

Progressive Education and Native American Schools, 1929-1950

By Joseph Watras

In her widely quoted book, *Education and the American Indian*, Margaret Connell Szasz contended that, during the late nineteenth century, education served as a tool of assimilation as teachers prepared Indians to enter the mainstream culture. According to Szasz, the federal government sponsored three separate forms of education for Native Americans from 1879 to 1930. These included industrial vocational boarding schools located outside reservations, vocational boarding schools located on reservations, and day schools on reservations that stressed academic curriculums. Mission schools were a fourth, but separate type of school for Indians. In these philanthropic institutions teachers sought to introduce a few Native Americans into what Szasz called “church training.” Although each of these types of schooling differed from each other, they shared the aim of leading the Native American students to assimilate into the mainstream society.¹

Another historian, David Wallace Adams, claimed

Joseph Watras is a professor with the Department of Teacher Education at the University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio.

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

that, from 1875 to 1928, the schools for Native Americans promoted what he called “education for extinction.” This happened in two ways. The first was through the development of a standard curriculum. In 1887, the U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs required schools for Native Americans to conduct instruction in the English language and to introduce standard academic subjects such as arithmetic, science, history, and art. The second way was through a bias in federal policy favoring boarding schools that separated the children from their families. In 1885, there were 114 boarding schools with a total attendance of about 6,000 students. At the same time, there were 86 day schools on reservations that permitted students to live with their families. These day schools enrolled about 2,000 students. By 1895, the number of boarding schools grew to 157 enrolling about 15,000 students while the number of day schools increased to 125 with about 3,000 students.²

Both Szasz and Adams contend that in the 1930s, a reform movement changed the direction of education for Native Americans. Szasz wrote that the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs encouraged a return to what she called Indian culture. In the late 1940s, the policies took the name, “termination,” because they returned to efforts to end the separate status of Native Americans by assimilating them into the mainstream society.³

Despite Szasz’s assertion, the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs did not reinforce the traditional cultures of Native Americans in the legislation the officials sponsored or in the educational programs they promoted. Instead, the federal officials during the 1930s and 1940s sponsored legislation that introduced democracy, a European conception, in hopes that Native Americans would reinforce their traditional cultures. Similarly, the officials in the educational branch of the Indian Service, who served as officials in the Progressive Education Association (PEA), drafted policies applying to reservation day schools the methods of progressive education that were popular throughout the country at that time. As a result, the teachers reinforced ideals of democracy and a faith in science rather than traditional Amerindian ways of life.

Advocates for Native Americans

The change in direction came in part through the work of John Collier. In 1922, Collier joined Stella M. Atwood and the General Federation of Women’s Clubs to begin what one historian called the first mass movement on behalf of Native Americans. In his campaigns, Collier sought to preserve the land the Native American tribes held in common, and he tried to preserve the religious practices of the Native Americans. In these campaigns, Collier rallied such a wide audience that in 1923 he became executive secretary of the newly formed American Indian Defense Association.⁴

As Collier developed his organization, Dr. Hubert Work became Secretary of the Interior. Seeking to defend his agency against attacks from Collier’s group, Work established, in 1923, an advisory committee on Indian affairs known as the

Committee of One Hundred. By 1926, Collier complained that this committee did not offer reasonable suggestions, and Work asked the Brookings Institution to make a comprehensive survey of Indian affairs. Headed by Lewis Meriam, the members of the research staff included W. Carson Ryan, Jr. He was a professor of education at Swarthmore College, active in the Progressive Education Association, and four years later, he became the director of Indian education.⁵

In 1927, while Meriam and his colleagues performed their research, the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs published a bulletin explaining the progress in the education of the Indians. Contending that confinement on the reservations hurt the Native Americans, the bulletin praised efforts such as the Dawes Act of 1887 that sought to allot lands to individual Native Americans to afford them opportunities for improvement through personal effort. The bulletin noted that the federal government supported educational endeavors to enable the Indians to take advantage of such opportunities. In several photographs, the bulletin showed students working at day schools and in boarding schools such as Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania. According to the bulletin, the students who attended the boarding schools learned to speak, read, and write in English; they mastered elementary academic abilities; and they developed vocational skills in such areas as house-keeping, agriculture, and painting. Vocational instruction did not come through formal teaching. Instead, the students acquired vocational skills while that performed the practical duties necessary to maintain the boarding schools.⁶

The bulletin from the Indian Service offered a different vision of Native American education and life than the Meriam report compiled. To conduct their research, the staff spent seven months visiting reservations, schools, and agencies. In 1928, they submitted their findings. The Meriam report claimed it did not offer an evaluation of the performance of the Indian Service. Instead, it compared the activities of the Indian Service to programs conducted by other agencies engaged in similar efforts. Despite the authors' efforts to remain neutral, the report claimed that Native Americans endured harsh conditions and placed the blame on the federal government.⁷

The Meriam report observed that most Native Americans were extremely poor; they were not adjusted to society; they suffered from diseases more than the general population; and they could not earn money to alleviate their problems. According to the report, the federal government had contributed to the poor health of the Indians by providing inadequate food allowances. The housing arrangements maintained by the government resulted in unsanitary conditions. Worse, the report complained that the federal government had instituted policies that made the Native Americans into paupers by encouraging them to remain dependent on the government's charity. For example, the research staff noted that the federal government had tried to turn the Indians into independent and self-reliant farmers by giving parts of the reservations to individual Native Americans. The report claimed this policy of land allotments was based on the hope that private ownership

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

of land would magically transform the Amerindians into capitalists. Unfortunately, the Indians did not take up agriculture. They sold or leased the land to white neighbors and lived off the proceeds until they were gone.⁸

The Meriam report found that the Indian Service lacked any well considered educational program. There was no reasonable system to teach adults about public health. Although the policy of the service was to direct Native American children to public schools, some Indian youth attended boarding schools on reservations. The research staff condemned the service for making grossly inadequate provisions for the students' care at these boarding schools. Because of budget problems, the schools tried to feed the students at a cost of eleven cents per day. In the 1920s, this sum could not provide any one with a reasonable diet. As a result, the children contracted such diseases as tuberculosis that sufficient food could have prevented.⁹ The Meriam report noted that the Indian service lacked essential statistical information. The researchers could not find accurate information about population size, birth or death rates, or incidence of diseases. Consequently, the researchers estimated that in 1926 there were about 355,000 Native Americans in the United States and Alaska. The number of school age children in this population was about 84,000, and about 70,000 of these children attended some form of school. While the report noted that this rate of school attendance was creditable, it was lower than the rates found in most public school systems. Furthermore, most of the Native American students were over age for their assigned grades. Of the more than 16,000 Amerindian students the researchers counted, only about 1,000 were working at the appropriate grade level for their ages. The rest were from one to eight-years behind what should have been their normal grades.¹⁰

According to Donald T. Critchlow, many historians claimed the Meriam report called for an end of assimilation policies toward Native Americans. Critchlow disagreed because he found that the report urged the Indian Service to use resources more efficiently and to hire better personnel. In this way, the report seemed to follow a perspective similar to one that an efficiency expert such as Frederick Winslow Taylor might recommend. Critchlow noted that the report did not offer as solutions the policies that Collier advocated such as giving tribes their own governments and allowing tribes to hold their own land as corporate entities. Although Critchlow acknowledged that the Meriam report mentioned governance and land control as points for experimentation, he argued that the report's recommendations concentrated on the need for increased revenues for the Indian Service and for the rearrangement of the administration.¹¹

The education section of the report reinforced Critchlow's observation. Although it stated unequivocally that the U.S. Department of the Interior had to change its prevailing conception of education, this change was needed to end the backward, out-of-date, and inefficient approach that characterized Indian schools. It did not call for an end to efforts to prepare the Native American children to enter mainstream society. Instead, the report urged the service to adopt the more modern view that the

children should be raised within natural settings of home and family life. In doing this, the education branch could follow what the report called the more modern perspective of building curriculum on an understanding of human growth and development. The report noted that this would be better than trying to remove Native American children from their home environments because home and school could cooperate.¹²

In making its criticisms of the Indian Service, the Meriam report followed the views of the Progressive Education Association. In 1919, the PEA adopted as its principles the desire for schools 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 homes. The similarity between the Meriam report and progressive ideas derived from the fact that the author of the education section of the Meriam Report was W. Carson Ryan, Jr. Not only was Ryan active in the association when he worked with Meriam, after Ryan left government service, he was president of the PEA.¹³

The Meriam report noted that the newer, more modern approach would allow the teachers to gather instructional material from the life around the students. Besides being more efficient, this would be more sensible. For example, the report stated that the education office in the Indian Service followed a uniform curriculum for all schools that was constructed in 1915. Acknowledging that this standard curriculum had many noteworthy objectives, such as learn to use the library, the report observed that teachers could not meet these goals because the conditions at the schools made them impossible. For example, most of the schools lacked any access to library facilities. Thus, the Meriam report recommended that instead of imposing an outmoded curriculum on the teachers, the Indian Service should imitate more advanced school districts and encourage the teachers to work together to develop appropriate curriculums for their schools. To obtain competent teachers, the service would have to raise the teachers' pay and offer substantial advancements in salary for length of service. In addition, the service had to change the image of industrial training. The report noted that boarding school administrators had put the students to work producing commodities the officials could use to lower the cost of the school. The more effective model would be to design industrial training in ways that enabled the students to earn adequate incomes on their reservations or in the wider society. Nonetheless, the report did not recommend the removal of boarding schools. Some boarding schools would have to remain in those locations where populations were sparse and distances among families were great. As much as possible, though, the research staff recommended that the service establish more day schools and provide able and interested Indian students opportunities to enroll in advanced educational training.¹⁴

Presidential administrations changed a year after the Brookings Institute submitted the Meriam report. In 1929, when Herbert Hoover took office as U.S.

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

President, he appointed Charles James Rhoads as U. S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs with the understanding that he would support the changes recommended in the Meriam report. In 1930, Rhoads appointed the educational consultant for the Meriam report, W. Carson Ryan, Jr., to be the director of Indian education.

In 1932, Rhoads wrote his final report as U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs. He claimed that the most significant achievement had been to shift Native American children from boarding schools to day schools on the reservations or public schools off the reservation. He noted that he and Ryan had closed six boarding schools that had enrolled about 1,200 students and sent the students to local schools so they could live at home. In addition, Rhoads and Ryan prohibited existing boarding schools from enrolling young children. As a result, the boarding schools aligned their curriculums toward genuine vocational training, and the Indian Service used the money saved to improve day schools on reservations. The biggest growth was the attendance of Indian children in neighboring public schools. In 1930, the total number of Native American youth attending public schools was about 38,000. By the end of 1932, Rhoads and Ryan increased the number to about 48,000.¹⁵

According to Lawrence C. Kelley, during Rhoads's administration, the education branch of the Indian Service hired more than eight hundred new elementary school teachers who had at least three years training beyond high school. In addition, the service encouraged teachers who lacked the necessary training to attend normal schools, offered summer courses for teachers on reservations, and stressed the adoption of vocational training courses that were appropriate for life on the reservations. In line with the Meriam report's recommendations, the service established guidance programs and loans to send Native American students to colleges or to technical schools.¹⁶

At first, Collier approved of Rhoads and the innovations he sponsored. Although Collier maintained a favorable opinion of Ryan's reforms in education, he disagreed with Rhoads. As a result, Collier labeled the Hoover administration's policies as a false start. One disagreement occurred when conservative congressional representatives resisted Rhoads' plea to increase financial support for Indian boarding schools as the Meriam report recommended, Rhoads accepted the defeat. In defiance, Collier launched a public attack causing the U.S. Senate to approve the increased spending. In another incident, Rhoads allowed the teachers in the boarding schools to resume corporal punishment after the education branch had forbidden the practice as the Meriam report had urged. Rhoads qualified the reinstatement of such punishments by requiring that they be administered in private rooms. Collier took issue with this change and publicly charged that teachers were flogging children.¹⁷

The Indian New Deal

The possibility of more extensive changes in federal policies toward Native

Americans appeared when Franklin Roosevelt assumed the office of U.S. President. Roosevelt appointed Harold L. Ickes to be U.S. Secretary of the Interior. In April, 1933, Ickes picked Collier to be U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Although there were other candidates for the position, Ickes had long supported Collier's efforts in behalf of Native Americans. In fact, Ickes and his wife had joined the American Indian Defense Association when it began.¹⁸

In January 1934, Collier began a campaign to obtain passage of the Indian Reorganization Act. Submitted as the Wheeler-Howard Act, this act was the basis of what was called the Indian New Deal because it promised to radically change the status of Native Americans. Beginning with a conference to unite the various groups of advocates for Native Americans, Collier solicited support from various tribal councils around the U.S. To Collier's dismay, many of the tribes disapproved of the plan. Nonetheless, Senators Burton K. Wheeler and Edgar Howard introduced the proposed bill in February 1934. Although the U.S. Congress modified the bill before accepting it, the act made significant reforms when Roosevelt signed it in June 1934. For example, the act ended the system of individual allotment of lands, and it gave Native Americans the freedom to organize into self governing bodies. Although the original proposal had directed the appropriation of funds for schools to teach children and adults about Indian civilization as well as traditional arts and crafts, the final act did no more than provide funds for vocational education.¹⁹

The Indian Reorganization Act required tribes to vote to accept the conditions of the act. Once a tribe accepted the act, the members had to draw up a constitution and a corporate charter that described what they would do in governing themselves. Therefore, Collier set about campaigning among the Native American groups to persuade them to accept the provisions. When the voting ended in 1936, the totals indicated that 181 tribes had accepted the act while 77 had rejected it. Most important, the biggest tribe, the Navajos, refused to accept the act. Realizing that the Native American groups who approved of the act had no experience with such legal constructions, Collier drafted a circular that explained what had to be included in the constitution and the charter. He sent representatives from his office to visit the tribal councils and help them draft their documents.²⁰

To help the Native Americans understand and profit from the Indian Reorganization Act, Collier brought anthropologists into the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs. From 1935 to 1938, Collier assigned a staff of anthropologists to work with legal and economic advisors to identify tribal groups, prepare constitutions and charters, and to develop land use projects. In addition, the anthropologists helped teachers in the Amerindian schools to understand the cultures with which they were working. Finally, in 1941, he arranged for anthropologists to evaluate the long term impact of his policies.²¹

Although the anthropologists could have benefited from the Indian Reorganization Act, Collier had difficulty enlisting anthropologists in its support. In accordance with the theme of Roosevelt's brain trust, Collier sought the advice of

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

specialists at the University of Chicago, the Smithsonian, and the U.S. Bureau of Ethnology to shape legislation. Although he delivered an address at the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, the organization did not offer to support the act. Further, when Collier solicited expert opinion for the U.S. Congress about the benefits of the Indian Reorganization Act, most anthropologists offered general but limited approval.²²

Although anthropologists gave limited support for the Indian Reorganization Act, they made critical remarks after the act had been in place for several years. For example, in 1944, the then former director of the Applied Anthropology Unit in the U.S. Indian Affairs, H. Scudder Mekeel, complained that the Indian Reorganization Act had caused harm. Mekeel argued that the act ignored the traditional social structures that Native Americans possessed and forced them to accept Anglo-Saxon democratic principles. While Mekeel thought assimilated Native Americans may have understood and accepted the idea of drafting a constitution, he claimed that Indians following traditional forms of self government saw the requirement as inflexible and foreign. In addition, noting that the personnel in the field would apply the act, he argued that these white officials held to the former notions of forcing assimilation as quickly as possible.²³

Collier replied to Mekeel indicating that not only assimilated Indians but members of traditional tribes had accepted the requirements of the act. He added that the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs did not require all tribes to adopt written constitutions. Instead, the office allowed some tribes to retain their ideas of village control rather than forcing them to form a federalist model with wider responsibilities. In addition, Collier defended his staff. He claimed that Mekeel misrepresented the affection the field representatives had for the Native Americans and for their rights to self-government. According to Collier, these officials welcomed the decentralized authority that the act could bring into being.²⁴

The controversy between Mekeel and Collier fueled historians' investigations. For example, Graham D. Taylor sought to test Mekeel's assertion that the Indian groups with high levels of assimilation favored the act and Indian groups with low levels of assimilation did not. Combining figures from the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Civil Works Administration, Taylor considered the extent of intermarriage with white people and the level of literacy as measures of assimilation, and the extent of intact reservation lands as a measure of economic status. When Taylor tried to determine the relation between the level of assimilation of a group in 1934 and the group's vote on the Indian Reorganization Act a year or so later, he could not find any correlation. Further, Taylor found that there was no relation between the extent to which individual Indians owned their own land and their decisions about the act.²⁵

Although Mekeel had associated the level of assimilation with understandings of democratic proceedings, Taylor concluded that the Indian Reorganization Act imposed a system of governance that was unfamiliar to the Native Americans. Taylor argued that, before 1934, white executives or smaller family units had controlled

many elements of life for Native Americans. With the act, institutions that were nominally representative of the Native Americans took control. As a result, the act increased what he called factionalism among the Native Americans. Tribal officials bickered constantly with their constituent units about the nature and extent of the authority each level possessed.²⁶

According to Stephen J. Kunitz, one problem was that Collier held an idealized vision of tribes that he shared with other progressives and several anthropologists. This vision was that Native American tribes had integrated all the aspects of their social life in some functional manner. According to this progressive notion, lifestyles that were called primitive contrasted to those in technologically advanced societies wherein people held individualistic notions of personality development. In modern cities, people were not linked together by a web of customs. It was this type of integration the progressives wanted to preserve among the Native Americans.²⁷

While Collier held a romantic vision of Native American life, he and his assistants had a practical, legal reason to base the Indian Reorganization Act on the view of Native American tribes as uniform. According to Lawrence C. Kelly, in the early nineteenth century, U.S. Chief Justice John Marshall had defined Indian tribes as sovereign entities. Seeking to reaffirm this precedent, the authors of the Indian Reorganization Act wrote their bill in a way that gave the tribes the powers allowed municipal corporations. While Collier assumed the Native Americans would assert their traditional, close knit social structure when given freedom, Kelly noted that this did not happen. Instead, many Amerindian groups reacted strongly against the act and its provisions.²⁸

If democratic government was antithetical to traditional Native American societies, progressive educational policies were equally unsuitable. As noted above, the progressives agreed that schools had to allow students the freedom to select activities for themselves, the teachers should show how science could be applied to solve everyday problems, and the lessons should show the students how to work cooperatively. For Native American schools, the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs selected a model of curriculum development that was directed toward those goals.

Native American Education and Progressive Education

Before taking office, Collier had promised to continue the educational program of the previous Hoover administration. Collier did this by retaining Ryan in office until 1936 when Ryan took a position with the Carnegie Foundation. In their time together, they advanced the progressive innovations that Ryan had implemented under Rhoads.²⁹

In February 1932, the magazine, *Progressive Education*, devoted the entire issue to the development of Indian education. In the first article, Ryan wrote that the official position of the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs was to sponsor education in

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

ways that would help the Native Americans adjust to modern life, protect their own traditions, capitalize on their cultural resources, and contribute to modern civilization. Ryan added that there were two groups of Amerindians with different needs. The first included those Native Americans who had assimilated into mainstream society. Although Ryan thought most of the students who fell into this category should attend public schools, he wanted to help them regain as much as possible of their traditions. The second group included those Indians in the southwestern states who could live apart from mainstream society. Ryan argued that among Indians of this type, education could be truly integrated into the community as progressive educators wanted to do everywhere. For example, he noted that teachers invited adults to demonstrate their knowledge of Native American poetry and music to the children. Navajo rug weavers taught the Navajo children how to weave. In addition, teachers organized field trips to nearby anthropological museums to show the children the traditional pottery. Finally, through such public shows as the Indian Tribal Arts Exposition that was touring the United States, the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs sought to demonstrate to the public what tribal arts could contribute to mainstream culture.³⁰

Similar optimistic outlooks appeared in the reports of the U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs. In his first report, published in 1933, Collier implied that his office might be able to improve the educational situation. One reason was that, although the census information about Native Americans was inaccurate, almost 65 percent of the Native Americans resided Oklahoma, Arizona, New Mexico, and South Dakota. In addition, Collier added that more than 12 percent of the students lived outside any federal jurisdiction and would attend public schools where the extent of the federal supervision of the education for such students might be to provide funds for public schools. According to Collier's report, in 1933, there were less than 200 schools exclusively for Native Americans under federal direction with an enrollment of around 30,000 students.³¹

In 1934, Collier's agency spent about \$1.5 million to build schools on the Navajo reservation. Four of the buildings resembled large traditional Navajo hogans and about eighty more day school building represented a compromise between a Pueblo style and typical school architecture. All were built by Navajos from native stone. In addition to classrooms, the buildings contained showers, kitchens, and shops that adults from the community could use. Controversies erupted in 1934 when Collier and Ryan selected fifty young Navajo community workers and sought to train them to take charge of the day schools. The furor over untrained teachers was so extensive that by 1935 the education agency relented, and Ryan announced that qualified teachers would be hired.³²

In addition to requesting trained teachers rather than locally trained Navajo youth, several Navajos petitioned the Indian service to spend some of the money allocated to the construction of day schools to the building of boarding schools. These Navajos argued that the advanced students needed boarding schools if they

were to learn the skills they would need to leave the reservation. Further, the parents appreciated the fact that boarding schools offered clothes, shelter, and food for the students. They asked that the day schools offer transportation, meals, and clothes.³³

In 1936, Collier appointed Willard W. Beatty to replace Ryan as director of Indian education. On 10 February 1936, *Time*, a weekly newsmagazine, announced that Beatty, then president of the Progressive Education Association, would become the chief of education in the office of Indian affairs. The article predicted that Beatty would dispense the faith of progressive educators to Amerindian students. Noting the failure of previous efforts to teach Native Americans to adopt the ways of the mainstream society, *Time*'s authors wrote that Beatty would allow the Amerindians to study what they wanted. This included Indian arts, customs, and languages as well as academics subjects.³⁴

Although the *Times* article suggested that Beatty would bring a new progressive attitude to the office, this was not entirely true. Both Ryan and Beatty shared a strong affection for the PEA and its principles. Beatty was president of the Progressive Education Association when he was appointed, and Ryan became president of the association after he left government service. From 1930 to 1941, both of the men occupied important positions in the Progressive Education Association's Eight-Year Study. They had helped initiate the study; worked with sociologists, psychologists, and curriculum specialists to determine how schools could meet children's needs; helped to organize workshops in the summers for teachers in participating schools; and they worked with evaluation experts to determine how to measure intellectual growth of children following new curriculums. Nonetheless, Ryan may have appeared more conservative of the two men. According to Francis Paul Prucha, while Ryan was a cautious man who planned carefully, Beatty was a forceful personality who acted with zest.³⁵

Perhaps more than Ryan, Beatty had shared many experiences with Collier before he joined the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs. For example, in 1915, Beatty became director of training at San Francisco State Normal School where he met Burk, who Collier idealized.³⁶ In his memoirs, Collier wrote that he and Beatty became intimate friends, and Collier praised Beatty for working as director of Indian education in one of the most demanding jobs in the world. Collier explained that the problems of education among the Native Americans were complicated by the fact that each tribe represented a different and distinct ethnic group, and the tribes were scattered throughout the United States. Nonetheless, Collier claimed that the Indian schools shared with other rural schools problems recruiting and maintaining qualified professionals. To overcome the difficulties, Collier added that he and Beatty had to develop theories out of their experience and test them in practice as they went along.³⁷

In his description, Collier exaggerated Beatty's responsibilities and accomplishments. First, most Amerindian attended public schools. Second, Beatty was responsible for relatively few students. According to Collier's 1936 report as the

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the total student enrollment of Native Americans was about 26,000 in the 249 government schools then operating. In the 1930s, many city school districts contained more than 26,000 students and some had more than 80,000.³⁸ Third, when Collier boasted that he and Beatty approached educational reform without guidelines, he ignored the fact that the models they instituted had appeared in the more progressive schools in the Eight-Year Study.

In his memoirs, Collier pointed to Dr. Pedro T. Orata's description of the events at Little Wound Day School at Kyle, on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota as an illustration of the revolutionary nature of the efforts that he and Beatty undertook. While Collier claimed that Orata's work had lessons for the entire world, the approach that Orata took was the type he had used at The Ohio State University.³⁹

After finishing his Ph.D. at the Ohio State University where he had worked as a staff member, Orata traveled to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation to become the principal of the school in Kyle for the 1936-1937 school year. The curriculum Orata implemented at Kyle was similar to the curriculum the Ohio State University School followed as one of the participating schools in the Eight-Year Study. In both schools, teachers did not present separate academic subject matters to the students. Instead, teachers, students, and parents cooperated on projects that interested them. In both schools, an important element of the curriculum was decorating or maintaining the school facilities and preparing for holiday celebrations. While completing these tasks, the students were to acquire the academic skills they needed to improve their lives and to develop the abilities to advance the democratic nature of society. Writing the foreword to Orata's book, Boyd Bode claimed Orata's school arose from everyday life in the Kyle community, yet he believed that it proceeded in a direction that all schools should follow to make society more democratic. Bode had been head of the Department of Principles and Practice in Education at the university when Orata worked there. Bode was an important participant in the Eight-Year Study, and he had written several books urging progressive educators to adopt curriculums similar to those found in the university school.⁴⁰

Orata gave the name, "fundamental education," to his efforts with the Oglala Sioux Tribe in South Dakota because it was aimed at helping the Sioux achieve self-government. According to Orata, the Sioux had lived for many years as wards of the federal government, had lost their ambition, and could not manage their own affairs. Claiming that the Indian Reorganization Act called for Native Americans to attain economic security and to assume management of their own affairs, Orata wrote that he and his faculty shaped their program to reach the goals that the act stressed.⁴¹

Orata's school was located in the center of Kyle, a small town set on a treeless rolling prairie broken by three creeks. The town consisted of three houses and a building for the cafe and gas station. The school plant included a classroom building with space for four classrooms and a gymnasium; a community bath house; a cottage for the principal; and a cottage for a bus driver, the art teacher, and the assistant

housekeeper. In this setting, six teachers instructed 140 students who attended grades one through nine.⁴²

According to Orata, the staff tried to work as team and to share decisions with the adults in the community and the students. In general, the curriculum came from events in the community. The teachers' aim was for teachers, adults, and students to analyze the problems that came before them and to plan some solutions. As a result, the teachers participated in community activities. Since the teachers tried to use as many sources of information about local problems as they could find, they made literacy a means to solve such problems as the spread of disease or protection from the elements. Orata claimed that this showed the adults the value of literacy.⁴³

The year began with everyone getting acquainted. In addition to dividing responsibilities for the daily maintenance of the school, the teachers and the students discussed current events such as the upcoming national elections, voting rights, and citizenship responsibilities. The last part of October and most of November was devoted to planning a school carnival that took place just before Thanksgiving. In this activity, the teachers encouraged the students to form committees, divide the responsibilities, and use academic skills to perform their tasks. For example, the students wrote invitations, searched through magazines and books to find the proper ways to prepare and serve food, and used arithmetic to measure the proportions in recipes to prepare the menus. Orata claimed that, despite the teachers' care, most students had difficulty accepting cooperative and democratic planning. As a result, in these first months, the teachers devoted most of their time to straight forward academic lessons.⁴⁴

As the academic year progressed, the students grew accustomed to working in groups and cooperating. For example, in the first weeks of December, a dentist and a nurse came to the school to examine the children's teeth and make necessary repairs. To prepare for the visit, teachers asked the students about oral hygiene, proper diet, and appropriate behavior with medical personnel. When the dentist and the nurse came, many parents attended. As a result, the lessons expanded to include the adults as well as the children.⁴⁵

While the teachers sought the participation of adults in the students' activities, the school sponsored three organizations specifically for adults. These included the women's club organized by the home economics teacher, the men's club organized by a local farmer, and a mixed group that combined activities from the other two groups. The women considered problems of child care and home improvement while the men discussed difficulties in gardening and stock-raising.⁴⁶

In May, the adults and students joined together to hold a banquet and a dance. In this activity, the teachers did not have the problems having students and adults cooperate. They formed eleven committees, divided the work, kept records of expenses, and met together to determine the success of their efforts at the end.⁴⁷

At the end of the year in Pine Ridge, Orata and the teachers agreed that the program had succeeded. They claimed that the students had developed the desire

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

to work to improve their lives. For example, the students expressed desires to plant gardens, to preserve the harvests, and to prepare nutritious meals. They had learned about such things as the proper construction of outdoor toilets and the need for proper hygiene. Through the group activities, the students and the adults had learned to cooperate and to assume responsibilities. Most important to Orata, the students had learned about political affairs. He explained that one aspect of the Indian Reorganization Act was for each tribe to draw up and approve a constitution and a charter, but he added the tribe had rejected its charter. He claimed that in discussing this event, his students came to understand why people had to meet and discuss proposed political reforms. Orata proudly added that the students held a mock election and accepted the provisions of the charter.⁴⁸

In the year that Orata was with the Sioux, his school may have been a success. It did not reinforce the traditional culture. Instead, it reinforced a democratic, scientific model found in other progressive schools. The democratic aspect came from the importance the faculty placed on the notion of self government among a group of self-reliant yet cooperative individuals. The scientific aspect came from the use of such things as the principles of public sanitation to design outhouses. In these ways, the school brought what progressive educators thought were the best aspects of American culture to the reservation. Even the food the school served at the banquet came from recipes found in popular magazines rather than what might be called ethnic foods.

Although Orata may not have reinforced the indigenous culture, he had demonstrated cultural sensitivity by employing activities the community valued as part of the curriculum and by enlisting community members to help carry out the lessons. In 1936, H. Scudder Mekeel published the results of his three year study carried out on the same reservation where Orata had his school. In the article, Mekeel warned that teachers could throw children into serious conflicts if they sought to impart values that differed considerably from the prevailing community norms. For example, while mainstream society advocated thrift, the Sioux expected everyone to share their resources and considered the accumulation of wealth to be anti-social. Thus, Mekeel advised that white officials should try to enlist the values expressed in the lifestyles of the children's parents and friends rather than seek to impose the values of the mainstream culture. For example, Mekeel called for changes in printed resources noting that history texts disparaged Native Americans and glorified the victories of white settlers over what the texts called savages. Further, home economics training had to be given under conditions the children would find in their homes otherwise they could not apply it.⁴⁹

During his tenure as director of education, Beatty supported programs that followed the pattern Orata set in his school and that sought to build on the cultural patterns of the Native Americans in the ways Mekeel suggested. In doing this, Beatty followed the progressive model that Ryan believed appropriate for Native American schools and that appeared in the Eight-Year Study.

When Beatty took office, he designed a series of summer schools that were to

present an appropriate philosophy of education and to demonstrate this philosophy in action. In setting up these sessions, Beatty used a model that W. Carson Ryan, Jr. and Ralph Tyler used in the Eight-Year Study at the same time. At the summer schools for the Eight-Year Study, the participants agreed that they could not make progress until they held in common some notion of an appropriate philosophy of education.⁵⁰

In addition to the summer schools, Beatty set up curriculum planning conferences so the teachers in particular reservations could meet to determine how to apply the principles of curriculum formation they had learned in the summer. Furthermore, Beatty published a field letter entitled, *Indian Education*, that his office sent to the teachers every two weeks. The aim of the newsletter was to present clear cut statements of philosophy, policy, and preferred procedures. Beatty edited all the articles in the newsletter and he wrote many of them.⁵¹

In an article for this newsletter, Beatty noted that education for Indians on the reservations should take two directions. The first was to contribute to better living within the existing environment. The second was to enrich the students understanding of social life in ways that made life more tolerable under any conditions. Thus, he argued that Native American education should enrich the native way of life in the face of inevitable contacts with the outside world. To Beatty, this meant that the students had to acquire fluency in English. Although they had to learn arithmetic and gain an understanding of science, this instruction should be related to their common experiences rather delivered as sets of abstract ideas. In short, he noted the education had to meet the students' needs for improved housing, for improved sanitation, and for clean homes. At the same time, he warned that in advising young persons to seek higher education, teachers should be careful that the experience would not prevent the students from returning to their native homes.⁵²

In another article, Beatty described how the teachers had to prepare Indian students to support themselves in such activities as cattle raising, subsistence gardening, poultry raising, carpentry, or shoemaking. As a result, he advised teachers to present academic subjects in ways that enabled the students to learn to earn a living. In other articles, he wrote about the need to teach Native American youth to appreciate and to engage in honest labor. He commented on the abilities of people to change their live styles to fit new conditions. To justify the changes from teacher directed academic instruction, Beatty added that the Eight-year Study showed that students could take part in the planning of school lessons, enjoy their work, and succeed academically.⁵³

To Beatty, the Indian day schools represented a new type educational institution because they were central to the community. For example, on the Navajo reservation, families lived far apart and sometimes five miles away from any water. Thus, the first thing the Indian Service did to build a day school on the reservation was to sink a well. With these wells, the Navajo could settle close to the school, use the water for irrigation, and raise livestock and vegetables. As a result, the teachers and the school advanced the economic processes of the communities.⁵⁴

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

While Beatty took pride in the day schools, he cautioned teachers about the effects that cultural change could have on the Amerindians. Although he noted that many Native Americans could not become self supporting until they had more arable land, he urged teachers to help students recall the resourcefulness that had long been a tradition among Amerindians. In this way, they could learn that it was part of their culture to use efficiently the assets they had and the relief the federal government provided. To further enhance the indigenous culture, Beatty urged the teachers to understand different Amerindian holidays and traditions.⁵⁵

In describing the approved procedures of instruction, Beatty noted that some teachers thought they should allow the students to do whatsoever they pleased. In making this assumption, the teachers misunderstood what Beatty called activity programs. While they no longer had a formal course of study, Beatty advised the teachers to keep academic goals in sight and find ways to turn the activities the students found interesting toward those objectives. This meant the teachers had to carefully select goals and objectives the students could reach and that the teachers could measure. In this essay, he gave several examples of appropriate objectives such as the student can retell a primer story read orally.⁵⁶ In making these statements, Beatty recalled what became known as the Tyler rational from the Eight-Year Study wherein evaluation directed curriculum construction.

Another article in the teacher newsletters described the activity method in Amerindian schools. In one school, the children worked in small groups on different projects in different parts of the classroom. In one corner, two boys cleaned and arranged a fish tank. In another corner, two girls read books quietly. In these cases, the article contended the students used their energy purposefully, they felt the need to acquire new knowledge, and they put into practice what they learned.⁵⁷

In an article on the children's intellectual growth, Beatty suggested that students should be allowed to expand their fluency in their native languages because this enhanced their thinking abilities. Acknowledging that the students should acquire facility in English, he warned teachers not to limit the children's expressions to English and to realize that the children had to develop rich language abilities before they mastered English.⁵⁸

In commenting on the need for appropriate printed matter, Beatty told his teachers that the Indian Service had created a recommended booklist of titles in an effort to provide meaningful subject matter. In addition, the service had begun publishing and distributing pamphlets that described the history of the different tribes, detailed traditional handicrafts, and explained several traditional customs. Beatty claimed that the most important contribution was a series of bilingual readers. These readers used newly developed written forms of different Native American languages to spread more quickly ideas regarding health, economic adjustment, and wise use of resources. At the same time, the readers appeared to increase the speed with which the students could acquire English.⁵⁹

In these letters to the teachers in the Indian Service, Beatty conveyed the

messages found in most documents produced by the Progressive Education Association. They built on the desire to have the students select activities that were interesting and worthwhile, the view that teachers had to wisely integrate academic objectives into these activities, and that the progress of the students had to be consistent and measurable. Although Beatty thought the teachers should help the students to learn about their native cultures and languages, he did not think the schools should direct their growth towards those traditional forms of social life. Instead, his hope was to follow Mekeel's suggestions of using the cultural forms in ways that formed students who could solve the problems they faced, live well within the conditions they confronted, and acquire the academic subject matters most people expected school teachers to impart.

As the education program progressed, Beatty received three evaluations that tested the accomplishments. These included the on Indian education by the President's Advisory Committee on Education, the report of a philanthropic organization the Phelps-Stokes Fund, and a measure of academic achievement in reservation schools by the University of Chicago. The first evaluation was the report for the president's advisory committee written by Lloyd E. Blanch. Published in 1939, the report noted that the variety of tribes complicated educational reforms. For example, according to Blanch, in 1930, the Indians were divided into about 200 different tribes that spoke about 55 distinct languages. About 50,000 Native Americans did not speak either English or Spanish although these represented the only common languages among the tribes. Despite such isolation, many Native Americans had adapted to the mainstream culture in some way. Blanch's committee had determined that the Navajo were the only Native American group that could and did live independently following their traditional cultural patterns. According to this report, the other groups could not and did not exist apart from mainstream society.⁶⁰

In his report, Blanch complimented the education branch for selecting educational objectives that coincided with the aims of the Indian Reorganization Act. In this spirit, the schools provided training that would help the Native Americans learn to govern themselves and to determine their own lives. The report noted that an important change had been to allow the Indians students to use their own languages in schools and to introduce written forms of those languages in texts. Although some teachers thought that the use indigenous languages would help preserve native culture, the report noted that the use of these languages had increased the Native Americans' desire to learn English.⁶¹

In his conclusion, Blanch complimented Beatty and the Indian Service for directing the education to serve social aims. He wrote that the schools served as social centers and led to social regeneration to a degree never before realized. In addition, his committee considered the vocational studies to be particularly effective. Since the schools were equipped with shops, laboratories for home economics, and land for agriculture, school programs were adapted to the needs of the community in ways that taught the students to become self-sufficient.⁶²

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

The second evaluation came from the Phelps-Stokes Fund that had concentrated its observations on the Navajo reservation that stretched between New Mexico and Utah. Chaired by Thomas Jesse-Jones, the inquiry staff for the Phelps-Stokes Fund began its work after the Indian Rights Association complained about policies from the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs. Although the association had supported the Navajo in their rejection of the Indian Reorganization Act, the inquiry staff hoped they could conduct an objective study that would enable these conflicting parties to cooperate.⁶³

Encompassing almost 24,000 square miles, the Navajo reservation was the home of the largest tribe in the United States. In 1938, the Navajo population reached to about 45,000 individuals. Unfortunately, the inquiry staff found that the Navajo remained poor and unable to adjust to the mainstream economy. Thus, they concluded that the economic programs had not helped the Navajo.⁶⁴

In the area of education, the Phelps-Stokes report complimented the education branch for trying to change the boarding schools into day schools on the reservation. The inquiry staff noted that shift was difficult because the Navajo were a nomadic people who lived in concentrations of about two people per square mile. Worse, there were no roads to many parts of the reservation. As a result, the transportation problems were extreme. In the matter of curriculum, the inquiry staff approved of the Indian Service's effort to use the schools to provide such social essentials as knowledge about health care. At the same time, the inquiry staff found that teachers had difficulty imparting such academic subjects such as mathematics, history, and English grammar. This was a problem because, if Navajo children wanted to leave the reservation, they had to possess these academic skills to survive in the mainstream society.⁶⁵

Although the authors of the Phelps-Stokes inquiry hoped that their report could help conflicting parties cooperate, this did not happen. According to S. Lyman Tyler, the report included many negative aspects of the federal program that critics used against Collier and his programs. The result was that, in his last years in office, Collier had to spend his time and energies protecting programs he had established rather than crusading for wider changes.⁶⁶

In 1945, Collier resigned his position as commissioner. He had lost many of his personnel when they joined the military in World War II. The U.S. Congress reduced appropriations for his office and ended programs he had used to the advantage of his office, such as the Civilian Conservation Corps.⁶⁷

In 1948, after William A. Brophy replaced Collier as U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Indian Service published an evaluation of student achievement in the Native American schools. Directed by Ralph Tyler and Hilda Taba who had worked together on the Eight-Year Study, the researchers had found significant accomplishments. For example, while the Meriam report in 1928 had found that only 6 percent of the Indian students worked at their appropriate grade levels, in 1938, more than 36 percent of the Indian students worked at their appropriate grade

levels. While the Indian children attending public schools tended to perform better on standardized tests in arithmetic, reading, and language than did Indian children attending schools on reservations, there were no consistent differences in academic achievement between Indian children and non-Indian children in the public schools. The Native American children in the lower grades achieved higher standards than did the children four years earlier in those same grades. To the researchers, this indicated the academic programs had become better organized. Further, even the Navajo children, about whom the Phelps-Stokes researchers had worried, overcame their language difficulties and made commendable scores on academic tests. From this evaluation, it appeared that the social emphasis of the schools had not hindered the academic achievement of the students.⁶⁸

Termination

Unfortunately, studies such as Tyler's and Taba's were too little and came too late. In the late 1940s, conservative critics across the country launched attacks against progressive education claiming misguided teachers weakened children's patriotic feelings and ignored the practice needed to master academic skills. Not surprisingly, the Indian day schools suffered similar criticisms. In 1949, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, chaired by former U.S. President Herbert Hoover, recommended that the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs adopt as its aim the integration of Native Americans into the mainstream society. This meant that social programs, such as education, would be administered by state agencies and not the federal office. Declaring the reservation day schools and the teachers to be inadequate, the commission called for new schools and new methods of instruction.⁶⁹

Three members of Hoover's commission dissented on the grounds that the recommendations went far beyond the charge the commission received, contradicted legislative decisions that were in force, and were based on insufficient evidence. Nonetheless, the recommendations fit the ideas of the new administration. In 1950, U.S. Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman, appointed Dillon S. Myer to the position of Indian commissioner. Myer considered the reservations to be prisons. Since the U.S. was an urban nation, he thought that education for Native Americans should be directed toward vocational programs to enable them to relocate to more prosperous cities. To dramatize this new direction, Myer fired William Zimmerman, Jr. who had been assistant commissioner since 1933. Other appointees from the New Deal, including Beatty, resigned.⁷⁰

According to the personnel in the federal government, these shifts led to problems with employee morale. In 1957, Zimmerman characterized the educational policies under Collier as shifting from a type of preparation for white collar positions to agrarian ideals, from routine grammar school to community school, from banning Native American culture to encouraging and utilizing it. Zimmerman

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

claimed this effort changed in 1955 when the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs, as it had been called earlier, eliminated the projects that reinforced traditional Native American arts and crafts but increased vocational training suitable for industrial work. According to Zimmerman, federal employees worried that successive changes would eliminate any efforts they made.⁷¹

While federal employees complained about changing educational policies, similar disruptions took place in public schools. School boards removed superintendents who had identified with the progressive movement and hired conservative replacements. In 1955, amidst considerable public criticism, the Progressive Education Association disbanded. Two years later, its journal, *Progressive Education*, ceased publication. While many progressive educators considered the attacks to be the result of a conservative plot, Hollis L. Caswell, dean of Teachers College, tried to calm his colleagues by asserting that the changes came from a searching reappraisal of the philosophy of progressive education.⁷²

Although the Progressive Education Association and the Indian Service had several studies to show that their educational efforts had succeeded, conservative critics produced studies that showed they failed. In the case of the reservation day schools, several studies published in the 1950s verified the accusations of the Hoover commission. These studies indicated that the achievement test scores of Native American children in reading, spelling, and arithmetic who attended reservation schools were lower than the scores earned by Amerindian children who lived in towns and attended public schools. Although Native American children had elementary school achievement test scores that were comparable to the scores of white children, the achievement test scores for high school age Native Americans fell below their white counter parts.⁷³

At the same time, Native American migration from the reservations increased during and after World War II. For example, in the Pine Ridge reservation where Orata had his school, in 1938-1939, about 98 percent of the children remained on the reservation after leaving school. By 1947, about 54 percent of the graduates of the reservation remained on the reservation. While these figures indicated that a majority of the Sioux children remained on the reservation, significantly more Native Americans chose to leave after the war.⁷⁴

Despite the conservative criticisms, the reservation day schools had not prevented their graduates from leaving the reservations. These schools had served as agents of cultural transformation as had the boarding schools that preceded them. In fact, the reservation day schools may have been more effective in introducing Native Americans to the mainstream culture. To some extent, this happened ironically because the members of the U.S. Office of Indian Affairs, such as Collier, wanted to preserve traditional cultures by creating institutions that introduced Native Americans to aspects of what these officials considered to be the best aspects of mainstream culture such as the ideal of democracy, the faith in science to improve the conditions of life, and the benefits of literacy.

Summary

Although some historians claim that, from 1929 to 1945, Native American education sought to reinforce the traditional cultures, the directors of education in the office of Indian affairs turned the schools toward the principles of progressive education. In the workshops and the newsletters they used to help teachers improve their instruction, they advanced the models found in progressive schools and projects. Unfortunately, when progressive education fell into disrepute, the practices in the reservation day schools received similar criticisms. As a result, by 1950, the federal government began to remove many of the progressive innovations from Native American schools.

To some extent, this story suggests that scientifically developed techniques serve the culture that developed them despite the wishes of the people who employ those techniques. During the Great Depression, the government officials had more than ten years to change political policies and educational practices. Despite the power of their positions, they could not enable Native Americans to protect their cultural orientations. Instead, their reforms reinforced the modernistic notions found in the mainstream of the society.

Notes

¹ Margaret Connell Szasz, *Education and the American Indian: The Road to Self-Determination Since 1928* 3rd edition (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1999), 8-15.

² David Wallace Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1995), 21, 58.

³ Szasz, *Education and the American Indian*, 4.

⁴ Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*, vol. 2 (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 797-803. See also Donald T. Critchlow, "Lewis Meriam, Expertise, and Indian Reform," *The Historian* 43, no., 3 (May 1981): 325.

⁵ Prucha, *The Great Father*, 804-808.

⁶ *Education of the Indians* Bulletin 9 U.S. Department of the Interior (Chilocco, OK: The Indian Print Shop, 1927), 1-8.

⁷ W.F. Willoughby, "Letter of Transmittal" in *The Problem of Indian Administration: Report of a Survey Made at the Request of Honorable Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior* by Brookings Institution. Institute for Government Research (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928), vii-x.

⁸ Brookings Institution. Institute for Government Research, *The Problem of Indian Administration: Report of a Survey Made at the Request of Honorable Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928), 3-8, 170-171.

⁹ Brookings Institution, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 12-13.

¹⁰ Brookings Institution, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 354-357.

¹¹ Critchlow, "Lewis Meriam, Expertise, and Indian Reform," 325-344.

¹² Brookings Institution, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 346.

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

¹³ Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), 243-246, 265.

¹⁴ Brookings Institution, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 32-37, 370-374.

¹⁵ Charles James Rhoads, *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1932* (Washington, DC: G.P.O., 1933), 4-7.

¹⁶ Lawrence C. Kelly, "Charles James Rhoads, 1929-1933" in *The Commissioners of Indian Affairs, 1822-1977*, edited by Robert M. Kvasnicka and Herman J. Viola (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1979), 263-271.

¹⁷ Kenneth R. Philp, *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform, 1920-1954* (Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 1977), 96-100.

¹⁸ Philp, *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform*, 115-116.

¹⁹ Philp, *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform*, 135-141 and Prucha, *The Great Father*, 957-963.

²⁰ Prucha, *The Great Father*, 963-968, 1010

²¹ Graham D. Taylor, "Anthropologists, Reformers, and the Indian New Deal," *Prologue* 7, No. 3 (Fall 1975): 151-162.

²² David L. Marden, "Anthropologists and Federal Indian Policy Prior to 1940," *The Indian Historian* 5, no. 4 (Winter 1972): 19-26.

²³ H. Scudder Mekeel, "Appraisal of the Indian Reorganization Act," *American Anthropologist* 46, no. 2 (April-June 1944): 209-217.

²⁴ John Collier, "Collier Replies to Mekeel," *American Anthropologist* 46, no. 3 (July-September 1944): 422-426.

²⁵ Graham D. Taylor, *The New Deal and American Indian Tribalism: The Administration of the Indian Reorganization Act, 1934-1945* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), 39-65.

²⁶ Taylor, *The New Deal and American Indian Tribalism*, xii-xiii, 63-65.

²⁷ Stephen J. Kunitz, "The Social Philosophy of John Collier" *Ethnohistory* 18, no. 3 (Summer 1971): 213-229.

²⁸ Lawrence C. Kelly, "The Indian Reorganization Act: The Dream and the Reality," *Pacific Historical Review* 46, no. 3 (August 1975): 291-312.

²⁹ Philp, *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform*, 127.

³⁰ W. Carson Ryan, Jr. and Rose k. Brandt, "Indian Education Today," *Progressive Education* 9, no. 2 (February 1932): 81-86.

³¹ John Collier, "Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs" in *Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1933* by Harold Ickes (Washington, DC: G.P.O., 1933), 111, 152.

³² Donald L. Parman, *The Navajos and the New Deal* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1976), 193-198.

³³ Parman, *The Navajos and the New Deal*, 199-200.

³⁴ "Beatty to Indians," *Time*, 10 February 1936, 36-37.

³⁵ Francis Paul Prucha, *The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians*, vol. 2 (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1984), 978.

³⁶ Guy Senese, "Beatty, Willard Walcott" in *Historical Dictionary of American Education*, edited by Richard J. Altenbaugh (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), 35-37.

³⁷ Collier, *From Every Zenith*, 195-198.

³⁸ Readers interested in the enrollment figures of urban school districts might consult such reports as U.S. Department of Interior, *Biennial Survey of Education 1926-1928* Bulletin No., 16 (Washington, DC: G.P.O., 1930), 538-539.

³⁹ Collier, *From Every Zenith*, 197-198.

⁴⁰ For a description of the Ohio State University School, readers should consult *Thirty Schools Tell Their Stories* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943), 718-745. Bodes' foreword appears in Pedro T. Orata, *Fundamental Education in an Amerindian Community* (NP: Printing Department, Haskell Institute, 1953).

⁴¹ Orata, *Fundamental Education in an Amerindian Community*, 2-5.

⁴² Orata, *Fundamental Education in an Amerindian Community*, 13-14.

⁴³ Orata, *Fundamental Education in an Amerindian Community*, 6-8.

⁴⁴ Orata, *Fundamental Education in an Amerindian Community*, 25-31, 87.

⁴⁵ Orata, *Fundamental Education in an Amerindian Community*, 88.

⁴⁶ Orata, *Fundamental Education in an Amerindian Community*, 105-106.

⁴⁷ Orata, *Fundamental Education in an Amerindian Community*, 115-117.

⁴⁸ Orata, *Fundamental Education in an Amerindian Community*, 205-214.

⁴⁹ H. Scudder Mekeel, "An Anthropologist's Observations on Indian Education," *Progressive Education* 13, no. 3 (March 1936): 151-159.

⁵⁰ Willard W. Beatty, ed. *Education for Action: Selected Articles from Indian Education, 1936-1943* (Chilocco, OK: Printing Department Chilocco Agricultural School, 1944), 8. Readers interested in the summer schools for the Eight-Year Study should see W. Carson Ryan and Ralph W. Tyler, *Summer Workshops in Secondary Education: An Experiment in the In-Service Training of Teachers and Other Educational Workers* (New York: Progressive Education Association, 1939), 5-7.

⁵¹ Beatty, *Education for Action*, 8.

⁵² Beatty, *Education for Action*, 11-14.

⁵³ Beatty, *Education for Action*, 15-25.

⁵⁴ Willard W. Beatty, "Uncle Sam Develops a New Kind of Rural School," *The Elementary School Journal* 41, no. 3 (November 1940): 185-194.

⁵⁵ Beatty, *Education for Action*, 26-57.

⁵⁶ Beatty, *Education for Action*, 139-143.

⁵⁷ Beatty, *Education for Action*, 143-146.

⁵⁸ Beatty, *Education for Action*, 146-149.

⁵⁹ Beatty, *Education for Action*, 191-194.

⁶⁰ Lloyd E. Blauch, *Educational Service for Indians, Staff Study Number 18* Prepared for the Advisory Committee on Education (Washington, DC: G.P.O., 1939), 5-7.

⁶¹ Blauch, *Educational Service for Indians*, 46-47.

⁶² Blauch, *Educational Service for Indians*, 129-131.

⁶³ Phelps-Stokes Fund, *The Navajo Indian Problem* (New York: Phelps-Stokes Fund, 1939), ix.

⁶⁴ Phelps-Stokes Fund, *The Navajo Indian Problem*, vii, 111.

⁶⁵ Phelps-Stokes Fund, *The Navajo Indian Problem*, 39-70, 112-113.

⁶⁶ S. Lyman Tyler, *A History of Indian Policy* (Washington, DC: G.P.O., 1973), 136-137.

⁶⁷ Kenneth R. Philp, "John Collier, 1933-1945," in *The Commissioners of Indian Affairs, 1824-1977*, edited by Robert M. Kvasnicka and Herman J. Viola (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1979), 273-283.

Progressive Education and Native American Schools

⁶⁸ Shailer Peterson, "How Well Are Indian Children Educated: Summary of Results of a Three Year Program Testing the Achievement of Indian Children in Federal, Public, and Mission Schools (Lawrence, KS: Haskell Institute Print Shop, 1948), 9-19.

⁶⁹ Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, *Indian Affairs: A Report to Congress* (Washington, DC: G.P.O., 1949).

⁷⁰ Philp, *John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform*, 225)

⁷¹ William Zimmerman, Jr. "The Role of the Bureau of Indian Affairs Since 1933," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 311 (May 1957): 31-40.

⁷² Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, 340-343.

⁷³ Robert J. Havighurst, "Education Among American Indians: Individual and Cultural Aspects," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 311 (May 1957): 105-115.

⁷⁴ Havighurst, "Education Among American Indians," 113-114.