of the Sandwich Islands*. Lahainaluna Press of the Mission Seminary. American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions Library. https://books.google.com/books?id=EwqpkYKuXSMC&printsec=frontcover&source=gb_s_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false.

Donner, William W. (Spring 2008) "Neither Germans nor Englishman, But Americans": Education, Assimilation, and Ethnicity among nineteenth-century Pennsylvania Germans. *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, Vol. 75, No. 2, pp197-226. Penn State University Press.

Eastman, Charles

-- Eastman, C. (1971). *The soul of the Indian* (Series in American studies). New York: Johnson Reprint.

-- Eastman, C. (1915). *The Indian to-day: The past and future of the first American*. Doubleday, Page & company.

--Eastman, C. (1931). *From the deep woods to civilization*. Boston: Little, Brown, and.

Eastman, C., & Blumenschein, E. L. (1902). *Indian boyhood*. New York: McClure, Phillips & Eastman, Elaine Goodale. (1935) Pratt: *The Red Man's Moses*. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Fear-Segal, Jacqueline (2006). The Man-on-the-band stand at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School: What He Reveals about the Children's Experiences. In: *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences*. University of Nebraska Press.

-- (2007). *White Man's Club: Schools, Race, and the Struggle of Indian Acculturation*. University of Nebraska Press.

Hyde, George E. (1961) *Spotted Tail's Folk: A History of the Brulé Sioux*. The University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Indian child Welfare Act: Resource Educational Video. (2013) Native American Rights Fund. <https://youtu.be/VJCqeauLvY8>.

Jacobs, M. (2007). Working on the Domestic Frontier: American Indian Domestic Servants in White Women's Households in the San Francisco Bay Area, 1920-1940. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 28(1/2).

Jones, John Wesley (2012). *John Dewey and Cultural Racism*. Master Thesis. Master of Arts in Educational Policy Studies. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Urbana Illinois.

Karier, Clarence J. (1986) *The individual, society, and education*. Revised edition of *Man, Society and education* 1967. Illni Books, University of Illinios.

Kaestle F. Carl. (1983). *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780-1860*. Hill and Wang, New York.

Knight W. Edgar Ed. (1953) *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860 Vol. IV*. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill

---"Extracts from the Will of Dr. John De La Howe of South Carolina, 1796"

---"President Philip Lindsley of Cumberland College, Tennessee, On Manual Labor Schools, 1825"

Knight, Edgar W Ed. (1953) *A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860 Vol. V. Educational Theories and Practices*. The University of North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill.

---- “North Carolina Forbids Slaves or Free Negroes to Preach, 1831”

----editorial in *The Raleigh Register* (1830) “A North Carolina Editor Praises The School of John Chavis, Negro Teacher and Preacher, 1830”

----Ingraham Joseph Holt (1835) *The South-West. By a Yankee*

Kuntz, Stephen and John Collier. (Summer 1971) “The Social philosophy of Collier” *Ethnohistory* Vol.18 No. 3. Duke University Press.

Lipsitz, George. (2005) “The Possessive Investment in Whiteness” in *White Privilege: essential readings on the other side of racism*. Paula S. Rothenberg, ed. 2005. 2nd Edition. Worth Publishers, New York, NY.

La Flesche, F. (1901). *The Middle five: Indian boys at school*. 2d ed. Boston: Small, Maynard & company.

Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian., . (1886). *Proceedings of the ... annual meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*. [S.l.: s.n.].

Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian. (1887-1904). *Proceedings of the ... annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*. [New York: Lake Mohonk Conference]. Internet Archive
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=wu.89066407420;view=1up;seq=5>. HathiTrust Digital Library. April 16th 2016

Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian., (1904-1907). *Proceedings of the ... annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian*. [New York: Lake Mohonk Conference]. Internet Archive
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=wu.89066407420;view=1up;seq=5>. HathiTrust Digital Library. April 16th 2016.

Littlefield, Alice. (1993) “Learning to Labor: Native American Education in the United States, 1880-1930.” *The Political Economy of North American Indians*. Ed. John Moore. Norman University of Oklahoma Press.

Living Bible Proverb 16-27 The Living Bible copyright © 1971 by Tyndale House Foundation. Used by permission of Tyndale House Publishers Inc., Carol Stream, Illinois 60188. All rights reserved.

Lomawaima, K. Tsianina. (Summer 2013). “The Mutuality of Citizenship and Sovereignty.” *American Indian Quarterly*. Vol. 37 Issue 3.

Lomawaima, K Tsianina and Teresa L. MaCarty. (2006) *To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education 1928-1940*. Teachers College Press

LONE WOLF v. HITCHCOCK. 187 U.S. 553 (1903) No. 275 Supreme Court of United States.

McDade, J. R. (2008). *The birth of the American Indian manual labor boarding school: Social control through culture destruction, 1820-1850*. Lewiston, N.Y: Edwin Mellen Press.

Memmi, Albert. (1965) *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. 1991 Expanded Edition Beacon Press, Boston.

Meriam, Lewis (1928) *The Meriam Report Education Section Scanned-Digitized Version*. 2008 ankn.uaf.edu. *The Problem of Indian Administration*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Meriam, Lewis. (June 1931) *State and Local Cooperation with the National Government in Social and Educational Work for Indians* in *Cooperation in Indian Administration: Federal, State, Country, AND Local*. Four papers presented before the Committee on the American Indian of the National Conference of Social Work. Minneapolis, MN.

Meyer, John W, David Tyack, Joane Nagel and Audri Gordon. (Nov. 1979). "Public Education as Nation-Building in America: Enrollments and Bureaucratization in the American States, 1870-1930." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol 85, No. 3, pp. 591-613. University of Chicago Press.

Montezuma, Carlos, 1866-1923. *Carlos Montezuma papers, 1890-1922*.

Norgren, Jill. (2004) *The Cherokee Cases: Two Landmark Decision in the Fight for Sovereignty*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Perlstein, Daniel. (2016) "Class" in Miseducation: A History of Ignorance-Making in America and Abroad. A.J. Angulo, Ed, John Hopkins University Press.

Pratt, Richard Henry (1964) *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*. Yale University Press.

Pratt, Richard H. (1973) *Official Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Correction (1892)*, reprinted in *Americanizing the American Indians: Writing by the "Friends of the Indian" 1889-1900*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Pratt Brig. Gen. R. H. (1908) *The Indian Industrial School: Its Origin, Purposes, Progress and Difficulties Surmounted*. The Hamilton Library Association Carlisle, Pennsylvania. University of Texas Repository Library.

Prucha, Francis Paul. (1984) *The Great Father: The United States Government and the Indians*. University of.

Prucha, Francis Paul. Ed. (2000) *Report of the Indian Peace Commission (January 7 1868)*. *House Executive Document no. 97, 40th cong., 2d sess., serial 1337, pp.15-17, 20-22*. In *Documents of United States Indian Policy*. Third Edition. University of Nebraska, Press Lincoln, Nebraska.

Reese J. William (2005) *American Public Schools: From the Common School to 'No Child Left Behind'*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Richards King and Charles Fruehling Springwood Ed. C (2001) *Team Spirits: the Native American Mascots Controversy*. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln Nebraska.

Rosenstein, Jay (1997). In *Whose Honor?* Written and produced by Jay Rosenstein. Ho-ho-kus, New Jersey: New Day Films.

Robertson, Dwanna L. (2013) *A Necessary Evil: Framing an American Indian Legal Identity* in *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* Vol. 37 No. 5.

Rothman, David J. (1995) *Perfecting the Prison: United States 1789-1865*. In *The Oxford History of the Prison*. Oxford University Press Inc, New York.

Ryan, Carson W. Jr. and Rose K. Brandt. (February 1932). "Indian Education Today." *Progressive Education Today*. Vol. IX No.2 pp81-86.
<https://worldcat.org/ILL/articleexchange/FileDownloadLogin/vYE5fJuo8>.

Saito, Natsu Taylor (2002) "Asserting Plenary Power of the 'Other': Indians, Immigrants, Colonial Subjects, and Why U.S. jurisprudence needs to incorporate International Law." *Yale Law & Policy Review* Vol. 20: 427.

Schoenhals, Louise (Feb, 1964). *Mexico Experiments in Primary Education: 1921-1930*. *The Hispanic American Historical Review*. Vol. 44, No 1 Duke University Press.

Spindel, Carol (2002). *Dancing at Halftime: Sports and the Controversy Over American Indian Mascots*. New York: New York University Press.

Sullivan, Susan. (2003) *Reconstruction Zone* in *In Dewey's Wake: Unfinished Work of Pragmatic Reconstruction* Gavin, William J., ed. 2003. Albany: State University of New York Press. Accessed July 16, 2017. ProQuest Ebook Central.

THE UNITED STATES, PLAINTIFFS, v. WILLIAM S. ROGERS. 45 U.S. 567 (1946) 4 How. 567 Supreme Court of United States.

Thomas, David Hurst. *Skull Wars: Kennewick Man, Archaeology, and the Battle for Native American Identity*, 44-51. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2000.

Trennert, Robert A. (August, 1983) From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930. *Pacific Historical Review*. Vol. 52, No. 3.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph (1997) *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. 1 ed. Beacon Press.

United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1928/1929). *Annual report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior*. Washington: The Office. HathiTrust Digital books online, Original. University of Michigan.

United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (November 1933). *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 6 Washington, D.C.

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>.

United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (December 15,1933) . *Indians at work*. Vol. 1 No. 9 Washington, D.C.

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015034625700;view=1up;seq=221>.

United States. Bureau of Indian Affairs., (1933). *Indians at work*. Washington, D.C.

<https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/000058924/Cite>.

United States. Board of Indian Commissioners (1928). 59th *Annual report of the Board of Indian Commissioners to the Secretary of the Interior*. Washington: Govt. Print. Office.

United States Census Bureau (1860) *Eighth Census, United States—1860. Instructions to U.S. Marshals*

<https://usa.ipums.org/usa/voliii/inst1860.shtml>.

United States Department of the Interior (1936) *Annual Report of the Department of the Interior*.

United States, *History, Art & Archives, U.S. House of Representatives*, Pound Thaddeus Coleman <http://history.house.gov/People/Detail/19870>.

United States. Office of Indian Affairs (1878) *Annual report of the commissioner of Indian affairs, for the year 1878*, Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., v: fold. maps; 23 cm.

<http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/History.AnnRep>.

United States. Office of Indian Affairs. (1903) Superintendent of Indian Schools. *Report of the Superintendent of Indian schools*. Washington, D.C.: G.P.O.

Waggoner, Linda M. (2008) *Fire Light: The Life of Angel DeCora, Winnabego Artist*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Watras, Joseph. (Summer-Fall, 2004) Progressive Education and Native American schools, 1920-1950. Educational Foundations.

Williams, Robert A. (1992) *The Indian in Western legal thought: The Discourse of Conquest*. Oxford University Press.

Zitkala-Sa (1921) *American Indian Stories*. Washington: Hayworth Publishing House.

Zitkal-ša. (January-March 1916) *The Indian's Awakening*. *The American Indian Magazine: A Journal of Race Ideals* Ed. Arthur C. Park. *The Quarterly Journal of the Society of American Indians* Vol. 4 No. 1-4.

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=nyp.33433081688529;view=1up;seq=7>.