

PLAYING CITIZENS:  
THE SOCIAL EDUCATION OF AMERICAN INDIANS, 1875-1924

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
BY

Michael Hawkins Scarlett

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Patricia G. Avery, Co-Advisor  
Dr. Benjamin M. Jacobs, Co-Advisor

December, 2009



### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank everyone who played a role in helping me to complete this dissertation. To Dr. Brenda Child, thank you for providing the original inspiration for the study and initial guidance. Thank you to the many accomplished scholars who responded to my requests and helped me to define my topic and identify sources. These individuals include Tsianina Lomawaima, David Wilkins, Frederick Hoxie, David Adams, and Barb Landis. Next, thank you to the library staff of the University of Minnesota, the Newberry Library, and the National Archives Midwest Regional Branch in Chicago for your assistance in gathering sources. Thank you to my co-advisors, Dr. Benjamin M. Jacobs and Dr. Patricia G. Avery, for all of your help reviewing my many drafts. Thank you to the other members of my committee, Dr. Richard Nunneley and Dr. Martha Bigelow, for your guidance and encouragement. Finally, thank you to my family for your patience and support; I could not have completed this long journey without it.

## Abstract

Beginning in 1879, when Richard Henry Pratt opened the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, the United States government began a policy of removing American Indian children from their communities in an effort to prepare them for citizenship. Education was one part of a three-pronged assimilation policy that also included removing the legal boundaries that separated American Indians from the United States and dividing tribal lands into sections of land to encourage their adoption of farming and ranching. Off-reservation schools such as Carlisle are infamous in the history of American education for the way they attempted to erase American Indian cultures by subjecting students to a complete physical and psychological transformation that included cutting their hair, wearing military uniforms, adopting new names, and forbidding the speaking of Indian languages. While the attempts to erase Indian cultures and the industrial nature of education at schools like Carlisle are well-known, the way off-reservation schools created citizens of American Indian children has not been at the center of study.

The purpose of this dissertation is to deepen our understanding of the role off-reservation boarding schools played in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries in preparing American Indians for citizenship. Using historical methods, this dissertation examines the context in which the citizenship education curriculum was created, the beliefs of the people who created and implemented it, and finally, evidence of the citizenship education curriculum itself, in order to add depth and complexity to the current research. An examination of primary historical documents, such as courses of study, textbooks used in off-reservation schools, school newsletters and newspapers, annual reports, and the

writings of influential educational policymakers, reveals that citizenship education was central to the mission of off-reservation schools, but that the nature of citizenship education depended on the context in which it was implemented. I argue that competing beliefs about the capability of American Indians to adopt the “habits of civilized life” necessary for citizenship led to important differences in the ways two of the most influential off-reservation boarding schools, the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Pennsylvania and the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute in Virginia, approached citizenship education.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1—Introduction	p. 1
Chapter 2—Putting Indian Citizenship Education at the Center of Study: An Historiographic Essay	p. 31
Chapter 3—From Noble Savage to First American: The Context of Citizenship Education for American Indians	p. 63
Chapter 4—Transformation or Improvement: Citizenship Education and the Solution to the “Indian Problem”	p. 91
Chapter 5—“Into Civilization and Citizenship:” The Citizenship Education Curriculum of Carlisle and Hampton	p. 128
References	p. 172

Chapter 1

Introduction

You have taken our rivers and fountains  
And the plains where we loved to roam,  
Banish us not to the mountains  
And the lonely wastes for homes!  
Our clans that were strongest and bravest,  
Are broken and powerless through you;  
Let us join the great tribe of the white men,  
As brothers to dare and to do! (Ludlow, 1892)

Written by Helen Ludlow, a teacher and publicist at the Hampton Institute in Virginia for American Indians and African Americans, the above poem is an excerpt from a pageant play commemorating the passage of the Dawes Act on February 8, 1887. A provision of the act, also known as the General Allotment Act, granted citizenship to American Indians who accepted their allotments of land from the government. The division of tribal lands into allotments—sections suitable for family farms or ranches—would ostensibly encourage American Indians to develop the independent values needed for their successful assimilation into American society, according to reformers like Senator Henry Dawes. The pageant play, written for an all-Indian cast, was part of the celebration of a new holiday, created especially for Indian schools, known as Indian Citizenship Day, or Franchise Day. Historian David Adams (1995) describes the

celebration of Indian Citizenship Day as an example of the many rituals designed to “explain to Indians who they were, where they fit in the American story, and what they must become if they were to be part of America’s future” (p. 206).

The powerful, yet ironic, image of American Indians thanking the “great tribe of white men” for taking away their land so that they could become “brothers to dare and to do” is telling of the complex dynamics at work shaping the new legal and cultural relationships between whites and American Indians in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The passage summarizes in two lines the regrettable history of the dispossession of land that was to enter its final phase as a result of allotment. It represents the growing discontent of white reformers with the reservation system and their desire for a new solution to the so-called “Indian problem.” It reflects the pervasive racist ideology underlying assimilation: that, although they may have had some admirable qualities such as physical strength and bravery, American Indians were no match for the superiority of white culture. Finally, the passage is suggestive of the hope, primarily of eastern social reformers, that American Indians would be assimilated as equal citizens into the “great tribe.”

Taking this pageant play at face value, assuming that the Indian actors in the play meant the words they read and that the promise held out to them was genuine, is to deny the history of the legal and cultural development of citizenship and to overestimate the role of the schools charged with fulfilling its promise. The reality, of course, is much more complicated. Although the pageant play was a celebration of Indian citizenship, conferred by the Dawes Act (1887), the actual legal status of most American Indians was not one of political equality. Instead, a series of Supreme Court decisions in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century redefined their legal status in terms of guardianship, treating most American



Indians as “insensible wards,” incapable of exercising political rights (Hoxie, 2001; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). Culturally, too, citizenship in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century was increasingly being redefined in terms of the values and beliefs of the white Protestant majority in the United States, which were often in stark contrast to those of most American Indians (Reuben, 1997). The ultimate irony of the pageant play is that citizenship was not even welcomed by many American Indians during this period. The acceptance of citizenship, legal or cultural, was perceived to entail the loss of tribal sovereignty and the destruction of traditional culture and forms of subsistence, something many American Indians understandably did not want (Holm, 2005).

The setting of the play, the Hampton Institute, was one in a system of reservation and off-reservation boarding schools built in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century to fulfill the promise of “brotherhood.” Created to teach their American Indian students the skills, knowledge, and attitudes required for their new lives as citizens, these schools became, according to Jacqueline Fear-Segal (2007), “the location of the debate about whether Indians could be incorporated into the nation as well as the institutionalization of its outcome” (p. xv). Rather than preparing American Indians for equal participation in the civic life of the nation, most off-reservation schools offered only a rudimentary academic education, stressing the acquisition of vocational skills, the English language, and white, Anglo-Protestant culture and values (Adams, 1995; Child, 2000; Coleman, 2008; Ellis, 1994; Lomawaima, 1994). For many American Indians the experience was defined by the devastating impact it had on families that were separated from their children. In addition, many students learned skills that were of no use on the reservations and were considered outcasts by their tribes because of the cultural transformation that took place at the

schools (Ahern, 1997). Sadly, many did not survive the experience; dying from infectious diseases contracted at the boarding schools (Child, 2000; Reyhner & Elder 2004). Most historians agree that American Indian communities are still suffering as a result of the assimilationist policies of the late 19th century (Hoxie, 2001; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006).

In spite of the often low expectations and their assimilationist agenda, off-reservation boarding schools played an important role in shaping the political identities of their students. Graduates of the schools, for example, went on to lead influential pan-Indian organizations, leading the movement to attain the full rights of U.S. citizenship (Hertzberg, 1999). In addition, boarding school students enlisted in record numbers in World War I, even though many were not required to do so because of their citizenship status (Holm, 1996; Krouse, 2007). However, rather than reflecting the “success” of the assimilationist program, students often engaged in such activities for reasons that were different than those encouraged by the schools’ founders.

This dissertation focuses on the complex and often contradictory role off-reservation boarding schools for American Indians played in educating “good citizens” in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. It is a story as full of drama and irony as the pageant plays used to teach American Indians their place in the new nation. It is also one that addresses a central paradox in the history of the United States, stated by Margaret Smith Crocco (2000) this way: “that the U.S. Constitution established unprecedented freedom for some while denying it to the great majority of citizens of the new republic” (p. 1). Unfortunately, American Indians were not alone in experiencing the chasm between the lofty democratic ideals upon which the United States was founded and the political and

economic injustices that have defined their path to citizenship. However, the unique colonial relationship between American Indians and the United States and the unprecedented nature of the context of American Indian education present an opportunity to critically examine this paradox and to reflect on the modern day implications for the education of citizens in a pluralistic democracy.

### Research Questions

The central research question guiding this study is: What role did off-reservation boarding schools play in the social education of American Indian children? Following from this overarching question are four subordinate questions, with several related questions, that guided the research:

1. What were the social, political, and economic factors that led to the movement to prepare American Indians for citizenship?
  - A. How and why did the relationship between American Indians and the United States change over time?
  - B. What were the important periods of U.S. policy towards American Indians, particularly related to education and citizenship?
2. Who created the citizenship education curriculum and for what purposes?
  - A. How did policymakers understand the nature of citizenship, in general, and for American Indians, in particular?
  - B. How did policymakers' conceptions of citizenship influence the creation of the citizenship education curriculum?
  - C. What was the relationship between the citizenship education curriculum and federal policy related to Indian citizenship?

3. What was the nature of the citizenship education curriculum in off-reservation schools in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries?
  - A. What is the nature of citizenship that emerges from the official citizenship education curriculum?
  - B. How and why did the citizenship education curriculum change over time?
  - C. In what ways did off-reservation schools express competing and/or contradictory conceptions of citizenship through the hidden or null citizenship education curricula?
4. How did students respond to the citizenship education curriculum?
  - A. How did students understand the nature of citizenship taught to them in the schools?
  - B. What implications did the teaching of citizenship have for the relationship of American Indians to the United States?

#### Overview

Education had long been a part of the U.S. government's effort to "pacify" and "civilize" American Indians. In fact, Christian missionaries established schools for American Indians beginning in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and treaties made throughout the era of national expansion often included education as a gesture of paternalistic goodwill by the U.S. government to American Indians (Prucha, 1979; Szasz, 1988). It was not until after the Civil War, however, that a system of education was created to prepare American Indians for the duties of citizenship. The reasons for this shift are complicated but, in short, there was a growing discontent among reform groups and policymakers with the segregation of American Indians onto reservations as a solution to the "Indian problem"

(Adams, 1995; Hoxie, 2001; Prucha, 1984). Stories of the squalor and degradation of reservation life, as well as arguments over the injustice of reducing a formerly independent and free people to pauperism, elicited the sympathies of Christian social reformers and their political allies. Particularly as the political boundaries of the nation came to completely engulf the land occupied by American Indians (land that could be used more productively by white settlers, it was believed), reformers believed the time had come to break up the Indians' tribal organization and assimilate them into American society.

When the Dawes Act was passed in 1887 the population of American Indians throughout the United States was approximately 250,000 and had been declining steadily over the previous 40 years (Adams, 1988). This led many European Americans in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century to believe that American Indians were an inferior race doomed for extinction. There were some, however, who believed American Indians could be saved from this fate if they could be taught to reject their tribal organization, traditional forms of subsistence, and pagan cultural practices, and instead be uplifted to the level of civilization of their white, Christian neighbors. The “vanishing policy,” as it was named, had three major elements: land reform, citizenship, and education. Land reform, represented most significantly by the Dawes Act (1887), was aimed at breaking up the communal ownership of land and encouraging the adoption of agriculture and European American values. The movement to grant American Indians citizenship required removing the legal barriers established by treaties, Supreme Court and lower court decisions, and acts of Congress that recognized the sovereignty of Indian nations. Accompanying land reform and citizenship was a system of education designed to teach

American Indians the values, skills, and knowledge required for their new lives as citizens of the United States. The system that was created—a combination of reservation day schools, reservation boarding schools, and off-reservation boarding schools—carried out the assimilationist policy by forbidding the speaking of native languages and most traditional cultural practices. In off-reservation schools the policy was to remove Indian children from the harmful influences of the reservation and immerse them completely in Euro-American culture. By the turn of the century there were approximately 25 off-reservation schools across the United States (Calloway, 2004).

Most off-reservation schools were built west of the Mississippi River, but the most famous and influential were the Carlisle Indian Industrial School in Pennsylvania and the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute in Virginia. Carlisle was founded in 1879 by Richard Henry Pratt, a former lieutenant in the U.S. Cavalry, on the site of a former army barracks. The Hampton Institute was also founded by a former military officer, Samuel Chapman Armstrong, but it was originally a school for African Americans built during Reconstruction. American Indian students were brought to Hampton by Pratt in 1878, ten years after the school's founding, and although he went on to establish his own school, the program for American Indian students remained. Hampton and Carlisle were the flagship institutions in the new system of off-reservation schools, and their charismatic leaders helped establish models of Indian education that was imitated across the country. Curiously, despite their apparent similarities, the two schools' philosophies and approaches differed significantly. Briefly, Pratt's philosophy, encapsulated in the phrase, "kill the Indian, to save the man," was based on a belief in the inherent humanity of American Indians and the power of white civilization to "save" the

Indian (Pratt, 2003). The philosophy of Armstrong, on the other hand, is best encapsulated in the phrase, “to make a better Indian.” Essentially, the mission of Hampton was to teach American Indians their place on the evolutionary ladder, exposing them to the superior European civilization, thus teaching them how far they had to go (Lindsey, 1995). The major difference was that, for Pratt, the Indian was capable of achieving the same level of civilization as his white neighbors, but for Armstrong the chasm in the evolutionary development was too vast to be overcome in a single generation.

Both Pratt and Armstrong, however, subscribed to the same basic assumptions underlying the assimilation policy: a belief in the superiority of their own culture and in the need for the “uncivilized” qualities of American Indian culture to be redressed by the schools (Fear-Segal, 2007). Based on these assumptions the schools developed and implemented curricula to teach American Indians the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required of American citizens. Essential to their approach was the teaching of English and practical skills that would aid them in their new lives as independent farmers or ranchers. In general, the schools provided a half-and-half curriculum: a combination of rudimentary academic education and industrial training (Adams, 1995; Hamley, 1995). Many of the architects of the off-reservation system believed in the common school movement and had a great deal of faith in the power of schools to transform students. As a result, the academic curriculum resembled in many respects that of the common school movement, including many of the same textbooks and courses (Adams, 1987; Hamley, 1995).

In addition to shaping students' minds, children at most schools were subjected to a complete physical transformation that involved the cutting of hair and the wearing of uniforms. Strict militaristic regimentation was followed at many of the schools to teach students discipline and subservience to authority (Child, 2000; Fear-Segal, 2007). Sports, such as football, baseball, and basketball, were also used throughout the off-reservation system to teach competition and discipline (Bloom, 2000). To immerse students in the dominant culture and to teach them practical skills, a popular element of many off-reservation schools was the "outing system." Designed by Pratt at Carlisle, the "outing system" required students to do mostly manual labor on farms and in houses in the white community (Pratt, 2003). The coercive and comprehensive nature of off-reservation boarding schools make them a unique experiment in the history of American education (Adams, 1995).

The effort to create citizens of American Indians in off-reservation boarding schools was undertaken during a critical period in which the legal and cultural meanings of citizenship for American Indians were being redefined in the context of national expansion. Despite the extension of citizenship to African Americans, as a result of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, American Indians were deemed by some in Congress as not worthy or capable of citizenship and intentionally excluded (Anderson, 2007). In theory, the Dawes Act (1887) established the mechanism by which Indians who proved themselves capable of managing their allotments could gain citizenship. In reality, however, by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, instead of recognizing American Indians as equal citizens, the federal government limited the political rights of American Indians thereby redefining the relationship between American Indians and the U.S. government in terms of



guardianship. It was not until 1924, with the passage of the Indian Citizenship Act, that citizenship was granted universally to American Indians, and even then the political rights of American Indians continued to be limited by individual states (Holm, 2005).

Against a backdrop of limited political rights, the citizenship education curriculum was the tool used by policymakers and school officials to realize their idealized visions of the proper place of the American Indian in U.S. society. Even though the curriculum of off-reservation boarding schools essentially reflected an assimilationist philosophy, which entailed severing the tribal allegiances of Indian students, competing conceptions of citizenship held by people like Pratt, Armstrong, and a series of influential Commissioners of Indian Affairs and School Superintendents, resulted in significant differences in the ways schools addressed this aspect of the curriculum. Among the commonalities were an emphasis on patriotism, an introduction to the basic rights and responsibilities of citizenship, and an emphasis on rituals and performances to demonstrate one's political allegiance. Significant differences existed between schools and curricula as well, however, influenced by competing conceptions of race, social evolutionary theory, as well as the context of the schools. The portrayal of American Indians in the study of American history, for example, became a particularly contentious topic for reformers because of concerns for how negative images of Indians in history may affect Indian students. The degree to which students should be encouraged to actively participate in political life was also a source of disagreement reflected in the citizenship education curriculum. Overall, the citizenship education curriculum at both Carlisle and Hampton was riddled with contradictions and ironies when understood

against the backdrop of the dispossession of Indian land and the erosion of tribal sovereignty.

By the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the hope of Pratt and others that American Indians would take their place as equals aside their white counterparts was seen as folly by a new wave of reformers (Hoxie, 2001). Even though the assimilationist philosophy continued to define the curriculum of the schools well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century, many of the off-reservation schools closed as a result of their controversial nature (Adams, 1995; Child, 2000). Carlisle closed in 1918 after its rapid decline in stature due to the firing of Pratt fourteen years earlier, and Hampton's Indian program closed a year later amid concerns over the negative repercussions of racial mixing (Lindsey, 1995). The assimilationist curriculum of off-reservation boarding school system came under attack in 1928 with the release of the Meriam Report, a scathing indictment of their culturally insensitive curriculum (Szasz, 1977). Despite efforts to reform the curriculum, boarding schools for Indian students continued to play an influential role in Indian education well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century. While only a few still exist today, what remains is a painful legacy of a period in U.S. history when schooling was a weapon of cultural destruction.

## Research Method

### *Theoretical Framework*

The theoretical framework used to examine the citizenship education of American Indians comes from the fields of social education, curriculum history, and curriculum theory. In an effort to acknowledge the broader context of citizenship education, traditionally understood within the narrower field of the social studies, Margaret Crocco (1999) defines social education as, "teaching and learning about how individuals

construct and live out their understandings of social, political, and economic relations--past and present--and the implications of these understandings for how citizens are educated in a democracy” (p. 1). This conceptualization is particularly appropriate for the study of American Indian citizenship education because their social education was not confined to a narrow set of academic subjects within the public school setting: rather, it was a comprehensive effort aimed at addressing their economic and cultural relations to the nation; not just their political ones.

In line with this broader conceptualization of citizenship education, I understand the curriculum to include more than the traditionally-defined official courses of study, textbooks, and other teaching materials. A more meaningful conceptualization of the curriculum is provided by curriculum theorist Elliot Eisner (1992), when he defines it as the “array of activities used by schools to achieve its ends” (p. 302). This broader definition also takes into account the comprehensive nature of the off-reservation boarding schools to include all evidence of the ways the schools used to teach the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required of citizens. Boarding schools, for example, offered students a variety of extracurricular activities, such as athletics, debating clubs, and off-site work programs, explicitly designed to prepare its students for citizenship. All of these activities were examined in connection to conceptions of citizenship.

A broader definition of curriculum leads to another important point regarding the citizenship education curriculum of Indian schools. A curriculum obviously has different meanings for those who create it, for those charged with implementing it, and finally, for those who receive it. For example, the curriculum that policymakers create in the form of official courses of study and general guidelines or directives (or standards, to use a 21<sup>st</sup>

century example), often takes on very different forms in the unpredictable contexts of schools and classrooms. It is helpful, therefore, to conceptualize the curriculum as a sequence rather than an end state. Understood in this way, the curriculum is really made up of three parts: the preactive curriculum, which is the curriculum as it was planned; the enacted curriculum, as it was implemented; and finally, the reactive curriculum, as it was received by students (Goodson & Ball, 1984). Viewing the citizenship education curriculum in this way helps to better understand the relationship between the policymakers, the schools, and the students, a topic that is underdeveloped in the current scholarship on Indian education.

Another assumption guiding my research is that the curriculum is political in nature. Drawing from the work of critical curriculum theorists (Anyon, 1981; McLaren, 1993; Spring, 1986) who understand the role of the curriculum as a tool for the reproduction of existing class structures, I argue that the social education of American Indians should be understood in the context of the emerging industrial capitalist system of the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Reformers and policymakers, for example, consistently conflated citizenship with economic skills, particularly those which would prepare American Indians for lives on the lower rungs of the industrial economic order (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). In addition to economic considerations, however, I argue the cultural and political transformations were equally important. A common assumption of the scholarship on off-reservation boarding schools, and one that I think is undeniable, is that cultural genocide was central to the mission of the schools during the time period under study (Adams, 1995; Child, 2000; Hamley, 1995; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). But also important, and at the center of my study, is how the social

education of American Indians involved a transformation of their political identities and socio-economic relationships. The colonial relationship, American Indians' claim to the land, and their status as members of sovereign nations, makes the social education of American Indians particularly complicated, but important to understand.

To further understand the political nature of the curriculum I use the distinction critical curriculum theorists make between the overt and the hidden curriculum (Jackson, 1990; McLaren, 1994) to understand the complex and often subtle ways the schools achieved their ends. I understand the overt curriculum to consist of the formal curriculum as it was defined broadly above. To understand the hidden curriculum, I draw on Peter McLaren's (1994) definition,

the hidden curriculum deals with the tacit ways in which knowledge and behavior get constructed, outside the usual course materials and formally scheduled lessons. It is part of the bureaucratic and managerial 'press' of the school—the combined forces by which students are induced to comply with the dominant ideologies and social practices related to authority, behavior, and morality (pp. 183-184).

This conceptualization of the curriculum and its purposes is particularly appropriate to the study of the social education of American Indians because of the often contradictory meanings of citizenship taught in Indian schools. Although rarely subtle, off-reservation boarding schools both overtly and covertly attempted to shape the cultural and political identities of Indian students in significant ways.

To understand the influences that shaped the curriculum I draw on an interpretive framework developed by Herbert Kliebard (1995) and expanded on by others in the field

of social education (Dilworth, 2004; Evans, 2004). Rather than viewing the school curriculum as an expression of a single, unified ideology, for Kliebard (1995), the curriculum is the product of intense political and ideological debate involving competing interests groups. He identifies four interest groups that shaped the curriculum writ large during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries: humanists, developmentalists, social efficiency educators, and social meliorists (Kliebard, 1995, pp. 23-24). Each of these competing interest groups influenced the citizenship education curriculum for American Indians, although they took on very different meanings in the context of the highly racialized discussions surrounding the education of American Indians. Within the field of social education, too, the citizenship education curriculum is understood as being influenced by the debate between professional historians and advocates of the broader field of social studies (Woyshner, 2006). Evidence of this debate is seen in the development of the citizenship education curriculum in off-reservation boarding schools, particularly due to the influence of Thomas Jesse Jones, a significant figure in the development of the social studies curriculum, at the Hampton Institute. Understanding the citizenship education of American Indians in terms of competing interests helps one to better appreciate the relative influence of the many different individuals and groups that helped to shape the curriculum of the schools.

### *Organizing Metaphor*

Suggested in the title of my dissertation is the idea that the social education of American Indians resembles theater in several significant ways. In fact, I argue that the pageant play, like the one at the beginning of this chapter, provides a useful metaphor to conceptualize the complex relationship between policymakers, schools, and students.

Although I came to this metaphor independently, Herbert Kliebard (1999) makes use of a similar metaphor in describing the campaign for manual training in schools in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. He describes it as, “a kind of morality play in which the mythic American hero was portrayed as a vigorous, ‘bare-armed’ worker” (p. 6). Like Kliebard, I believe the curriculum expresses a representation of the ideal American in the same way the pageant plays of the era taught Indian students and the public what it meant to be an American.

Philip Deloria (1998) in his work, *Playing Indian*, from whom the title of my dissertation is borrowed, suggests the practice of adopting Indian identities throughout American history has served important functions and is imbued with powerful rhetorical meaning. He argues: “the practice of playing Indians has clustered around two paradigmatic moments—the Revolution, which rested on the creation of a national identity, and modernity, which used Indian play to encounter the authentic amidst the anxiety of urban industrial and postindustrial life” (p. 7). Although his work is primarily about the ways white Americans adopted Indian identities for their own purposes, he suggests, “these complex layers of history, meaning, and reality were confusing enough on their own terms, but they grew even more tumultuous when actual Indian people participated in the dialogue” (pp. 120-121). The citizenship education curriculum helps to uncover the complex layers of history, meaning, and reality of which Deloria speaks.

The rhetorical nature of the citizenship education curriculum and the performative nature of citizenship, reflected in the pageant play, provide a useful metaphor for understanding the role off-reservation boarding schools played in creating citizens of American Indians. The metaphorical “stage” is the context of Indian/white relations in

the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries and the development of a system of education to address the rapidly changing national identity in the Progressive Era—the subject of Chapter 3. The “producers” of this play—the subject of Chapter 4—represent the many politicians, policymakers, and administrators who competed to produce the curriculum, or the “script”—the subject of Chapter 5. Finally, the “actors” in this metaphorical play are the students and teachers themselves.

### *Terminology*

Central to understanding the nature of social education for American Indians is appreciating how the definition of citizenship shifted over time in response to changing political and cultural contexts. As many historians of education and social studies researchers have argued, citizenship has had different meanings for America’s racial and ethnic minorities than it has for the majority white population (Anderson, 1988; Banks, 2004; Dilworth, 2004). According to James Anderson (1988) in his landmark work *The Education of Blacks in the South*, “both schooling for democratic citizenship and schooling for second-class citizenship have been basic traditions in American education” (p. 1). Similar in many ways to African American citizenship education, the social education of American Indians should be understood not in terms of the full rights of citizenship, but rather a “second-class” role circumscribed in both law and practice. Scholars of the history of Indian education generally acknowledge that citizenship for American Indians was shaped by racial theories that viewed them as incapable of exercising the rights of full citizenship (Fear-Segal, 2007; Hoxie, 2001; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). In line with this basic assumption, scholars in social studies education identify three conceptions that have defined citizenship education historically: “cultural



transmission, reflective inquiry into social science knowledge, and democratic transformation” (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1982). Briefly, citizenship as cultural transmission involves passivity on the part of the student, the uncritical acceptance of what is taught, loyalty, and patriotism. Reflective inquiry into social science knowledge as an approach to citizenship education involves more active student participation, the application of social science methods to solve problems, and the development of critical thinking. Finally, democratic transformation involves the process of critical thinking, decision making, and social action for the purpose of improving society (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1982). Although the primary conception of citizenship promoted in off-reservation schools was cultural transmission, aspects of all three types of citizenship education are evident in the curriculum of off-reservation boarding schools. Understanding the ways these different conceptions were expressed and their meanings for American Indian students is an important aim of this study.

My use of the term American Indian is meant to be a respectful shorthand way to refer to the descendants of the indigenous peoples of United States. I recognize that there has been and continues to be debate over the appropriate way to refer to culturally diverse groups of people such as American Indians and that a more accurate nomenclature would use specific tribe or nation names. When possible and appropriate for establishing context I have made an effort to identify the tribe or nation of individuals or groups discussed in this dissertation. However, given the nature of my topic (off-reservation schools brought students together from many different tribes and nations) and my desire to understand the impact the curriculum had on members of many different tribes I decided American Indian was the most appropriate identifier to use. In doing so I realize

that I am sacrificing depth and nuance for the sake of understanding their social education in more general terms, leaving the study of the impact of the citizenship education curriculum on specific tribes for future scholars.

### *Methods*

To better understand the social education of American Indians during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries I used methods appropriate for the study of history. My research involved the interpretation of primary historical documents related to the attitudes and beliefs of the people responsible for creating the citizenship education curriculum, evidence of the curriculum itself, and the responses of those most directly affected by the curriculum: the students. With all primary documents examined, first I established the authenticity and reliability of the documents (McCulloch, 2004). Because most of the primary documents used for this study were published sources I used McCulloch and Richardson's (2000) guidelines to better understand the nature and potential of published primary documents. Accordingly, I identified four issues that were most pertinent to this study: authorship, context, audience, and influence.

In terms of authorship, after learning who produced the works, I used a combination of published primary and secondary sources to determine more about the circumstances influencing the document's creation and more about the author's life and career. Fortunately, most of the policymakers responsible for creating the documents were well-known: their writings are part of the public record, and their influence has been studied by other scholars. Some of them even have published memoirs or autobiographies that gave insights into their points of view and relevant aspects of their life. The issue of authorship was less transparent when examining newsletters,

newspapers, and other publications of the schools. Although many of these documents included writings by students, it is generally acknowledged that these sources should be viewed with skepticism because the publications were edited by school officials (Katanski, 2005). The issue of audience is also important to address when analyzing these publications. Because of their wide circulation, school officials took care to ensure the images of the schools portrayed in the publications were consistent with the values and beliefs of the schools, which were often at odds with those of the students. Similar caution was taken when examining annual reports of the Department of the Interior made by the Commissioners of Indian Affairs, school superintendents, and school officials. One would not expect to find evidence that would place the schools in a negative light, except when a case was being made for more funding or other improvements.

The context in which the documents were produced was also taken into account when determining their reliability, authenticity, and influence. The period under study was one in which significant changes were occurring in American society in general, and for American Indians in particular. Taking into account the influence of these broader social, political, and economic changes on the debate over education is a significant task of historians of education and one that was central to my analysis. The most significant issue that arose related to context involved understanding the role of time and place in assessing the significance of primary documents. In terms of place, the way in which the evidence coming from specific schools, Carlisle and Hampton in particular, reflected the distinct purposes and aims of those schools was given careful consideration. Temporally, it is understood that attitudes and beliefs shifted over time as a result of the context. For example, the off-reservation system was created at a time when the Indian wars had not

been “won” and attitudes about Indian citizenship were influenced by the image of the Indian as a savage enemy. At the same time, reformers had a sense of urgency during the late 19<sup>th</sup> century that began to wane in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and the influence of off-reservation schools declined. Constructing a narrative of the social education of American Indians sensitive to shifting contexts was an important aim of my study.

Establishing the influence of the documents was also significant in my analysis. As mentioned above, rather than reflecting a seamless connection between the philosophies of policymakers and the classroom, the curriculum must be understood as layered and its influence on students muted by a variety of contextual factors. Accordingly, when analyzing evidence of the citizenship education curriculum it was understood that the formal curriculum, reflected in the official courses of study and textbooks, was perhaps a good representation of the ideologies of those who created it, but it did not necessarily translate into the classrooms. When determining the influence of evidence of the social education for students, more weight was given to documents that came from the schools themselves, although, depending on the source, their influence on students was also viewed with some skepticism. Unfortunately, there is very little evidence of the enacted or reactive curriculum, making conclusions about the exact nature of instruction in citizenship education difficult to make. Influence, then, is better understood in terms of the ways these documents reflected and shaped the debate over the citizenship education of American Indians than in terms of their actual influence on the political and cultural transformations of the students. Evidence of the influence of citizenship education on American Indian students, although not a central purpose of this

study, is addressed through the available published writings of former students and teachers.

For each primary source used in this study careful notes were taken and efforts were made to ensure that the above issues (authorship, context, audience, and influence) were taken into account as the notes were organized thematically according to the various aspects of this study. Once the data was organized broadly it was then organized again into meaningful subcategories within the general topics. For example, evidence of the curriculum of the school (a broad category) was further broken down into aspects of the curriculum related to the teaching of American history: the use of pageant plays, extracurricular activities, and so on. The sources were analyzed with the theoretical frameworks discussed above in mind and themes were identified that captured the nature of the subcategories. A narrative was then constructed which was sensitive to the issues of authorship, context, audience, and influence, that helped to understand the social education of American Indians.

### *Periodization*

The historical period selected for study (1875 to 1924) encompasses the critical period in the development of off-reservation boarding schools as well as important developments in the citizenship status of American Indians. The starting point of 1875 is significant because it was the year Richard Henry Pratt began his educational experiment when he was assigned the task of transporting 72 Kiowa, Comanche, and Cheyenne prisoners of war to St. Augustine, Florida (Pratt, 2003). The ending point coincides with the universal grant of citizenship to American Indians in 1924, a dubious event for many reasons, but an event which coincidentally occurred in the same year as Pratt's death.

## Source Base and Research Activity

*Primary Sources*

Published primary sources form the basis of my interpretation in this dissertation. I studied the citizenship education curriculum primarily through government documents and the publications of Indian Schools, most notably Carlisle in Pennsylvania and Hampton in Virginia, widely considered the most influential boarding schools of the era. Government documents included the Courses of Study for 1892, 1898, 1901 and 1915; Rules for the Indian School Service from 1898; Annual Reports of the Commissioners of Indian Affairs, 1875-1903; the Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools from 1901; and several bulletins related to education issued by various commissioners of Indian Affairs. Publications from the boarding schools examined included school newsletters and newspapers from Carlisle: the *Indian Helper*, the *Indian Craftsmen*, and the *Red Man*, and from Hampton: the *Southern Workman*. I examined additional evidence of the citizenship education curriculum of other Indian schools in the records of the National Archives Regional Branch in Chicago and at the Newberry Library.

I studied the attitudes and beliefs of policymakers regarding citizenship and the social education of American Indians in the above government documents, but also in several of the books written and published by the policymakers during the time period, including Thomas Jefferson Morgan's (1892) *Studies in Pedagogy*, Francis Leupp's (1910, 1914) *The Indian and his Problem* and *In Red Man's Land: A Study of the American Indian*, and Richard Henry Pratt's (2003) autobiography *Battlefield and Classroom*. The writings of influential reformers were also examined in Francis Paul

Prucha's (1973) *Americanizing the American Indian: Writings of the Friends of the Indian*.

I examined the context of the legal development of citizenship during this period reflected in several key pieces of legislation: the Major Crimes Act of 1885, the Dawes Act of 1887, the Curtis Act of 1898, the Burke Act of 1906, and the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924. In addition, I used several influential Supreme Court rulings to understand the relationship of individual American Indians and the United States, they included: *Elk v. Wilkins* (1884), *United States v. Kagama* (1886), and *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock* (1903).

The availability of primary sources that express the attitudes of Indian students on the citizenship education curriculum is very limited, particularly in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Several outspoken graduates of the boarding schools went on to publish books on their experiences that provide some glimpse into the schools. The works consulted for this study, although not all were cited directly, include Charles Eastman's (also known as Ohiyesa)(1975, 1931) *The Indian To-day* and *From the Deep Woods to Civilization*, Thomas Wildcat Alford's (1936) *Civilization, As Told to Florence Drake*, Polingaysi Qoyawayma's (1964) *No Turning Back: A Hopi Indian Woman's Struggle to Live in Two Worlds*, and *Born a Chief: The Nineteenth Century Hopi Boyhood of Edmund Nequatewa*, as told to Alfred F. Whiting (1993). Although their perspectives are not necessarily representative of all Indian students, they provide important voices of Indian students who experienced the boarding schools.

Most of my research was conducted at the University of Minnesota libraries, as most government documents and published sources were available there or through

interlibrary loan. I also visited the National Archives regional branches in Chicago and the Newberry Library in Chicago to examine specific curriculum materials.

### Limitations

Whenever one engages in the study of history there are always factors that limit one's ability to uncover the most "accurate" picture of what occurred in the past. This study is no different. Some of the factors that limited this study are related to logistics, sources, scope, and theory. When I set out to uncover the social education of American Indians I did so with an orientation towards the curriculum of the schools as the best representation of that effort. Accordingly, I consulted with several scholars, particularly in the fields of Indian education and American Indian studies. It became clear through these conversations that few unpublished curriculum materials exist from off-reservation boarding schools for the period under study. The decision was made, then, to rely on published sources for evidence of the social education curriculum. A more productive approach, perhaps, would have been to do more archival research myself, but due to limitations of time and money, such work proved difficult. Relying on published sources limits my study in several significant ways, some of which were mentioned in the methods section. In short, a more nuanced picture of the attitudes and beliefs of policymakers and students would likely come from writings not intended for public viewing. In addition, a more authentic picture of the role of off-reservation schools played in the social education of American Indians would come from the classroom materials, such as teachers' lesson plans, assignments, tests, and other teacher or student artifacts. The limited number of curriculum documents that were viewed presents an incomplete picture of what occurred inside off-reservation boarding school classrooms.



I made the decision, too, to narrow the focus of my dissertation on two schools: Carlisle and Hampton. The main reason for this decision was due to their being the first and most influential off-reservation boarding schools. Also, because of the different philosophies of these schools' founders, they provide a unique opportunity to explore the way the debate over the social education of American Indians was translated into specific schools. The influence of the work of Thomas Jesse Jones, a teacher at Hampton, on the creation of the social studies curriculum writ large, was also a reason for the narrow focus. One consequence of focusing on just two schools is that it is difficult to assess the social education of American Indians overall. Evidence from the work of scholars in the field of the history of Indian education suggests that the context of the specific schools had a significant influence on the social education of their students. In short, this dissertation is not meant to be a comprehensive exploration of the social education of American Indians during this time, but will feature the curriculum of two influential schools.

Finally, there are many theoretical lenses through which one could analyze the social education of American Indians. I chose to focus primarily on how race influenced social education because it seemed to me to be the most salient factor for policymakers. I decided not to examine in any depth the role gender, socio-economic class, religion, and the ways the unique cultural beliefs of specific tribes influenced this topic. The result is an analysis that lacks the complexity and nuance of the actual history, but instead focuses on the topic in a broader way.

## Organization

My analysis begins in chapter two with a historiographic essay that provides an overview of the scholarship related to the social education of American Indians. The purpose of this chapter is to identify gaps and weaknesses in the current literature, and to make an argument for the advantages of using theoretical frameworks derived from social education, curriculum history, and curriculum theory to study the citizenship education curriculum. Chapter three examines the context needed to understand the development of social education in off-reservation schools. This includes, most importantly, the changing political and economic relationship between whites and American Indians in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries exemplified by legislation, court decisions, and the resulting educational policy. Chapter four is an analysis of the competing ideologies that shaped the development of the citizenship education curriculum. In particular, the educational philosophies of several influential policymakers are examined, including commissioner of Indian Affairs Thomas Jefferson Morgan, superintendent of Indian schools Estelle Reel, the founders of Carlisle and Hampton, Richard Henry Pratt and Samuel Chapman Armstrong, and Hampton teacher Thomas Jesse Jones. Chapter five focuses on the evidence of the citizenship education curriculum at both Carlisle and Hampton. This chapter explores the nature of the curriculum and the competing conceptions of citizenship expressed in it while providing some examples of the way in which the curriculum was experienced by students. The responses of Indian students to the citizenship education curriculum are also addressed in this chapter.

### Significance of the Study

The need to appreciate the relationship between off-reservation boarding schools and the current position of American Indians in the United States is generally acknowledged by historians of Indian education. Most agree that American Indians are still suffering as a result of the culturally genocidal policies formulated in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Frederick Hoxie (2001) argues in his research on the assimilation of American Indians that “the dependence and powerlessness cultivated by the assimilation campaign continues to be a major theme in the life of Native American communities” (p. xiii). Recent scholarship by Lomawaima and McCarty (2006), too, attributes the dismal indicators of quality of life and educational achievement to the “decades of repressive administration, when Native American parents and communities were denied the right to local control over education” (p. 6-7). Even today, almost a century after the official abandonment of forced assimilation as an appropriate goal of education, researchers point to a continued disconnect between the values of the dominant educational system and those of Indian communities resulting in ambivalence to schooling (Peshkin, 1997, p. 112). It would be naïve to think we can simply put the past behind us and move on with new educational policies without confronting the past.

For scholars in social studies education, like myself, the citizenship education of American Indians in off-reservation boarding schools presents an opportunity to critically examine the past in order to theorize and design a more inclusive citizenship education curriculum for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. It is a task made particularly difficult when one considers the philosophical dilemma inherent in American Indian social education. On the one hand, social studies educators are charged with educating future citizens committed to

core democratic values, such as equality, social justice, and human rights (National Council for the Social Studies, 2001). On the other hand, we must confront a history, in which, according to critical theorist Sandy Grande (2004), “from the perspective of American Indians, ‘democracy’ has been wielded with impunity as the first and most virulent weapon of mass destruction” (p. 32). A critical first step towards resolving this dilemma is the need for social studies educators to, in the words of Margaret Crocco (2002),

... come to terms with the full range of meanings and historic legacy as they reconsider citizenship education for this new century, a period of time in which the nation is confronted with comparable issues of inclusion and exclusion as demographic changes produce a visibly different citizenry (p. 2).

This dissertation is my attempt to come to terms with the historic legacy of citizenship education. Understanding the political and social contexts, the underlying philosophies, and the influence the citizenship education curriculum had on students can have a significant impact on the quality of social studies education for all students, native and non-native alike. As I argue in the next chapter, the social education of American Indians in off-reservation schools is a topic that has not been explored in depth by scholars in the history of social education. In pursuing this topic, I share Crocco’s (2002) hope that, “[t]he social studies can contribute to keeping democracy healthy by rewriting its history, reexamining its commitment to equity in the present, and reconsidering its future commitments—in short, by taking citizenship seriously” (p. 4-5).

## Chapter 2

## Putting Indian Citizenship Education at the Center of Study:

## An Historiographic Essay

The great purpose which the Government has in view in providing an ample system of common school education for all Indian youth of school age, is the preparation of them for American citizenship. The Indians are destined to become absorbed into the national life, not as Indians, but as Americans. They are to share with their fellow-citizens in all the rights and privileges and are likewise to be called upon to bear and fully their share of all duties and responsibilities involved in American citizenship. (ARCIA, 1889, p. 95)

Although not all reformers and policymakers were as optimistic about the capacity of American Indians to share in “all the duties and responsibilities involved in American citizenship,” in issuing the above directive Commissioner of Indian Affairs Thomas Jefferson Morgan identified the central purpose underlying the creation of a system of off-reservation boarding schools. Given the importance afforded citizenship education, at least in the directives of policymakers like Morgan, one would expect the nature and quality of citizenship education to be well understood by scholars of the history of Indian education. Unfortunately, this does not seem to be the case. There are, of course, several defensible reasons for the lack of study in this area. The unavailability of primary sources shedding light on what happens in schools, for example, is a perennial problem plaguing historians of education during this period (Cuban, 1993). It is also possible that citizenship education was simply not a significant part of the curriculum,

despite policymakers' statements to the contrary. A careful reading of the scholarship and historical sources suggests otherwise. There is ample evidence that off-reservation boarding schools shaped students' identities vis-à-vis the nation and provided a wide range of skills and knowledge required for citizenship.

One reason for the incomplete picture of the history of Indian citizenship education is due to the fact that it is a topic that exists at the intersection of at least two fields of study. There is a body of scholarship on the history of Indian education produced by an eclectic group of scholars embracing several different methodologies: historical, anthropological, and sociological; and theoretical perspectives: revisionist, post-revisionist, and critical race. There is also a body of scholarship, not as eclectic as the previous one, concerned with the historical development of citizenship education. Unfortunately, scholars in neither the history of Indian schooling nor citizenship education have examined Indian citizenship education in-depth. A review of the scholarship related to the history of the citizenship education of American Indians reveals much about the nature, purposes, and contexts of Indian education, but an incomplete picture of the citizenship education curriculum. Likewise, a review of the scholarship in the history of citizenship education reveals a great deal about the nature, purposes, and contexts of citizenship education, but an incomplete picture of the place of American Indians in that history. I argue that citizenship education has never been placed at the center of study.

#### Historiography of Indian Citizenship Education

The entire historiography of Indian education is too vast to be revisited in a chapter of this length, but a review of how this body of research addresses the issue of

Indian citizenship education is important for understanding the current state of scholarship on the topic. Prior to the 1970s, the history of Indian education, in general, was not a topic that was well understood by scholars. In fact, in Francis Prucha's (1984) two volume comprehensive analysis of American Indian history, *The Great Father*, he states authoritatively: "Although the most significant reform measures had to do with education, there are no detailed histories of Indian education" (p. 1247). The only exception appears to be Evelyn Adams' (1971) *American Indian Education*. Originally written in 1946, Adams' work is brief and cursory in its treatment of Indian citizenship education when compared with the work of a new generation of historical scholarship in the 1970s. Increased interest in the history of Indian education appears attributable to several factors: the rise in popularity of social history and area/ethnic studies; the birth of the American Indian Movement; and a greater interest in the roots of social inequalities in American Indian communities. Among the first to contribute to an understanding of Indian citizenship education were Prucha (1976, 1984) and Frederick Hoxie (2001). Both authors offer comprehensive analyses, focusing primarily on the peoples and forces that shaped educational policy. Although both authors address the citizenship education curriculum, their evidence of what happened in classrooms is scant and the picture they present must be understood as reflecting the attitudes and concerns of policymakers rather than the complex realities of specific boarding schools.

#### *Education Policy and Indian Citizenship Education*

Prucha, in *The Great Father*, situates his discussion of education within the context of the movement to individualize American Indians through the allotment of land and the effort to grant legal citizenship. Appreciating that citizenship was not welcomed

by many American Indians, nor would it significantly alter their lives, Prucha (1984) argues: “The great drive to make citizens of Indians in the late 1880s and the 1890s through a system of national Indian schools was not a matter of legal citizenship, but of a cultural amalgamation of the Indian into the mass of white citizens...” (p.686). To support his conclusion he emphasizes the role Richard Henry Pratt played in establishing the prototype school at Carlisle, Pennsylvania. Prucha explains that Pratt, following the lead of Samuel Chapman Armstrong at Hampton, believed in “education for the hand and the heart as well as the head” (p. 698). His assessment of the overall quality of Carlisle is very negative, describing the education as “basically that of a grammar school” (p. 698). Accordingly, Prucha’s discussion of citizenship education emphasizes the importance of learning English and the practical industrial skills needed to compete economically alongside their white neighbors, juxtaposed against the lofty rhetoric of reformers like Thomas Jefferson Morgan who advocated for a common school education to prepare American Indians for the full rights of equal citizenship.

Prucha argues that the assimilationist philosophy of policymakers remained basically the same into the 20<sup>th</sup> century but that there were significant changes in outlook and emphasis after 1900. He characterizes it as a shift from “the theoretical, religiously oriented dream of Christian reformers” to “a pragmatic, practical approach, with an emphasis on efficiency and businesslike management that marked the Progressive Era” (p. 761). Although he maintains that policymakers never lost their faith in the belief that Indians could be incorporated into the body politic, Prucha acknowledges that the much more pragmatic, industrial curriculum created by Estelle Reel at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was as a reflection of the new emphasis on self-support in Indian education that



reflected the much lower expectations policymakers held for the place of Indians in American society. Concluding that Indian educational policy was doomed to fail because of “the unwillingness of educators to consider the Indians’ cultural heritage and its persistence in spite of the efforts to eradicate it” (1984, p. 840) Prucha ends his discussion of Indian education in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century by citing a history exam from the Albuquerque Indian School in 1911 that included questions like: “Explain the difference between the township government of New England and the county government of Virginia” (p. 840). Prucha concludes: “The textbooks and lessons in Indian schools were geared to produce American citizens and were heavy with history and civics lessons that made little sense to the native pupils” (p.840).

A more focused treatment of the context of Indian educational policy is presented by Frederick Hoxie (2001) in *The Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Native Americans, 1880-1920*, originally published in 1984. Like Prucha, Hoxie’s work is also a political history, tracing the legal development of citizenship and its relationship to educational and land policy. Challenging the “traditional view” that “the government in the late nineteenth century embarked on a wrong-headed but persistent campaign to push Native Americans into American citizenship and force them to adopt Anglo-American standards of landownership, dress, and behavior,” Hoxie argues that assimilation was actually marked by two phases: the first was aimed at transforming Indians into “civilized” citizens and the second was aimed at their incorporation as second-class citizens or partial members in the nation (p. x). He describes total assimilation, the goal of reformers like Morgan and Pratt in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, as a process by which American Indians would leave behind their tribal ways and enter American society as

cultural and political equals. The extension of citizenship was meant to be evidence of “the power of the nation’s institutions to mold all people to a common standard” (p. 15). Providing very little detail of the nature and quality of citizenship education beyond the rhetoric of reformers, Hoxie argues that the optimism of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century soon gave way to the realism of the “modern view,” which viewed Indians as “incapable of rising to the level of their civilized countrymen” (p. 189).

Hoxie frames the debate over assimilation as both a cultural movement, supported by anthropological theory that viewed American Indians at the bottom of the evolutionary ladder, and political movement, in which the appropriateness of extending full citizenship to a racially “backwards” peoples was questioned. He argues that the result of this debate was a shift to a policy of partial assimilation, which “was simply a label for the process by which aliens fit themselves into their proper places in the ‘white man’s’ United States” (p. 210). The effect of this new policy was the redefinition of their citizenship status reflecting their status as dependent wards. Hoxie argues the effect on educational policy was a de-emphasis of the academic curriculum in favor of one that placed industrial training and self-support at the center. Citing the official courses of study of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century as evidence, Hoxie suggests the curriculum of the schools became increasingly vocational to match the lower expectations of the period. He concludes by pointing out two ironies of assimilation: that a policy that was originally intended to lead to the absorption of American Indians into white society came to mean the exact opposite, and that rather than weakening the tribal bonds it intended to break, the assimilation policy may have actually strengthened them. Overall, Hoxie presents a

picture of Indian education policy shaped by a debate over the terms of citizenship and the proper place of the American Indian in white society.

Although the work of Hoxie and Prucha is important for understanding the evolution of Indian education policy in general and the forces that shaped it they lack an appreciation of the nature and quality of Indian citizenship education. Specifically, the major limitation of both is their lack of attention to the specific contexts and complex issues that arise when educational policy is implemented in schools. For example, in Prucha's comprehensive two-volume work there is only one direct example of the citizenship education curriculum originating from a school. Curriculum theorists, like Ivor Goodson (1985), remind us that policy does not necessarily enter the classroom in predictable ways. Clearly, whenever the idealized rhetoric of policymakers meets the realities of schools, the intended outcomes are likely to be significantly altered by specific contexts and the subjective experiences of students. When one acknowledges the gap between policy and practice, it is reasonable to be skeptical of the conclusions of Prucha and Hoxie. For example, both scholars are critical of the efforts of the schools to create ideal citizens because, when compared to the reality of most American Indians, it is easy to conclude that the schools were failing to meet expectations. Likewise, when the expectations are lowered, it is reasonable to conclude that the schools were underestimating the potential of the students and are therefore inferior. These conclusions, however, are based on a direct, predictable relationship between policy and practice that may belie a more complex reality. Nonetheless, a policy analysis is useful for understanding citizenship education because, rather than viewing citizenship as static, Hoxie in particular presents it as a dynamic concept, changing as a result of significant

changes to the national identity caused by immigration, urbanization, and industrialization (p. 12). Several scholars started to penetrate the fog of policy in the 1980s. They did this in two ways: by investigating specific schools and by examining multiple layers of experience; policy, practice, and student experience. In doing so, they raise important questions about the relationship between policy, institutional practice, and student response.

*Citizenship Education Enters the Classroom*

One of the first scholars to attempt to penetrate the fog of policy was David Wallace Adams (1979, 1983, 1995). In his comprehensive analysis *Education for Extinction*, Adams takes a three-tiered approach to understanding Indian education: examining the attitudes of policymakers, how policy was translated into institutional practice, and how Indian students responded to the efforts of the schools (p. ix). Attempting to discern the larger patterns of Indian education Adams places Indian citizenship education within what he understands as the overarching purpose of the schools: a process of moving Indians from a state of savagism to one of civilization (p. 6). According to Adams, educational policy during the late 19<sup>th</sup> century needs to be understood as part of a comprehensive humanitarian movement that included land policy against the backdrop of “an ever-changing definition of the Indians’ citizenship status” (p. 145). He elaborates:

First, allotment enables us to understand why educators placed so much emphasis on individualization and citizenship training- both were essential if the Indians were going to survive in their new citizen-farmer roles. Without such preparatory

education, reformers pointed out, allotment would prove to be a cruel hoax. (p. 18)

Within this context Adams identifies four aims of Indian education: providing “the rudiments of an academic education,” individualization, Christianization, and lastly, citizenship training (p. 23-24). Although he recognizes the interrelated nature of the four aims, Adams is the first author to specifically address citizenship education as a distinct element of the curriculum enacted in Indian schools.

Adams characterizes citizenship education as including the teaching of “fundamental principles of government, the institutional and political structure of American society, the rights of citizens under the Constitution, and the role and sanctity of law in a democratic society” (p. 24). He argues further that it included instilling “deep devotion to the nation and its flag” as well as an effort to have Indian students “internalize the national myths that were central to [the study of American history]” (p. 24). In other works, as well, Adams (1979, 1988) emphasizes the importance of English language instruction, rituals and routines, such as military drill and the celebration of holidays like Indian Franchise Day, as key elements of citizenship education. For evidence, Adams cites the policy directives of Thomas Jefferson Morgan, such as the one at the beginning of this essay, and the use of Horace Scudder’s (1884) *A History of the United States of America*, which he claims was “what [the Indian Office] was looking for to help Indian students “identify with the ‘American experience’ wherein Indian-white conflict and settlement of the West were central themes” (p. 146). He also emphasizes, although not within the context of citizenship education, the importance of rituals, such as “dramatic renderings, the pageants, the parades, the fluttering banners, the praying, the

hymn singing, and the graveyard observances” as evidence of the effort to “explain to Indians who they were, where they fit in the American story, and what they must become if they were to be a part of America’s future” (p. 206).

Adams is also one of the first scholars to explore student responses to the citizenship education curriculum. He argues that student responses ranged from complete resistance to different levels of accommodation of the schools’ messages (1995, p.336). Although downplaying student accommodation by suggesting it was “frequently little more than a conscious and strategic adaptation to the hard rock of historical circumstance,” Adams suggests that some students internalized the savagism-civilization paradigm but also expressed a pragmatic hope that the schools could be used to aid in the protection of tribal interests (1995, p. 336). Overall, he concludes, “Indian students were anything but passive recipients of the curriculum of civilization” (p. 336). Thus, the efforts of the schools to produce loyal and patriotic citizens are complicated when viewed from the perspective of the schools’ students.

Compared with the work of Prucha and Hoxie, a much more detailed look at the nature of citizenship education emerges from the writings of Adams. By giving examples of the curriculum of the schools beyond the official courses of study and policy statements, he is one of the few to directly address the ways in which the schools addressed citizenship education. Interestingly, Adams’ conclusions are not that dissimilar to those of his predecessors. For example, he points out one of the ironies of the boarding schools by concluding: “the very institution designed to extinguish Indian identity altogether may have in fact contributed to its very persistence in the form of twentieth-century pan-Indian consciousness” (1995, p. 336). However, like Prucha and

Hoxie, Adams' evidence of the curriculum is limited in scope and lacks an appreciation of the complex ways the curriculum was enacted in specific schools. Adams' comprehensive approach is helpful for placing citizenship education in the broader context of a larger picture but lacks an in-depth analysis of the specific contexts that helped shape the implementation of the curriculum and the ways students experienced it.

### *Institutional Perspectives*

Beginning in the 1980s scholars began to study the histories of specific Indian schools to better appreciate the context of Indian education. Although these institutional histories (Ellis, 1994; Hyer, 1990; Lindsey, 1995; Lomawaima, 1996; Riney, 1999; Trennert, 1988) address the curriculum of the schools, glimpses of the citizenship education curriculum enacted in the schools are rare and generally limited to the rhetoric of policymakers and official courses of study. In general, they acknowledge the schools had a half-and-half academic and vocational curriculum, but they tend to emphasize the vocational nature of the curriculum. Despite the lack of attention to the ways the schools taught specific knowledge and skills needed of citizens, one important conclusion of the institutional histories is that Indian educational policy did not necessarily translate into practice in the ways intended by policymakers of school officials. Factors such as a lack of funding, the limited English proficiency of students, and the poor quality of teachers, limited the implementation of an academic curriculum in many schools. In terms of social education, only one of the institutional histories stands out for its treatment of the curriculum.

Donal Lindsey's (1995) *Indians at Hampton Institute, 1877-1923*, is exceptional among institutional histories in the way that it directly addresses Indian citizenship

education. The context is also important because Thomas Jesse Jones, a teacher at Hampton Institute, went on to national prominence as an author of the NEA's influential 1918 Committee on the Reorganization of the Secondary Education and is one of the first to use the term "social studies," the modern discipline with civics at its center (Saxe, 1991). It also acknowledged that Hampton's program, although unique in that it was biracial, was important because it was considered a model other schools followed (Fear-Segal, 2007). Finally, Lindsey's work is significant because Hampton, as a biracial school, provides a setting for understanding the complex role of race in influencing the appropriate form of citizenship education for American Indians, a topic that is underdeveloped in the scholarship on the history of social education (Woyshner, 2006).

Lindsey situates his discussion of Hampton's "social studies curriculum" within the debate over whether the school respected the cultural diversity of its students or aided in their acculturation (p. 176). Unlike Pratt, whose mission at Carlisle was to eliminate cultural differences in order to prepare American Indians for their integration into white society as citizens, Armstrong established Hampton as an institution designed to prepare its students for lives as "cultural missionaries" who would return to their peoples and help to gradually move them up the ladder of civilization (p 180). Accordingly, the curriculum designed and implemented by Thomas Jesse Jones was intended to convince its students, both black and Indian, of the superiority of Anglo-Saxon culture and to instill just enough racial pride so that they would understand exactly how far they had yet to go (p. 185). Contrary to what one might assume, Lindsey points out that what is notable about Jones' course on civics is that it did not include any discussion of the rights of citizenship (p. 189). In fact, he argues that the academic program was designed to



support the overwhelmingly industrial nature of a Hampton education. He concludes: “academic classwork possessed no sacred power to free blacks or Indians even intellectually from the accommodationist bonds of industrial education. Indeed such a course could furnish a student with philosophical justification for disenfranchisement, civil inequality, and occupational discrimination” (p. 191).

Lindsey’s analysis is perhaps the most well-developed to date in terms of his attention to the curriculum and his appreciation of the context—in particular the role of race—in influencing the nature of citizenship education at Hampton. His work is also important because he links the development of the social studies curriculum at Hampton to the broader social studies movement, of which Jones was a significant influence. Although Lindsey does not attempt to weigh in, he cites the debate between historians of the social studies over the relative influence of Jones and his Hampton model on the national movement as evidence of this relationship. Perhaps the only significant critique that can be offered of Lindsey’s work is the lack of student voice. Lindsey is not alone among historians of Indian education in his top-down analysis of schools, and although he and others do not ignore student voices, a new wave of scholarship in the mid-1990s places student perspectives at the center of their analysis.

#### *Student Perspectives on Indian Citizenship Education*

The picture that emerges of citizenship education from the perspective of Indian students is understandably complex. However, it is important to note that none of the scholars who have explored students’ experiences at Indian boarding schools through oral histories (Lomawaima, 1994), diaries and letters (Child, 2000), and autobiographical accounts (Coleman, 2008), placed a traditionally-defined citizenship education

curriculum, such as the type described by Adams (1995), at the center of analysis. Instead, what defined life at boarding schools for most students was not the time they spent in classrooms, but their relationships with other students, their involvement in extracurricular activities, and the experience of being away from their families and communities. In fact, except for vocational training, the traditionally defined curriculum of the schools receives very little attention from the perspective of students. For example, in Brenda Child's (2000) *Boarding School Seasons* there is almost no discussion of an academic curriculum or any type of direct citizenship instruction. Instead, the curriculum described by the students in her work was very basic and very vocational. At Flandreau in South Dakota, for example, "the students, who ranged in age from five to twenty-five, received what must be regarded as an essentially elementary school education in reading, writing, and arithmetic. The rest of the school day was devoted to vocational training, which consisted primarily of labor at the school" (p. 73). According to Lomawaima (1994), students at Chilocco in Oklahoma, downplayed the quality of the academic program, often praising instead the vocational program and "social training" they received at the school (p. 162). For Coleman (2008), the only author to address students' response to the curriculum in depth, the key elements of the curriculum are instruction in English, the vocational courses, and the schools' attempts to proselytize. Overall, research on the experiences of students at Indian boarding schools supports the argument that the purpose of the schools was not to prepare students for the rights and responsibilities of equal citizenship, as indicated by policymakers, but rather to prepare students for lives as obedient, docile, workers on the periphery of U.S. society.

Despite the low academic standards and vocational nature reported by these scholars, some intriguing insights about the role of the schools in creating citizens are revealed through students' responses. There is evidence, for example, that some American Indian students embraced the assimilationist program and were transformed by the experience. Coleman (2008), in his research on Indian school graduates, suggests that students did not reject the Euro-centric focus of the schools; in fact, he concludes, "they accepted without question the entirely Euro-American curriculum, with its deliberate rejection of 'savage' knowledge" (p. 111). In other works, however, it appears that some students were deeply suspicious of the attempts by the schools to reshape their identity and rejected the idea of citizenship altogether. Instead of learning useful skills for effective citizenship or being instilled with a patriotic fervor, the picture presented by Child (2000) is one of disappointment and disillusionment. The only bright spot, she concludes, was that "the schools designed to separate Indian families, dilute the influences of home, and impose a new set of cultural values ironically helped many Ojibwe families survive hard times and economic depression" (p. 100).

There are many examples in the scholarship of ways in which students resisted the entire experience and took pride in retaining their Indian identity (Adams, 1995; Child, 2000; Horne & McBeth, 1998; Lomawaima, 1994). As already mentioned, several scholars agree, that one of the significant unintended, and ironic consequences of the off-reservation boarding schools was the formation of a pan-Indian identity facilitated by the bringing together of different tribes at the schools (Adams, 1995; Hertzberg, 1999; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006; Reyhner & Eder, 2004). In terms of shaping their new American identity, it seems that Chilocco strengthened tribal identities, rather erased

them. Lomawaima (1994) concludes: “there is a moral to the story of Chilocco, and it falls somewhere between the depiction of the boarding schools as irredeemably destructive institutions and Tillie’s sentiment that Chilocco ‘was really a marvelous school’” (p. 164). In terms of citizenship education, it seems the role of Indian boarding schools from the perspective of students, should also be understood in a similarly complex way.

*Interdisciplinary Perspectives*

Most of the recent scholarship on Indian education is best described as interdisciplinary, as it tends to draw from several different research traditions. Several of these works stand out in terms of their contribution to our understanding of Indian citizenship education: Lomawaima and McCarty’s (2004) *To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education*, Jacqueline Fear-Segal’s (2007) *White Man’s Club*, Jon Reyhner and Jeanne Eder’s (2004) *American Indian Education*, Amelia Katanski’s (2005) *Learning to Write “Indian:” The Boarding School Experience and American Indian Literature*. Drawing from the fields of sociology, anthropology, literary criticism, and education, these works make use of diverse theoretical perspectives to examine the history of Indian education and assess its impact.

Although ostensibly a history of Indian education, Reyhner and Eder (2004) are much more present-minded than most in framing their study with current educational research. They argue that in order to understand “why certain curricula are more likely to lead to success, they must know about the past failures and successes of Indian education” (p. 12). Accordingly, they are concerned with the role the schools played—and continue to play—in limiting Indian peoples’ rights to self-determination and cultural

retention. Understandably, Reyhner and Eder construct a narrative that is highly critical of the assimilationist policies of the previous centuries. Like other scholars, they also situate Indian citizenship education within the broader context of the land policy which was designed to end the reservation system and prepare American Indians for lives in mainstream white society. Acknowledging the rhetoric of policymakers like Morgan, who aimed at preparing Indians for full citizenship, the gap between institutional policy and practice for Reyhner and Eder is particularly wide. References to any type of explicit citizen citizenship education are few. Instead, they characterize the nature of Indian education as strictly assimilationist and vocational. Even at Carlisle, where one might expect a greater emphasis placed on a traditionally-defined citizenship education curriculum, Reyhner and Eder assess the academic program as being “largely at an elementary level with a vocational, manual labor emphasis” (p. 107). Beyond the academic program, Reyhner and Eder discuss the role of discipline and regimentation as efforts to civilize students, but provide little other evidence of a citizenship education curriculum. If anything the schools had the opposite effect intended by policymakers, Reyhner and Eder point out, acknowledging the role the schools played in strengthening tribal identities and fostering a Pan-Indian identity that would prove important for the future of American Indian peoples (p. 199-200).

Also comprehensive in scope and present-minded in perspective, Lomawaima and McCarty (2004) explore the development of educational policy and practices and their impact on Native communities during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Using both historical and anthropological methods they understand federal Indian policy as a “socio-cultural process in which federal authorities *appropriate* policy to serve particular interests and

goals” (italics original, p. xxiii). In doing so, Lomawaima and McCarty challenge the assumption that Indian policy vacillated, like the “swings of a pendulum,” between tolerance and intolerance (Deloria & Lytle, 1998). They suggest instead that: “Each generation was working out, in a systematic way, its notion of a safety zone, an area where dangerously different cultural expressions might be safely domesticated and thus neutralized” (p. xxii). Their work highlights the ways in which boarding schools-- designed to eradicate all elements of Native culture--allowed certain aspects, such as arts and crafts; but rather than doing so as a sign of respect for their rights of cultural expression, they reflected their “racially defined view of social hierarchy and Indians’ ‘appropriate place’ in the lower rungs of American society” (p.44). Addressing citizenship, they argue:

Native individuals, as well as particular cultural traits or practices, were being fitted into an American ‘safety zone’ of obedient citizenry and innocent cultural difference. Parameters of the safety zone corresponded to relations of power: Safe citizens were part of a subservient proletariat, and safe cultural differences were controlled by non-Native federal, Christian, and social agencies that could proclaim themselves benefactors dedicated to “preserving” Native life.

(Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006, p. 49)

To support their interpretation of the schools they examine evidence of the ways boarding schools allowed, and even encouraged, certain elements of tribal culture such as basket-making. They understand vocational training as a means to preventing Indians’ economic competition with whites, rather than promoting their integration into white society. The military regimentation and harsh discipline of the schools is offered as

further evidence of the effort to create an “obedient citizenry.” They summarize the role of the schools by concluding:

Whether schools were located on or off reservation, organized as day or boarding, they shared pedagogical and disciplinary practices. Schools provided elementary academic training (equivalent to the public schools’ lower elementary grades) alongside explicit, well-developed moral, manual labor, and domestic training. (p. 48)

Lomawaima and McCarty (2004) offer a significant contribution to our understanding of the relationship between citizenship and schooling for American Indian students. Like most other scholars they conclude that boarding schools had a devastating impact on the lives of students and their legacy is responsible for the dismal indicators of academic achievement in the American Indian community in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. What is particularly important about their work, however, is the way they have helped to understand the role the schools played in preserving Indian culture and how this effort connected to policymakers’ conceptions of citizenship. In doing so, they also recognize that students did not simply passively receive the assimilationist curriculum; rather they actively worked to shape the “safety zone.” The notion of the “safe citizen” is a useful way to understand the seemingly contradictory relationship between the rhetoric and practice of the schools, which professed to produce self-sufficient citizens but in practice encouraged obedience and dependency.

The limitations of Lomawaima and McCarty are more a matter of scope than interpretation, but in any case, important questions regarding the development of Indian citizenship education are left unanswered. If the flaw with Adams (1995) is a lack of

appreciation of how competing conceptions of citizenship changed over time, especially due to the influence of the highly racialized reformers of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, then the flaw in the work of Lomawaima and McCarty is a lack of appreciation of the ways in which the rhetoric and institutional practices of people like Richard Henry Pratt and Thomas Jefferson Morgan, influenced the development of the schools into the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Acknowledging Hoxie's "hinged interpretation," they never unpack its meaning for citizenship education in any meaningful way. In addition, rather than focusing on specific schools, Lomawaima and McCarty instead decide to examine the impact of the schools more generally; the result is a comprehensive analysis, but one that lacks the nuance of more focused study. Nevertheless, Lomawaima and McCarty's work significantly deepens our understanding of the nature of Indian education by challenging the nature of assimilation and by grounding their work in the context of Indian attitudes towards education, schooling, sovereignty, and self-determination.

An even more recent contribution to the study of the history of Indian education is Jacqueline Fear-Segal's (2007) *White Man's Club*. Grounding her work in Michel Foucault's postmodern literary analysis and James C. Scott's (1990) studies of dissident subcultures, Fear-Segal's study is about how:

Schools, supposedly established to educate native children for citizenship, became arenas where whites debated the terms of that citizenship and where native peoples, struggling in this convoluted context against the total erasure of their cultures, adapted, or deflected the 'white man's club' and in the process, realigned and redefined tribal and Indian identities. (p. xi-xii)



Her analysis is particularly helpful for understanding how race influenced citizenship education at Carlisle and Hampton, even from the beginning. Fear-Segal challenges Hoxie's "hinged interpretation," arguing that at both schools, "from the outset, opposing racial discourses about Indians interwove and became incarnated in the structures and practices of education" (p. xiii). She argues further that the ways in which the schools were "integral not only to a story of land theft, ethnocide, and cultural erasure but also a pattern of progressive racialization" is a topic not explored in the current literature on the history of Indian education (p. xiv). Although Fear-Segal explores the broader aims of the schools, she argues that the discourse of race played a central role in the way in which the civic mission of the schools was approached.

By examining the ways Indian schools attempted to preserve elements of Native culture both Fear-Segal (2007) and Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) offer significant insights into the nature of the assimilation policy. Although their methodologies are different and the explanations they offer for the intentional preservation of Indian culture differ, they do not necessarily contradict each other. For Lomawaima and McCarty, the schools' efforts are understood as creating a "safety zone" of cultural expression, but for Fear-Segal the efforts need to be understood within the racialized context of the particular schools. Fear-Segal argues that for universalists like Pratt, "the Americanization campaign which attempted to recast Indians as white threatened to 'destroy the one thing that could protect the Indian from racialization and all of its consequences: 'Indianness'" (p. 164). She argues further that Pratt used a "carefully packaged, white-led version of 'Indianness' to serve a reminder of their distinctness" (Fear-Segal, 2007, p. 165). The purpose of preserving a "semi-protective marker of their difference" was a belief that the

unique status of Indians as “first Americans” gave them a legitimacy unavailable to other groups (p. 165). Accordingly, she emphasizes the ways in which Pratt attempted to model the common school curriculum, with particular emphasis placed on putting Indians on display. At Hampton, on the other hand, the preservation of Indian cultures was part of the racial philosophy of its founder Samuel Chapman Armstrong, who viewed Indians, African Americans, and other non-white groups, as “child races,” not capable of achieving the same level of civilization as their white counterparts. Instead of preparing Indians for the full rights and responsibilities of citizenship, Fear-Segal describes the Hampton curriculum as consisting primarily of manual training, needed for preparation for second-class citizenship (p. 116).

By situating her analysis of the development of Indian schools in the discourse of race, Fear-Segal (2007) addresses fundamental contradictions between the assimilationist rhetoric of the schools and their racialized realities. In doing so, she helps to trace the origins of the schools’ and identify significant philosophical differences that shaped Indian policy well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Rather than attributing the lowering of expectations to a group of Progressive Era reformers, as earlier scholars have done (Adams, 1995; Hoxie, 2001; Prucha, 1984), Fear-Segal helps us to understand how the schools, from their beginnings, harbored low expectations of their students. By interrogating the overt and covert agendas of white educators, Fear-Segal is able to paint a nuanced and complex picture of the ways the attitudes and beliefs were translated into the schools. At the same time, referencing the work of Ivor Goodson (1985), she acknowledges that there can be “very wide gaps between the published curriculum, the taught curriculum and the received curriculum” (p. 119). Unfortunately, what is lacking

in Fear-Segal's analysis is an examination of curriculum as it related specifically to citizenship education. For example, there are no references in her work to Thomas Jesse Jones or the curriculum he developed at Hampton. Instead, like Lomawaima and McCarty (2004), she argues that at Hampton, citizenship education meant manual training for "second class citizenship." Despite these limitations, Fear-Segal's work is significant in that it provides a powerful analytical tool for understanding the role race played in the development of perhaps the two most influential Indian boarding schools.

#### *A Curriculum Perspective*

For those interested in the history of the curriculum of Indian boarding schools, a review of the history of Indian education leaves one generally unsatisfied. Perhaps the only author to approach the history of Indian education from a curriculum perspective is Jeffrey Hamley (1995) in his dissertation. Defining the curriculum as "the aggregate of courses of study given in Indian schools, including textbooks and other instructional materials," Hamley frames the development of the curriculum in general in terms of the common school movement (p. 74). Listing "basic academic instruction, moral development, and the socializing 'republican' function" as essential components, Hamley stresses the importance of textbooks for citizenship education (p. 79). Citing, too, as Adams did, the policy directives of Morgan, Hamley also mentions Morgan's "List of Books Adopted for Use in Indian Schools" that included many of the same books used in common schools (p. 87). Reflecting the shift in philosophy from assimilation to the more pragmatic curriculum that prevailed after Morgan, Hamley supports the claim that the new curriculum deemphasized academics and strengthened the vocational aspects of the

curriculum. Beyond the influence of Morgan, there is no specific mention of citizenship as being an important part of the official curriculum.

\*\*\*\*\*

A review of the historiography of Indian education confirms citizenship to be a central aim of the schools, but in general it lacks a serious engagement with the meaning and nature of citizenship education beyond its vocational elements. For example, there is agreement among scholars about the centrality of work and self-sufficiency as prerequisites for citizenship in the rhetoric of reformers. In addition, scholars understand that reformers viewed labor as a moralizing force, particularly well-suited to addressing what they perceived to be the unique deficiencies of American Indian students. The research is clear: off-reservation schools were defined by their industrial programs. In fact, Indian schools were on the cutting edge of the manual training movement that shaped the development of public education in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The relationship between the allotment of land as a way to end the reservation system by breaking up the communal ownership and tribal organization of American Indian communities, is also generally acknowledged as a prerequisite for American citizenship by scholars in the field of Indian education. What is not as well-known, despite a vast amount of scholarship on Indian schools, is the type of education reformers believed would most effectively prepare Indian youth for American citizenship beyond instruction in English and manual training. Several scholars acknowledge and provide evidence of the existence of a distinct citizenship education curriculum (Adams, 1995, 1983, 1973; Hamley, 1995; Prucha, 1984), even after the lowering of expectations and redefinition of Indian citizenship during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, yet none examine it in any depth.

Research into the history of citizenship education in general provides the context for better addressing the nature of Indian citizenship education, but very little direct evidence of the actual effort.

#### Historiography of Social Education related to American Indians

The field of social education, which explores the role of schools in creating citizens, is where one would expect to find research on the citizenship education of American Indians. Unfortunately, the field is largely silent on the topic. Scholars have addressed the history of social education both broadly (Butts, 1978; Evans, 2004; Reuben, 1997, 2005) and more narrowly (Crocco, Watras, & Woysner, 2004; Crocco & Davis, 1999) but there has been relatively little focus on the place of American Indians in that story. There is a recognition within the field of social education that race can provide a potentially powerful lens through which to understand the historical development of citizenship education (Woysner, 2006), and the scholarship in this field has examined the citizenship education of disenfranchised groups such as women, African Americans, Jews, and immigrants. But no scholars have addressed the citizenship education of American Indians directly. The closest scholars have come to addressing the topic is indirectly, through an examination of African American citizenship education at Hampton (Dilworth, 2004; Johnson, 2000; Kliebard, 1994, 1995; Watkins, 1995). But, as the scholarship on the history of Indian education demonstrates, the context of Indian citizenship education is unique and cannot and should not be subsumed within the study of African American citizenship education or other disenfranchised groups.

Related to the field of social education is scholarship on the development of the social studies as a school subject (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Lybarger, 1983; Saxe, 1991). Because of the central role citizenship education has played in the development of the social studies, this field is important for understanding the broader context and its influences on specific contexts. Of particular interest to these scholars are the people and ideas that shaped the official curriculum beginning in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Within this field of scholarship Indian education is often mentioned tangentially, again because of the influence of Thomas Jesse Jones and his role in the 1916 NEA Committee on Social Studies that is widely recognized as laying the foundation for the field of the social studies. Accordingly, there is a good deal of interest, and of course some debate, about the relative importance of the Hampton social studies and the ideology of its founder in shaping that document. Unfortunately, the unique case of American Indian citizenship education is addressed only in passing. Understanding how these fields have addressed the topic of Indian citizenship education, tangentially as it may be, is useful because the theoretical perspectives and definitions for this study are drawn from that field of study and they also provide the context for understanding the place of Indian citizenship education within the broader movement, thus identifying the influences on its development.

#### *American Indians and the Social Studies*

The first author to investigate the relationship between the citizenship education of American Indians and the broader social studies movement was Michael Lybarger (1983). In an essay entitled, "The Origin of the Modern Social Studies, 1900-1916," Lybarger traces the origin of the discipline to, what he claims, are its roots at Hampton.

In doing so, he challenges Lawrence Cremin's (1964) assertion that the ideals of the progressive education movement reflected in the 1916 NEA Committee on Social Studies represented democratic ends. Rather, Lybarger argues, "the view of the world embodied in the Hampton social studies and popularized by the work of the Committee...sought to legitimate social, economic, and political inequality" (p. 466). To support his conclusion he cites the influence of the theories of racial evolution theory, which emphasized the importance of work as a moralizing force and the need for African Americans to understand and accept their place on the bottom of the economic ladder. Also placing the social studies curriculum in the context of the debate between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Dubois, Lybarger makes a convincing argument that the purpose of the social studies curriculum at Hampton was tied to a gradualist and accommodationist philosophy that sought to reduce economic competition between whites and blacks in the South. Lybarger concludes: "All of Hampton social studies viewed citizenship in relation to students' future status as workers in menial positions, subordinate to Whites, and living in a hostile social and political climate" (p. 466). What is conspicuously absent from Lybarger's analysis, however, is any understanding of the unique position of American Indians both at Hampton and in the United States generally. Even though Lybarger's work is significant in that he is one of the first to trace the development of the social studies back to its origins at Hampton, his conclusions lead to an unfortunate conflation of the historical experiences of African Americans and American Indians.

The only other scholar to address the relationship between the Hampton social studies and the 1916 NEA Committee on Social Studies in any depth is David Saxe (1991) in his book *Social Studies in Schools: A History of the Early Years*. Like

Lybarger, Saxe acknowledges that at Hampton, the social studies curriculum developed by Jones took at face value its role in preparing blacks and “Amerindians” for second-class citizenship (p. 16). In fact, he argues that there was nothing unusual about this aim of education, particularly in the South where schools had never been committed to any sort of radical social change. However, unlike Lybarger, Saxe does argue that the social studies at Hampton was both unique and liberal: unique because it offered its students an opportunity for higher education and liberal because it used the social sciences, rather than the traditional history curriculum, to reach its goals. Ultimately, Saxe (1991) argues:

This contradiction in the Hampton social studies (being both liberal and repressive) was worked out by the 1916 [Committee on] Social Studies. With the later social studies program, limits were not suggested or implied for any group of children; active participation and skepticism were encouraged with all children.

(p. 17)

Although future scholars have challenged this Pollyannaish conclusion, Saxe’s work is among the few that acknowledge the close relationship between the social studies program at Hampton and the 1916 NEA Committee on Social Studies. Unfortunately, like Lybarger before him, Saxe conflates the experiences of African Americans and American Indians, contributing little to our understanding of the citizenship education of American Indians.

*Social Education and the American Indian*

Lybarger and Saxe are not alone in conflating the experiences of African Americans and American Indians in exploring the Hampton social studies. Other scholars interested in the specific contexts of citizenship education have deepened our



understanding of Jones (Dilworth, 2004; Johnson, 2000; Kliebard, 1994/1995; Watkins, 1995) but most who have explored the origin of the social studies at Hampton have also focused on the African American context. The debate has either tended to center on the relative influence of Jones and the Hampton social studies on the national movement or the competing forces that shaped African American education. In terms of the influence of Jones, Herbert Kliebard (1994) is perhaps the most emphatic, suggesting, “Jones’ vision ultimately went beyond the education of African Americans; it became the prevailing doctrine for American education generally” (p. 6).

Another limitation of the scholarship on Jones and the Hampton social studies is the lack of any serious investigation of the ways the curriculum was enacted and received by students. There seems to be an assumption that the curriculum entered the classrooms in predictable ways and the debate over its appropriateness occurred only among intellectuals and policymakers. This, of course, belies a reality in which American Indians were anything but passive recipients of the Eurocentric curriculum (Adams, 1995; Coleman, 2008; Fear-Segal, 2007; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). Something else absent from the literature on the development of the social studies is how Hampton fit into the larger system of Indian education. Although a flagship institution, Hampton was unique for several reasons. Lindsey explains how it was different from other Indian schools:

Hampton was a missionary school that became isolated in a more secular age, a contract school outside governmental civil service, an eastern boarding school in a system beginning to emphasize reservation day schools, and a black school whose

Indian students experienced all of the vicissitudes of declining white-black relations. (p. 271)

Silent, too, in the literature on the history of the social studies are the voices of the policymakers of Indian education, such as Richard Henry Pratt, Thomas Jefferson Morgan, and Estelle Reel. Overall, research on the history of citizenship education and the history of the social studies reveals an incomplete picture of Indian citizenship education.

### Conclusion

How can we understand the role of off-reservation boarding schools in creating citizens of American Indians? Clearly, there are many ways to address this question. Scholarship on the history of Indian education during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries is deep and wide, encompassing a diverse range of perspectives and research traditions. Most of the scholarship that addresses this question has either focused on educational policy or the context of specific schools. Despite the wealth of scholarship on Indian schools there has been relatively little attention given to the curriculum used to achieve the ends of the schools. Generally, when the curriculum of the schools is examined, emphasis is placed on the schools' vocational programs. The scholarship of David Adams (1977, 1988, 1995, 2006) and Donal Lindsey (1995) provide the most detailed documentation of the citizenship education curriculum for American Indians, but even their works lack an in-depth analysis of the topic. More recent interdisciplinary scholarship (Fear-Segal, 2007; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006) has contributed to our understanding of the complex role race and gender played in the development of educational programs for American Indians, but these works lack an appreciation of the

broader context of the development of citizenship education. Finally, in the scholarship on the history of citizenship education, where one would expect to find an analysis of the citizenship education curriculum of Indian schools, there is relatively little scholarship directly related to this topic.

Considering that preparation for citizenship is consistently acknowledged as the ultimate goal of Indian education throughout the history of off-reservation boarding schools, seen in both rhetoric and policy, it seems that an analysis of the curriculum is overdue. What is lacking in the current scholarship is a perspective on Indian citizenship education that appreciates the unique place of American Indians in U.S. history and one that bridges the gap between policy and student. Even though the relationship between policy, curriculum, and students is complicated—the curriculum as it is envisioned by policymakers is almost always an idealized form of the curriculum that is actually enacted—focusing on the citizenship education curriculum of Indian schools presents an opportunity to explore the racially defined context of citizenship education. In the case of the citizenship education curriculum of Indian schools, the picture that emerges from the current scholarship must be reconciled both against the backdrop of the dispossession of American Indian land and the erosion of tribal sovereignty during a period of unprecedented change in the history of the United States. In addition, Kliebard (1995) suggests that we treat the curriculum as “artifacts of a period from which one might be able to reconstruct what was actually happening in the teaching of school subjects” (p.xiv). In other words, the curriculum offers another way to understand what was happening in schools, which is particularly important considering the paucity of first-hand accounts from Indian students and teachers. Finally, if, as Jeffrey Hamley (1995)

argues, “the curriculum comprised the essential means by which Euro-American culture would be sustained and assimilation achieved” (p. 73), then it is important to better understand it in its proper context.

### Chapter 3

#### From Noble Savage to First American:

#### The Context of Citizenship Education for American Indians

In 1914, Commissioner of Indian Affairs Cato Sells responded to pressure from critics that the Indian Office was not working quickly enough to grant individual American Indians fee patents to their land by authorizing competency commissions to visit reservations and determine whether individual Indians were capable of managing their allotments (McDonnell, 1991). Receiving the title, or fee patent, was considered by policymakers to be the last obstacle to citizenship and, in theory, would end the guardianship relationship (Prucha, 1984). Most American Indians living on reservations in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century were considered incapable of managing their own affairs and treated by the United States as wards of the nation, requiring the supervision of reservation agents; they were not entitled to the rights of full citizenship (Hoxie, 2001). Two years after Sells' decision, Interior Secretary Franklin Lane decided the occasion of granting citizenship was worthy of a ceremony befitting the significance of the event, so he devised the "last-arrow ceremony" (McDonnell, 1991).

According to one account of a last-arrow ceremony at the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, the ceremony began when the Indian allottee, dressed in traditional garb, appeared before the federal agent, was handed a bow and arrow, asked to state his Indian name, and instructed to shoot his "last arrow" (Deloria, 1971). He was told that he could keep the arrow as a "symbol of his noble race," but that from then on he would

live the life of a white man. After shooting his arrow the Indian entered a ceremonial teepee to change into “citizen dress” and then appeared again before the agent who asked him to state his “white name.” He was then instructed to put his hand on a plow, and was reminded of the relationship between hard work and one’s right to own the land. Next, he was given a purse and was reminded of the importance of saving his money for times of need, and he was given an American flag and was told that it was “the flag of freedom, the flag of free men, the flag of a hundred million free men and women of whom you are now one” (Deloria, 1971). With flag in hand he was instructed to repeat the following oath:

For as much as the President has said that I am worthy to be a citizen of the United States, I now promise to this flag that I will give my hands, my head, and my heart to the doing of all that will make me a true American citizen. (Deloria, 1971)

Upon stating this oath, a badge was placed on his breast and the audience was instructed to rise and shout: “[the Indian’s white name] is an American citizen.” A similar ceremony was performed for women, but instead of a plow she received a “work bag” and was admonished of the importance of the family and home as a foundation for civilization and citizenship.

The last-arrow ceremonies offer a fascinating look at the symbolic meaning of citizenship and the nature of the change policymakers believed American Indians needed to make in order to be prepared for its responsibilities in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. First, the cultural transformation—symbolized by the shooting of the last arrow, the changing of clothes, and the acceptance of a new name—demonstrates the importance of the

transmission of European American culture as a requirement for American citizenship. Secondly, the symbolic appurtenances received in the ceremony—the arrow, the plow, the purse, the work bag, the flag, and the badge—are indicative of what policymakers understood was required for Indians to carry out the responsibilities of citizenship. The flag and the badge represent allegiance to the nation—particularly significant on the eve of the United States’ entry into World War I. The plow, the purse, and the work bag symbolize the private ownership of land, the importance of hard work and frugality as the cornerstones of success. The arrow is imbued with perhaps the most intriguing symbolic meaning. Instructed to keep it as a “symbol of [his] noble race and the pride you feel that you come from the first of all Americans,” the arrow is the only marker of difference (Deloria, 1971). The arrow can be interpreted in two ways: as a deferential homage, indicated by the agent’s words, but also as a reminder of his racial and cultural difference—perhaps signifying a lesser form of citizenship. Finally, and most important in terms of the relationship between education and citizenship, at no point in the ceremony was any effort made by the agent to determine whether the new Indian citizen understood or was capable of exercising the rights and carrying out the responsibilities of citizenship (Deloria, 1971). All that was required was a willingness to accept his allotment in fee simple—thus legally giving him the right to sell, or perhaps more importantly, giving whites the opportunity to assess, tax, and, if the opportunity arose, divest him of, his land.

The acceptance of the American Indian into the nation as a citizen—through such a purely ceremonial act and with no assurances that the inductee understood the meaning of citizenship or was able to carry out its responsibilities—is surprising when one

considers the history of education for American Indians, particularly at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Beginning in the late 1870s, a system of off-reservation boarding schools was created throughout the country to prepare American Indians for citizenship. These schools are notable in the history of American education generally, and citizenship education specifically, for their comprehensive assimilationist approach (Adams, 1995; Coleman, 2008; Hoxie, 2001; Prucha, 1984). Sent to schools hundreds of miles from their communities—often by force—American Indian children were subjected to a complete physical transformation which involved the cutting of their hair, the adoption of a new name, the wearing of uniforms, and strict military discipline, all in an effort to shape them into model American citizens. The schools are also noteworthy for their emphasis on industrial training, which policymakers believed was essential to ensure the survival of the American Indian (Prucha, 1973). Assimilation, however, required more than a cultural transformation and training in a set of industrial skills; the schools were also engaged in a battle for the hearts and minds of their students (Adams, 1995; Coleman, 2008; Prucha, 1984).

Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Thomas Jefferson Morgan, summarized the civic mission of the schools this way:

The Indian youth should be instructed in their rights, privileges, and duties as American citizens; should be taught to love the American flag; should be imbued with a genuine patriotism, and made to feel that the United States, and not some paltry reservation, is their home. Those charged with their education should constantly strive to awaken in them a sense of independence, self-reliance, and self-respect. (ARCIA, 1889, pp. 95-96)



In short, preparation for citizenship involved teaching American Indians students their “proper” place in the nation (Adams, 1995; Coleman, 2008; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2007; Reyhner & Elder, 2004).

Indeed, understanding the role schools played in preparing American Indians for citizenship, the purpose of this study, requires an appreciation of the complicated and often tragic evolution of the relationship between American Indians and the United States. Throughout U.S. history, Indians have held a dichotomous place in the national identity, reflected in a seemingly contradictory set of policies aimed at both creating distance but also assimilating American Indians into the United States. At times American Indians have been demonized—seen as ruthless savages, obstacles to territorial expansion, and the enemy (Deloria, 1998; Prucha, 1984). Along these lines, numerous wars were waged, treaties negotiated, tribes relocated, and reservations established, all in an effort to create physical and psychological distance between American Indian peoples and the United States. At other times, however, American Indians have represented nobility, bravery, and, as the country grew and became more industrialized, a symbol of rugged individualism on the frontier (Holm, 2005; Prucha, 1984). Education administrators, like Richard Henry Pratt, argued that their admirable qualities and unique place in the history of the United States entitled them to preferential treatment as “first Americans” (Pratt, 2003). Accordingly, from the founding of the United States, there have been policies aimed assimilating American Indians into the nation, often in the spirit of Christian brotherhood. In the effort to assimilate American Indians, schools played a critical role (Adams, 1995; Coleman, 2008; Szasz, 1988), but they were just one piece of a larger puzzle.

An investigation of educational policy for American Indians reveals that behind this seemingly contradictory set of policies was a consistent effort to divest American Indians of their land, destroy their culture, and erode their tribal sovereignty. Citizenship, the focus of education in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, was the latest manifestation of a policy, began in the colonial period, designed to incorporate Indian lands into the United States by offering education in exchange for peaceful relations. While reformers and policymakers like Richard Henry Pratt and Thomas Jefferson Morgan believed that citizenship was the ultimate end of U.S. Indian policy—a solution to the “Indian problem”—for American Indians it came with an enormous price. Guided by an unerring belief in the superiority of their own culture and ways of life, policymakers throughout the history of United States were intent on finding a place for American Indians in the nation on their own terms.

This chapter traces the development of Indian educational policy by examining the key periods and events that defined U.S./Indian relations. By placing citizenship education in its historical context we can gain a greater appreciation for the forces, ideas, and people that have shaped, and continue to shape, its development (Woyshner, 2006). Whereas many have described educational policy for American Indians as a pendulum swinging between extremes—at times characterized as assimilation and destruction (Deloria, 1998), civilization or extermination (Adams, 1995), or reflecting the rise and fall of our democratic ideals (Cohen, 1953)—I argue that educational policy has actually been much more consistent. Even though Indian educational policy is fraught with contradictions, its development should be understood in terms its overall impact on native communities, which Lomawaima and McCarty (2007) characterize as the “ongoing

struggle over cultural difference and its perceived threat, or benefit, to a sense of shared American identity” (p. 6). Throughout the history of the United States educational policy for American Indians has reflected a debate about their place in the nation. The creation of a school system to prepare American Indians for citizenship represented the institutionalization of this debate during a critical period in the history of Indian/white relations (Fear-Segal, 2007).

### The Colonial Legacy

From the beginning of the colonial period the relationship between the indigenous peoples of the Americas and Europeans was shaped by both their differences and shared interests (Calloway, 2004). Each possessed resources the other desired—land, precious metals, guns, etc.—but they were separated by significant cultural, political, and economic differences. For Europeans, these differences caused them to judge American Indians by their own standards of civilization, which meant that they viewed them as inferior because of what they lacked, thus ignoring what they had achieved (Calloway, 2004). A belief in their own superiority led European powers—Spanish, French, English, and Dutch—to claim the land and its resources by right of conquest, treating American Indians as subjects of their respective crowns (Wilkins & Lomawaima, 2002). Europeans also viewed American Indians from a Christian worldview, as heathens with souls worthy of salvation, but with uncivilized cultures and practices incompatible with the basic tenets of their faith. Despite their differences, the colonial period was also shaped by interdependence (Axtell, 1985). American Indians had a usufruct claim to the land, traditions of self-government, and military presence that necessitated their treatment as members of distinct political and cultural groups (Wilkins & Lomawaima, 2002).

Colonial Indian policies, particularly in British North America, were created to ensure the success of the colony by maintaining peaceful relations by negotiating for land and resources required for their continued survival (Prucha, 1984). This meant that, in general, although there was a great deal of contact between Europeans and American Indians and both groups came to depend on each other in important ways, in the colonies of British North America, they largely remained separate (Bolt, 1987). With the exception of scattered military outposts American Indians still controlled the interior of British and French North America, thus limiting the extent of European influence. The primary method for maintaining peace between colonists and American Indians was to engage in treaties. English colonists viewed treaties as a legitimate way to gain possession of land held by American Indians and to assert that American Indians were subjects of the crown of England, whereas American Indians, on the other hand, viewed treaties as a way to establish alliances, secure exchanges of land and resources, and, at times, to argue the terms and conditions of the relationship (Calloway, 2004). Indian/European relations varied greatly by colony, but, in general the relationship was often tense and punctuated by violence and misunderstanding as colonists expanded further into Indian lands (Szasz, 1988).

Despite periodic violence, scattered attempts were made during the colonial period to convert and educate American Indians as “civilized Christians” (Prucha, 1984; Szasz, 1988). In fact, the need to Christianize and civilize the natives was written into some colonial charters (Szasz, 1988). Puritans in New England, for example, established “praying towns” for Christianized Indians as early as 1646, in what historian Paula Mitchell Marks (1998) characterizes as the “precursors of the highly controlled Indian

reservations of the mid- to late- nineteenth-century” (p. 15). From the beginning, in their efforts to educate American Indians, Europeans were driven by ethnocentrism and a desire to spread their faith (Szasz, 1988). Indians, although a political and economic force to be respected, were viewed as uncivilized heathens in their tribal state. It was believed that if more Indians would adopt the trappings of European civilization, which meant converting to Christianity and farming, then perhaps the relationship with Indian peoples would improve (Szasz, 1988). In this respect, attempts to educate Indians were complementary to the overall efforts of the colony to maintain peaceful relations. But, as colonial populations grew and increasing pressure was put on Indian tribes to give up their land, education became less of a choice and more of the price of colonial expansion.

#### Indians and the Formation of the United States

The independence of the United States from Great Britain had little impact on popular attitudes towards American Indians and despite the Enlightenment principles on which the new nation was founded, policy towards American Indians changed very little after the Revolution. Interestingly, when the boundaries of the new nation were established by the Treaty of Paris in 1783 there was no mention of Indians, it was assumed that all lands once held by Great Britain would then transfer to the United States by right of conquest (Wilkins & Lomawaima, 2002). Then, when the U.S. Constitution was drafted, American Indians were recognized not as foreign people or nations, but as distinct political entities with which Congress was given the exclusive right to trade. In addition, for purposes of taxation and representation, “Indians not taxed” were to be excluded, in another example of their unique position. Although American Indians were clearly defined as outside of the new nation, independence led to territorial expansion and

increased tensions between settlers and American Indian tribes (Hoxie, Hoffman, & Albert, 1999). In an effort to maintain peace on the frontier, the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 laid the foundation for Indian policy west of the Appalachians, stating: “[t]he utmost good faith shall always be observed towards the Indians, their lands and property shall never be taken from them without their consent” (National Archives, 1787). In addition, George Washington passed a series of Trade and Intercourse Acts that set aside government funds to purchase tools and animals to encourage Indians to adopt a more “civilized” life (Holm, 2005; Prucha, 1970). Having established a policy of good faith in theory, in practice, American policy as the nation expanded was guided by two basic principles: that the United States held the title to all lands occupied by American Indians, but that they would continue the English tradition of negotiating with Indian tribes through treaty-making (Deloria, 1992). As in earlier times, the aim of U.S. policy towards American Indians was the acquisition of their land in the most peaceful manner possible (Calloway, 2004).

Thomas Jefferson, one of the early influential architects of U.S. Indian policy, characterized the relationship between the United States and American Indians in terms of a “coincidence of interests,” which historian David Adams (1988) restated this way: “Indians possessed the land and needed civilization; Whites, on the other hand, had civilization but needed the land” (p. 17). In fact, Jefferson reasoned that too much land would prove to be a disincentive for Indians to adopt civilized habits because he believed they would naturally prefer to hunt. The argument was that if Indians were encouraged to adopt the values and economic practices of “civilized” white society their need for land would decrease and their desire for white goods would increase. Accordingly, Jefferson

encouraged increased white settlement and trade so that “the good and influential individuals among them” would incur debt that would require them to give up more of their land (Prucha, 1975). Eventually, Jefferson reasoned further, as the available lands became increasingly scarce and American Indians were surrounded by settlers, they would need to “either incorporate with us as citizens of the United States, or remove beyond the Mississippi” (Prucha, 1975). Jefferson’s strategy led to over thirty treaties that resulted in the loss of over 200,000 square miles of Indian land (Calloway, 2004).

Jefferson’s faith in progress allowed him to imagine that once American Indians settled down as farmers they would prove themselves worthy of citizenship. He believed in “the inherent racial equality of Indians with whites and their innate capacity for climbing the ladder of cultural evolution” (Wallace, 1999, p. 78). In order for this to happen, Jefferson understood American Indians would need to be converted to “the white man’s way of agriculture, domestic manufactures, and education” (Wallace, 1999, p. 78). Education was part of the deal: “goods and education needed for survival as European-style agriculturalists and citizens of the republic in exchange for their lands” (Wallace, 1999, p. 225). Similar to the colonial period, the education of American Indians in the early national period continued to be characterized by efforts to spread Christianity and encourage Indian adoption of “civilized habits.” Those who resisted the natural and inevitable path of progress, Jefferson believed, would be faced with extinction. From the foundations of the nation, citizenship was synonymous with independence, self-sufficiency, and morality—all required for self-government—according to people like Jefferson. Even though Jefferson envisioned citizenship as a potential end of policy

towards American Indians, the realities of the frontier made the realization of such a policy a virtual impossibility.

### Removal

The promise to keep the “utmost good faith” towards American Indians and their land was put to the test in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. As the area of the United States doubled and waves of settlers traveled west, the relationship between American Indians and the United States entered a new phase. The period was marked by continued conflict as tribes were pushed further west and increased pressure was put on American Indians to give up their lands. By this point, the southern United States had become the world’s leading supplier of cotton, and the value of land had increased dramatically (Calloway, 2004). Confronted by this increased pressure, the U.S. government was faced with four different alternatives to solve the “Indian problem”: destroy them through warfare, assimilate them, protect them and their lands, or relocate them further west (Calloway, 2004). The pressure was so great on many tribes that even some American Indians came to feel that removal represented the best opportunity for survival (Calloway, 2004). Some tribes, however, such as the Cherokee in Georgia, had adopted the “habits of civilized life;” developing a constitutional government, a system of writing, and agriculture. Despite this fact, the U.S. government pursued a policy of removal in the 1830s, uprooting thousands of American Indians in a series of forced marches, the most infamous being the Trail of Tears in 1838, to the Indian Territory of modern-day Oklahoma. This tragic period represented a shift in policies made during the early national period and it had ramifications for education policy.



President Andrew Jackson, who oversaw the removal policy, believed that Jefferson's policies of exchanging the "arts of civilization" for land had failed because Indians had been pushed further into the wilderness, where they "retained their savage habits" (cited in Prucha, 1975, p. 47). In addition, Jackson feared that the history of conflict on the frontier had caused American Indians to come to "look upon us as unjust and indifferent to their fate" (cited in Prucha, 1975, p. 47). Underlying his support of removal, however, was Jackson's belief that the Cherokee had no right to form a sovereign state, because the U.S. Constitution did not permit it (Calloway, 2004). The Cherokee's refusal to submit to the laws of the state of Georgia required that they should be removed for their own good, according to Jackson. To justify the removal policy, Jackson couched his argument in humanitarian terms by suggesting that they be removed so that they could "be secured in the enjoyment of governments of their own choice, subject to no other control for the United States than such as may be necessary to preserve peace on the frontier and between the several tribes" (cited in Prucha, 1975, p. 48). Once relocated, he believed that "the benevolent may endeavor to teach them the arts of civilization, and, by promoting union and harmony among them, to raise up an interesting commonwealth, destined to perpetuate the race and to attest the humanity and justice of this Government" (cited in Prucha, 1975 p. 48). In 1835, Jackson declared that "all preceding experiments for the improvement of the Indians have failed. It seems now to be an established fact that they can not live in contact with a civilized community and prosper" (Prucha, 1971, p. 71).

While Jackson refuted the Jeffersonian vision of American Indians assimilating into U.S. society, the removal policy also helped to define the legal status of the

American Indian in the United States, which had been ambiguous up until the removal of the Cherokee (Martin, 1990). Shortly after Congress narrowly passed the Indian Removal Act (1830), John Ross, the principal chief of the Cherokee, brought the issue of Indian sovereignty to the United State Supreme Court. In two significant rulings, Supreme Court Chief Justice John Marshall attempted to determine whether the state of Georgia had the jurisdiction to implement the removal policy. In *Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia* (1831) he characterized American Indians as members of “domestic, dependent nations,” but in the same ruling asserted that “their relation to the United States resembles that of a ward to his guardian” (*Cherokee Nation v. State of George*, 1831). Nevertheless, their sovereignty was recognized and the Supreme Court found that it had no jurisdiction in that case and could not determine the rights of the parties. A year later in the case of *Worcester v. Georgia* (1832), involving a white U.S. citizen refusing to take an oath of allegiance to the state of Georgia, Justice Marshall ruled that the state had illegally arrested the defendant because it had no authority to execute its laws within an Indian nation. In these two cases Marshall reaffirmed the federal government’s role in negotiating with Indian nations as sovereign entities, but did not resolve the issue of the legal status of individual American Indians. According to United States law, “Indians were nonentities and had no legal status” (Martin, 1990). It is important to note, however, that despite Marshall’s recognition of tribal sovereignty, the State of Georgia disregarded those rights in implementing the policy that led to the Cherokee and other tribe’s removal from that state (Calloway, 2004).

## Antebellum: The Era of Manifest Destiny

While the removal period was tragic, many hoped that once removed American Indians would be able to follow their own paths, free from interference by the U.S. government. Unfortunately, this was not the case, as the decades following removal of the Cherokee were some of the deadliest in the relationship between the United States and American Indians (Calloway, 2004; Prucha, 1984). Rather than entering a vacuum, tribes that had been pushed west came into competition and conflict with the tribes of the Great Plains. In addition, the ravages of disease and a series of Indian wars decimated Indian populations, leading to a new era in Indian/white relations (Prucha, 1984). Determined to protect settlers and trade routes, the United States used its military to implement its policy designed to reduce conflict and encourage nomadic tribes to settle down by delineating the boundaries within which Indian peoples could live. Still negotiating with Indian tribes with treaties, such as one at Fort Laramie in 1851, the U.S. government attempted to compel the tribes of the Great Plains to settle down and adopt the “civilized” habits of their white neighbors (Prucha, 1984). Often times, however, the land set aside for reservations was not suitable for agriculture and the promises of support made in treaties were not realized.

Against this violent backdrop, the legal status of individual Indians was again addressed by the Supreme Court. This time, in the context of antebellum disputes over the citizenship status of the descendents of slave, the court ruled in *Dred Scott v. Sanford* (1856), “although they [American Indians] were uncivilized, they were yet a free and independent people, associated together in nations or tribes, and governed by their own laws” (*Dred Scott v. Sanford*, 1856). A significant departure from Marshall’s previous

rulings, Judge Taney in issuing his ruling also characterized Indian nations as “foreign Governments” whose peoples had been treated as foreigners. This interpretation was significant because, unlike the Marshall decision, if Indians were now considered members of foreign nations the implication was that individuals were also eligible for citizenship through naturalization (Martin, 1990). However, the Dred Scott decision did not resolve the issue because the Naturalization Act of 1790 restricted the right to becoming a citizen to “aliens being free white persons.” Although Justice Taney recognized the impracticality of naturalizing Indians who were still in “a state of savagery,” he did imagine the possibility of Indians who left their tribes and assimilated becoming citizens (Martin, 1990). In practice, the Dred Scott case had little legal impact because the treatment of American Indians was included in the obiter dicta, the section of the decision in which the judge details his argument, not in the ruling itself (Martin, 1990). Nevertheless, at the heart of the matter was the belief that American Indians living in tribal relations were not prepared or qualified to become citizens of the United States. Even if they left their tribe it was not clear what their legal status would be.

As the reservation system was established education policy continued to be a central feature of the exchange of land for peace. According to many of the treaties signed during this period, funds were to be set aside for the building of schools and the promotion of “civilization” as a way to individualize and detribalize American Indians (Prucha, 1984). But, as reflected in the Dred Scott case, Indians for the most part were still considered outside the pale of civilization. As in earlier times, education was directed at encouraging American Indians to settle down and adopt civilization and, in the

context of the Indian wars, it was probably difficult for most to imagine a policy directed at preparing Indians for citizenship.

### Post-Civil War

The critical period in the development of a system of education for American Indians came after the Civil War. With the war over, there was a spirit of reform and renewal that permeated all parts of U.S. society (Prucha, 1984). In addition, the population of the western United States skyrocketed as the country was connected by the transcontinental railroad. In this context, the stage was set for another change in U.S. policy towards American Indians. The efforts to confine American Indians to reservations had led to increased violence as many tribes resisted efforts to force them to settle down. Many came to believe that the reservation system, too, was seriously flawed. In 1865, the Doolittle Commission conducted an extensive survey of the reservations and revealed that conditions were miserable and that the population of American Indians was in rapid decline (Holm, 2005, p. 4). Motivated by a desire to secure peaceful relations and a spirit of Christian humanitarianism, President Ulysses S. Grant implemented his “Peace Policy.” After reviewing Indian policy, the Indian Peace Commission suggested that the reasons for conflict stem from “the antipathy of race,” “the differences in customs and manners,” and “the difference in language,” which divided Indians from whites (Prucha, 1975, p. 107). To end conflict the commission recommended the need to, “educate and instruct [American Indians] in the peaceful arts—in other words, to civilize the Indians” (Prucha, 1975, p. 108). In implementing his policy Grant established the Board of Indian Commissioners, “a group of zealously Christian, business-minded, Republican reformers” to oversee the management of the

reservation system (Holm, 2005, p. 5). In addition, Grant appointed missionaries as Indian agents, and called for the building of schools on the reservations (Holm, 2005). Even though the U.S. Government was committed to civilizing the Indian on reservations, the legal status of American Indians was still being debated in the context of post-Civil War racial politics.

Many assume that the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment settled the issue of citizenship by establishing a color-blind Constitution (Anderson, 2007). But that idea, supported by a small number of radical Republicans, “stood in marked contrast to the views of the moderate-conservative majority, a group virtually obsessed with the ways in which race affected fundamental questions of citizenship, civic equality, and political power,” argues historian James Anderson (p. 250). At question was the proper wording of the amendment that would allow newly freed slaves to become citizens, but not American Indians. The majority of the Senate felt that Indians were not ready for citizenship in their current state (Martin, 1990). Senator Howard from Michigan, for example, expressed his concern this way:

I am not prepared to pass a sweeping act of naturalization by which all Indian savages, wild or tame, belonging to a tribal relation, are to become my fellow citizens and go to the polls and vote with me and hold lands and deal in every other way that a citizen of the United States has a right to do. (cited in Martin, 1990)

After much debate, and many opportunities to create a color-blind constitution, the legislature settled on the wording “subject to the jurisdiction thereof” as the “best means to exclude Indians from birthright citizenship,” argues Anderson (p. 252). It was clearly

understood that “subject to the jurisdiction thereof” served as a “proxy for ‘uncivilized Indians’ or Indians deemed unworthy of American citizenship” (p. 252). The fact that most American Indians lived in tribal relations—thus owing their allegiance to their tribe—and were not Christian was grounds for most to deny them the rights of citizenship. The implication at this point was that citizenship entailed the exercise of political rights, Christian values, and responsibilities that were beyond the capabilities of most American Indians.

While Congress determined that American Indians were not worthy of citizenship, they also determined that they were not worthy of being treated as sovereign peoples. In 1871, Congress passed an appropriations act that declared, “No Indian nation or tribe...shall be acknowledged or recognized as an independent nation, tribe, or power with whom the United States may contract by treaty” (Congressional Record, 1871). After nearly one hundred years and over 650 treaties, the United States abruptly decided to end its nation-to-nation relations and engage with American Indian tribes through legislation that did not require their consent. Although treaties made before 1871 were still honored, Congress’ decision reflected paternalistic attitude that the future place of American Indians was inside and not outside the United States. The decision to end the treaty-making relationship marked a beginning of a new policy aimed at eventually making citizens of American Indians (Prucha, 1984).

It was in this context that a lieutenant in the U.S. Cavalry and veteran of the Indian Wars, Richard Henry Pratt, was charged with the task of taking a group of prisoners of war to St. Augustine, Florida. Pratt’s experiences on the frontier had given him a deep interest in the situation of American Indian peoples. Convinced that the

United States was perpetrating an egregious crime by segregating Indian peoples on reservations, Pratt was convinced that, if American Indians were to survive, they needed to be assimilated into the United States as equal citizens (Pratt, 2003). A more in-depth analysis of Pratt's philosophy is offered in the next chapter, but beginning in 1875 Pratt was given permission to begin an experiment in education with a group of prisoners of war that eventually led to the creation of the Carlisle Industrial Indian School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. The creation of a system of off-reservation boarding schools for American Indians, which began with Carlisle, and a smaller program at the Hampton Institute in Virginia, marked the beginning of an intensive twenty-five year movement to mold American Indians into U.S. citizens. Education, however, was just one piece of a larger policy designed to detribalize and individualize American Indians by incorporating them and their land into the United States.

#### Citizenship and Allotment: The Final Assault on Tribal Sovereignty

By the time Pratt opened Carlisle in 1879, the idea of granting citizenship to American Indians who had given up their "tribal relations" and adopted the lives of independent farmers was not a new idea. In 1868, for example, the Treaty of Fort Laramie extended citizenship to Indians who received a patent for their land by demonstrating their ability to "improve" the land through cultivation (cited in Prucha, 1975, p. 112), but at the national level the issue was still contentious. Illustrating the controversial nature of the issue of Indian citizenship, the Supreme Court ruled in *Standing Bear v. Crook* (1879), a case that attracted national attention, that a group of twenty-five Ponca Indians arrested after attempting to leave the Indian Territory and return to their old reservation were entitled to the writ of habeas corpus. Reaffirming the



decision making tribal Indians ineligible for citizenship, but recognizing that they were entitled to basic protections of the U.S. Constitution because they met Webster's Dictionary definition of a "person," the ruling was significant because it determined that the U.S. government needed to act within the law in its treatment of American Indians (Martin, 1990). Then, in 1884 the Supreme Court revisited the issue of Indian citizenship in the case of *Elk v. Wilkins*, which again involved an Indian who voluntarily left his tribe, assimilated into white society, and attempted to vote. This time the court clearly ruled that he was not a citizen, citing the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment and its exclusion of American Indians because they were not within the jurisdiction of the United States government. The fact that the defendant had left his tribe was not considered enough because the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment stated American Indians could not become citizens by birth, and naturalization required an affirmative act of Congress (Martin, 1990). Essentially, the court decided that American Indians could not decide to become citizens, only an act of Congress could grant citizenship, something it was not willing to do. The reluctance to grant citizenship or to recognize the civil rights of assimilated Indians is indicative of the attitudes held by policymakers, politicians, and the general public at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. American Indians, particularly in the West, were considered incapable of becoming citizens because most associated citizenship with Christian values and the knowledge and skills required of an emergent capitalist society, something that most tribal American Indians lacked in their eyes.

Even though they reflected popular attitudes, the decisions in *Elk v. Wilkins* (1884) and *Standing Bear v. Crook* (1879) caused controversy particularly among individuals who were sympathetic to the plight of American Indians (Hoxie, 2001). In

the wake of these decisions several influential civil rights organizations were created that began advocating for changes in U.S. Indian policy. In addition, reformers who dubbed themselves the “Friends of the Indians” began holding conferences in 1883 at the Lake Mohonk Resort near New Paltz, New York to discuss the reform of Indian policy. It was at these meetings that the cause of Indian citizenship education became a matter of serious discussion (Prucha, 1973). Reformers recognized the need to create a new Indian policy that was imbued with their faith in the power of white civilization to uplift American Indians and that would do justice to the Christian ideals of the nation (Adams, 1995; Prucha, 1979). As a result of pressure from reformers a new policy was created that aimed at individualizing the American Indian by breaking up the reservations into allotments of land, granting citizenship, and providing a universal system of education to Americanize the American Indian (Prucha, 1973). Reformers believed that assimilation and Americanization, the two main thrusts of Indian policy beginning in the 1880s, would achieve the ultimate goal—an end to the “Indian problem.” Instead of viewing American Indians as an obstacle to the settlement of the United States, they were to become part of it.

The crowning achievement of the assimilation movement was the passage of the General Allotment Act of 1887. Also known as the Dawes Act (1887), named for its sponsor, Massachusetts senator Henry Dawes, it broke up the reservations by allotting tribal land to individual Indians. The reasoning behind allotment, according to Holm (2005), was that “the individual ownership of property would force American Indians to abandon their cultural heritages, enter mainstream American society, and shift their allegiances to the federal government as the ultimate protector of the right to private

property” (p. 11). Accordingly, citizenship was granted to those who accepted their allotments as well as those who had left their tribes and voluntarily “adopted the habits of civilized life” (Prucha, 1975, p. 174). For the reformers who met at the Lake Mohonk Conferences citizenship represented individualism, Protestantism, and freedom from the reservation system (Adams, 1984, 1995; Prucha, 1973). Yet, it was also understood that most American Indians living in tribal relations were not ready for its responsibilities. One prominent reformer, Carl Schurz, characterized citizenship as a “dangerous gift” and argued that it should be regarded as the “terminal, not as the initial, point of their development” (Prucha, 1973). To protect American Indians land allotted by the Dawes Act (1887) was held in severalty, meaning it could not be sold for a period of twenty-five years. In addition, reformers advocated for a system of federally-controlled schools to mold American Indians into the type of citizens they envisioned.

Influenced greatly by Pratt’s “successes” at Carlisle, the system of education created for American Indians in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century was a combination of day schools, reservation, and off-reservation boarding schools. In theory, younger students were to be educated in the day schools and then boarding schools on the reservations, and some would go on to off-reservation boarding schools for more advanced education. In reality, even the very youngest children were sent to off-reservation schools, often hundreds of miles from their homes (Child, 2000). In an effort to increase enrollment and address the reluctance of many parents to send their children to schools away from their communities, reservation agents were given the authority to compel students to attend. By 1900 there were 25 off-reservation schools located throughout the country. Approximately 85% of Indian children were educated in either reservation or off-

reservation boarding schools by 1900 (Adams, 1988, p. 13). Although the majority of these schools were located west of the Mississippi River, the most influential continued to be Carlisle and Hampton Institute in Virginia.

Off-reservation schools varied greatly depending on their location but they were united by the common philosophy underlying assimilation, namely that American Indians were possessed of uncivilized qualities that needed to be redressed by the schools. With this philosophy in mind the schools sought to destroy all elements of tribal culture and identity (Adams, 1995; Coleman, 2008; Prucha, 1984). In many respects these schools must be considered unique in the history of American education. In addition to physically removing the Indian children from their homes, sometimes by force, the children were subjected to a complete physical transformation that involved the cutting of hair and the wearing of uniforms. Indian languages were officially banned by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as were most tribal customs, including rituals and ceremonies. Strict militaristic regimentation was followed at many of the schools. In general, the education provided at the schools was rudimentary, including a basic academic education and a strong component of industrial training (a more complete discussion of the nature and meaning of the curriculum is to follow). A popular element of many off-reservation schools was the “outing system” created to immerse the Indian student in the dominant culture by having them do mostly manual labor on farms and in houses in the white community. All elements of the institutions were intentionally designed to serve the ultimate purpose of the schools which was the destruction of native culture and the assimilation of American Indians into the dominant society.

Despite their unwavering belief in the superiority of white, Anglo-Saxon culture, there were significant differences in the ways the schools approached the assimilationist policy (Fear-Segal, 2007; Lindsey, 1995). A more detailed analysis of the ideological bases of their differences will be offered in the next chapter, but two schools stand out for their influence on the development of Indian schooling in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries as well as for their lasting impact on Native communities. Reflecting the debate over the fitness of American Indians for the responsibilities of citizenship, the Carlisle Indian Industrial School and the Indian program at the Hampton Institute developed educational programs for their students that mirrored this debate. At the heart of the debate was the role citizenship should play in preparing American Indians for self-sufficiency. Even though most white reformers held an earnest desire to free American Indians from the supervision of the U.S. government, which meant providing them with an education that would prepare them to become independent, self-sufficient, land owners, there was significant disagreement about the nature of citizenship and the appropriateness of a policy that would prepare American Indians for its responsibilities.

#### Turn of the Century: Decline

The hope of Christian humanitarians, such as Henry Dawes, that American Indians would become the political and cultural equals of whites through the private ownership of land, however, was short-lived in the reality of the American West. Once the Dawes Act (1887) took effect, it became clear to the Indian Office that tribes owning valuable land would need federal protection from unscrupulous settlers (McDonnell, 1991). This period illustrates the fundamental dilemma of those involved in solving the “Indian problem”: how to grant freedom to while at the same time protecting American

Indians. The solution to this dilemma was the abandonment of full equality for a new relationship based on the doctrine of guardianship, which granted limited citizenship but reserved the right of the federal government to intervene when deemed necessary (Hoxie, 2001, p. 213). While the presumption of guardianship was deeply rooted in the paternalistic and ethnocentric policies that defined the relationship from earliest times, the drive to assimilate American Indians meant a redefinition of their legal status that had significant implications for the type of education proposed by policymakers.

In law, the guardian relationship was reflected in two significant legal decisions: *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock* (1902) and the Burke Act of 1906. In the Lone Wolf case the Supreme Court upheld its plenary powers to abrogate the provisions of an Indian treaty. According to George Kennan, a muckraking journalist during the period, in the Lone Wolf case “the Supreme Court has virtually given Congress full power to take Indian lands without Indians’ consent” (cited in Hoxie, 2001, p. 155). Then, in 1906, Congress passed the Burke Act delaying the grant of citizenship until the end of the 25 trust period established by the Dawes Act (1887). In addition, discretion was given to the Secretary of the Interior to grant citizenship to Indians he deemed competent. The Burke Act (1906) reflected the concern that many Indians were not sufficiently “civilized” to become citizens. Hoxie (2001) argues that by the early 20th century, a category of partial citizenship was created for American Indians based on their perceived “unfitness” for modern life (p. 230).

Reflecting this redefinition of citizenship and the continued paternalism of the United States in dealing with Indian peoples, policymakers at the turn of the century began to criticize the efforts to education American Indians as extravagant.

Commissioner of Indian Affairs Francis Leupp argued further that providing boarding school education to the Indian had led to his pauperism. In reference to education being the source of his destitution Leupp (1910) called the American Indian “the only inhabitant of the United States for whom the Government furnished an education, with support thrown in, free of all expense or future obligation- sets a price upon his acceptance of the favor, and gets it!” (p. 33). Unlike many of the early architects of the system of off-reservation schools, people like Leupp held very low expectations for Indian students. Still couching their mission in the language of citizenship, they attempted to revise Indian policy to reflect their lower expectations. Rather than preparing Indian students for equal citizenship, in the 20th century, schools began to emphasize self-support as the goal of Indian education (Hoxie, 1984; Prucha, 1984). In reality, the movement away from preparation for full and equal citizenship was not as radical as some historians have argued (Fear-Segal, 2007). Continuing to underlay Indian educational policy, and Indian policy in general, was an effort to incorporate Indian lands into the United States. An examination of the curriculum of these schools, the topic of chapter 5 of this study, will examine the relationship between citizenship, land, and education.

### Conclusion

By 1916, support for the assimilation of American Indians through a system of off-reservation boarding schools continued to wane. When Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Cato Sells, authorized the last-arrow ceremonies, the schools at both Carlisle and Hampton were on the brink of closing their doors to Indian students. Among the many ironies of Indian citizenship education was that a significant reason for their closing was

that many enlisted to fight in World War I, despite the fact many were not legally citizens (Lindsey, 1995). The closing of Carlisle and the Indian program at Hampton reflects the movement away from assimilation as the goal of Indian education. By the 1920's, there was a growing respect for Indian cultures and the remaining schools were harshly criticized for their poor treatment of Indian students (Holm, 2005; Szasz, 1974).

By 1924, partially in recognition for their service to the United States, full citizenship was eventually granted universally to American Indians. But, it is important to note that even then their legal rights continued to be limited by individual states and that it was not until the 1950s that American Indians were able to vote in some states (Holm, 2005). Even though there is considerable debate among historians about the meaning of citizenship for American Indians (Holm, 2005; Hoxie, 1984; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2007; Prucha, 1984), in the end, the drive to assimilate and prepare American Indians for citizenship should be appreciated in terms of its impact on American Indian nations: the loss of land, the erosion of tribal sovereignty, and the destruction of Indian cultures and ways of life. When viewed in the context of the historical development of Indian/white relations, citizenship education is the logical result of a colonial relationship. From the earliest period of contact American Indians have been on the losing end of an exchange that involved the trade of land for trade goods, promises of fair treatment, and finally their tribal sovereignty.



## Chapter 4

## Transformation or Improvement:

## Citizenship Education and the Solution to the “Indian Problem”

I like the Indian for what is Indian in him. Let us not make the mistake, in the process of absorbing them, of washing out whatever is distinctly Indian. Our aboriginal brothers bring, as his contribution to the common store of character, a great deal which is admirable, and which only needs to be developed along the right line. Our proper work is *improvement, not transformation*.

(italics added, ARCIA, 1905, p. 12)

As the above statement suggests, those responsible for Indian education policy in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century were concerned about the proper way to “absorb” American Indians into the United States. Commissioner of Indian Affairs Francis Leupp, the quotation’s author, was particularly adamant that it was frivolous to try to change the culture of American Indians in order to prepare them for citizenship in the United States. Motivated by a seemingly contradictory combination of respect for native cultures and lower expectations for what Indians could achieve, Leupp’s beliefs stood in marked contrast to the assimilationist vision and practices that characterized Indian education policy and curriculum of the previous 25 years (Hoxie, 2001). Based on the belief that citizenship required American Indians to shed their “inferior” culture and lifestyles, a system of off-reservation schools was created throughout the United States to prepare American Indians to become citizens.

In 1905, when Leupp expressed his concern about the efforts to transform Indian students, the debate over the appropriate way to prepare American Indians for their future status as citizens was not new. From the very beginning of the movement to educate American Indians in off-reservation schools, individuals with different philosophies regarding the capabilities of Indian students to fulfill the responsibilities of citizenship shaped the curriculum of the schools. Although most policymakers understood citizenship to be the ultimate end of U.S. Indian policy, competing conceptions of race, citizenship, and education significantly influenced the debate over the appropriate way to realize this goal. An examination of the influence of several key individuals responsible for creating and implementing the citizenship education curriculum of off-reservation boarding schools during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries reveals that even though education policymakers were united in their desire to remove the legal barriers that treated American Indians as sovereign nations, they were divided over the nature of the citizenship they envisioned and how long it would take for Indians to achieve it. Accordingly, for some education policymakers, citizenship education required teaching American Indians to *know their place* as a racially and politically inferior class; for others, it required teaching Indian students to *take their place* as cultural and political equals. Either way, citizenship education came at a significant price for American Indians.

This chapter explores the beliefs of some key policymakers who were influential in shaping Indian citizenship education during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Behind the scenes of Indian education were policymakers and school administrators who shaped the citizenship education policy and curriculum of off-reservation boarding

schools in both direct and indirect ways. In much the same way Herbert Kliebard (1995) characterizes the development of the public school curriculum in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries as being the product of an ideological battle between competing interest groups, those creating citizenship education for American Indians were also waging an ideological battle. Although it was shaped by similar influences, the debate over Indian education took on new meaning in the context of Indian/white relations at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The relationship between American Indians and the United States government—shaped by colonial land policies and a history of violent conflict—makes the debate over the citizenship education of American Indians unique and important to understand.

#### The “Friends of the Indian” and the Roots of Assimilation

The movement to create citizens of American Indians occurred during a tumultuous period in Indian/white relations. As the United States was still healing from the open wounds of the Civil War, the western portion of the country remained a battlefield of sorts as Indian peoples were engaged in a violent struggle for their cultural and political survival (Calloway, 2004). The territorial expansion of the United States, spurred on by advancements in technology and waves of settlers flooding the plains in search of land and natural resources in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, required addressing the future place of the American Indian in the United States. Policies aimed at confining American Indian nations onto reservations in the hope that they would settle down and adopt “civilized habits” met with violent resistance. To preserve the peace the United States government negotiated treaties that promised financial compensation for Indian land and support in the form of food and supplies. Eventually, policymakers feared that

the reservation system, rather than encouraging the adoption of “civilized habits,” was actually inhibiting the civilization of American Indians and increasing their dependency. “Carrying to them victuals and clothes, thus relieving them of the necessity of labor,” argued Commissioner of Indian Affairs Hiram Price, “never will and never can civilize them” (ARCIA, 1880, p. iii). In addition, the declining population of American Indians, caused by decades of conflict and squalid conditions on the reservations, led to fears that American Indians were on the verge of extinction (Hoxie, 2001). In this context a reform movement began that sought to incorporate American Indians and their land into the United States by removing the legal and cultural barriers that separated them (Hertzberg, 1999; Prucha, 1973).

The cause of the American Indian was taken up by reformers who understood the source of the problem to lie not in any inherent racial defect but in the misdeeds of past generations and contemporaneous policies that segregated American Indians onto reservations (Prucha, 1973). Historian Frederick Hoxie (2001) identifies an event known as the “Ponca Affair” as epitomizing what reformers understood to be wrong with Indian policy and helped spark the movement for Indian citizenship. The event involved the arrest of a leader of the Ponca tribe of Nebraska named Standing Bear who was attempting to return to his tribe’s homelands from their reservation in the Indian Territory in Oklahoma in order to bury his son. Outraged that Standing Bear was denied due process simply because he was an Indian, several prominent leaders took up his cause, arguing that his humanity entitled him to basic protections under the law. Soon after the incident Standing Bear and his supporters began a citizen’s tour to raise awareness of the unjust treatment of American Indians and to call for new solutions to the “Indian

problem.” They argued that the reservation system was anathema to the ideals of the nation because it unfairly restricted the freedom of American Indians, denied them their rights, and segregated them from the rest of the United States, thus preventing them from following the path of civilization.

Shortly after the “Ponca Affair” several groups formed dedicated to the cause of Indian civil rights, including the Indian Rights Association, the Women’s National Indian Association, and the Boston Indian Citizenship Committee. One of the most prominent groups, the Indian Rights Association, declared as its purpose “the civilization of the two hundred and ninety thousand Indians of the United States and to prepare the way for their absorption into the common life of our own people” (in Prucha, 1973, p. 42-43). But perhaps the most influential Indian reform group, known as the “Friends of the Indian,” began meeting in 1883 at the Lake Mohonk Resort, near Lake Paltz, New York. The group was comprised of prominent lawmakers, religious leaders, and Indian leaders, and it met annually to discuss important issues related to the “Indian problem.” Throughout the late 19<sup>th</sup> century the “Friends of the Indian” was a driving force behind the movement to assimilate American Indians (Burgess, 1975).

Convinced that American Indians could be saved from extinction only if they were assimilated into the United States, the “Friends of the Indian” supported a three-pronged solution they labeled the “vanishing policy” to achieve their goal (Prucha, 1973). First, they advocated for the grant of land in severalty, which required breaking up the tribal, communal ownership of land, dividing the reservations into sections of land suitable for individual farms, and assigning individuals to their allotted plots of land. Second, the grant of citizenship required the removal of laws and abrogation of treaties

that separated American Indians from the United States. Finally, they advocated for a system of education to prepare Indians for their new lives as citizens. All three policies were viewed by the “Friends of the Indian” as equally important for the overarching goal of assimilating American Indians into the United States and each policy was understood as being interconnected (Prucha, 1973).

Tying all of these policies together was a belief that citizenship represented the pinnacle of civilization—the ultimate goal of assimilation. According to Merrill Gates, one of the movement’s founders,

...[f]or what ought we to hope as the future of the Indian? What should the Indian become? To this there is one answer—and but one. He should become an intelligent citizen of the United States. There is no other ‘manifest destiny’ for any man or any body of men on our domain. (cited in Prucha, 1973, p. 46)

In the view of the “Friends of the Indian” there were two things holding American Indians back from citizenship: culture and policy. First and most significant in the minds of reformers was the notion that most American Indians had not yet reached the level of civilization required for political participation. Underlying their arguments for and against Indian citizenship was the ethnocentric belief that American Indians in a tribal state lacked the intellectual ability, values, and morals required of citizenship. In terms of what was lacking in Indian civilization, Seth Low, a well-known education reformer and president of Columbia University, explained, “What, then, is the fundamental aspect of the white man’s civilization as opposed to the red man’s? It is individual relation to law in place of tribal, individual duty toward law, and individual protection by law” (cited in Prucha, 1973, p. 220). Taken together, reformers understood that what kept

American Indians from achieving the status of citizen was their identity as an Indian, which they often characterized as tribal, pagan, and savage (Prucha, 1973). In general, the “Friends of the Indian” saw themselves as Christian humanitarians whose mission it was to save American Indians from extinction by erasing their Indian identity and replacing it with a new Christianized American identity. Specifically, reformers believed that citizenship required an ability to manage one’s own affairs (necessitated by the private ownership of land), Christian morality, an ability to participate in the political process, knowledge of English, and an allegiance to and love of the United States—which most American Indians in their view lacked (Adams, 1988, 1995).

While popular perceptions during the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century often characterized American Indians as irredeemable savages, underlying the assimilationist philosophy was an optimistic belief in the basic humanity of the American Indian that convinced reformers that they could be saved from extinction through a process of civilization, particularly if they were taught at a young age. For example, Commissioner of Indian Affairs Ezra Hayt explained, “Indian children are as bright and teachable as average white children of the same ages; and while the progress in the work of civilizing adult Indians who have had no educational advantages is a slow process at best, the progress of the youths trained in our schools is of the most hopeful character” (ARCIA, 1878, p. vii). Furthermore, reformers were also motivated by what they understood as the rightness of their cause. Many were veterans of the Civil War and were profoundly influenced by the spirit of Protestant evangelical social reform of the abolition movement (Prucha, 1973). In fact, just as Radical Republicans attempted to make up for the past wrongs of slavery by extending to African American men the rights and protections of equal citizenship,

those concerned with the welfare of the American Indian were motivated by a similar spirit of Christian brotherhood to make up for past wrongs. Reformers often alluded to the injustice of keeping American Indians in bondage on the reservations while emancipating African Americans from slavery. Lastly, the growing influence of the scientific study of the development of human societies, represented by the work of influential anthropologists such as Lewis Henry Morgan and John Wesley Powell, provided the “Friends of the Indian” with evidence that American Indians were capable of progressing through the stages of civilization, if they were provided with the proper environment in which to do so (Smith, 1997).

Even though the “Friends of the Indian” attacked the “Indian problem” with a missionary zeal, there were conflicting attitudes about the capability of American Indians to assume the responsibilities required of citizenship, and a paternalistic fear about what would happen if American Indians were not adequately prepared for citizenship. Citizenship, “if conferred indiscriminately...would be of incalculable damage to them” argued Hayt (ARCIA, 1877, p. ix-x). He and other reformers feared that citizenship would lead to the corruption of American Indians because they would be forced to compete with their white neighbors before they were ready. Even Henry Dawes, the senator whose name became synonymous with the effort to assimilate American Indians, expressed concern that Indians were not ready for citizenship:

What is he [the American Indian]? Blind, helpless, ignorant. Not one in a hundred speak the language of the country. The responsibilities of citizenship you have put upon him, without his even knowing what you were doing, or



having the faintest idea of what you were imposing up on him. (cited in Prucha, 1973, p. 104)

In addition, reformers and education policymakers acknowledged that citizenship was not necessarily something that American Indians desired. Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz argued that most American Indians viewed citizenship as “a dangerous gift,” something that they neither wanted nor understood (cited in Prucha, 1973, p. 16).

For some reformers, citizenship was viewed as a civilizing force and that more harm would come both to American Indians and to the ideals of the United States by delaying its grant. One of the most outspoken critics of gradualism was Merrill Gates, a highly respected member of the Board of Indian Commissioners and president of Amherst College. In arguing for immediate Indian citizenship he compared the cause of the Indian to the freed slave by suggesting: “by the stupendous precedent of eight millions of freedmen made citizens in a day, we have committed ourselves to the theory that the way to fit men for citizenship is to make them citizens” (Prucha, 1973, p. 46). Expressing his faith in the ability of the American Indian to protect his own interests, Gates argued further that he would rather “see the Indians run the risk of being flattered a little by candidates for Congress” (p. 46). Philip Garrett, a lawyer and advocate for Indian rights, argued that granting citizenship was even a moral obligation:

Let him lay aside his picturesque blanket and moccasin, and, clad in the panoply of American citizenship, seek his chances of fortune or loss in the stern battle of life with the Aryan races. It will be no hardship, no unkindness to ask this of him. If civilization is a blessing, then in the name of Christianity let us offer it as a boon, even to the untutored savage. (cited in Prucha, 1973, p. 65)

Accordingly, Garrett expressed a common plea made by many “Friends of the Indian”:  
“...with fraternal cordiality, let us welcome to the bosom of the nation this brother whom we have wronged long enough” (p. 65).

Although they may have disagreed about the timing of the grant of citizenship and the speed of the civilizing process, one thing the producers of assimilation policy held in common was the belief that American Indians were capable of becoming civilized and that education was both the most efficient and moral way to achieve their goal. “Schools are less expensive than war. It costs less to educate an Indian than it does to shoot him. A long and costly experience demonstrated that fact” argued Lyman Abbott, another ardent assimilationist (cited in Prucha, 1973, p. 212). Education for citizenship involved shaping the political identities of students and preparing students for new roles. Although there was much overlap in the minds of reformers about the requirements of citizenship, in that a level of civilization was required of citizenship, to be a citizen required a love of country, allegiance to democratic principles, material independence and self-sufficiency, and high moral character. Off-reservation schools, it was argued, were required to achieve these new higher expectations for American Indians. Preparing Indian students for citizenship meant not only removing the legal barriers and ending the reservation system that segregated them from the rest of the United States, but it also meant saving them from their own “inferior” culture.

The men and women who met at the Lake Mohonk Conferences played an important role in creating and implementing the system of education to prepare American Indians for citizenship. Although curriculum historians are generally skeptical of the influence of policymakers far removed from schools (Goodson, 1985), the support of the

“Friends of the Indians” for off-reservation schools and land reform legislation came at a critical period in the nascent assimilation movement (Adams, 1995; Hoxie, 2001). In addition, many influential school administrators and superintendents with more direct influence over the curriculum of the schools, such as Richard Henry Pratt and Samuel Chapman Armstrong, often attended the annual conferences. Understanding their views helps to appreciate how and why the movement to assimilate American Indians began, as well as to appreciate how education fit into the broader movement to solve the “Indian problem.” Creating citizens of American Indians involved much more than a simple legislative act; it entailed a comprehensive assimilationist program to transform them by individualizing them in the ownership of land and educating them for civilization, so that they would vanish into American society.

#### Richard Henry Pratt: The Red Man’s Moses

In what must have seemed a fortuitous coincidence to the “Friends of the Indian,” just as outrage over the reservation system was building and demands for equal opportunities and rights for American Indians were growing stronger, a like-minded former lieutenant in the U.S. cavalry was given permission to begin an experiment that would profoundly influence the debate over the citizenship education of American Indians well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In 1875, Richard Henry Pratt was charged with the duty of taking 18 prisoners of war captured during the Red River War to a prison in St. Augustine, Florida. Convinced that his Indian prisoners were capable of becoming “civilized,” Pratt turned the prison into a school (Pratt, 2003). Reflecting what was to become the core of his educational philosophy, Pratt attempted to mold his Indian prisoners into model citizens by teaching them English, converting them to Christianity,

and putting them to work in prison industries, such as polishing shells for tourists and other menial labor. To complete the transformation, “by kindly persuasion” Pratt had his prisoners wear military uniforms and cut their hair so that they would not invite “the stare of visitors who invariably noted every difference between them and ourselves” (Pratt, 2003, p. 118). Emboldened by his success after three years at St. Augustine, Pratt lobbied his superiors to continue his experiment at the Hampton Institute, a recently established school in Virginia for freed African Americans. After only a short stay at Hampton, Pratt became disillusioned with the biracial nature of education there (Pratt, 2003). Fearing that his students would be further handicapped by the racial prejudices most Americans felt towards African Americans, Pratt petitioned the government to allow him to open his own boarding school for American Indian students on the grounds of a former army barracks in Carlisle, Pennsylvania (Pratt, 2003).

The Carlisle Indian Industrial School opened in 1879 and it soon became the flagship of the off-reservation boarding school movement, while Pratt became the most influential force in Indian education in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. An ardent—and by all accounts intransigent—believer in assimilation, Pratt’s philosophy and methods were perhaps the clearest expression of the assimilationist movement. In reference to Pratt’s influence on Indian education, Elaine Goodale Eastman (1935) entitled her biography of him, *Pratt, the Red Man’s Moses*. In many ways Pratt’s beliefs were in alignment with those of other prominent “Friends of the Indian.” He shared their overarching concern that the Indian needed to be put on the path to civilization or else face extinction. He admired many qualities he believed American Indians possessed, such as loyalty and bravery, but he shared an antipathy for what he felt kept them from developing along the

lines of civilization: namely, their tribal, communal identity. He also believed strongly that the reason for the “Indian problem” was the policy that segregated American Indians on reservations, thus preventing them from developing along the lines of civilization. Accordingly, Pratt believed the solution to the “Indian problem” lay in removing the legal and cultural barriers that prevented their progress. A closer examination of Pratt’s beliefs, particularly as they relate to the intersection of race, citizenship, and education, helps to illuminate the core philosophy of the assimilationist movement and how it was translated into the effort to transform American Indians into citizens.

Underlying Pratt’s philosophy and expressed in all of his efforts was an insistence that the causes of the deficiencies of Indian civilization were environmental and not hereditary in nature (Pratt, 2003). Although difficult to identify the source, this belief probably came from his religious faith that kept him from believing that God would create any human less than perfect. His experience, too, as a soldier in the Indian Wars, fighting alongside Indian scouts, gave him a great admiration for what Indians could accomplish if given the opportunity. Because the source of the problem was environmentally and not racially determined, Pratt understood the solution to be a simple one: remove the Indian from what he viewed as the harmful influence of his tribe and expose him to the superior civilization of his white neighbors. Ultimately, Pratt hoped that

the day is not far distant when the reservation for every Indian within the United States shall only be bounded by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans...and when the system of maintaining tribes and separate peoples will be abandoned, and the

Indian no less than the negro, shall be an unrestricted citizen. (ARCIA, 1884, p. 231)

Not only did Pratt believe that it was possible to “civilize” American Indians, he understood it to be the fulfillment of a moral obligation the United States had towards the “first Americans.” He viewed the segregation of American Indians onto reservations as a national disgrace and argued throughout his life for an end to policies that treated American Indians as politically or culturally different. According to Pratt (2003),

In a country like America, composed of people from all races, it has seemed to me both the highest privilege and a sacred duty devolving upon our government and people to see that the original inhabitants, from whom we were wresting so much, should be admitted to the very best opportunities to prove their worth. What brighter glory could shine from our national escutcheon than to give the native people we found here foremost privileges to become a very part of our citizenry under our benign Declaration of Independence and Constitution! (p. 195)

Armed with a strong faith in the ability of American Indians to assimilate and the power of nation’s institutions to fulfill the promise, Pratt began his experiment in education at Carlisle.

Pratt’s insistence on the importance of environment in determining one’s culture led him to identify the American Indian’s identity as an Indian as the greatest barrier to assimilation and citizenship. Like most reformers during the period, Pratt believed that citizenship required much more than a change in legal status—it represented a higher level of civilization and a transformation of the American Indian’s identity. Pratt (2003) argued,

I suppose the end to be gained, however far away 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. (italics added, p. 266)

The adoption of an American identity necessary for citizenship meant both a physical and psychological transformation for Pratt. A more detailed account of the form of citizenship education Pratt implemented at Carlisle is the topic of the next chapter, but briefly, it entailed removing all outward markers of an Indian identity, including clothing and hair, and erasing all of what Pratt understood as the negative aspects of the Indian's identity—including their superstitious beliefs, approach towards work, lack of discipline, and oppositional attitudes harbored against the United States. Pratt believed this transformation was necessary so that American Indians would have the knowledge and skills needed to participate fully as equal citizens in the political, economic, and cultural life of the nation.

But Pratt also understood that assimilation would not be possible if American Indians were not accepted by non-Indian society. He knew that if Indians were discriminated against and the object of prejudice, they would never achieve equal political or economic status. In order for Indians to compete on an equal footing with white citizens, Pratt believed that both whites and Indians needed to be educated. Although Pratt argued environment was more important than race, he was acutely aware of the role race played in the public's perception and attempted throughout his career to overcome racial prejudices that he felt would keep American Indians from being accepted

as equal citizens (Fear-Segal, 2007). Pratt believed that African Americans had already been exposed to civilization during slavery and in that way had an advantage over American Indians, who he felt were the target of unfair prejudice caused by the history of conflict and racial segregation that defined the relationship between them and the United States. But Pratt also believed that African Americans were crippled by white racism and he disagreed with Hampton's founder's insistence on fostering his students' racial identity, causing Pratt to leave Hampton (Lindsey, 1995). Ironically, Pratt decided to open his own race-exclusive school, albeit away from the racial prejudice of the South. The reason for segregating Indians in off-reservation boarding schools (seemingly a contradiction) was that Pratt was genuinely concerned that Indians needed to be prepared for assimilation before they were thrust into U.S. society. Even on the issue of citizenship, which he viewed as a birthright of all Americans, Pratt argued it should not be granted until American Indians demonstrated an ability to accept its responsibilities. In his first report to Congress Pratt posited, "[w]hether it is good public policy to place upon them the grave duties of citizenship before the civilization, intelligence, and ability of citizenship is educated and trained into them is very questionable" (ARCIA, 1880, p. 191). At Carlisle, all aspects of the experience were carefully designed to provide the education needed for citizenship and assimilation and to demonstrate to non-Indian society that Indians were capable of such a transformation.

While recruiting students for Carlisle, Pratt recounts in his autobiography an intriguing story that perfectly encapsulates his views about Indian citizenship. In convincing Spotted Tail, a Brulé Lakota chief, to send his children to Carlisle, Pratt (2003) argued,



Under the laws of my government, one white man with education and intelligence can own all the Black Hills and hold them as his own against everybody. If you, yourself, had had education you might be owning the Black Hills and be able to hold them. No army is required among us to do a thing like that. The law does it. If you had been educated, Spotted Tail, you might be helping to make the laws that take care of us in these United States. What you have always needed is the same education, the same industry, and the same opportunity the white man has.

(p. 223)

What his argument reveals is both a deep faith in the laws and institutions of his country as well as insight into the nature of citizenship education he envisioned. Citizenship, according to Pratt's argument, could be used as a tool to protect the interests of his people. Whether or not Pratt sincerely believed the argument he made or was simply using the only argument he knew that might convince a father to send his children across the country is open to debate. For Pratt, the assimilation of the American Indian was much more than a cultural process whereby the Indian would vanish. It involved preparing American Indians to compete economically and politically. In order for the transformation to be complete, the Indian must adopt the political values of his fellow Americans.

The Carlisle approach was widely touted by Pratt and evidence of its influence can be seen in the number of elements of Pratt's program that were copied in other off-reservation boarding schools for Indians. Because of his efforts Pratt became synonymous with the off-reservation boarding school movement and efforts to assimilate American Indian students. His mark on Indian citizenship education is undeniable.

Pratt's influence, however, may not have been possible if it weren't for support from key officials in Indian Affairs, such as Thomas Jefferson Morgan.

Thomas Jefferson Morgan, Commissioner of Indian Affairs

Whereas Pratt was the outspoken voice of off-reservation boarding schools and their mission to transform American Indians into citizens, Thomas Jefferson Morgan represented the effort to implement the assimilationist vision on a national scale. Understanding Morgan's views on citizenship education are particularly important because, as Commissioner of Indian Affairs, it was his efforts to standardize the curriculum and his directives specifically related to citizenship education that were likely to be influential in the development of the system of off-reservation schools. In addition, his tenure as commissioner came at the critical period just following the passage of the Dawes Act (1887)—the landmark legislation in the effort to assimilate American Indians as citizens.

When Morgan came into office it appears that Pratt had a like-minded supporter to help him implement his assimilationist vision. Both Pratt and Morgan were veterans of the Civil War, and both coincidentally had experience leading African American soldiers, but while Pratt continued his military service after the Civil War, Morgan dedicated himself to public education, serving as the head of state normal schools in New York, Rhode Island, and Nebraska. In addition, Morgan wrote several books on education, gaining national recognition and eventually serving as vice president of the National Education Association (Prucha, 1984). When he was appointed the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1889, his arrival was met with approval by the "Friends of the Indian" as he laid down a vision for Indian education that was very much

in accordance with their assimilationist vision. In an address to the Lake Mohonk Conference Morgan expressed his goal for Indian education as a “comprehensive system of education which will convert them into American citizens, put within their reach the blessings which the rest of us enjoy, and enable them to compete successfully with the white man on his own ground and with his own methods” (cited in Prucha, 1973, p. 703). With a clarity of vision and a drive that matched the most ardent assimilationists, Morgan set out to create a system of schools for American Indians modeled after the common schools to prepare American Indians for citizenship.

In espousing this goal Morgan was professing the same beliefs underlying the assimilationist movement. He believed that Indian civilization was deficient, but his faith in the inherent humanity of the American Indian allowed him to view them as worthy and capable of salvation through education. Morgan argued that Indian children “are human and endowed with all the faculties of human nature; made in the image of God, bearing the likeness of their creator, and having the same possibilities of growth and development that are possessed by any other class of children” (cited in Prucha, 1973, p. 241). But Morgan also subscribed to a belief in the “scale of civilization” and that “as a mass the Indians are far below the whites of this country in their general intelligence and mode of living” (cited in Prucha, 1973, p. 222). The cause of their “savagery” is due more to “unfortunate circumstance, for which they are not always responsible, than to any inherent defect of nature” (p. 241). He agreed with Pratt and other reformers that the civilization of the Indian was possible in a single generation and that it was not a very great task because of the small population of Indians (p. 223), but that they would be doomed to degradation because of the reservation system and the laws that separated

them from the United States (p. 240). Accordingly, Morgan believed that education would bring Indians into

fraternal and harmonious relationship with their white fellow-citizens, and with them enjoy the sweets of refined homes, the delight of social intercourse, the emoluments of commerce and trade, the advantages of travel, together with the pleasures that come from literature, science, and philosophy, and the solace and stimulus afforded by a true religion. (cited in Prucha, 1973, pp. 222-223)

Like Pratt, Morgan was also deeply committed to the cause of Indian citizenship as a matter of national mission, seeing it as the only option for Indian salvation. In fact, Morgan took the logic of assimilation a step further by suggesting that adopting “civilized habits” was no longer a choice, but that “[t]he Indian must conform to ‘the white man’s ways,’ peaceably if they will, forcibly if they must...They cannot escape it, and must either conform to it or be crushed by it” (ARCIA, 1889, p. 3). And, in true assimilationist fashion, Morgan believed that the grant of citizenship required a transformation of the Indian’s identity: “The logic of events demands the absorption of the Indians into our national life, not as Indians, but as American citizens” (ARCIA, 1889, p. 3). Through the power of American institutions and ideals Morgan believed the type of change required was possible. He argued:

All of our institutions are modified and controlled by this all-powerful, ever-present spirit of freedom. We recognize no caste, no aristocracy, no classes. All are on a political level. The highest office is open to the lowest person if he will fit himself for it. (Morgan, 1892, p. 171)

He saw the schools' job as "the preparation of the rising generation for citizenship in a free republic. They are to take their places as freemen, exercise the privilege of voting, and become at once law-abiding subjects and intelligent lawmakers" (Morgan, 1892, p. 172). If this were to happen, Morgan, like Pratt, believed that Indians could not be treated differently from other U.S. citizens. In his annual report Morgan argued that

each Indian must be treated as a man, be allowed a man's rights and privileges, and be held to the performance of a man's obligations. Each Indian is entitled to his proper share of the inherited wealth of the tribe, and to the protection of the courts in the 'life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.' He is not entitled to be supported in idleness. (ARCIA, 1889, p. 3)

Similar to Pratt, Morgan understood citizenship as the best way for Indians to defend their rights. The purpose of the public school was to "prepare them for the inevitable duties and responsibilities that await them" (ARCIA, 1892, p. 45). Morgan understood citizenship education to be an urgent matter because of the passage of the Dawes Act (1887) that opened up the reservations to settlement. He argued,

[e]very year renders it more and more apparent that the Indians, unless prepared to defend themselves in the courts, will be robbed of their property and denied their rights. I wish there were to-day a hundred young men of the highest type, such as can be found among them, preparing themselves, by the study of law, for the defense of their people in their rights of person and property. (ARCIA, 1892, p. 48)

For Morgan, the public school was the "nursery of American patriotism" (Morgan, 1895, p. 10). He believed that the "only safeguard that the republic can have against anarchy,

riot, defalcation, partisan strife, the clash of race and class, and the ultimate ruin of peace, prosperity and liberty itself is that the kind of culture that seeks to enthrone reason and conscience in the bosom of every pupil in the common schools” (Morgan, 1892, p. 123). Citizenship education in the common school was conceived by Morgan not only as the best way to protect the interests of American Indians, but also the only way to ensure the preservation of the nation from the forces that threatened to destroy it.

Rather than advocating for the integration of American Indians into the common schools as the best way to prepare them for citizenship, Morgan expressed the same paternalistic fears as Pratt and most other reformers that Indian students, in their tribal state, were not ready to compete with their white neighbors. Instead, he helped to implement “a comprehensive system of education modeled after the American public school system, but adapted to the special exigencies of the Indian youth” (ARCIA, 1889, pp. 3-4). Although separate, Morgan believed the curriculum of the Indian schools should match as closely as possible that of the common public schools. An advocate of the child-centered theories of Froebel and Pestalozzi, Morgan believed that “the first fundamental condition, upon which rests the work of causing to learn, is a supreme regard for the child’s individuality” (Morgan, 1892, p. 130). He also eschewed rote memorization and recitation, favoring instead education of the mind and heart that would seek to awaken in Indian students “a sense of independence, self-reliance, and self-respect” (ARCIA, 1889, pp. 95-96).

Morgan’s influence on citizenship education needs to be appreciated, but not overstated. During his three years as Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Morgan standardized the curriculum of the schools in an attempt to make them more aligned with

the public school system and issued several important policies related to the best manner to teach citizenship. His directives and reports are perhaps the clearest expression of the assimilationist philosophy that believed that “the Indians are destined to become absorbed into the national life, not as Indians, but as Americans,” (ARCIA, 1889, p. 3) but there is good reason to be skeptical of the actual influence of his ideas.

From the very beginning of the development of off-reservation schools, the assimilationist vision of Pratt, Morgan, and other “Friends of the Indian” was challenged by people who harbored much lower expectations for the capability of Indian students. Even among those who openly supported the assimilationist program of the off-reservation boarding schools there were doubts and concerns about the fitness of American Indians for citizenship. Pratt, Dawes, and others cautioned against extending the rights and responsibilities of citizenship to American Indians before they were ready, fearing that their new-found freedom would allow them to be taken advantage of by their more “civilized” neighbors. So, even though the Dawes Act (1887) granted citizenship to American Indians, it did so only to those who accepted their allotments and adopted the “habits of civilized life.” Despite their concerns, their faith in the humanity of the American Indian, the rightness of their cause, and the power of schools and American institutions to transform American Indians caused them to remain committed to the off-reservation boarding school movement.

#### The Roots of Citizenship Education for Racial Improvement

Also imbued with a fervent belief in the rightness of their cause were politicians, policymakers, and administrators who took up the cause of the Indian; but instead of envisioning a world in which American Indians would vanish into U.S. society,

becoming the political and cultural equals of whites, this group was much more circumspect about the future of the American Indian. They tended to view the differences between Indians and whites as a result of thousands of years of evolutionary progress, which could not be overcome in a single generation. Like their assimilationist counterparts, they too saw citizenship as the ultimate solution to the “Indian problem” and education as a necessary prerequisite for achieving it, but instead of attempting to transform American Indians so they could compete alongside their white neighbors, they advocated a program of racial improvement that would prepare Indian students for their lives on the periphery of U.S. society. Shaped by progressive era advancements in teaching and social evolutionary theory, racial improvement became the dominant force in Indian education at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, reflected in the citizenship education curriculum of the schools. Before the program of racial improvement gained national prominence, however, it had its roots at Hampton in the educational philosophy of the school’s founder, Samuel Chapman Armstrong.

#### Samuel Chapman Armstrong and “Coercive Benevolence”

The end of the Civil War was a pivotal period in race relations in the United States. To address the situation of six million newly freed slaves, the Freedman’s Bureau was created to provide them with housing, food, medical care, and schools. Prior to the Civil War formal educational options for African Americans were limited, but after the war it was argued that former slaves would need access to education in order to prepare for their new lives as citizens (Anderson, 1988). In 1868, Samuel Chapman Armstrong, the son of missionaries in Hawai’i and a former general in the Union Army, established the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute in Hampton, Virginia, with financial



assistance from the American Missionary Association. Founded on the belief that African Americans had been morally degraded by slavery and that whites had a duty to help uplift “despised races,” Armstrong’s program at Hampton was designed to provide its students with an education “first for the heart, then for health, and last for the mind” (cited in Talbot, 1904, p. 276). In practice what this meant was an education that stressed manual training, which Armstrong believed was “the only conceivable moral force that would lift the average Negro from his attitude of indifference and slovenliness to one of earnest endeavor and industry” (cited in Talbot, 1904, p. 210-211). Because Armstrong understood that the type of evolutionary change required for African Americans to reach the same level of white civilization would take generations, education at Hampton was also meant to demonstrate to its African American students exactly how far they had to go to reach to goal of white civilization, which meant teaching a message of patience, gratefulness, and ultimately a sense of race pride that would placate them during their long, arduous journey.

When Pratt arrived at Hampton in 1878 with his group of Indian students, Armstrong saw an opportunity to expand his mission and to demonstrate the power of his educational program for uplifting other “despised races” (Lindsey, 1995). In fact, Armstrong was confident that the environment at Hampton would be ideal for the new Indian students. In a speech he gave in 1880, Armstrong confidently expressed, “sending Indians to a Negro school is like putting raw recruits into an old regiment” (cited in Talbot, 1904, p. 276). Even though Armstrong believed that African Americans had a head start in the evolutionary path to civilization because of their experience with slavery, he felt that Indians suffered from similar deficiencies that needed to be corrected through

labor. But because Armstrong believed that “Indians are grown-up children, [and that] we are a thousand years ahead of them in the line of development” the task would not be an easy one (cited in Talbot, 1904, p. 277). To address the deficiencies of race, the Hampton model of education differed from the other off-reservation boarding schools in the way in which the school used race as a powerful educative tool for promoting the institution’s overall goal of promoting social cohesion and cultural understanding. Rather than ignoring racial and cultural differences, Armstrong believed that Indians and blacks would benefit from the example of the other. Using African Americans to assist in the civilization of Indians also helped Armstrong deflect criticism by Northerners that Hampton was only preparing its students for manual labor (Lindsey, 1995).

In identifying race, and not environment, as the chief source of the Indian’s deficiency, Armstrong crossed the line from paternalism to racism, yet he still shared much in common with many of the “Friends of the Indian” that made his efforts acceptable in their view. Armstrong believed, for example, that the Indian’s nomadic existence had given them an inherent distaste for labor, and ultimately he felt that “the Indian question will never be settled till you make the Indian blister his hands. No people ever emerged from barbarism that did not emerge through labor” (cited in Talbot, 1904, p. 214). He also agreed that the reservation system was inhibiting the Indian’s progress toward civilization, in particular the practice of providing Indians with rations was “like a millstone around his neck” (cited in Talbot, 1904, p. 214). However, unlike assimilationists like Pratt and Morgan, Armstrong believed that the best solution to the Indian problem was the proper management of the reservation system, not its destruction. “I am convinced of the truth that reservations under good management afford the best

conditions to prepare the red race for citizenship—to develop, not destroy them” (cited in Talbot, 1904, p. 286). In terms of Indian citizenship, Armstrong took a particularly strong view, and one that reveals his “tough love” approach to racial improvement.

Armstrong declared:

Give him [the Indian] the vote as it was given to the blacks. This would force things, as it did in the South. The Indian is not fit for it; neither was the Negro; but it compelled the South to educate him. [Once the Indians become voters] delegation after delegation from the West would stay in Washington, and demand education as protection from these wild voters, until they got it. (cited in Lindsey, 1995, p. 77)

So, unlike Pratt, Morgan, and some “Friends of the Indian” who envisioned civilization preceding citizenship, Armstrong took the view that has been labeled “coercive benevolence” by historians, that Indians should be granted citizenship whether they were ready for it or not; or, it should be added, whether they wanted it or not (Lindsey, 1995). This philosophy also applied to his belief in abrogating promises made in treaties of support if they led to the further dependence of American Indians. In addition, rather than seeing citizenship as a tool for the protection of the interests and rights of American Indians, as Pratt envisioned it, Armstrong understood it as a weapon in his mission to educate African Americans and Indians.

With racial improvement as the cornerstone of his philosophy of education, Armstrong implemented a program that ostensibly would prepare students to back and lead their communities on the path to civilization and citizenship. In order for his approach to be successful Armstrong understood that the greatest barrier to overcome

was the Indian's sense of racial superiority and indignation at their treatment by whites. Unless Indians overcame their animosity towards whites, social cohesion and national unity would be impossible. In much the same way he hoped to teach African Americans that slavery, though morally wrong, had been in the best interests of his black students, Armstrong hoped that his educational program would teach Indians that the injustices they faced at the hands of whites had been necessary given the superiority of white civilization. Furthermore, Indians at Hampton were encouraged to view their own progress in terms of what African Americans had suffered during slavery and continued to experience in the South. By teaching Indians how African Americans had persevered through slavery, without the need for violent retribution or rejection of American ideals, the Indian would see that their situation was not as dire (Lindsey, 1995). So, in a peculiar and delicate balancing act Hampton used race as a way to overcome the racial prejudice that could potentially derail its educational mission. Pratt, on the other hand, made every effort to conceal and transform the racial identity of his Indian students so that they would be accepted into white society. Even though preparation for citizenship remained Armstrong's professed goal for American Indian education, a belief Armstrong shared with the "Friends of the Indian," the Hampton philosophy clearly was more pragmatic about its function.

Thomas Jesse Jones: That "Evil Genius of the Negro Race"

Armstrong's philosophy of gradualism and accommodation was well-suited to the political, social, and economic context of the post-Civil War South and his message of the power of manual labor as a means of moral uplift was well-received by white reformers concerned with solving the "Indian problem." His attitudes about race and

education also were supported by the growing field of sociology that was beginning to influence education at the turn of the 20th century. The movement to reform education based on social scientific principles and a model of business-like efficiency, generally labeled progressivism, which was to have a profound impact on the development of public schools and their curriculum overall, also had a significant impact on Indian citizenship education. In 1902, Thomas Jesse Jones, a Columbia University Ph.D. candidate originally from Wales, arrived at Hampton as an associate chaplain and head of the Economics and Missionary Department. While writing his dissertation, entitled “The Sociology of a New York City Block,” Jones began teaching and saw an opportunity to apply the sociological theories he was studying to his work with African Americans and Indians at Hampton. Jones soon became a national figure in black education and progressive education generally (Kliebard, 1994). Lamenting his influence, W.E.B. Dubois once referred to Jones as “that evil genius of the Negro race” despite the fact that he was not black (cited in Kliebard, 1994, p. 5).

Jones garnered this epithet from such an esteemed figure as Dubois because of his efforts to design and promote a curriculum for African Americans that addressed their perceived deficiencies and prepared them for their likely future roles, which in Jones’ opinion were most likely agricultural and industrial. Dubois, a respected leader in the early African American civil rights movement and a founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), naturally bristled at the low expectations Jones held for African Americans. But Jones’ philosophy of education was not directed exclusively at African Americans; in fact, he is often credited with designing the model of social studies education that is still followed today (Lybarger, 1983; Saxe,

1991). A student of Franklin W. Giddings, an influential sociology professor at Columbia University, Jones was educated in Herbert Spencer's theories of social development. At the center of his philosophy of education was a belief that the basic laws of evolution applied to human social development and that, due to the forces of natural selection, influenced by human's ability to adapt to their environment, humans had developed along distinct, and hierarchical, racial lines based on environmental and historical forces (Kliebard, 1994). In his own research, Jones was fascinated by the forces that governed the successful assimilation of different racial and ethnic groups. Expressing a combination of Protestant missionary zeal of the social gospel movement and a faith in social science as a tool for social improvement, Jones concluded that the characteristics that led to social strife, such as the "impulsivity of the Italian" and the "extreme individualism of the Jew" were not inborn, but could be ameliorated through the proper form of education (cited in Kliebard, 1994, p. 19). What Jones understood was needed, and what motivated his efforts at educational reform, was a system of education designed to take into account specific racial and ethnic differences. With this background Jones embarked on a career in education with the goal of designing curriculum that would improve the "deficiencies" of racial and ethnic minorities instead of treating all groups equally.

When Jones arrived at Hampton in 1902 it appeared to be the perfect match for all involved. Although Armstrong had died ten years earlier, Jones most likely viewed favorably Armstrong's mission of addressing the specific deficiencies of his students by using labor as a form of moral uplift. Armstrong's message of gradualism and accommodation were consistent with Jones' beliefs in the slow speed of evolutionary

progress and the function of education to promote social cohesion. They both also had a profound faith in the power of education to remedy what they believed was wrong with African American and Indian civilization; viewing the source of the problem a matter of historical circumstance, not inherent deficiency. But the success of Jones at Hampton most likely lay in his ability to apply the latest in social science theory to a problem in a way that was consistent with the educational mission of the school.

The “genius” of Jones was his creation of a program of study, which he labeled social studies, which would remedy the deficiencies of African American and Indian students by specifically addressing what he understood to be the root causes of their degraded situation. A more detailed analysis of the Hampton social studies curriculum is included in the next chapter; briefly, the program he introduced included the study of economic, civics, and sociology, and it was designed to teach African American and Indian students the practical knowledge and skills they would need for their lives as second-class citizens. In all aspects the curriculum was utilitarian and based on limited expectations for what the students could and should achieve. For example, Donal Lindsey (1995) points out that the remarkable aspect of the civics portion of the curriculum was that it “lacked civics,” because it dispensed with “any discussion of the rights of citizenship, or rather the lack of them, of blacks and by implication of Indians” (p. 189). Instead, students were taught a message of patience in the face of disenfranchisement and discrimination, the hallmark of education at Hampton.

#### Estelle Reel and “Kindly Consideration”

Whereas the Hampton philosophy of racial improvement for second-class citizenship was evident from the school’s founding, Indian education at the national level

was generally dominated by men who promoted a school system designed to transform Indians, not just improve them. By the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, however, several individuals came into positions of influence who lacked the optimistic attitude of their predecessors. In terms of citizenship education at the national level, one of the most influential figures was Estelle Reel, the Superintendent of Indian Schools from 1898-1910. Under Reel's influence, self-support became the new emphasis of Indian education. Reel subscribed to essentially the same philosophy of Armstrong and Jones, namely that the education of American Indians should reflect their racially-determined capabilities and that it was only through physical labor that Indians could be taught to advance along the evolutionary path towards civilization. Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) cite evidence of Reel's racist ideology: "in short, the Indian's instincts and nerves and muscles and bones are adjusted one to another, and all to the habits of the race for uncounted generations, and his offspring cannot be taught like the children of the white man until they are taught to do like them" (p. 52). In light of their perceived deficiencies Reel saw American Indian children as "wards of our nation...entitled to kindly consideration," not capable of exercising the rights and responsibilities of full citizenship (cited in Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006, p. 52).

Despite her limited view of the capabilities of Indian students, the rhetoric of citizenship permeated the Uniform Course of Study (1901) that Reel created for Indian schools. The details of the curriculum she wrote are discussed in the next chapter, but what is clear from her approach to Indian education is that, like her predecessors, citizenship was still viewed as the end goal of Indian education. What was significantly different was the way Reel subtly redefined citizenship to match her limited expectations



of Indian students' abilities. Similar to assimilationists like Pratt or Morgan she maintained that citizenship required the adoption of "civilized habits" but she promoted an apolitical version of citizenship that more closely matched the actual legal status of most American Indians. In short, rather than transforming the Indian into the citizen, Reel favored transforming citizenship education to match the Indian. In writing her Uniform Course of Study, Reel was also applying scientific theories of race to develop what she understood to be a developmentally appropriate form of citizenship education for American Indian students. Reel's application of scientific principles to the design of a curriculum for the "actual needs" of Indian students was on the cutting-edge of education at the time. It was also in alignment with Indian policy in general during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, which Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) argue was defined by what policymakers considered to be within the "safety zone" of "obedient citizenry and innocent cultural differences," meaning that Indian education was "designed to prevent Native economic competition in the American workforce, just as low-level academic training precluded aspirations to professional schools or careers" (p. 49). While evident at Hampton from the beginning, citizenship education for racial improvement and self-support on the national level was the product of people like Estelle Reel.

#### Indian Critics of Off-Reservation Schooling

Representing an important counterbalance to the movement to prepare American Indians for second-class citizenship was a vocal group of Indian leaders that emerged in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century. While their influence on the citizenship education curriculum was minimal during the critical stage in the development of schools like Carlisle and Hampton, their voices serve as a reminder that Indian peoples were not

simply passive recipients of the “curriculum of civilization,” but an important part of the movement away from culturally assaultive educational practices. Not surprisingly, many of these leaders had first-hand experience with mission schools and off-reservation boarding schools, and some, like Charles Eastman and Carlos Montezuma, went on to become college-educated. In 1911, a group of some of the most out-spoken and educated Indian leaders formed the Society of American Indians, an organization founded to address problems facing American Indian communities.

While it is difficult to generalize, this group was generally united in the belief that the Indian Office was misguided in its paternalistic treatment of Indian communities. Even though they almost universally acknowledged the need for American Indians to learn English, useful skills, and to become familiar with the “white man’s ways,” they often expressed a deep ambivalence towards the government’s efforts to erase Indian culture in the process (Hoxie, 2001). Particularly after the racial downgrading of the curriculum at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Indian leaders become increasingly united in their criticism of culturally assaultive educational practices and attempted to charter a middle ground between the educational programs of assimilationists like Pratt and Morgan, on the one hand, and strictly vocational programs aimed at moral and racial uplift, like those of Armstrong, Reel, and Jones. In doing so, Indian leaders in the Progressive Era expressed a vision of Indian education that would prepare American Indians for equal citizenship and preserve their cultural traditions.

Underlying the critique of Indian education in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century by Indian leaders was a belief in the capability of Indian students to assume the responsibilities of equal citizenship. They saw themselves as proof positive of what the Indian could

achieve if given the opportunity. In this belief they shared much in common with people like Pratt and Morgan, who often held up the achievements of Indians like Charles Eastman as evidence of the potential of his assimilationist program. In fact, Carlos Montezuma, a prominent Indian leader who spent time as a doctor at Carlisle, was a strong supporter of Pratt's efforts to prepare Indians for equal citizenship. But what distinguished many Indian leaders from their white counterparts was their desire to recognize a culturally inclusive form of citizenship. Arthur C. Parker, a founder of the Society of American Indians (SAI) and a respected anthropologist, leveled one of the most eloquent arguments against racially-defined notions of citizenship in an editorial for the SAI's Quarterly Journal:

There is something greater in life than being like someone else, there is something better in life for the Indian than being like a white man. An imitation is at best a cheap thing and all men of true culture despise it. The Indian must understand the ways of the white race and follow in general the paths of enlightenment, but all civilization does not lie in the ways of the white race—far from it. (cited in Hoxie, 2001, p. 65)

For Parker and others, the solution lay in providing an education that would recognize the inherent worth of American Indian culture and in providing opportunities for education beyond what Parker understood as the basically elementary education provided at most off-reservation boarding schools.

In crafting their critique of Indian education, Parker and other Indian leaders represented forces that would eventually reshape the citizenship education curriculum of Indian schools and lead to more culturally pluralistic conceptions of citizenship. The

field of anthropology, for example, thanks to the influence of people like Parker, was beginning to challenge the theories that placed all cultures on a scale of civilization, with Indians at or near the bottom. The Pan-Indian nature of their movement also represented a more unified effort to protect rights of Indian people that would continue throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Indian leaders in the Progressive Era also embodied an important check against the power of the Indian Office, which, they argued was not acting in the interests of Indian people—by supporting educational programs for second-class citizenship and by not protecting Indian lands. Overall, Indian leaders in the Progressive Era provided an important voice in the debate over Indian citizenship education in terms that reflected the rights of American Indian peoples to political sovereignty, cultural identity, and economic independence.

### Conclusion

In one of the many apparent ironies of off-reservation schooling for American Indians, the decline and closing of the flagship off-reservation boarding schools, Carlisle and Hampton, rather than being the result of the influence of prominent Indian critics of culturally assaultive education was in reality due more to the increasing influence of people like Estelle Reel and Thomas Jesse Jones. The program of racial improvement they promoted could be accomplished more effectively and efficiently closer to Indian students' homes, they argued. Even though preparation for citizenship continued to be the expressed goal of off-reservation Indian boarding schools throughout their existence, the type of citizenship that was the focus of Indian education in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century was aligned with their lower expectations, much to the disapproval of Indian leaders.

The waning influence of the people like Richard Henry Pratt, Thomas Jefferson Morgan, and other “Friends of the Indian” meant a movement away from the effort to culturally, politically, and economically assimilate American Indians, but it did not mean the end of culturally assaultive educational practices. American Indians continued to be removed from their communities and sent to off-reservation boarding schools well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century, albeit closer to their home communities. Policies aimed at divesting American Indians of their land and eroding their tribal sovereignty also continued, continuing the movement to incorporate American Indians and their land into the United States. In order to understand how these competing visions of the place of American Indians in the United States were translated into the schools, an examination of the curriculum is needed.

## Chapter 5

## “Into Civilization and Citizenship:” The Citizenship Education Curriculum of Carlisle and Hampton

In 1893, Richard Henry Pratt brought 305 of his Indian students from the Carlisle Indian Industrial School to Chicago to participate in a parade that was a part of a commemoration of the World’s Columbian Exposition, a celebration the 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Christopher Columbus’s landing in the Americas. Over three weeks the exposition drew 26 million visitors to see exhibits and events from 41 countries. In order to publicize the work he was doing at Carlisle, Pratt organized his students into ten platoons, each representing a characteristic of the school’s curriculum. The students carried various implements representing each characteristic on small platforms on the top of short poles resting on the students’ shoulders, like a soldier carries a gun (Pratt, 2003). The first platoon carried schoolbooks and slates, while the rest carried implements representing the school’s work in teaching printing, agriculture, baking, carpentry, blacksmithing, shoemaking, harness-making, tinsmithing, and tailoring. At the front of the Carlisle contingent three students carried a large silk banner that read “Into civilization and citizenship” (Pratt, 2003).

Pratt’s decision to have his students march in a parade commemorating Columbus’ arrival is not surprising. As an astute promoter for the cause of Indian education he was always keenly aware of the importance of demonstrating to society at large the progress his students were making. Pratt believed that if American Indians were to be accepted into the United States as equal citizens he needed to lessen the effects of hundreds of years of racial prejudice harbored by many Americans who viewed Indians

as savage, warlike, and treacherous. By having his students don uniforms, march in military formation, and carry tools instead of guns, Pratt was presenting to the public an emasculated, yet disciplined and useful, version of American Indians that would demonstrate the feasibility of his assimilationist experiment. Pratt remarked that having his students carry “the implements and products of industry” rather than guns “both amused and was highly appreciated by the army officers” in attendance at the parade (Pratt, 2003, p. 296).

The symbolism of the banner is also significant for understanding how Pratt and other educational policymakers viewed the relationship between civilization, citizenship, and education. The equation of civilization with citizenship reflects the view of educational policymakers and administrators like Pratt that citizenship was much more than a legal status determined by birth or naturalization. Instead, citizenship at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was being redefined in response to growing concerns about the ability of the nation to absorb diverse peoples into the body politic (Reuben, 1997). For American Indians and other racial and ethnic minorities, citizenship—the often-expressed purpose of off-reservation boarding schools—was increasingly connected to a “civilizing” process that involved learning industrial and agricultural skills, such as those represented by the students in the parade. In fact, schools such as Hampton and Carlisle were on the cutting-edge of a broader movement in American education to make manual training an important part of the school curriculum. In addition, most educational policymakers were convinced that American Indians could only be saved if they gave up their traditional culture and ways of life and became citizens of the United States. Off-reservation

boarding schools, like Carlisle and Hampton, were the primary locations of the U.S. government's effort to transform American Indians into "good citizens."

Nevertheless, from the beginning of the movement to prepare American Indians for citizenship, education policymakers debated the type of change that was to take place and the appropriate form of education needed to accomplish the task. At the heart of this debate was the question of whether or not American Indians were capable of fulfilling the responsibilities of citizenship. Most reformers in the mid to late 19<sup>th</sup> century, including many influential "Friends of the Indian," understood citizenship to require material independence, connected with the private ownership of land; personal independence, associated with the transfer of allegiance from the tribe to the United States; and a level of moral and intellectual development needed to participate in the political and cultural life of the nation (Adams, 1988, 1995, 2006). It should be noted that citizenship was not desired by many American Indians at the time because it was connected to the movement to abrogate treaties, open up land to white settlement, and force American Indians to adopt lives as small farmers and ranchers (Martin, 1990). Policymakers, however, were united in their belief that education was an essential part of the solution to the "Indian problem" and that citizenship was the ultimate goal, but they were divided by competing social scientific, biological, and theological theories about the capacity of human beings for change. Some, like Richard Henry Pratt, claimed that the differences that kept American Indians from becoming civilized were the result of policies that segregated them from the rest of society, and others believed their differences to be the result of evolutionary forces that would take generations to overcome. Against this backdrop, reformers expressed their vision for the place of American Indians in the United States by



creating citizenship education curricula that addressed what they believed to be lacking in Indian civilization.

This chapter offers an examination of the citizenship education curriculum—the tool used to transform American Indians into citizens—of the two flagship off-reservation boarding schools: the Carlisle Indian Industrial School and the Hampton Institute. Studying the citizenship education curriculum of off-reservation boarding schools is important for two reasons: first, the curriculum reveals a great deal about the attitudes and beliefs held by its creators about race, citizenship, and education; and second, it offers one of the best ways to imagine what actually happened in schools from this period. Even though both Carlisle and Hampton were located in the eastern United States—Carlisle was in Pennsylvania and Hampton was in Virginia—far from most of the off-reservation boarding schools that opened west of the Mississippi, their influence was far-reaching (Reyhner & Elder, 2004). Carlisle and Hampton were often held up as examples of what was possible in Indian education, providing a model for other schools to follow. In addition, the founders of the two schools—Richard Henry Pratt and Samuel Chapman Armstrong—were respected leaders in Indian education. Their influence was evident throughout the system of off-reservation schools and, partly because of their proximity to Washington D.C., Pratt and Armstrong also had an influence on Indian education policy at the federal level. The fact that Pratt and Armstrong held very different philosophies regarding the capabilities of Indian students make Carlisle and Hampton intriguing case studies of the evolution of the citizenship education curriculum of Indian schools.

In examining the curriculum, however, it is important to keep in mind that the curriculum as it is written by policymakers, school administrators, and textbook authors—reflected in official courses of study, textbooks, directives, and other classroom materials—is an idealized form of the curriculum that is enacted by teachers and received by students. Herbert Kliebard (1995) argues that, at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the curriculum writ large was the product of intense ideological debate reflecting competing educational philosophies. In this respect, the citizenship education curriculum offers a case study of the broader changes that were occurring in the United States at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. When possible, the citizenship education curriculum, as it was enacted by teachers and received by students at Carlisle and Hampton, will also be explored as a way to add depth to the analysis of the official curriculum offered in this chapter. Regrettably, teacher and student voices, as they reflect an appreciation of the citizenship education curriculum, are largely silent in off-reservation boarding schools.

An examination of the curriculum reveals that preparation for citizenship was the expressed purpose of both schools throughout their existence and that there was remarkable similarity between the curricula of the two schools, despite significant differences in the philosophies of the schools' founders. As discussed in the previous chapter, at the heart of the difference was Richard Henry Pratt's belief that Indian students were capable of assimilating into U.S. society as cultural and political equals, whereas Hampton's founder, Samuel Chapman Armstrong, believed American Indians should be prepared to return to their communities to continue a process of racial uplift. Despite their differences, the citizenship education curriculum of both Carlisle and

Hampton reflected the belief that citizenship involved first and foremost the adoption of civilization, but it also required an education that would prepare Indian students to participate in the political, economic, and cultural life of the nation.

Particularly in the early years of these two schools' existence, citizenship education fit what Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1982) labeled the "citizenship transmission" model of social studies education, which was designed to transmit a set of knowledge, behaviors, and values associated with being a "good citizen." Although citizenship education in off-reservation boarding schools predates the creation of the social studies as a course of study in the secondary schools (defined by the integrated study of the social sciences and humanities), many elements of the future social studies curriculum were in place at Carlisle and Hampton, including the study of American history, geography, government, and current events—essentially a common school education adapted for Indian students. In addition, both institutions used extracurricular activities, such as athletics, debating societies, military training, off-campus trips, and work programs, to prepare Indian students for citizenship. In short, off-reservation boarding schools provided a comprehensive curriculum for citizenship education that went beyond a narrow education in the specific rights and responsibilities of political citizenship to address what education policymakers and school administrators understood was lacking in American Indian students—that is, civilization.

By the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, however, significant changes were happening in Indian education and education in general that were reflected in the citizenship education curriculum of the off-reservation boarding schools. As a result of mounting criticism of the effectiveness and appropriateness of off-reservation schools, combined with emerging

progressive forces in education—namely a focus on child-centered pedagogy, the influence of social evolutionary theory, and a new concern for efficiency in education—the citizenship education curriculum was reformed to reflect lower expectations for Indian students (Lindsey, 1995). Although the shift in emphasis from a common school curriculum to a strictly functional curriculum had its roots in the educational philosophy and program of Armstrong at Hampton, its expression in the curriculum was most clearly evident in the work of Thomas Jesse Jones, a teacher at Hampton who went on to national prominence as a leader in social education, and Estelle Reel, a superintendent of Indian schools who significantly revised the official course of study for Indian schools in 1901. The influence of Reel and Jones, along with the support of several Commissioners of Indian Education at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, marked the movement away from citizenship education curriculum for equal participation towards a citizenship education curriculum for second-class citizenship.

\*\*\*\*\*

Before I begin my analysis of the citizenship education curriculum, a couple of caveats regarding the curriculum that I originally made in Chapter 1 bear repeating. First, the relationship between the curriculum, what is taught, and what is learned is complicated. In other words, the curriculum as it is implemented in schools should be understood keeping in mind the way it was interpreted by administrators and teachers—reflecting their own knowledge and beliefs—and how it was received by students, who, make meaning of the transmitted messages. But, in the absence of more detailed firsthand accounts of classroom life, which is common for the time period and topic (Cuban, 1993; Fear-Segal, 2007), the curriculum offers perhaps the best window into the

classroom available. Therefore, it is important not to overestimate the seamlessness by which the curriculum entered the classroom and was received by students. In the case of the citizenship curriculum of Indian schools, the picture that emerges from the scholarship must be reconciled both against the backdrop of the shifting ideologies of policymakers and school administrators but also in terms of the realities of the schools. If, as Jeffrey Hamley (1995) argues, “the curriculum comprised the essential means by which Euro-American culture would be sustained and assimilation achieved,” then it is important to better understand it in its proper context (p. 73).

My primary purpose in this chapter, then, is to better understand how the competing philosophies underlying Indian education in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries were translated in the form of a citizenship education curriculum. To do this faithfully to the mission of the schools requires that I conceive of the curriculum broadly as the “array of efforts used to reach the desired ends” (Eisner, 1992, p. 302) and therefore I am not limiting my discussion to the curriculum traditionally defined as the course of study, the textbook, and other classroom materials. Instead, given the comprehensive nature of the effort to create citizens in off-reservation boarding schools, I will be taking into account all intentional efforts in the schools to promote the stated goals of citizenship. In my discussion I also hope to illuminate the conceptions of citizenship *not* taught in the schools, as well as some of the inconsistencies, ironies, and paradoxes revealed by the study of the citizenship education curriculum. An examination of the citizenship education curriculum helps us to better understand the assumptions of its authors and the implications for the way we educate young people for citizenship in a democracy.

## Citizenship Education as the Curriculum of Civilization

*Manual Education*

Underlying all efforts to prepare American Indians for citizenship well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century was the belief that people living in a tribal state represented a lower level civilization and were therefore not prepared for the responsibilities of citizenship. Reformers and policymakers may have disagreed about the reasons for the Indians' inferior status, the degree to which they could change, and the best way to move forward, but there was very little disagreement about what was wrong with American Indian culture. In a speech on Indian education at the NEA Convention of 1901, Commissioner of Education William Torrey Harris articulated what he understood to be the causes of the inferior nature of Indian civilization when he asserted that what made higher civilizations superior to lower ones was the "higher order of individualism and the greater distribution of local self-government, and at the same time a greater participation of the masses of the people in the products of the industry of its own community and of all communities in the world by means of commerce" (RSIS, 1901, p. 70). He went on to characterize Indian societies as autocratic, lacking a division of labor that enables a "high degree of productivity in the industries," and providing only a narrow education, mainly involving superstitious explanations of the natural world. The result was that "the tribal knowledge of the races of mankind can amount to but little, and the concentration of all the nervous energy of the tribe upon defense and the procurement of subsistence renders literature, science, and art next to impossible" (RSIS, 1901, p. 70). Others were perhaps less articulate in their assessment, but there was general agreement among education

policymakers that preparing American Indians for citizenship required a curriculum that would address all aspects of their “inferior” civilization.

Herbert Kliebard (1999) argues that in the increasingly industrialized society of late 19<sup>th</sup> century United States, “schools were a mediating institution between an intimate and familiar world marked by traditional values and the increasingly impersonal and remote world of modern industry” and that manual education became “a vehicle for resurrecting and preserving nineteenth-century ideals and as a way of coming to terms with the new industrial society” (p. 6). In this new industrial world American Indians stood out because of their apparent lack of interest in owning and working the land in ways that European Americans could understand. Accordingly, the major thrust of Indian policy in the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was to individualize American Indians in the ownership of land, to encourage their settlement on homesteads, and to foster their adoption of forms of economic subsistence such as farming and ranching. Although the ownership of property was no longer a requirement for citizenship in the United States in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, educational policymakers still understood material independence to be important for American Indians because of the communal nature of their society. In fact, the Dawes Act of 1887, a landmark in Indian policy, granted citizenship only to those Indians who accepted their allotments and adopted the “habits of civilized life.” Material independence was still understood to be important for participation in democratic life because it was connected to one’s moral and intellectual development and ensured one had a stake in the society, which education policymakers also understood to be requirements for citizenship. In addition, both Armstrong and Pratt subscribed to the popular belief that learning to work would help to correct deficiencies in character that

plagued American Indians. Even though manual education was advocated for different reasons—Pratt viewed it as essential for Indian assimilation and Armstrong saw it more as a moralizing force—it was an integral component of the curriculum of civilization throughout the schools' existence.

At both institutions the manual education curriculum included industrial and agricultural training for boys, domestic training for girls, as well as general menial labor for both. At least half the day was spent by students at both Carlisle and Hampton learning manual skills, including work in different shops, like those represented in the Chicago parade. Having the students work at the schools also provided the labor necessary for the schools to operate. An important program at both schools was the “outing program,” in which Indian students were placed with white families in the community often during the summer to work as servants and maids. Pratt, in particular, saw the outing program—which he referred to as the “supreme Americanizer”—as the best way for American Indians to learn the skills they would need to survive in the United States and to prove to the non-Indian society the potential value of American Indians to the “national family” (Pratt, 2003, p. 311-312). Forever impatient, Pratt viewed any opportunity to immerse Indian students in non-Indian society as a positive step. At the 1892 National Conference of Charities and Corrections he argued: “Theorizing citizenship into a people is a slow operation...They must get into the swim of American citizenship. They must feel the touch of it day after day until they become saturated with the spirit of it, and thus become equal to it” (p. 58).

During a period when the role of manual education in a democracy was being hotly debated, schools like Carlisle and Hampton were on the cutting edge of the



movement and were widely praised for their efforts. By the turn of the century, industrial education had attracted broad appeal, including the support of progressive reformers who wished to see education more aligned with the natural interests of the child; those concerned with making sure education more efficiently matched the needs of society; and traditionalists who saw value in the power of labor, particularly for groups of people who were in need of moral improvement, such as American Indians and African Americans. Commissioner of Indian Affairs Hiram Price once observed the innovative nature of industrial education at off-reservation boarding schools by noting: “In a very few schools in the United States can the white child, unless he is a criminal, learn how to work as well as how to read; how to use his hands as well as his head” (ARCIA, 1892, p. xxxiv).

Apparently, if industrial education was good enough for criminals and Indians, it would be good enough for the general population. At both Carlisle and Hampton manual education played a central role in their efforts to create citizens of American Indians.

*Learning English: The Language of the Republic*

When they take upon themselves the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship their vernacular will be of no advantage. Only through the medium of the English tongue can they acquire a knowledge of the Constitution of the country and their rights and duties thereunder. (ARCIA, 1887, p. 19)

In his annual report of 1887, Commissioner of Indian Affairs J.D.C. Atkins reiterated the Indian Offices’ policy that government and mission schools instruct their students only in English. Atkins asserted that “the first step to be taken towards civilization, toward teaching the Indian the mischief and folly of continuing their barbarous practices, is to teach them the English language” (ARCIA, 1887, p. 21). Ruth

Spack (2002) contends that the relationship between learning English and the advance of civilization “was linked to the national sense of the country’s ‘manifest destiny’ to dominate territory” (p. 32). In this respect, the teaching of English was an important element of the effort to detribalize Indian peoples and reshape their identities. But what is also revealing is the connection Atkins makes between learning English and citizenship. Characterizing Indian students as “embryo citizens,” Atkins and other assimilationists believed that learning English was an essential component of the “citizenizing” process because it would allow American Indians to come into greater contact with non-Indian society and create a sense of unity needed for the perpetuation of a democratic society (ARCIA, 1885, p. vi). Although he does so in an ultra-nationalistic way, Atkins expresses his faith that English could be of use to American Indians, not just in terms of commerce, but also in terms of participating in the political life of the country.

Even though Pratt and Armstrong both believed in the importance of learning English as an essential component of the curriculum of civilization, the emphasis each placed on the subject reflected their different approaches to Indian education. Considering the fact that many students came to Carlisle and Hampton with very little knowledge of English, each school offered remedial language classes before their students could advance to classes in different subject areas. At Carlisle, however, Pratt adopted a strict English-only policy reflecting his belief in the need for his students to be immersed as much as possible in the culture of non-Indian society. In his fourth annual report he lamented: “Ignorance of our language to be the greatest obstacle to the assimilation of the Indians with our population” (ARCIA, 1882, p. 179). Whereas at Hampton, Armstrong’s belief that his students would return to their communities as

cultural emissaries led him to be more lenient in his attitude toward the prohibition of English. For example, Indian students at Hampton were not required to speak English before breakfast and after dinner, on holidays and during the Sabbath (Lindsey, 1995). Despite their differences, learning English, similar to manual training, was another important aspect of the curriculum of civilization and citizenship.

*The Accoutrements of Civilization and Citizenship*

The final piece of the curriculum of civilization involved teaching behaviors, manners, and the appearances that education policymakers understood as required of civilization and citizenship. Policymakers often gauged their progress in civilizing American Indians by noting changes in physical appearance. For example, a statistic that was annually reported to the Secretary of the Interior by reservation agents was the number of Indians living on reservations who wore “citizen clothes”—European-American style clothing. The presumption was that if American Indians looked more like non-Indians then they were making progress on the path towards civilization. At both Carlisle and Hampton students were subjected to a complete physical transformation upon arriving at the school (Adams, 1995; Lindsey, 1995; Pratt, 2003). In particular at Carlisle, where Pratt was fond of taking before and after pictures of his students’ physical transformations, students’ hair was cut and they were forced to wear uniforms. Basic hygiene, such as bathing, another area school officials thought Indian students were lacking, was also taught (Pratt, 2003). The physical transformation was necessary, in the opinion of Pratt, because he believed that equal citizenship required that American Indians be accepted by non-Indian society. Unless American Indians adopted Euro-

American styles of dress and other habits they would be perceived as inferior and treated as unequal citizens.

Beyond the physical transformation, students were often given new English surnames and taught behaviors that would allow them to assimilate into American society. Adopting new names was partly based on practicality—white teachers often had difficulty pronouncing Indian names—but it also reflected the need to ensure orderly lines of inheritance and accurate census-taking (Prucha, 1984). At Hampton, however, Indian names were often kept, unless they were deemed inappropriate (Lindsey, 1995). Lessons in manners and behavior were important aspects of the curriculum of civilization at both schools. At Carlisle, for example, a student writing in the school newspaper listed some of the things they learned outside of the regular curriculum:

How to earn money.

To be strictly truthful.

To economize in all our affairs.

To be polite in our manners.

To avoid tobacco and strong drinks.

Careful and correct business habits.

How to get most for our money.

How to do things well.

Habits of cleanliness and good order.

To avoid profane and indecent language.

To speak English fearlessly. (“Some Things We Are Learning,” 1887, p. 3)

As this list indicates, education for civilization and citizenship at Carlisle was a comprehensive effort designed to physically and psychologically transform American Indians into “civilized” citizens by teaching them the Euro-American values and behaviors. While Pratt and Armstrong had different visions of the place of American Indians in U.S. society, they both saw the changes as a necessary step in the civilizing process that led to the citizenship.

#### Citizenship Education in the Classroom

The Indian youth should be instructed in their rights, privileges, and duties as American citizens; should be taught to love the American flag; should be imbued with a genuine patriotism, and made to feel that the United States, and not some paltry reservation, is their home. (ARCIA, 1889, p. 95-96)

In addition to addressing the supposed cultural and economic deficiencies of Indian civilization, as the above excerpt from Thomas Jefferson Morgan’s instructions to Indian schools indicates, the citizenship education curriculum also included instruction in the rights and responsibilities of citizenship and efforts to instill a sense of allegiance to the United States. Educational policymakers understood this aspect of the curriculum to be particularly important, yet complicated, in the context of American Indian education because of the strong tribal identities held by Indian students that had been encouraged by their historical treatment as sovereign political entities. Fostering an allegiance to the nation first required removing the legal barriers that separated Indians from the United States—a key aim of Indian policy in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century—and secondly, addressing the psychological barriers that prevented the Indian’s identification with the nation, namely the history of broken promises, conflict, and cultural misunderstandings that

characterized Indian/white relations from the colonial period. The teaching of rights and responsibilities was also complicated by the fact that most American Indians were denied full legal citizenship. The late 19<sup>th</sup> century represented a transitional period defined by immigration and industrialization in which the country was working out the meaning of American citizenship. Off-reservation schools like Carlisle and Hampton were important sites where the meaning of citizenship was defined through the curriculum.

### *Patriotic Identification*

Although Pratt and Armstrong both felt strongly about the need to foster patriotic feelings towards the United States in their Indian students, the most outspoken and influential force on this aspect of the curriculum was Morgan. When Morgan took over as Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1888 he brought to the Indian Office a desire to promote an almost messianic brand of Americanism (Prucha, 1984). In acknowledging “the great purpose which the Government has in view in providing an ample system of common school education for all Indian youth of school age, is the preparation of them for American citizenship,” his plan was to standardize the Indian school curriculum so that it resembled as closely as possible the system of public schools—“the nursery of American patriotism” (Morgan, 1895, p. 10). In doing so Morgan directed Indian Agents and Superintendents of Indian Schools to teach American history, elementary principles of government—including instruction in their duties and privileges as citizens—respect for the flag, patriotic songs, and the observance of National holidays—including the anniversary of the passage of the Dawes Act (1887) on February 8<sup>th</sup>. In all that they do, the schools were urged by Morgan to “endeavor to awaken reverence for the nation’s power, gratitude for its beneficence, pride in its history, and a laudable ambition to

contribute to its prosperity” (cited in Prucha, 1975, p. 181). Reflecting his assimilationist philosophy, Morgan also instructed teachers of American history to focus on the study of “the lives of the most notable historical characters” and to not ignore the injustices committed against the Indian people but that these should “be contrasted with the larger future open to them, and their duties and opportunities rather than their wrongs” (cited in Prucha, 1975, p. 181). And, in order to “appeal to the highest elements of manhood and womanhood in their pupils...they should carefully avoid any unnecessary reference to the fact that they are Indians” (cited in Prucha, 1975, p. 181). Although Morgan’s message of replacing an Indian identity with an American identity was translated differently at Hampton than at Carlisle because of the contrasting missions of the schools, there is ample evidence that both schools embraced Morgan’s general directives and had been doing so even prior to his arrival as Commissioner.

Evidence of the schools’ efforts to foster a patriotic identification with the nation can be found in the academic courses offered at both schools, which included the study of American history, civil government, geography, and economics. The primary tool of the citizenship education curriculum in the classroom appears to have been the textbook. Jeffrey Hamley (1995) suggests that “textbooks of Indian schools played an important socializing, republican function of common school education” (p. 79). In a period in which textbooks and recitation were central to teaching, the ones used at both Carlisle and Hampton were the same as those used in non-Indian schools. Although Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Oberly lobbied to have a set of textbooks created specifically for Indian schools, he was unable to get this reform passed, and the result was that Indian schools used textbooks written for the common schools. Some of the

history textbooks adopted by Indian schools included Edward Eggleston's (1917) *A First Book of American History*, Horace Scudder's (1884) *A History of the United States of America*, and George Quackenbos' (1871) *Primary History of the United States*.

In terms of advancing the patriotic ends of Indian schools, these textbooks are interesting in that they offer unabashedly Euro-centric interpretations of American history, in which American Indians are either depicted as obstacles to progress or are almost completely absent. Scudder's textbook begins by asserting, for example, that "an intelligent reading of American history" requires an understanding that from independence "America faced the Atlantic" (1884, p. iv). Indians in Scudder's text are described as "brave, but they were also treacherous," (1884, p. 93) yet they come across remarkably dispassionately overall, compared to Eggleston's text where they are often depicted as ruthless savages who were "dealt with" by the brave and honorable actions of great men like Captain John Smith and Myles Standish. In other places American Indians were conspicuously absent. In Eggleston's (1917) chapter entitled "How the United States became Larger," for example, the only mention of indigenous peoples was a reference to a conflict between "the people of this country and the Spanish inhabitants of Florida" (p. 206). It is difficult to imagine Indian students feeling a strong sense of patriotism to the United States when they are being depicted as either absent from the historical narrative or as ruthless savages, but both messages made sense when understood in terms of the missions of the two schools.

At Hampton, Armstrong did not seem too concerned about the potential negative repercussions of having Indian students learn about American history in a way that depicted them as savage and ruthless. On the contrary, he explained in the annual report



of 1882 that Indian students responded calmly and “their interest seems easily awakened” by the “graphic descriptions of the aborigines, with scalping knife and tomahawk” (ARCIA, 1882, p. 181). Hampton teacher Henrietta Lathrop concurred that her Indian students showed an “unflagging interest in their [history] lessons,” taking them as an opportunity to learn lessons about themselves, which was exactly how Armstrong understood the study of history (ARCIA, 1884, p. 243). Although teachers like Lathrop made efforts to emphasize the “bright spots in the sad story of their race,” (ARCIA, 1884, p. 243) the purpose of studying history at Hampton was to maintain a delicate balance between instilling Indian students with racial pride and impressing upon them the superiority of European American civilization, the inevitability of American progress, and the futility of their resistance.

Even though Carlisle and Hampton used similar textbooks to teach American history, because of Pratt’s assimilationist philosophy, he most likely would not have approved of his teachers emphasizing aspects of American history that depicted Indians as savages. Beyond the writings of Pratt it is difficult to ascertain how teachers at Carlisle approached the history of Indian/white relations, leaving this an area of citizenship education in need of further research. There is evidence, however, that Pratt encouraged the study of history because it “broadens the mind, makes the pupil more intelligent and helps in gaining a knowledge of English” (*Indian Helper*, 1888, p. 3). It appears that, even though both Carlisle and Hampton used similar American history textbooks, they used them in different ways.

In addition to using textbooks with patriotic themes and messages, both institutions heeded Morgan’s call to take every opportunity to instill a sense of allegiance

to the nation through the use of patriotic celebrations and rituals. This appears to be one aspect of the citizenship education curriculum embraced by both Pratt and Armstrong equally. Indian Citizenship Day, also known as Emancipation Day or Franchise Day, for example, was a particularly important celebration at Hampton. At both institutions the day was celebrated with speeches and pageants, but at Hampton, Armstrong often took it as an opportunity for his American Indian students to learn from Hampton's African American students (Lindsey, 1995). At a celebration in 1901 at Hampton, for example, the theme was "ring out the old, and ring in the new." According to an article in *The Southern Workman*, the Indian students were instructed in the keynote address to ring out "the old customs and superstitions, the reservation, the ration system, the 'white man's fire-water, [and] the multiplicity of languages" and to ring in "Christian homes, education, and citizenship" ("Ring Out The Old," 1901).

#### *Citizenship Education as Preparation for Political Participation*

In order to teach Indian students to identify with the nation, the citizenship education curriculum at both Hampton and Carlisle also provided opportunities to develop skills needed to participate in political life, including an awareness of and ability to analyze current events, instruction in the basic elements of government, and the specific rights and responsibilities associated with legal citizenship. Although this aspect of the curriculum should be appreciated considering most American Indians were denied the rights of citizenship, the presumption and hope of both Pratt and Armstrong was that Indian students would soon be recognized as citizens and would therefore need to be prepared for their new responsibilities. Similar to the efforts to foster a patriotic identification with the nation, efforts to prepare Indian students for political participation

were also designed to shape Indian students' identities by encouraging them to think beyond what educational policymakers understood to be their "narrow" tribal interests.

At both institutions the study of current events was encouraged through participation in debating societies and the study of the newspaper. Pratt felt that the study of current events was essential in order "to make it possible for them to think and talk intelligently of the economic and political subjects of the day" (ARCIA, 1894, p. 416). The Man-on-the-band-stand (believed to be Pratt's *nomme de plume*) also encouraged Indian students to read the newspaper; if they did not have time, they should at minimum read the editorial page because "there you will find the best thoughts on all the leading subjects of the day" (*Indian Helper*, 1888, p. 2). At Hampton, reading the newspaper was also a part of what was called the "most original and interesting feature of the Indian school"—the "civilization class," which was specifically designed to "instruct the Indian youth in the new rights and duties of citizenship to which the Dawes bill and the progress of events is calling them" (ARCIA, 1888, p. 282). According to the description of the course, students in the "advanced class" learned to "read and understand newspapers by having daily news given and explained" (p. 282). A Hampton student described in a letter from 1904 how current events were addressed in her junior class:

in this period we bring up some of the political subjects which are being discussed in the newspapers. Our class was very much interested in watching how the election went. In the classroom our teacher let us vote just to see how it was done. Nearly every candidate was voted for but Roosevelt received the majority. (cited in Molin, 1988, p. 97)

Although no comparable class was offered at Carlisle, Pratt also exposed Indian students at Carlisle to the current issues of the day by inviting guest lecturers onto campus to give talks on important issues.

Debating clubs and literary societies were another part of the citizenship education curriculum at both Carlisle and Hampton designed to raise awareness about issues of importance and to give Indian students “every opportunity is given for free and independent thought,” according to the Man-on-the-band-stand (“Is It Right?,” 1887, p.2). At both Carlisle and Hampton topics were selected for debate that would resonate with Indian students. For example, when the decision was made to ban the teaching of Indian languages in Indian schools, Pratt encouraged the Union Debating Club to take up the topic: “Resolved, that all Indian education be taught only in English” (“We Expect a Lively Discussion,” 1887, p. 2). Not surprisingly, the affirmative was unanimous. Other topics debated included whether Indian education should be compulsory, whether civilization increases human happiness, and if poverty causes more crime than wealth. Whereas many of the topics related to items of particular interest to Indians students, topics related to the general interest were also debated at Carlisle, such as “resolved, that an income tax should be created by Congress,” and “resolved, that woman suffrage should be adopted by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States” (*Indian Helper*, 1900, p. 3).

At Hampton, too, debate was used to encourage discussion of current events, such as “resolved, that the steam boat has been of more use to civilization than the railroad” and “resolved, that it is for the best interest of the country that Prohibition be adopted” (*Southern Workman*, 1892, p. 73). Judging from the topics debated at both schools, it

appears that the study of current events was used to increase Indian students' identification with the nation by exposing them to both issues of larger national importance and to encourage them to come to the conclusion that the democratic process would give them an opportunity to influence their fate as citizens of the nation.

There is also evidence at both schools that Pratt and Armstrong heeded Morgan's call that Indian schools provide basic instruction in the elements of government and the more mundane aspects of citizenship. For example, in the "civilization class" at Hampton, Indian students learned "something about money, checks, receipts, notes of various kinds, postal orders, banks and their rules, deeds, mortgages, taxes, about voting, and something about the town, county, State, and Federal Governments under which the new citizens are soon to come" (ARCIA, 1888, p. 282). Something that is unclear from the published records is exactly how students at Hampton and Carlisle learned to exercise specific political rights, such as voting. Considering that few Indians were even granted the rights of full citizenship and that states continued to limit their political rights well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this is an aspect of the citizenship education curriculum that needs further exploration.

#### *Citizenship Education as Performance*

In the minds of education policymakers, citizenship required not just an understanding of the law, but the self-discipline to obey it. Pratt and Armstrong believed that living in a democracy required a respect for the ethical obligations that bind citizens together, but that the freedom and independence American Indians experienced in their tribal state, not constrained by the social mores of American civilization, had caused them to be prone to immoral behavior. In addition, Pratt, in particular, felt that the policy

of confining American Indians on reservations only exacerbated the problem because it increased their dependence on the U.S. Government. Therefore, a critical aspect of the citizenship education curriculum involved teaching American Indians the discipline needed to handle the new found freedom that accompanied citizenship. Apparently overlooking the irony of needing to teach a formerly independent people to obey in order to be free, both Pratt and Armstrong used physical activity—most significantly athletics and military training—to remediate their lack of discipline and to encourage obedience. Whereas manual training was intended to provide American Indians with the skills, knowledge, and values needed for their individualization as self-supporting citizens, athletics and military training encouraged their development as obedient, law-abiding citizens. Armstrong noted, for example, that military drill was important because it “enforces promptness, accuracy, and obedience, and goes further than any other influence could do to instill into the minds of the students what both Negro and Indian sadly lack, a knowledge of the value of time” (ARCIA, 1880, p. 109).

Pratt’s desire to prove that his Indian students were capable of civilization and citizenship led him to promote activities such as athletics and military drill for the effect they would have on outside audiences. Ever concerned about avoiding stereotypes of Indians as savage and ruthless, Pratt carefully selected the types of performances he felt would be viewed as enabling their assimilation as equal citizens. For example, throughout his career Pratt railed against the popular Wild West Shows performed by Buffalo Bill Cody because they depicted Indians as ruthless and savage. Considering Carlisle’s reputation as being a national powerhouse in football, it is interesting to note that it was at first reluctantly that Pratt allowed his Indian students to play fearing that

their participation would reinforce the image of the Indian as barbaric (Bloom, 2000). Eventually, athletics such as football, basketball, and baseball became important sources of pride for Indian students, both boys and girls, and provided Pratt with national exposure as Carlisle's teams competed against—and beat—the best collegiate teams in the country. Pratt also used the daily military drill as an opportunity to demonstrate to the public the success he was having in teaching his Indian students self-discipline. Although Pratt was perhaps more overt in his use of physical training as a way to promote his assimilationist program, both Pratt and Armstrong understood its value in shaping Indian students into obedient, disciplined citizens.

#### A Curriculum for Second-Class Citizenship

Toward the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, off-reservation boarding schools came under attack on several fronts. A major criticism was that the efforts of assimilationists, like Pratt and Morgan, were misguided because they were based on an overly optimistic assessment of the capabilities of Indian students. Also, some critics questioned the appropriateness of absorbing American Indians into mainstream U.S. society, arguing like Armstrong that the reservation offered the best hope for the future progress of American Indians along the path toward civilization and citizenship. Finally, prompted by reports of abuse, illness, and death, social reformers began to raise concerns about the poor condition of off-reservation schools. Accordingly, a new brand of educational policymakers advocated for the expansion of schools on Indian reservations and for the reform of the curriculum to deliver what they believed to be a more appropriate education to match their lower expectations of Indian students. Generally, in terms of citizenship education, this meant that the emphasis changed from transforming Indian students into

copies of their white neighbors to fostering their Indian identity and preparing them for limited economic and political roles. Influenced by a concern for social efficiency, child-centered developmental theories, and scientific racism, the new curriculum for second-class citizenship was best reflected in the work of Estelle Reel, a superintendent of Indian schools who rewrote the official course of study for Indian schools, and Thomas Jesse Jones, a teacher at Hampton who created a “social studies” curriculum designed to teach Indian students to adapt as political and cultural inferiors.

The new attitudes shaping Indian education at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century were perfectly summarized at the 1901 NEA Convention by Calvin Woodward in a speech he delivered entitled, “What Shall Be Taught in an Indian School?” A nationally-recognized advocate for manual training, Woodward began his speech by raising Herbert Spencer’s age-old question: What knowledge is of most worth? Woodward continued:

You remember that Spencer insists in his reply to his own question that education must first be directed to developing the power of providing food, clothing, and shelter for one’s self and one’s family. Self-support is the cornerstone of all good citizenship. Without this there can be no good citizens, no sound basis for society, no reasonable hope for civilization and culture. (cited in RSIS, 1901, p. 67)

In referencing Spencer, Woodward was placing Indian citizenship education within a debate over the proper form of education for racial and ethnic minorities in a democracy. Woodward’s contention that self-support is the fundamental aspect of citizenship was a direct attack against the assimilationist philosophy that American Indians needed an academic education similar to that of the common schools, albeit with a strong manual



education component to prepare Indian students for lives as equal citizens. The movement towards self-support as the overriding aim of Indian citizenship education reflected an evolutionary perspective that viewed the forces governing human and societal development to be natural, yet capable of being influenced by education, albeit slowly. Given the slow nature of evolutionary change, education policymakers such as Estelle Reel and Thomas Jesse Jones created a citizenship education curriculum more in line with the actual, rather than the future legal status of most American Indians.

Although the new curriculum significantly deemphasized academic training in favor of an education that would prepare Indian students for their predicted future roles as farmers and laborers, it represented a break from the assimilationist curriculum in the way it encouraged American Indians to take pride in the accomplishments of their people, thus ironically marking the beginning of a more pluralistic conception of citizenship education. It is important to note, however, that rather than representing a radical shift, the new emphasis on a practical course of study included many of the same elements of the old citizenship education curriculum, including fostering a patriotic identification with the nation, the curriculum of civilization, and basic instruction in the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

#### *Estelle Reel and Citizenship Education for Self-Support*

As the first woman to occupy a position requiring Senate ratification, the significance of Estelle Reel's selection as Superintendent of Indian schools in 1898 perhaps overshadowed the influence she was to have on Indian citizenship education. A tireless worker, Reel traveled over 65,000 miles by train, wagon, horse, and foot in her first three years in office, visiting Indian schools across the country (Lomawaima, 1996).

Following her review of Indian schools, Reel wrote a new Uniform Course of Study in 1901 that was designed to

give teachers a definite idea of the work that should be done in the schools to advance the pupils as speedily as possible to usefulness and citizenship. The aim of the course is to give the Indian child a knowledge of the English language, and to equip him with the ability to become self-supporting as speedily as possible.

(RSIS, 1901, p. 30)

In general, the Uniform Course of Study is significant because of the ways it differed from the assimilationist curriculum of her predecessors. Although Reel shared many of the basic assumptions underlying Indian education from the beginning—most significantly that Indians were an inferior race but that they could be saved through civilization and citizenship—she did not envision Indians taking their place alongside their white neighbors. Accordingly, the Uniform Course of Study offered in minute detail the type of manual education that she felt would enable Indian students to become self-supporting. In this way, Reel supported and gave a new level of depth and detail to the curriculum of civilization in use in Indian schools at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

One significant departure from her predecessors, however, was her support for teaching “Native arts and crafts,” such as basketweaving in addition to the types of manual skills traditionally taught in Indian schools. Rather than supporting Native arts and crafts out of respect for Native culture Reel saw them as an economic opportunity to capitalize on skills Indian women already had. Lomawaima (1996) suggests that Reel’s support of Native arts and crafts was to have a significant impact on generations of Indian women who were encouraged to practice traditional cultures.

In terms of citizenship education in the academic program, Reel's Uniform Course of Study in many ways resembled her predecessors in that it emphasized learning English and provided a rudimentary academic training. She made it clear, though, that the quality and nature of the academic citizenship education should reflect more limited roles. In terms of teaching American history, for example, she recommended:

It is not desired that American history be studied with much detail, but rather a general view of it given the pupils. They should know enough about it to be good, patriotic citizens, but valuable time should not be used in learning minor details. They should learn a few important dates, such as that of the discovery of America, settlement of Virginia, Declaration of Independence, etc. (RSIS, 1901, p. 34)

For other subjects as well, such as Government, the emphasis was to be on only those details that would be useful to Indian students. In addition to being given less emphasis, Reel understood the purpose of the academic curriculum to be different from her assimilationist predecessors. For Reel, the purpose of the academic curriculum was to “arouse in the pupils an interest in the upward struggles of their people in the past and a determination to do their part toward the progress of their race in the future” (RSIS, 1901, p. 34). To do this meant offering a sanitized version of history that would “create a spirit of love and brotherhood in the minds of the children toward the white people” (RSIS, 1901, p. 34). So, rather than teaching the Euro-centric curriculum represented in popular textbooks in use in Indian schools, Reel recommended teaching American history by starting with the stories of their tribe that had been handed down “in tales told around camp fires” (RSIS, 1901, p. 34). Again, belying this seeming respect for Native

traditions and histories was a belief that Indian peoples were an inferior race, incapable of benefitting from a common school education.

Reel also put her mark on Indian citizenship education beyond the traditional academic curriculum. For example, instead of using the evening hour like Pratt and Armstrong had done for literary societies and debating clubs, Reel suggested turning it into a series of vocational talks given by various teachers (RSIS, 1901, p. 32). However, Reel still supported the celebration of holidays, such as the birthdays of presidents, and the performance of patriotic rituals.

The overriding message of Reel's Uniform Course of Study was that Indian students needed to be prepared for lives of manual labor as they began the long, arduous "upward climb towards civilization" (RSIS, 1901). By the time Reel left office in 1910, the emphasis of the citizenship education curriculum appears to match the new emphasis of Indian education expressed very clearly by Commissioner of Indian Affairs Francis Leupp when he commented: "To me the most pathetic sight in the world is a score of little red children of nature corralled in a closed room, and required to recite lessons in convert and go through the conventional daily program of one of our graded common schools" (Leupp, 1910, p. 126).

#### *Thomas Jesse Jones and the Social Studies*

Shortly after Estelle Reel began her work in Indian education, another influential figure was just beginning to put his stamp on citizenship education at the Hampton Institute. Thomas Jesse Jones is better known for his role in shaping African American education and in the development of the social studies (he chaired the National Education Association's influential committee for the Reorganization of Secondary Education in

1916, which produced the document that was to become the core of the social studies curriculum), but the curriculum he designed and implemented at Hampton was also designed for American Indians. Jones believed that both groups were members of inferior races and in need of a curriculum to address what he perceived to be their unique deficiencies. In fact, Jones viewed both Indians and blacks as being the victims of similar circumstances—blacks being the victims of slavery and Indians being the victims of their tribal governments. The result was that both groups lacked a proper home life and knowledge of the political, social, and economic institutions that made a higher civilization possible, according to Jones. He identified differences in “mental characteristics” and the “social organizations of races” to be the greatest obstacle to their development (Jones, 1907, p. 46). What made Jones’ social studies curriculum significant, however, was the fact that it was based on the latest sociological research, giving it a perceived legitimacy that Reel’s curriculum probably lacked, even though they shared many things in common.

Armed with data from census reports and the research of his mentor Franklin Giddings of Columbia University, Jones created a broad based course of study that united several disciplines, including civics, political economy, history, and sociology (Lindsey, 1995). Similar to the philosophy of Hampton’s founder, Samuel Chapman Armstrong, the overall purpose of the curriculum was to provide a program for racial improvement. But because the difference between civilized and uncivilized peoples was so vast, the program was also designed to impress upon Jones’ African American and Indian students the superiority of the white race in order to justify the discrimination against them. In terms of citizenship education, what was ironic about the curriculum was that it left out

any notion of the rights of citizens (Lindsey, 1995). Instead, Indians and blacks were to be taught about the evolution of government from “the horde or herd states in which there was no family relation” all the way to democracy, which was “composed of individuals prepared to undertake the heavy responsibilities of citizenship” (Jones, 1907, p. 50).

Indians and blacks were to be taught that any discrimination they experienced was just a phase in the evolution of government, and not permanent. The hope was that they would “become more intelligent in their work, more patient under oppression, and more hopeful as to the future” (Jones, 1907, p. 50). The civics curriculum also addressed the relationship between the government and the public welfare as a way to demonstrate to Indian and blacks students the important role of the government in promoting economic development, particularly agriculture. The least important part of the civics curriculum, according to Jones, was the section on the “Machinery of Government,” which described the functions of the various parts of government, legislation and taxation, political parties, and finally, “the methods of voting are described” (Jones, 1907, p. 55).

Imbued with the cold rationality of social science, the Hampton social studies curriculum was on the cutting edge of the movement to align the curriculum with the actual needs of students. Indeed, the influence the model of social studies Jones promoted was to have on the national level suggests perhaps that it was truly innovative for the time period. However, when viewed within the context of Indian education in general up to that point, the Hampton social studies was simply the latest manifestation of a curriculum designed to civilize American Indians by teaching them to accept their allotments and give up their traditional cultures. Although it represented a departure from the assimilationist curriculum of people like Pratt and Morgan, Jones’ curriculum

was the translation of Armstrong's pragmatic, gradualist philosophy into the language and methods of social science.

#### Indian Students' Response to the Citizenship Education Curriculum

Considering the low expectations, the emphasis placed on performances and rituals, the efforts to physically and psychically erase Indian culture, and the backdrop of the dispossession of Indian land, it is difficult to imagine Indian students responding to the citizenship education curricula with anything but contempt. Evidence from published historical records, particularly the school newspapers of both Carlisle and Hampton and the annual reports to Secretary of the Interior, however, present a different picture. Rather than rejecting the schools' efforts to reshape their political and cultural identities, students often reported being grateful, even indebted, to the education provided by the schools. However, instead of expressing a desire to vanish into American society—the desire of assimilationists—students often reported a desire to use the knowledge and skills learned at Carlisle and Hampton to defend the rights and interests of their people. So, even though students often parroted the assimilationist message of the schools' founders, which generally depicted Indian culture as inferior, they also expressed a desire to use the knowledge and skills they acquired from the citizenship education curriculum to preserve an Indian political identity.

Even students who rejected the assimilationist philosophy and were critical of the schools were motivated by their experiences used the knowledge and skills they learned to advocate for the rights of American Indians. Although there is good reason to be skeptical of accounts written in the schools' newspapers and annual reports (they were carefully edited for use as tools of propaganda and to justify funding), the students'

perspectives and actions speak to the importance of the citizenship education curricula of both schools.

An aspect of the citizenship education curriculum that students often expressed an appreciation for was the ability to read and speak English, which was often understood by Indian students as a powerful political tool. A prize-winning essay written by Dennis Wheelock, for example, an Oneida student at Carlisle expressed his appreciation for learning English because of political power it would give his people. He described the Indian language as a “cord that pulls down the race” because “[y]ou can’t express a wise idea with the Indian language in a way that would be wise and you can’t make a law with it, and you can never make a speech as well and as good, as you would with the English language” (“Is It Right,” 1887, p. 2). Thomas Wildcat Alford, an Absentee Shawnee, was sent to Hampton by his elders specifically so that he could learn the white man’s ways, in particular the ability to read and write in English. In his autobiography Alford quotes a chief of his tribe encouraging him to learn to read and write English because “it would enable us to use the club of white man’s wisdom against him in defense of our customs and our Mee-saw-mi as given us by the Great Spirit” (Alford, 1936, p. 73). Alford’s story is particularly poignant because he was rejected by his tribe upon returning after graduation because he converted to Christianity and adopted the white man’s ways. Despite his treatment Alford went on to defend the rights of his tribe, albeit in his capacity as an agent for the United States Government.

In addition to expressing gratitude for learning English, students also credited their experiences at Carlisle and Hampton with providing them with a desire to become citizens so that they could be entitled to the same rights as non-Indian citizens. Although



this is another area that is in need of further research, it seems that students at both Hampton and Carlisle expressed this desire for citizenship, but their reasons seem to reflect the different missions of the schools. Students at Carlisle, for example, seemed to be motivated by the unjust treatment of American Indians at the hands of the United States Government—a common theme expressed by Pratt—whereas students at Hampton apparently accepted the gradualist philosophy of Armstrong that encouraged Indian students to put their faith in the United States as the ultimate guarantor of their rights. An unidentified student at Hampton, for example, lauded the efforts of the school because his education allowed him to “see more clearly the true condition of the Indian, and a desire has been created within me to see the day when my race like other races shall stand as men among men—when they shall be called citizens of this, that you call the Land of the Free” (ARCIA, 1885, p. 251). A student at Carlisle, on the other hand, argued in response to the concern that his education would lead to his losing his rights as an Indian:

Lose my rights and an Indian! What are the rights that an Indian has? Is it the drawing of rations and beef every week? No, the Indians have no rights...The negroes become citizens while they were just as ignorant as can be, even now. Why cannot the Indians be allowed citizenship? Free us from the rights of support and ignorance, and give us the rights of civilized citizenship. We are bound to be citizens, and why not now? (ARCIA, 1885, p. vii)

Despite these differences, it appears that graduates of both Carlisle and Hampton used their education to exercise their political rights. Not only did students make speeches and write essays on the influence of the citizenship education curriculum, there are also examples of Carlisle and Hampton graduates who went on to fight for Indian

treaty rights. For example, Reuben Quickbear, a member of the inaugural class at Carlisle in 1879, went on to lead a delegation to Washington D.C. to help negotiate treaty rights with the Secretary of the Interior (“Ex-students and Graduates,” 1909, p. 42). Graduates of both Carlisle and Hampton also played a significant role in the movement for Indian rights that began in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century (Hertzberg, 1971). Ten of the eighteen founding members of the most influential group formed to defend the rights of American Indians, the Society of American Indians, were graduates of either Carlisle or Hampton. Members of groups who fought for Indian civil rights like the Society of American Indians held different attitudes about the place of American Indian culture in American society than did the founders of the schools. As was discussed in the previous chapter, some were supporters of the efforts of off-reservation boarding schools generally, seeing assimilation as the best hope for the survival of American Indians, but they rejected the notion that Indian cultures were inherently inferior and therefore were harshly critical of the efforts of the schools to erase them.

The influence of the citizenship education curricula on shaping Indian students’ identities is also evident in the high proportion of Indian students who joined the military after leaving Carlisle and Hampton. A disproportionate number of American Indians enlisted in the military, and continue to do so, despite the fact that many were not required to enlist because they were not citizens. Historically, off-reservation boarding schools were fertile recruiting grounds, in fact, one of the reasons Carlisle closed was because of the large number of its students who enlisted in World War I. Although it is logical to assume that enlistment in the military was an expression of patriotism engendered by the schools, it appears that Indian students’ reasons for enlisting go

beyond a desire to serve their country. Holm (1996) points out that many American Indians who enlisted in World War I did so as an expression of their tribal loyalty and to the warrior culture in which they were raised. For example, Indian veterans of World War I were treated by their tribes just as warriors had been who fought against white a hundred years earlier because “he had taken part in those time-honored tribal traditions linked to warfare” (Holm, 1996, p. 101). Ulysses Ferris, a Carlisle student who enlisted in the Spanish American War, expressed his divided loyalties in a letter reprinted in the *Indian Helper*:

Fear not, classmates, that the Philippine's bullet will lay me low to be buried in a soil drenched by the blood of my comrades. No, I shall stand for my country, my tribe, my honorable class, and for the Stars and Stripes, so that in the end, those downtrodden of the islands may enjoy the blessings of liberty as we do in this grand nation of ours. (“An Indian Soldier Boy Talks,” 1900, p. 1)

Even though there is ample evidence that suggests the political identities of Indian students were shaped by their experiences at Carlisle and Hampton, further research is needed to explore the nature of this influence, particularly for Indian students who did not serve their country or become leaders in the movement for Indian rights. Several scholars have documented the devastating impact off-reservation boarding schools had on students' lives and the communities from which they came, but the overall impact of the citizenship education curriculum on students has not been explored. When one looks at the larger picture, for example, what is most striking and troubling is the lack of political power in Indian communities, a legacy of the off-reservation boarding schools that deserves greater attention, but is beyond the scope of this study. Even though the voices

of students were largely silent, an examination of the citizenship education curriculum of Carlisle and Hampton suggests that students who attended these institutions were most likely deeply influenced by their experiences.

Conclusion—the Citizenship Education Curriculum: Whitewash or Wallpaper?

In assessing the historical debate over the appropriate curriculum for Indian students at the turn of the century, Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) suggest that what was more important was the relationship between off-reservation boarding schools and the allotment policy, which involved the systematic effort to divest Indians of their land and erode their status as sovereign entities. Against this backdrop, they argue that the question of the curriculum becomes one of “whitewash or wallpaper”—an insignificant distinction in the grand scheme of things (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006, p. 51). In many ways their assessment is accurate. When one considers the role off-reservation boarding schools played in disrupting American Indian communities, questions of method seem particularly meaningless. Also, when one considers that citizenship was not even granted universally to American Indians until 1924, nor was it something many American Indians even wanted, the issue of citizenship education seems even more irrelevant. Overall, off-reservation boarding schools played an important role in the destruction of native cultures, the loss of Indian lands, and the erosion of tribal sovereignty—despite the hope of reformers like Pratt that American Indians would be transformed into equal citizens.

However, an examination of the citizenship education curriculum for American Indians during the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries is important precisely because of the tragic context in which it took place. Herbert Kliebard (1995) argues that during

periods of social upheaval the curriculum is an important artifact documenting the way society responds to change. He suggests that, at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, schools were mediating institutions, providing the social cohesion needed for the perpetuation of democracy during a period of unprecedented change in U.S. society. Immigration, the end of slavery, and national expansion fundamentally altered the nature of democracy by expanding the definition of who belonged in the nation. These changes necessitated a different role for schools. For this reason the citizenship education curriculum serves as an important artifact documenting the changing role of schools from preparation for equal citizenship to preparation for second class citizenship during a critical period in the history of American Indian/U.S. relations.

Considering the backdrop, what stands out is the symbolic nature of citizenship education for American Indians during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Much like the pageant play at the beginning of this dissertation, the citizenship education curriculum for American Indians in general resembled the script of a play in that it expressed conceptions of citizenship that stood in marked contrast to the realities experienced by most American Indians during this period. Whether the curriculum emphasized transformation or improvement, equal or second-class citizenship, Indian students at both Carlisle and Hampton were required to put on costumes (citizen dress) in order to act out rituals, performances, and celebrations designed to teach them what educational policymakers understood to be required for citizenship. In linking citizenship and civilization, educational policymakers were not only rejecting the value of American Indian culture, but they were contradicting the democratic values they were attempting to instill in their students; namely, freedom of expression, religion, movement, and to be

treated equally before the law. Instead, most American Indians were treated as wards of the nation, often confined to reservations under the supervision of government agents.

In many ways, it could be argued, the education of American Indians in off-reservation boarding schools resembles the experiences of other racial and ethnic minorities, especially those from lower social classes that came to the United States in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Particularly during the Progressive Era, schooling in general was aimed at Americanizing new immigrants, a process that involved teaching them the cultural values and industrial skills policymakers believed were needed to become productive American citizens. New immigrants, African Americans, and women were also the object of discrimination, being denied many of the rights of citizenship, despite the expansion of the cultural and legal definitions of citizenship expressed in the school curriculum. Manual education, too, although originally developed for groups who were perceived to be in need of moral uplift due to their “inferior” civilization, such as African Americans and American Indians, became another popular Progressive Era educational innovation because of the desire of some to make schooling more responsive to the new industrial needs of society. In fact, it could be argued that in many ways Indian education at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was on the cutting edge of many Progressive Era trends in education. While the relationship between Indian education and broader trends in education are apparent, the citizenship education of American Indians deserves to be understood as unique because of colonial relationship and its long term impact on American Indian communities.

Unlike other racial and ethnic minorities in the United States, American Indians have been engaged in a struggle for self-determination that began with the founding of

the country and continues to this day. The colonial relationship requires interpreting the history of citizenship education in terms of an unequal exchange. Not only were American Indians expected to give up their traditional ways of life in order to assimilate, citizenship was also tied to the movement to dispossess American Indians of their land and limit their sovereignty.

\*\*\*\*\*

In 1893 at the World's Fair in Chicago—the same event Pratt put his group of students on display—a Potawatomi leader, Simon Pokagon, was asked to open the ceremonies by tolling a replica of Philadelphia's Liberty Bell and giving an address. Organizers most likely selected Pokagon to open the ceremonies because he and his tribe represented to them a model for other tribes to follow: they had converted to Christianity, adopted farming, and expressed their loyalty to the U.S. government (Hoxie, 2001). But Pokagon had also witnessed the forced relocation of most of his tribe to the Midwest and in the process experienced firsthand the devastation caused by the onslaught of American "progress." Rather than extolling the virtues of American progress, a theme of the fair, Pokagon took the opportunity to deliver a scathing indictment of the treatment of Native Americans since European discovery. His address, entitled the Red Man's Greeting, was widely disseminated after the fair and it stands as an important example of a Native response to this period in U.S./Indian relations. He began his address with a poem:

Shall not one line lament our forest race,  
 For you struck out from wild creation's face,  
 Freedom—the selfsame freedom you adore,  
 Bade us defend our violated shore. (cited in Hoxie, 2001, p. 31)

When compared with the poem at the beginning of this dissertation (the other was written at Hampton a year earlier to celebrate Indian Citizenship Day) a starkly different picture of U.S./Indian relations emerges. Instead of expressing gratitude like the students at Hampton, Pokagon declared to the “pale-faced race that has usurped our lands and homes, that we have no spirit to celebrate with you...do not forget that this success [evidenced by the World Fair] has been at the sacrifice of our homes and a once happy race” (cited in Hoxie, p. 31).

When it was given, Pokagon’s address drew attention to the consequences of civilization for American Indians, which most Americans during the period, even many American Indians themselves, understood to be the inevitable result of progress. If American Indians were going to survive at all, most educational reformers and policymakers believed, they would need to give up their “inferior” culture and assimilate into the United States as citizens. By equating civilization with citizenship and by defining civilization in terms of European American values and accomplishments, those who created the citizenship education curriculum were complicit in the effort to destroy native cultures, detribalize native societies, and dispossess American Indians of their land. The role education played in the complex period in the history of U.S./Indian relations—the focus of this dissertation—makes this a unique and important topic to understand.

Educators, particularly social studies professionals, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century need to be acutely aware of our conceptions of citizenship and how they influence the ways in which we educate children for citizenship in the United States. In the case of American Indians, there needs to be an appreciation that, historically, education that sought to assimilate and



detrimental to American Indians had significant negative consequences that continue to be felt in American Indian communities (Peshkin, 1997). In order to avoid the mistakes of the past we need to conceptualize citizenship and citizenship education so that it recognizes the historic and current right of self-determination for American Indians. Doing this requires an acknowledgement that the political sovereignty of American Indian peoples, as well as their cultural and linguistic diversity, do not pose a threat to national unity, but are an expression of fundamental democratic values.

## References

- (1888, January 13). *Indian Helper*, 3(22), 1-4.
- (1892). *Southern Workman*, 73.
- (1900, January 17). *Indian Helper*, 15(12), 3.
- Adams, D. (1977). Education in hues: Red and black at Hampton Institute, 1878-1893. *South Atlantic Journal*, 76(2), 159-176.
- Adams, D. (1988). Fundamental considerations: The deep meaning of Native American schooling, 1880-1900. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(1), 1-28.
- Adams, D. (1995). *Education for extinction*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.
- Adams, D. (2006). Land, law, and education: The troubled history of Indian citizenship, 1871-1924. In Patrick, J. & Warren, D. (Eds.). *Civic and moral learning in America* (pp. 119-134). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Adams, E. (1971). *American Indian education: Government schools and economic progress*. New York: Arno Press.
- Ahern, W. (1997). An experiment aborted: Returned Indian students in the Indian school service, 1881-1908. *Ethnohistory*, 44(2), 263-304.
- Alford, T. (1936). *Civilization, as told to Florence Drake*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- An Indian soldier boy talks. (1900, February 23). *Indian Helper*, 15(17), 1.
- Anderson, J. (1988). *The education of blacks in the south, 1860-1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Anderson, J. (2007). Race-conscious educational policies versus a “color-blind constitution”: A historical perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 36(5), 249-257.

*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.* (1877). Washington DC:  
Government Printing Office.

*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.* (1878). Washington DC:  
Government Printing Office.

*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.* (1880). Washington DC:  
Government Printing Office.

*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.* (1882). Washington DC:  
Government Printing Office.

*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.* (1884). Washington DC:  
Government Printing Office.

*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.* (1887). Washington DC:  
Government Printing Office.

*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.* (1888). Washington DC:  
Government Printing Office.

*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.* (1889). Washington DC:  
Government Printing Office.

*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.* (1892). Washington DC:  
Government Printing Office.

*Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.* (1905). Washington DC:  
Government Printing Office.

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11(1), 3-42.

Axtell, J. (1985). *The invasion within: The contest of cultures in colonial North America.*  
New York: Oxford University Press.

- Banks, J. (2007). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Barr, R., Barth, J., & Shermis, S. (1978). *The nature of the social studies*. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.
- Bloom, J. (2000). *To show what an Indian can do: Sports at Native American boarding schools*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bolt, C. (1987). *American Indian policy and American reform*. Winchester, MA: Unwin Hyman, Inc.
- Britten, T. (1997). *American Indians in World War I: At home and at war*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Burgess, L. (1975). *The Lake Mohonk Conference of Friends of the Indian: Guide to annual reports*. New York: Clearwater Publishing, Inc.
- Butts, R. (1978). *Public education in the United States: From revolution to reform*. New York: Holt, Reinhart, and Winston.
- Calloway, C. (2004). *First peoples: A documentary survey of American Indian history* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Bedford/St. Martin's Press.
- Chilcoat, G., & Ligon, J. (1994). Developing democratic citizens: The Mississippi freedom schools as a model for social studies instruction. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 22, 128-175.
- Child, B. (2000). *Boarding school seasons: American Indian families, 1900-1940*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Cohen, F. (1953). The erosion of Indian rights, 1950-1953: A case study in bureaucracy. *Yale Law Review*, 62, 349-390.

- Coleman, M. (2008). *American Indian children at school, 1850-1930*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- Crocco, M. (2000). Women, citizenship, and the social studies. *Educational Forum*, 65(1), 52-59.
- Crocco, M., & Davis, O. (Eds.). (1999). *Bending the future to their will: Civic women, social education, and democracy*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Crocco, M, Watras, J., & Woysner, C. (2004). *Social education in the twentieth century: Curriculum and context for citizenship*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890-1990* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Deloria, P. (1998). *Playing Indian*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Deloria, Jr., V., & Lytle, C. (1984). *The nations within: The past and future of American Indian sovereignty*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Dilworth, P. (2004). Competing conceptions of citizenship education: Thomas Jesse Jones and Carter G. Woodson. *International Journal of Social Education*, 18(2), 1-15.
- Eastman, C. (1931). *From the deeps woods to civilization*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Eastman, C. (1975). *The Indian to-day: The past and future of the first American*. New York: AMS Press.
- Eastman, E. (1935). *Pratt: The red man's Moses*. Norman: Oklahoma University Press.

- Eggleston, E. (1917). *A first book in American history*. Chicago: American Book Company.
- Eisner, E. (1992). Curriculum ideologies. In E. Eisner, (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 302-326). Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Ellis, C. (1994). *To change them forever: Indian education at the Rainy Mountain Boarding School, 1893-1920*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Evans, R. (2004). *The social studies wars: What should we teach the children?* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ex-students and graduates. (1909, October). *The Indian Craftsman*, 2(3), 42.
- Fear-Segal, J. (2007). *White man's club: Schools, race, and the struggle of Indian acculturation*. Omaha: University of Nebraska Press.
- Goodson, I. (Ed.). (1985). *Social histories of the secondary curriculum: Subjects for study*. London: Falmer Press.
- Goodson, I., & Ball, S. (1984). *Defining the curriculum: Histories and ethnographies*. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.
- Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Haig-Brown, C. (1988). *Resistance and renewal: Surviving the Indian residential school*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press.
- Hamley, J. (1995). Cultural genocide in the classroom: A history of the federal boarding school movement in American Indian education, 1875-1920 (Doctoral

dissertation, Harvard University, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55, (07), 1849. (UMI No. 740809221).

Hertzberg, H. (1999). *The search for an American Indian identity: Modern pan-Indian movements*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Holm, T. (1996). *Strong hearts, wounded souls: Native American veterans of the Vietnam War*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Holm, T. (2005). *The great confusion in Indian affairs*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Horne, E., & McBeth, S. (1998). *Essie's story: The life and legacy of a Shoshone teacher*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Hoxie, F. (2001). *A final promise: The campaign to assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Hoxie, F. (Ed.).(2001). *Talking back to civilization: Indian voices from the progressive era*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's Press.

Hoxie, F., Hoffman, R., & Albert, P. (Eds.)(1999). *Native Americans and the early republic*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Is it right? (1887, September 2). *Indian Helper*, 3(4), 1-4.

Is it right for the government to stop the teaching of Indian languages in schools? (1887, November 18). *Indian Helper*, 3(15), 1.

Jackson, P. (1990). *Life in classrooms* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Johnson, D. (2000). W.E.B. Dubois, Thomas Jesse Jones and the struggle for social education, 1900-1930. *Journal of Negro History*, 85(3), 71-95.

- Jones, T. (1907). Social studies in the Hampton curriculum. *Southern Workman*, 36(1), 43-47.
- Kaestle, C. (1982). Ideology and American educational history. *History of Education Quarterly*, 22, 123-137.
- Kaestle, C. (1983). *Pillars of the republic*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Katanski, A. (2005). *Learning to write "Indian": The boarding-school experience and American Indian literature*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Katz, M. (1987). *Reconstructing American education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kliebard, H. (1994). "That evil genius of the Negro race": Thomas Jesse Jones and educational reform. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 10(1), 5-20.
- Kliebard, H. (1995). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Routledge Press.
- Kliebard, H. (1999). *Schooled to work: Vocationalism and the American curriculum, 1876-1946*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Krouse, S. (2007). *North American Indians in the great war*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Leupp, F. (1914). *In red man's land*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company.
- Leupp, F. (1910). *The Indian and his problem*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Lindsey, D. (1995). *Indians at Hampton Institute, 1877-1923*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Lomawaima, K. (1994). *They called it prairie light: The story of Chilocco Indian School*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.



- Lomawaima, K. (1996). Estelle Reel, superintendent of Indian schools, 1898-1910: Politics, curriculum, and land. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 35, 5-31.
- Lomawaima, K., & McCarty, T. (2006). *To remain an Indian: Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ludlow, H. (March, 1892). Columbia's roll call. *The Southern Workman*, 42-44.
- Lybarger, M. (1983). Origin of the modern social studies. *History of Education Quarterly*, 23(4), 455-68.
- Marks, P. (1998). *In a barren land: The American Indian quest for cultural survival, 1607 to the present*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Martin, J. (1990). Neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red herring: The citizenship status of American Indians, 1830-1924. *Journal of the West*, 29(3), 75-87.
- McCulloch, G. (2004). *Documentary research in education, history and the social sciences*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- McCulloch, G., & Richardson, W. (2000). *Historical research in educational settings*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- McDonnell, J. (1991). *The dispossession of the American Indian, 1887-1934*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- McLaren, P. (1993). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Longman Press.
- Molin, P. (1988). Training the hand, the head, and the heart: Indian education at Hampton Institute. *Minnesota History*, 51(3), 82-98.
- Morgan, T. (1892). *Studies in pedagogy*. Boston: Silver, Burdett & Company.
- Morgan, T. (1895). *Patriotic citizenship*. Chicago: American Book Company.

National Archives. (1787, July). *An ordinance for the government of the territory North-West of the River Ohio*. Retrieved November 6, 2009, from Our Documents via

National Archives Online access:

<http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=true&doc=8>

National Council for the Social Studies. (2001, May). *Creating effective citizens*.

Retrieved November 6, 2009, from

<http://www.socialstudies.org/positions/effectivecitizens>

Quackenbos, G. (1871). *Primary history of the United States*. New York: D. Appleton & Company.

Qoyawayma, P. (1964). *No turning back: A true account of a Hopi Indian girl's struggle to bridge the gap between the world of her people and the world of the white man*.

Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Peshkin, A. (1997). *Places of memory: Whiteman's schools and Native American communities*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pratt, R. (1892). The advantage of mingling whites with Indians. In I. Barrows, (Ed.), *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections* (pp. 45-58).

Boston: Press of George H. Ellis.

Pratt, R. (2003). *Battlefield and classroom: Four decades with the American Indians, 1867-1904*, edited by Robert M. Utley. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Prucha, F. (Ed.). (1973). *Americanizing the American Indians: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian" 1880-1900*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Prucha, F. (Ed.). (1975). *Documents of United States Indian policy*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- Prucha, F. (1979). *The churches and the Indian schools, 1888-1912*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Prucha, F. (1984). *The great father: The United States government and the American Indians* (Vol. II). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools*. (1901). Washington DC: Government Printing Office.
- Reuben, J. (1997). Beyond politics: Community civics and the redefinition of citizenship in the Progressive Era. *History of Education Quarterly*, 37(4), 399-420.
- Reuben, J. (2005). Patriotic purposes: Public schools and the education of citizens. In Furhman, S., & Lazerson, M. (Eds.), *The public schools* (pp. 1-24). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reyhner, J., & Elder, J. (2004). *American Indian education: A history*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Ring out the old, ring in the new. (1901). *Southern Workman*, 177.
- Ruggles-Gere, A. (2005). Indian heart/white man's head: Native-American teachers in Indian schools 1880-1930. *History of Education Quarterly*, 45(1), 38-67.
- Rules for Indian schools with course of study*. (1890). Washington DC: Government Printing Office.
- Saxe, D. (1991). *Social studies in schools: A history of the early years*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Scott, J. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Scudder, H. (1884). *A history of the United States of America*. Chicago: Taintor Brothers & Company.
- Smith, R. (1997). *Civic ideals: Conflicting visions of citizenship in U.S. history*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Some things we are learning at Carlisle besides regular study and work. (1887, September 9). *Indian Helper*, 3(5), 4.
- Spack, R. (2002). *America's second tongue: American Indian education and the ownership of English, 1860-1900*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Spring, J. (1986). *The American school, 1642-1985: Varieties of historical interpretation of the foundations and development of American education*. New York: Longman Press.
- Szasz, M. (1977). *Education and the American Indian: The road to self-determination since 1928* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Szasz, M. (1988). *Indian education in the American colonies, 1607-1783*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Talbot, E. (1904). *Samuel Chapman Armstrong: A biographical study*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company.
- Trachtenberg, A. (2004). *Shades of Hiawatha: Staging Indians, making Americans, 1880-1930*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Trennert, R. (1988). *The Phoenix Indian School: Forced assimilation in Arizona, 1891-1935*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Wallace, A. (1999). *Jefferson and the Indians: The tragic fate of the first Americans*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University.

- We expect a lively discussion this evening. (1887, January 4). *Indian Helper*, 3(13), 2.
- Whiting, A. (1993). *Born a chief: The nineteenth century Hopi boyhood of Edmund Nequatewa, as told to Alfred F. Whiting*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Wilkins, D., & Lomawaima, T. (2002). *Uneven ground: American Indian sovereignty and federal law*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Woyshner, C. (2006). Notes toward a historiography of the social studies: Recent scholarship and future directions. In Barton, K. (Ed.). *Research methods in social studies education: Contemporary issues and perspectives* (pp. 11-38). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Woyshner, C. (2004). Preparations for the duties of life: Women reformers and the functional curriculum, 1893-1918. *Educational Foundations*, 8(3/4), 25-44.
- Woyshner, C., Watras, J., & Crocco, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Social education in the twentieth century: Curriculum and context for citizenship*. New York: Peter Lang.