

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Carole Ann Jaworski for the degree Master of Arts

Interdisciplinary Studies
in (History, Anthropology, Education) presented on May 6, 1975

Title: Non-reservation Indian Boarding Schools, 1879-1969

Redacted for privacy

Abstract approved:

Darold D. Wax, Professor of History

This study examines two major issues: (1) to what extent have the conditions at non-reservation Indian boarding schools, as described by the Meriam Report of 1928, been in evidence from the beginning?; and (2) to what extent have these conditions improved since 1928?

The conditions examined are: (1) General Conditions of the Schools; (2) Health; and (3) Curriculum and Personnel. Patterns became evident that would not necessarily have been observed by the study of one school, or one time frame, alone. In addition, the non-reservation school system itself was seen to be a part of the larger pattern of federal Indian policy that has sought, since 1870, to assimilate the American Indian.

The study maintains that, with the exception of deaths, sickness, student labor, and militarism, the conditions at the non-reservation schools remained in 1928 and in 1969 largely the same as they were in the beginning. Among the conditions which were found to be in existence for the 90 year period covered by this study were: (1) the goal of the schools; (2) the similarity between the schools and penal institutions; (3) corporal punishment; (4) dilapidated physical

plants; (5) over-crowded dormitories; (6) presence of young children; (7) deficient diet; (8) inadequate budget; (9) inadequate personnel; and (10) increasing attendance.

The study concludes that the education of Indian children in the government's non-reservation Indian boarding schools has been in stark contrast to the traditional pattern of American education. Not only have these schools largely ignored the needs, values, and culture of the students whom they are supposed to serve, they have not even compared favorably with white schools whose values and culture they have been meant to impose.

Non-reservation Indian Boarding Schools, 1879-1969

by

Carole Ann Jaworski

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Arts

Completed May 6, 1975

Commencement June 1975

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

Darold D. Wax, Professor of History

Redacted for privacy

William G. Robbins, Assistant Professor of History

Redacted for privacy

Thomas C. Hogg, Associate Professor and Chairman of Anthropology

Redacted for privacy

Carvel W. Wood, Associate Professor of Education

Redacted for privacy

Lavern J. Weber, Chairman of Interdisciplinary Studies

Redacted for privacy

Emery N. Castle, Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis presented May 6, 1975

Typed by

for Carole Ann Jaworski

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
II. The Non-reservation School: History and Philosophy.....	5
III. Opening of the Schools: A Pattern.....	19
IV. General Conditions of the Schools.....	24
V. Health.....	41
VI. Curriculum and Personnel.....	56
VII. Summary and Conclusions.....	78
VIII. Bibliography.....	82
IX. Appendices.....	94
Non-reservation Schools Opened Before 1931.....	94
Non-reservation Schools in 1961.....	96

NON-RESERVATION INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOLS, 1879-1969

I. INTRODUCTION

For 312 years, 1568 to 1880, the system of formal education maintained by whites for Indians in the United States was largely left to the direction of religious missionary organizations. (1:2) Generally, federal involvement in Indian education is not thought to have begun until 1870, when the first general appropriation for Indian school purposes was made by Congress. In that year, \$100,000 was appropriated. (2:89)

Prior to this, the first direct appropriation of public money had been in 1819 when Congress appropriated the annual sum of \$10,000 for inducing the habits of "civilization" among the tribes adjoining the frontier. (2:78) This act was in effect until 1873. (3:11)

From 1819 until July 15, 1870, when \$100,000 was appropriated by Congress for Indian schools, the system of formal education maintained by whites for Indians was left to the direction of the various churches. (4:3) The year 1870 seems to mark the beginning of federal involvement in Indian education. Six years were to pass, however, before another appropriation was made. In 1876 Congress made the first annual general appropriation for Indian school purposes, appropriating the sum of \$20,000. From 1876 on these appropriations increased yearly. By 1879, just three years later, the sum had reached \$75,000. (2:90)

This study examines one part of the emerging governmental takeover of Indian education- the non-reservation school. A non-reservation Indian boarding school is just what the name implies; it is a boarding school for Indian children located off of the reservation. In most

cases, the students at these schools represent several different tribes.

The non-reservation school was a unique development in Indian education; there was no counterpart in the preceding mission school system. Not only was it unique, but, at least until 1928, it was almost universally thought to be the apex of the government's educational program for Indian children. Whatever conditions might be at the reservation boarding school, the non-reservation schools were considered "showcases" for the entire governmental school system. Governmental administrators, educators, and congressmen lauded the schools for the work they were doing. From the non-reservation schools was expected the ultimate solution of the Indian problem.

For some 50 years the government proceeded in its educational program for Indians largely undisturbed. By 1926, however, general criticisms leveled at the entire Indian Service prompted the Secretary of the Interior, Hubert Work, to engage the Institute for Government Research to make a comprehensive survey of Indian affairs.

Technical director for the study was Lewis Meriam, a member of the permanent staff of the Institute. Specialist in education was W. Carson Ryan, Jr., Professor of Education, Swarthmore College.

In 1928 the report was published under the title, The Problem of Indian Administration. It is known generally, however, as The Meriam Report.

The Meriam Report was highly critical of the system of boarding schools maintained by the federal government for Indian children. The report stated flatly:

The survey staff finds itself obliged to say frankly and unequivocally that the provisions for the care of the Indian children in boarding schools are grossly inadequate. (5:11)

The report spelled out in detail the many inadequacies it found and offered suggestions for their improvement.

Although 49 years had passed between the opening of the first non-reservation school and the first investigation into the government's school system for Indian children, another 41 years were to elapse before another such investigation occurred. This was conducted in 1969 by the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate. Chairman of this study was Senator Edward M. Kennedy.¹

These two reports, The Meriam Report of 1928 and the 1969 report of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, are, strangely enough, the only two major investigations ever to be conducted into the system of education maintained by the federal government for Indian children.

It will be the purpose of this study to examine the conditions at non-reservation boarding schools through their some 90 year history. Two questions will be asked: (1) to what extent have the conditions at non-reservation Indian boarding schools, as described by the Meriam Report of 1928, been in evidence from the beginning?; (2) to what extent have these conditions improved since 1928?

¹ The study was begun in 1967 under the chairmanship of Robert Kennedy. After his death the chairmanship passed to Senator Wayne Morse. Following Senator Morse's election defeat the chairmanship passed to Senator Edward Kennedy.

Three main categories will be examined: (1) General Conditions of the Schools; (2) Health; and (3) Curriculum and Personnel.

As a method of comparison the above conditions will be examined in three time frames: (1) the early period, from 1879 to 1907, after which time the annual reports of the schools disappeared from the public record; (2) 1928, which saw the publication of the Meriam Report; and (3) 1969, which saw the report of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education.

By this method, a clearer picture of the conditions at non-reservation Indian boarding schools, from their inception down to the time covered by this study, should emerge. It is anticipated that patterns might be observed that would not be evident by the study of only one time frame, or one school, alone.

II. THE NON-RESERVATION SCHOOL: HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY

In 1865 a congressional committee was appointed to tour the West and report on the conditions of the Indian tribes therein. In 1867 the committee published its report, detailing the miserable state of the tribes in the West and recommending "reservations and education" as more humane and less costly than the current policy of military control. (6:43) An Indian Peace Commission was appointed whose duty it was not only to stop the Indian wars, but to work out a permanent solution to the Indian problem. (7:487)

As early as 1864 Brigadier General Alfred Sully, commander of the Northwestern Indian Expedition sent out to control the Teton Sioux, had written from the Dakota Territory that "the easiest way to exterminate a wild Indian was to civilize him." Believing that the adult Indian was already hardened into his savage ways, Sully pointed out that a program could be inaugurated whereby the rising generation could be acculturated. (8:45-46)

By 1868, however, two schools of thought existed as to the means that should be employed to bring about the assimilation of the Indians. General William T. Sherman, representing one school of thought, held that the assimilation of the American Indian could only be brought about at the point of a bayonet. Because the Indians must be forced to work, this group believed that the Indians should be managed by those "best qualified to use force." The humanitarian school of thought, however, sought to have the Indians placed on reservations and teachers sent among them, as the congressional committee recommended, and a

program of assimilation begun among the children. (8:71)

As it was, a bit of both of these schools of thought was adopted.

Commissioner of Indian Affairs, W. A. Jones, pointed out in 1899:

....two alternatives presented themselves - extermination or absolute control. Humanitarian principles prevailed, and the latter was accepted ...it was necessary that they should be placed upon ...reservations, not for the purpose of forming or reforming the...character of the old Indian... but to prevent him from interfering while the Government could secure the necessary time to mold the individualism of his children under the enlightened influence of schools established for their benefit. (9:15)

Thus it was that the government began its new policy of civilizing the Indian rather than fighting him. For over 200 years military control had not been effective in bringing about the ultimate solution to the Indian problem. The country was ready to try a new approach. Unsuccessful with the adult Indian, the government turned to his children.

Once education was decided upon as an instrument to assimilate the Indian race, the question arose as to what type of schools would be the most effective. The long history of missionary schools seemed to offer the government two choices: day schools or reservation boarding schools. While the day school was preferable to no school at all, the reservation boarding school stood in much higher favor as it separated the Indian child more completely from the influence of his parents and prevented their interference to a greater extent.

Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz stated in his annual report for 1880 that "mere day schools" upon the Indian reservation had not

been an effective instrument for the educating of Indian children. The reason for this, he maintained, was that the pupils were not withdrawn from the influences of their home surroundings "in such a manner as to facilitate a change in their habit of daily life." To this end, Schurz stated, boarding schools were required. (10:7)

As the government was thus inaugurating its experiment upon Indian children, far to the south an event was occurring that was to affect the whole direction of Indian education for many years to come.

Lieutenant Richard H. Pratt, in charge of a group of Cheyenne, Kiowa, and Arapaho prisoners of war at Fort Marion, St. Augustine, Florida, was impressed by how quickly these Indians, far from their home, had adapted themselves to new modes of living and working. In 1878, Pratt arranged for the admittance of 17 of these prisoners of war at Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton, Virginia.² This school, an industrial school for Negroes, had been established by Colonel Samuel C. Armstrong in 1867. (6:52)

The experiment thus conducted at Hampton was viewed so favorably in Washington that, although Indian students continued to be admitted to Hampton until 1912, Pratt received authorization from the Indian Office to establish an all-Indian school away from the reservation. Convinced that the transformation of the Indian race could only be achieved by removing the children as far away as possible from their home environment and placing them in the midst of civilization, Pratt asked for and received the abandoned army barracks at Carlisle, Penn-

² Some confusion exists as to this number. Some sources state there were 18 prisoners of war admitted to Hampton.

sylvania. This school, known as the Carlisle Indian Industrial Training School, was opened November 1, 1879. (48:301)

This date marks the real beginning of the non-reservation school system. In 1880 another non-reservation boarding school was established at Forest Grove, Oregon and later merged into the Chemawa School, near Salem, in 1885.³ (11:33)

Non-reservation schools were a novel idea in Indian education. Prior to 1878, when the experiment at Hampton was launched, all the efforts of the government had been directed to the education of the Indian children on their reservations. By 1882, however, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs was stating:

It is as common a belief that the boarding should supercede the day school as it is that training-schools remote from the Indian country ought to be substituted for those located in the midst of the Indians. (12:27)

A bill passed in 1882 authorized the turning over of vacated army posts to the Department of the Interior for use as Indian schools. (13:30)

By 1883 the government was wholeheartedly endorsing the idea of the non-reservation school. Commissioner Price stated that year:

No one can read the reports of the Carlisle, Hampton, and Forest Grove training schools...without being impressed with the growing interest and

³ These three schools were funded in part out of the Civilization Fund, established in 1867 from the proceeds of Indian land sales in Kansas. Nearly \$200,000 of this fund was used in the establishment and maintenance of Hampton, Carlisle, and Forest Grove.

value of the work they are doing, and without wishing that it might be increased four fold... Their standing and importance are now so fully recognized as to need neither explanations nor defence...The verdict has been uniform that these schools should be continued and enlarged, and other similar ones established. (13:25)

In 1884 four new schools were opened at Chilocco, Oklahoma; Lawrence, Kansas; Genoa, Nebraska; and Albuquerque, New Mexico. By 1890 there were 11 non-reservation schools and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs was stating that if the entire rising generation could be taken at once, and placed in such schools, there would be no Indian problem. (14:xi)

The popularity of these schools stemmed from the fact that a much more intensive and thorough campaign could be waged upon the children than at schools located on the reservation. Once at a non-reservation school, the child was subjected to Americanization 24 hours a day, year in and year out, with no returning for vacations until the training period, three years at first, five after 1882, was up. (12:29) John Oberly, the Superintendent of Indian Schools, summed up the purpose of these schools in 1885 when he stated that the children should be taken from the camps at an early age and taught "to eat, to sleep, to dress, to play, to work, to think, after the manner of the white man." (2:113-114)

Pratt's purpose, in developing the non-reservation school, was much the same. In 1883 he stated that he believed in "immersing the Indians in our civilization and when we get them under, holding them there until they are thoroughly soaked." (15:335)

By 1887 the government was congratulating itself upon the wisdom of this new policy that undertook to assimilate the Indian child rather than fighting the Indian adult. Commissioner of Indian Affairs, J. D. C. Atkins, stated in that year:

One thing is clear, the Government has made a wonderfully economic move in undertaking to educate these people...instead of fighting them. The cost of the schools is immeasurably less than the wars which they supplant. (9:15)

Commissioner of Indian Affairs, W. A. Jones, elaborated on this same reasoning in 1903. Omitting the wars with Great Britain, 1812-1815, with Mexico, 1846-1848, and the Civil War, 1861-1865, Jones maintained that two-thirds of the total expense of the United States Army could be charged, directly or indirectly, to the Indians. Using data from The United States Census of 1890 which estimated the total expenses of the United States Army from March 4, 1789, to June 30, 1890, Jones arrived at an estimated figure for the cost to this country of wars with the Indians. "Eight hundred and forty-five millions of dollars expended to carry the sword and bayonet among these people," he stated, "as against \$240,000,000 for the education and care of their children." (16:24)

Although education was supposedly more humane and less costly than military control, the government, by adopting this policy, did not relinquish its right to the use of force. The twig, Pratt maintained, was easier to bend than the bough. But even the bough could be bent if enough force was applied. (17:93)

As Commissioner Morgan stated in 1889:

The Indian must conform to "the white man's ways," peacefully if they will, forcibly if they must. They must adjust themselves to their environment, and conform their mode of living substantially to our civilization...They can not escape it, and must either conform to it or be crushed by it. (18:3)

One way the adult Indian was expected to conform was to place his children in government schools whether he wished it or not. As early as 1887, the superintendent of the Albuquerque, New Mexico School was reporting the great difficulty he was having in collecting children for that school. Noting that violent opposition to the schools had taken deep root in the pueblos that he visited, he placed the blame upon the "questionable, not to say reprehensible devices" that had been used in the past to secure children. (19:330)

A compulsory school law for Indian children was passed March 3, 1891. (20:67) The law stated that only so far as it was practical should the preference of Indian pupils or parents be consulted as to whether the children would attend government, public, or private schools. Furthermore, if day or boarding schools upon the reservation were lacking, or if they were filled, or "if for other reasons the good of the children shall clearly require that they be sent away from home to school," they were to be placed in non-reservation schools. The consent of parents was not required. (20:158)

The effect of the workings of this law are illustrated in the following communication from the Fort Hall, Idaho Agency, dated March 6, 1892:

Acting upon the instructions contained in your

communication of January 16...will say that I have followed out your instruction to the letter; and even went further than ordered, inasmuch as I have, after my police have failed, gone in person and taken quite a number of school children by force... As it was my clothes were torn, and it became necessary for me to choke a so-called chief into subjection. We, however, placed his children in school...

On the 27th ultimo I was informed by some of my Shoshone friends that five of the Bannack policemen had at a Bannack council promised the other members of the tribe that they would make no further effort to get Bannack school children. On learning these facts I called up the aforesaid five policemen and demanded that each of them should procure at least one Bannack school child by the following Saturday, and named as a penalty for their failure to do so their discharge from the force. Accordingly they were discharged yesterday, as they had made no effort to get the children. One of their number...requested me to write and tell you that no more Bannacks would act as policemen... (21:150)

The agent recommended that troops be sent at once. Apparently, they were not, for an investigator, sent by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, made the following report of the situation at Fort Hall, dated May 7, 1892:

....yesterday I went with Agent Fisher to the Black-foot settlement to get children, and being positively refused, the police were ordered to gather the children up; upon which they all refused to obey orders and each and all resigned...Members of the tribe refused to serve as policemen unless assured that they will not be required to take school children by force. These same men are fearless when ordered to arrest even desperate criminals. It is not physical courage that they lack, but the moral courage to take the children against the protest of the parents... (21:151)

By 1893, however, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Daniel Browning,

announced that it had been decided not to force the attendance of Indian children at non-reservation schools against the will of their parents. In that year, instructions were sent to superintendents and agents advising them that thereafter, no children were to be removed from their reservations without the full consent of the parents. "The consent of parents," Commissioner Browning stated, "must be voluntary and not in any degree or manner the result of coercion." (22:10)

The Commissioner noted, however, that this in no way interfered with the practice of withholding rations from Indian parents who refused to place their children in reservation boarding schools.

The unpopularity of this 1893 ruling among the superintendents of the non-reservation schools was soon apparent. By 1894 the superintendent of the Flandreau, South Dakota School was complaining that the drawback to securing more children for his school was the absence of authority to merely take them, as before, as it now required the full consent of both parents and the child. He recommended that there should be some means devised for the forcible filling of all Indian schools. (23:411)

Superintendent Lemmon, of the Grand Junction, Colorado School also found fault with this new rule, believing that the children ought to be compelled to patronize the schools that the government was at so much expense to maintain. (24:377)

The superintendent of the Fort Lewis, Colorado School stated that if he were allowed to withhold rations, he was confident that his school could be "filled to overflowing" with Navajos, Southern Utes, and Apaches, "without much difficulty." (25:361)

A conference of Indian School Superintendents, held in 1898, had, as its main topic for discussion, "Reasons For and Against Requiring the Consent of a Camp Indian Parent Before Putting His Child Under the Influence of Civilization Away from Home." Reactions were almost uniform among the superintendents. Superintendent Nardin, for instance, of the Warm Springs, Oregon Reservation thought that only when Indian parents were "desirous of having their children abandon Indian ways and become enlightened" should their wishes be consulted. (26:338)

Estelle Reel, Superintendent of Indian Schools, joined the hue and cry on behalf of the non-reservation schools in 1900. "I am convinced," she said, "that force is the only method to be pursued in order to uplift these people." (27:427)

Despite the 1893 ruling forbidding coercion of any kind to occur in enrolling children for the non-reservation schools, the Indian Office, under Commissioner Francis Leupp, felt compelled to issue this circular to superintendents and agents in 1908:

No pressure must be brought to bear, by you or any other government employee, to force any child into a nonreservation school, or keep any from going to a school designated by the parents or guardian... (28:20)

Denied direct access to the children without parental approval, a strange form of competition sprang up between the non-reservation schools in the securing of children. Appropriations for these schools was on a per capita basis and it was the responsibility of the superintendent to see that the school was filled, or face a possible deficiency. As Commissioner Leupp stated in 1908, a "regular system of traffic in these helpless little red people" sprang up. Canvassers were sent

out each year to collect children, serving, as Leupp pointed out, as "supply agents" for the non-reservation schools. (28:18) It was not uncommon to have as many as eight different canvassers, representing eight different non-reservation schools, on one reservation at the same time. In order to secure the needed parental approval, promises were given to parents that could not possibly be met. The child, however, was secured and, barring death, would be a legacy to the school's maintenance for five years.

By 1909 the peak number of non-reservation schools was reached. In that year, there were 27 schools. (29:17) In 1909, some 8,032 children were in attendance at these 27 schools. (29:17) It is important to note, however, that although the number of such schools was reduced after 1909, the number of students attending these schools rose rather than declined. In fact, the peak attendance at non-reservation schools seems to have occurred in 1969! (30:253)

Non-reservation schools were always the largest schools in the government's Indian school system. But even within the non-reservation school system there was a wide range of sizes. By 1928, the largest school, Sherman Institute at Riverside, California had a capacity of 1,000 although some 1,239 were enrolled with 1,048 listed as the average attendance. The smallest that year was Bismarck, North Dakota, with a listed capacity of only 125. (31:284)

By 1961⁴ the largest non-reservation school was Intermountain,

⁴ After 1963 non-reservation schools were no longer listed separately in Statistics Concerning Indian Education, but appeared, with no distinction, under the general category of "Boarding Schools."

Brigham City, Utah. In that year, 1994 students were enrolled. The smallest was Wrangell Institute, Wrangell, Alaska, where 262 students were enrolled. (32:14-15)

The non-reservation boarding schools had been criticized as early as 1907 by Commissioner Francis Leupp. Calling them an "anomaly in our American scheme of popular instruction," Leupp asserted that there was no longer any excuse for the continuance of the non-reservation school system. (33:18) He pointed out, however, that "the resistant force or error long persisted in is great." (33:24) Objecting to these schools primarily on the grounds of their greater expense, Leupp stated that:

Because the Government has built up a system which changed conditions have rendered no longer effective for good, there is no reason why it should continue pouring out its money in the same interest when it can put this money to better use elsewhere. That is poor economy, and worse progress. (33:25)

Even Leupp, however, could not stem the tide of the non-reservation school. During the remainder of his administration, two new non-reservation schools were added.

By 1928 the Meriam Report found the boarding schools, and particularly the non-reservation boarding schools, as the most prominent feature of the government's school system for Indian children. (5:402) Of the 69,892 Indian children reported in some kind of school in 1926, 27,361, or slightly less than two-fifths were in government and other boarding schools. Of the 26,659 enrolled in government schools, 22,099 were in boarding schools. (5:402)

In 1969, 34,605 Indian children were enrolled in the Bureau of Indian Affairs' boarding schools, 15,450 in BIA day schools, and 3,854 were housed in peripheral dormitories while attending public schools. In addition, 62,676 Indian children were enrolled in public schools. (3:55)

In 1969, therefore, about two-fifths of all Indian children were still in government boarding schools. While the number of students in schools of all kinds had increased, the percentage of children in federal boarding schools had remained about the same. In 1969, boarding schools were still the most prominent feature of the federal school system for Indian children.

At the time of the Meriam Report in 1928, there were 19 non-reservation boarding schools, with some 10,310 students in attendance. (31:284) Although the Meriam Report had urged the gradual phasing out of the boarding schools with the substitution of both day and public schools, by 1969 there were still 19 non-reservation boarding schools and the attendance at those schools had risen to more than 12,000 students. (30:253)

Confusion existed in 1969, however, over what the philosophy of the schools should be. One school, the Albuquerque, New Mexico School, was operating under three different philosophies in 1969. One was prepared by the BIA in Washington, the second by the area office, and the third by the school itself. (30:265)

The role of the schools, however, remained largely unchanged. In 1969, according to the final report of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, teachers and administrators in the government's

school system for Indian children still saw their role as one of "civilizing the native." (3:100)

Moreover, for a wide variety of educational, social, and psychological reasons, children, in 1969, were sent to non-reservation schools because of what the 1969 review team called the "outmoded" belief that sending a child far from the source of his problems will somehow, "almost miraculously," solve those problems. (30:256) It was this belief that prompted Pratt to develop the non-reservation school some 90 years before.

When, therefore, was the heyday of the non-reservation school? In the 1880's and 1890's when they were receiving almost universal acclaim as the final solution to the Indian problem? In 1909, when the greatest number of such schools occurred? Or in 1969, when the greatest attendance at non-reservation schools occurred? A case, it would seem, could be made for each of these periods.

III. OPENING OF THE SCHOOLS: A PATTERN

As it is the purpose of this study to examine conditions at all non-reservation boarding schools, the better thereby to observe any patterns that would not be evident by the study of only one school, or one time period alone, it became apparent that there was an almost immediate pattern to be observed in the manner in which the schools opened.

When Captain Richard Pratt opened the first non-reservation boarding school at Carlisle, Pennsylvania in 1879, conditions were less than ideal. After the train trip from the Dakotas, riding in day coaches all the way, the 84 children were greeted with empty, unheated buildings. In the rush to procure the children, no one had made any provision for them once they got there.

Luther Standing Bear, then 11 years old and the first Indian boy to step inside the Carlisle Indian School grounds, described it in this way:

All the covering we had was the blanket which each had brought. We went to sleep on the hard floor, and it was so cold! ...Next morning we were called downstairs for breakfast. All we were given was bread and water. For some time we continued sleeping on the hard floor..One evening the interpreter called us all together, and gave us each a big bag. He said these were to be our mattresses, but that we would have to fill them ourselves with straw...That night we had the first good sleep in a long time... We had no sheets and no extra blankets thus far - nothing but the blanket we had brought from the reservation. (34:133-136)

But at least they had a roof over their heads, which was more

than the first group of children to arrive at Forest Grove, Oregon had. The first chore for the boys in this group was to erect the buildings that were to house them. Not only did they erect the buildings, but they manufactured all the necessary beds, dining tables, and desks after they arrived. (35:256)

Five years later this episode was to repeat itself when the Forest Grove School, because of a lack of sufficient land for a farm, moved to its new site at Chemawa, near Salem, Oregon. By this time, the school had passed to its third superintendent in five years. Superintendent John Lee, upon assuming the superintendency, found the school divided into two branches, one at Forest Grove and the other at Chemawa. At Chemawa, Lee stated:

The scholars were crowded together in crude shanties ...erected by the Indian boys for mere temporary quarters, but owing to the delay in completing and furnishing the new buildings, we were compelled to winter in these buildings. It was with difficulty that we managed to keep the school together and maintain proper order and discipline during the cold, rainy, and inclement weather... (36:233)

Superintendent of Indian Schools, John Oberly, commenting on the Genoa, Nebraska School one year after its opening, stated that the school had had many disadvantages to overcome. There were no out-houses, no cisterns, and alkali well water was used for all purposes. "The school," he stated, "needed everything that such an institution ought to have." (2:118)

One year later the physician at Genoa was reporting that water still had to be carried in buckets to all parts of the building and

that the facilities for heating water for bathing would be "meager" for a family of a dozen children but were "totally inadequate" for the 150 then at the school. (37:230)

The miserable state of affairs of the first year at Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, was described by its superintendent, James Marvin, in 1885:

All of the machinery for steam heating was on the ground July 1. Plans and estimates for a boiler house were not acted upon and authority given to proceed with the work until October 4, and then time had to be given to advertise, make contracts, and collect materials. A very severe autumn... ensued, and steam was not passed through the radiators until the 29th of November. A few stoves had been placed in sick-rooms and in school and dining rooms, but these were not sufficient to warm the air nor to dry the walls. Severe colds, coughs, and congestion of lungs were frequent among both pupils and employes. The transition from cold to a surplus of heat, when steam was applied, was too great. The sick-rooms were soon filled...

By act of Congress, passed in February, 1885, the institution was relieved from financial embarrassment for the remainder of the current year. Before this relief could be applied, overwork and excessive anxiety had caused some resignations and much suffering among employes...Sickness and deaths among the pupils naturally created a restless desire for change. Indian parents desired to call their children home and the sick plead for permission to go, though unable to arise from their beds. Desertions became frequent among those having homes or friends in Kansas...From November to April pneumonia was the prevailing disease. At one time 26 cases were reported... and about one-half of the number critical. Ten deaths have occurred during the year. (38:456)

Although supposedly begun to teach Indian children the rudiments of civilized life, the Chilocco, Oklahoma School was still without

bathing facilities some five years after its opening. The superintendent of the school pointed out that the United States Government was "surely able, financially, to erect suitable buildings and equip them with modern conveniences for bathing at this school. If not," he stated, "it should retire from the field of education, leaving it to church organizations." (39:359)

Four years after the opening of the Grand Junction, Colorado School the superintendent reported that the pupils, before they came, had been told that there were workshops and tools and that they would be taught trades. "As a matter of fact," the superintendent stated, "there is not a single shop in connection with this industrial training school." (40:282-283)

The opening of the Santa Fe, New Mexico School continued the pattern. The superintendent reported that, by borrowing beds and bedding, he was able to open the school on November 15, 1890. Supplies, however, were late in coming and it was, for some time, difficult to accommodate even the small number then in attendance. (41:576)

The first pupils at the Pipestone, Minnesota School arrived in February, 1893. The steam plant was not installed until the end of March. (42:421)

The school at Flandreau, South Dakota spent the entire first winter without heat. The steam plant was there; it just didn't work. The superintendent reported there was a great deal of dissatisfaction with the school on the part of pupils and parents. (43:411)

The short-lived school at Clonterf, Minnesota opened with a lack of supplies of all kinds. The superintendent reported that for

some time it was impossible to conduct the school with any degree of satisfaction to the management or advantage to the pupils. (44:371)

It is impossible to tell, of course, if this pattern was evident in the opening of every school. Superintendents were reluctant to make their schools look bad. As the new superintendent of the Albuquerque, New Mexico School stated in his annual report to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1894:

I am in receipt of your favor of the 19th instant directing me to write the annual report of the Albuquerque industrial training school. I have read all the reports published of the various schools for several years back, and have visited so many of the schools and found the surroundings so different from the conception formed by reading these reports, that I fear I am not a very good selection for writing one.... (45:391)

It would appear, however, that the lack of supplies upon opening, and the late arrival of supplies at the opening of each school year, was a perennial problem of the non-reservation schools. Not until 1930 did the Commissioner of Indian Affairs announce that one of the "outstanding features" of that year had been the delivery of the necessary supplies "on or before the opening of the school term." (46:31)

It had taken 50 years and a major investigation for the government to accomplish this feat in its Indian school system.

IV. GENERAL CONDITIONS OF THE SCHOOLS

Many of the non-reservation schools were actually abandoned army forts. A law enacted in 1882 had authorized the army to turn over vacated military posts to the Department of the Interior for use as Indian schools. The first non-reservation school, Carlisle, occupied a vacant army barracks. The father of the non-reservation school, Pratt, was an army man and throughout his superintendency he maintained his army standing, achieving a generalship in the process. When Pratt was replaced at Carlisle in 1904, 25 years after Carlisle opened its doors, his replacement was a Captain in the Seventh Cavalry. (47:451)

Other schools were manned in a similar way by the army. The founder of the Forest Grove, Oregon School was a Lieutenant. The first superintendent of the Genoa, Nebraska School was a Colonel.

As a result, an extreme military atmosphere pervaded these schools. Children were organized into companies and marched and drilled in a military manner. Court martials were established to "try" serious offenders. Guardhouses were maintained. Corporal punishment was the rule. Children who attempted to run away were referred to as deserters. Disciplinarians, in many cases, were former army men.

The army, it would seem, had abandoned military control on the reservation, but they had taken it up in the schoolrooms.

As early as 1880 the boys at Carlisle had been organized into companies and were uniformed and drilled in the movements of army tactics. As Pratt stated, "this has taught them obedience." (48:302)

From almost all the schools came the same reports. The Phoenix,

Arizona School reported in 1894 that the system of military drill used was very helpful in maintaining discipline. The idea of strict obedience, the superintendent pointed out, was "inculcated from the first entrance of school." (49:370)

Twenty years after the opening of Carlisle, the Perris, California School was reporting:

On the first day of school all the pupils were organized into military companies, two of girls and two of boys; officers and non-commissioned officers were appointed and assigned as prescribed by the United States Army Drill Regulations for Infantry...Mr. J. J. Wickham...who has had ten years service in the United States Army as a noncommissioned officer, was assigned as acting disciplinarian... (50:357)

Moreover, many of the early students at these schools were, in fact, prisoners of war. The experiment at Hampton had been made with prisoners of war. The first children sent to Carlisle were chosen primarily because of their value as hostages. Pratt described what it was that determined the selection of these first children:

....Mr. Hayt, the Commissioner, was insistent that I must go to Spotted Tail and Red Cloud, because the children would be hostages for the good behavior of their people... (15:220)

Although at first reluctant, Pratt, too, came to favor this idea. "I finally concluded," he stated, "that the hostage idea of the Indian Bureau administration warranted increase to sixty-six from Rosebud." (15:227)

By 1894, 15 years later, some of the students at Carlisle were still prisoners of war. As Pratt stated in his annual report for that

children were locked into the dormitory at night. It wasn't until 1912 that Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Robert G. Valentine, announced that this practice had finally been changed. (56:40)

As early as 1892 corporal punishment was supposedly out of favor

year:

Most of them have now been connected with the school for the full period of five years- some for eight... The question arises, What is their future?...They came here as prisoners of war. What is their present status? Are they still prisoners? (51:407)

By 1896, school jails were being frowned upon. Superintendent of Indian Schools, W. N. Hailmann, stated in his annual report for that year that, while solitary confinement may be an acceptable punishment for "hardened offenders," it was entirely "out of place with girls and small boys." (52:343)

In this same year that the Superintendent of Indian Schools was calling for an end to school jails, however, the Albuquerque, New Mexico Superintendent was claiming that a guardhouse was badly needed there. (53:383)

The superintendent of the Fort Lewis, Colorado School stated in 1899 that the guardhouse there was only used for offences of the gravest nature. "Eighteen years in the Regular Army and nearly eight as superintendent of an Indian school," had convinced him that "confinement of children is barbarous in the extreme." (54:390) Be that as it may, four years later the Fort Lewis, Colorado School was reporting that the guardhouse there had been resingled. (55:452)

Although guardhouses were being frowned upon, at some schools the children were locked into the dormitory at night. It wasn't until 1912 that Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Robert G. Valentine, announced that this practice had finally been changed. (56:40)

As early as 1892 corporal punishment was supposedly out of favor

in Washington. Superintendent of Indian Schools, Daniel Dorchester, stated in that year that he had had to rebuke the "harsh and barbarous" methods of discipline resorted to in some of the schools. Some superintendents and matrons, he reported, had used "heavy whips and small boards in subduing the pupils, and have even applied shackles to the ankles." (57:488)

By 1896 Superintendent of Indian Schools, W. N. Hailmann was reporting that very few schools were finding themselves hindered by the new provision prohibiting corporal punishment. During the coming year, he stated, he would work even more strenuously upon securing strict observance of this rule. (51:343)

Corporal punishment, however, in spite of official pronouncements to the contrary, was still being practiced in many schools. Don Talayesva told of an incident that happened to him at Sherman Institute, Riverside, California during the year 1908- 12 years after corporal punishment had been prohibited:

Finally the evil day came when I was selected to debate in the auditorium before six or eight hundred students. I felt this was too much for me and refused to do it. The assistant disciplinarian was called and offered me a choice between debating and getting a thrashing. I stood my ground and chose the thrashing. He led me into the basement. Two strong boys let down my pants and held me. After about fifteen blows with a rawhide in a heavy hand, I broke down and cried. I slept very little that night and was sore for several days but was never again asked to debate in the auditorium. (58:130)

According to Pratt's biographer, Elaine Goodale Eastman, Pratt

presumably obtained special permission to continue the use of corporal punishment at Carlisle after it had, supposedly, been banned from the government's Indian school system. (17:209)

The repressive rigidity of the schools was paramount in the early years. Everything was subordinated to discipline and order. In 1887, at the Salem, Oregon School even talking and laughing during working hours was prohibited. "The result," the superintendent stated, "has been a saving of much time and securing perfect order throughout the department." (59:336)

Regimentation was apparent everywhere. Even meals conformed to an inflexible timetable. The superintendent of the Fort Stevenson, North Dakota School reported in 1892 that not one of the three meals on any given day had been one minute late. Any child that was not there on time went hungry. (60:689)

As early as 1887 the superintendent of the Fort Stevenson, North Dakota School had recommended that nothing but a wall surrounding his school, with iron gates and sentinels posted, could prevent escape. (61:319) It was not until 1903, however, that official Washington began to notice the striking similarity between these schools and penal institutions.

The first, almost casual, reference to this feature of the non-reservation school was made by Commissioner Jones in his report for 1901-1902. Stating that the largest government schools were located off the reservations, the nearest thing he could think of to compare them to were the reform schools maintained by the states. "Military discipline is maintained," Jones said, "and thorough obedience

to civil authorities inculcated." (62:19)

Returning to this idea the next year, Commissioner Jones further elaborated:

In order that a comparison may be made between the cost of Indian schools and other schools, data have been secured concerning the expenses of maintaining reform schools and industrial institutions in the country. These were selected as subject of comparison by reason of the fact that they more nearly correspond in principal details with Indian schools than do the average public and private schools for white children... (16:22-23)

In comparing this data, Commissioner Jones found that the cost per capita at state reform schools was \$160 a year, while that at non-reservation Indian schools was \$138, thereby destroying the argument that Indian schools were expensive luxuries! (16:23)

Estelle Aubrey Brown described a civil service examination she took while employed as a teacher at the Crow Creek Reservation Boarding School. Asked to write an essay on the subject, "Should the United States Establish Penal Colonies?" she added this postscript to her reply:

If the United States needed a penal colony at once, if it would install some plumbing and greatly improve the kind and amount of food served, the Crow Creek school for Indian children could be made to serve the needs of two hundred criminals. (63:104)

By 1928, the non-reservation schools were again being compared to reform schools. By this time, the yearly allowance for the support of Indian schools had risen from \$138 to between \$230 to \$260 per student per year, depending on the size of the school. This com-

puted out roughly to about \$5.00 per week per child. Comparing figures for the cost of similar institutions run by the State of Wisconsin in 1926, the Secretary of the Interior found all such state institutions operating on a higher per capita basis than the federal government's Indian schools. While the federal government was spending from \$4.73 to \$5.00 per week per Indian child at the non-reservation schools, the State of Wisconsin was spending: (1) for its general hospital for the insane, \$10.17 per week; (2) for the state reformatory, \$7.20 per week; and (3) for the state prison, \$6.29 per week. (64:14)

Moreover, the Meriam Report noted in 1928 that in a number of schools, the girls were sleeping at night like prisoners, with the doors locked and the windows nailed down. (5:578) As previously noted, Commissioner Valentine had announced that this practice was supposedly abolished in 1912. Although the Meriam Report also noted that the BIA had taken steps to correct this situation in 1928, in 1969 the practice was still allegedly going on at the Chilocco, Oklahoma School. (30:300)

By 1969 almost all of the descriptions given of the non-reservation schools by the survey team contained the words "prison-like" or "reform school atmosphere." At the Stewart Non-reservation School, Carson, Nevada, however, the analogy was a bit more concrete: barbed wire surrounded the campus there. (30:420) The final report of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education characterized the 19 non-reservation schools flatly as "custodial institutions at best, and

repressive, penal institutions at worst." (3:103) Furthermore, the 1969 report summarized the environment of BIA schools as "sterile, impersonal, and rigid, with a major emphasis on discipline and punishment." (3:101)

Although the government as early as 1896 had announced that corporal punishment was no longer a feature of its school system the Secretary of the Interior in 1931 felt compelled to announce that:

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs has given peremptory orders that no flogging will be tolerated. Cases of brutality are being summarily dealt with. (65:11)

Even by 1969, however, corporal punishment was still evident in some non-reservation schools. In that year, this condition was found at the Chilocco, Oklahoma School:

Youngsters reported they were handcuffed for as long as 18 hours in the dormitory, handcuffed behind their back from above or around a basement pillar or from a suspended pipe. One team member was shown the restraining procedures by the personnel in the boys' dormitory and therefore verified the youngster's expressions. However, the permanent wrist scars on one youngster's arms, the deformed hand of another boy, and an obviously broken and misshapen rib on another tended to reveal the veracity of student's statements. (30:311)

As for how "summarily" these incidents were being dealt with, the survey team had this to say:

The responsibility for these actions rests not only with the school administration, but also with the Area Office. For example, the Assistant Area Director for Education related that these conditions (e.g., lack

of interest, poor administration and supervision, student punishment, etc.) were known to the Area Office and that they "have been trying to get rid of the Superintendent for years." One cannot help but wonder at the efficiency and sincerity of these remarks and efforts. For example, a social work report was turned into the Area Office several weeks prior to the site visit and for the most part, reiterated what was found by the review team. Yet no action had been initiated regarding excessive physical punishment. (30:311)

At the Pierre, South Dakota School, which housed children 6 to 16 in 1969, the survey team found that, although the school disavowed corporal punishment, the smaller pupils were spanked during their introduction to school to show them how to "shape up." (30:328)

As to the physical plants of the schools, many, as was noted in Chapter III, opened in very poor condition. Others were actually abandoned army forts, unsuited in numerous ways as schools for children. Many of the schools never seemed to overcome either one of these circumstances.

Mrs. Dorchester, Special Agent in the Indian School Service, commented on the condition of the buildings at Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, just six years after its opening:

Nearly every room in the hospital was in disorder because of repairs. The first bath-tub ever set up in the building was put in May 24. By its size and shape I conclude it is the one first made in our country...Some needs will be met by the repairs and additions, but altogether it is the dreariest looking house I have seen in the West. (66:343)

Buildings were sometimes a downright menace. The superintendent of the Fort Mojave, Arizona School, for instance, reported in 1899 that a rainstorm had caused the walls of the boys' dormitory to fall

in. (67:381)

Even drinking water at an Indian school was hazardous to the health. The superintendent of the Grand Junction, Colorado School reported this situation in 1890:

The water used for drinking and cooking is what is known here as "ditch water." Coming down the Grand River it flows through an irrigating ditch in which dead animals and other decaying matter are often found and has to be used by our school, although thick with mud and strong with alkali... (40:282-283)

Many schools had to haul water for over a mile and one, nine years after its opening, was even hauling away its sewage in wagons. (68:428)

The very land on which the schools sat was, in many cases, poor. The superintendent of the Albuquerque, New Mexico School commented that the farm upon which that school was built consisted of 66 acres of the worst alkali land in the whole Rio Grand Valley. (69:298) The superintendent of the Perris, California School was even more specific. "This school," he said, "was built on the kind of land usually finally selected for an Indian reservation- the poorest in the locality." (70:362)

Moreover, some school sites were chosen not so much for their advantage as an Indian school site, but rather, their advantage to the prosperity of the nearby white community. Superintendent of Indian Schools, Daniel Dorchester, included this excerpt from a pamphlet published by the Indian Rights Association of Philadelphia, in his annual report for 1893:

In that part of the Indian field lying in South Dakota there has been of late, under the pressure of political influence, a tendency to press too far the erection of school buildings in the towns adjacent to the Indian country. The mainspring of this movement is not the benefit of the Indian, but the booming of the towns. One school has been erected at Pierre, another at Flandreau, and another on the Indian reservation at Pipestone, Minn... The erection of the school building at Pipestone, on land expressly reserved to the Yankton Indians by treaty seems to be wholly without justification. The Indians protested against it, but in vain... (71:371)

Other schools originating with Congress, and not with the Indian Office, were the Mount Pleasant, Michigan School and the Tomah, Wisconsin School. (72:48)

W. N. Hailmann, the Superintendent of Indian Schools, summed up the physical situation at the schools as it existed by 1894. "Much treasure," he pointed out, "had been expended by the Government in the erection of school buildings." He stated, however, that not only were they "lacking in the simplest requirements of architectural grace," but were even "deficient in the provisions made for sewage, lighting, ventilation, and sanitary requirements generally." (73:355-356)

Conditions never seemed to improve very much at an Indian school, however. By 1906 the Fort Lewis, Colorado School was reporting that the building used for school purposes there was an old frame barracks, without a foundation, and in such a bad state of repair that the children actually "suffered" if kept there on cold winter days. The superintendent stated that the building was not worth repair. (74:417)

By 1927 conditions were much the same throughout the government's Indian school system. The Board of Indian Commissioners summed

up the physical conditions at the schools in 1927 in this way:

Steam plants that are so old that they are practically useless; pumping machinery which is so ancient that its efficiency has almost reached the vanishing point; buildings that are so dilapidated that they are a reproach to the Federal Government and, in a number of cases, are a source of peril because of their structural weakness... (75:11)

Some 35 years later the situation was much the same. The Secretary of the Interior stated in 1962 that many of the Bureau's schools, built around the turn of the century, were "obsolete and had structural or other deficiencies that made them both unsafe and unsanitary." (76:27)

One of the most characteristic features of the non-reservation school plants was its pattern of large, over-crowded dormitories. Reports of inadequate, over-crowded dormitories are evident from practically the beginning. It is a rarity when the annual reports, in any given year, do not mention at least several instances of this condition. The new superintendent of the Santa Fe, New Mexico School, however, was one of the few superintendents who objected to this practice of crowding children in to keep up the required appropriations. He stated:

I note in my predecessor's last report that he states that, with a new hospital built, these buildings can easily accommodate 200 children. I beg to state that this is a serious mistake. No doubt 200 can be accommodated or crowded into the building, but no proper work can be accomplished with such a number with our present dormitories and sleeping apartments, as with more than 125 or 130 the main features of our work will then be in the line of nursing the sick... (77:393)

This practice was so overwhelming, however, that it prompted the Superintendent of Indian Schools, W. N. Hailmann, to comment in 1894:

....permit me to protest against the not uncommon practice of crowding children into dormitories, placing beds almost in close contact, and putting from two to four children in one bed. The practice is unclean and demoralizing in the extreme, and should be peremptorily forbidden. (73:355-356)

Conditions did not improve, however. So long as appropriations for the schools were based on a head count, and the superintendent was made financially responsible for the proper running of the schools, children continued to be crowded in. Superintendents must keep up their attendance or face a deficiency. Every child represented so much money for the maintenance of the school.

Moreover, a school enrollment campaign, begun in 1921 with the slogan, "Every eligible pupil in school," actually encouraged the superintendents in this practice. An appeal from the Indian Office was sent to every superintendent outlining the cooperation that should be sought from missionaries, Indian traders, and all Indian Service employees, with the announced purpose of filling to capacity all available space in government, mission, and public schools. (78:2)

By 1922 Secretary of the Interior Albert B. Fall proclaimed proudly that he had secured an average attendance in government boarding schools of 549 more than their combined capacity. (78:17)

The members of the survey team for the Institute for Government Research were not as enthusiastic as Secretary Fall, however.

In 1928 they stated:

Entirely too many children are already crowded into the non-reservation boarding schools. Many of the schools regularly enroll one-fifth more than their rated capacity, and the "rated capacity" of an Indian school is in excess of ordinary standards. Members of the survey staff were repeatedly told at schools with a rated capacity of around 850 that it was the practice to enroll a thousand or more, even if there was no place to put them, so that the average attendance would meet the requirements for securing the necessary Congressional appropriations. If this is true, the situation should be clearly presented to the Budget Bureau and to Congress so that better methods of financing might be adopted. (5:404)

It is a wonder, in the 49 year history of the non-reservation schools, that no Commissioner of Indian Affairs had thought of that.

Moreover, the Meriam Report further stated:

Almost without exception Indian boarding schools are "institutional" to an extreme degree. This is especially true of those non-reservation boarding schools that have upwards of a thousand students, where the numbers and general stiffness of the organization create problems that would be bad in any school but are especially serious in Indian schools. Much more attention should be given to boys and girls as individuals rather than in mass. This will necessitate rooms for two to four students, for example, rather than the immense open dormitory system that prevails so generally... (5:405-406)

Apparently, the recommendation against the immense dormitories customarily used to house the children had no effect on the practice of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Just four years after the publication of the Meriam Report, the Board of Indian Commissioners, reporting of their 1932 visit to Haskell Institute, stated that the

new girls' dormitory was attractive, but that it was to be "regreted that the congregate system has been adopted which gives the pupils no opportunity for privacy." (78:35)

In 1969, the survey team at Oglala Boarding School, Pine Ridge, South Dakota, which housed grades 1-12, found this condition at the new boys' dormitory:

....the planner of the building must have forgotten the type of environment a student needs. When you place 50 or 60 boys in one large room it leaves a lot to be desired. It was my understanding that the local administrator had no influence upon the plan of this building. The suggestions which were given were ignored. (30:391)

At the Chilocco, Oklahoma School in 1969, the girls' dormitory was so crowded that beds were not even separated. Girls had to stay in bed until their partners got up. (30:312)

Vast dormitories were still the pattern in BIA boarding schools some 47 years after the Meriam Report recommended their abolishment. As the final report of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education stated, "Most dormitories resemble army barracks and some actually are." (3:101)

As for the institutionalism that the Meriam Report found so distressing, the survey team at Sherman Institute, Riverside, California stated in 1969:

....a rapid survey of the Institute produces the impression of a rigid, uncompromising, bureaucratic, authoritarian non-innovative feudal barony in which the students are handled or processed rather than educated. (30:404)

The committee pointed out that this description could well fit other schools.

If the members of the Meriam team found the degree of institutionalism extreme in the schools having upwards of a thousand students, it is to be wondered what their reaction would be to Intermountain Non-reservation Indian School, Brigham City, Utah. There, in 1969, 2100 pupils were enrolled, grades 1-12.

Charles N. Zellers, Assistant Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, gave this review of the Intermountain School in 1969:

Many people throughout the Bureau of Indian Affairs reflect back to education workshops that were conducted at Intermountain and think that it is the showplace of the Bureau's education system. In reality, this facility was never built to accommodate an educational program, let alone one of such magnitude that it involves 2,100 youngsters. When workshops were conducted, only the best buildings were utilized and educational materials and equipment were in abundance leaving the false impression that Intermountain School was the ultimate as an education facility. A closer look at the total educational facility at Intermountain reveals that it is an over-crowded, underequipped school struggling to do the best job possible under very adverse conditions. (30:411)

A teacher at the Tuba City Reservation Boarding School, which houses 1200 elementary children, stated that she didn't believe that any public school system in this country would "tolerate" an elementary school of that size, "for the simple reason that the individual student would be lost in the crowd. We have them here," she pointed out, "not only for an ordinary school day, but 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 9 months a year." (3:68)

Even this, however, represented some improvement. At the non-reservation schools, in the past, it had been possible to keep them there for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 12 months a year, for 5 years.

V. HEALTH

No one seemed to care very much about the health of Indian pupils at the non-reservation boarding schools. It wasn't until 1909, some 30 years after the opening of the first non-reservation school, that there began any kind of a campaign to do something about it. (56:18) But by that time, a great many Indian children had died.

The report from Hampton in 1881, evaluating the first group of Indians to be enrolled there for the three year period, stated:

Their health has proved the most serious question in the problem, 15 students, 30 per cent of the 49 brought by Captain Pratt, have broken down in health during the three years; 10 of these (20 per cent of the whole number brought), have died, either at school or after their return to their homes... (79:253)

Cemeteries seemed to be an essential part of the school plants for many years. In 1893 Superintendent Charles Meserve was calling attention to the cemetery at Haskell:

It is important that we should abandon the school burying ground. I would recommend that a lot be purchased in the city cemetery, and that the bodies now buried in the school burying ground be removed and that there be no further interments made upon the Haskell grounds. It would not be very interesting for white parents who were visiting an educational institution to spy in some secluded corner the graves of those who were formerly members of the school. What the effect is upon the minds of the untutored Indian parents when they visit Haskell Institute can well be imagined. (80:418)

The Carlisle School closed in 1918 when it was returned to the War Department for a military hospital. Today, a total of 191

headstones, dating from 1879 to 1904, mark the time it was a school for Indian children. (81) This number, of course, does not take into account the children who were sent home to die.

Sickness was also a common occurrence. The report from the Albuquerque, New Mexico School in 1892 is typical of many others:

During the months of January and February there was so much sickness that the hospital, two dormitories, and two storage rooms were so crowded that some single cots held two patients...There have been 22 deaths...When the crowded condition of the sick is taken into consideration, the wonder is that the death rate is so small... (82:682)

Lieutenant Wilkinson, Superintendent of the Forest Grove, Oregon School stated in his annual report for 1882 that it had been said "to educate an Indian is to sign his death warrant." (83:250) Perhaps this was true, for by 1889, Superintendent Beadle was reporting this pathetic situation at Chemawa:

No pupils have been brought to the school during my service as there were no funds for the payment of transportation. I was compelled to return many to their homes that were sick, and a few left without permission. I found many pupils suffering from scrofula, consumption, or other chronic diseases, and sent them all home...Many were too young, a few only five, six, and seven years old, and some of these have been delivered to their relatives. After this was done there were 43 pupils of twelve years or under... (84:363)

Things did not improve very quickly at Chemawa for four years later, in 1893, the school had a total of 2,462 cases of sickness. Of this number, amazingly, only six died at school, one a girl under five

years old. (85:684-685)

From the beginning the practice had been to enroll young children in the non-reservation boarding schools. It was the young who could be most easily bent. As Commissioner Morgan pointed out in 1899:

The hope of the Indian race lies in taking the child at the tender age of four or five years, before the trend of his mind has become fixed in ancient molds or bent by the whim of his parents, and guiding it into the proper channel. (4:5)

Although his biographer, Elaine Goodale Eastman, denied it, Carlisle, under Captain Pratt, often had young children.

As Mrs. Eastman claimed:

Pratt has been criticized for "robbing the cradle," as well as taking children "forcibly" from their homes. A responsible former employe is quoted as saying that he thinks the average age of pupils when received at the school was fifteen years. The few who came much younger than this were accepted because of special needs. (17:215-216)

"Special needs" is a rather convenient phrase in government schools for Indian children. As presumably Mrs. Eastman had access to the annual records of the school, it is interesting that she apparently overlooked the second Annual Report of the Carlisle School, dated October 15, 1881, in which Pratt stated that 32 of his boys were under 12 years of age. (86:247) It was not until 1900, 21 years after the opening of Carlisle, that Pratt stated in his report for that year that he had determined, "for the present," not to take any children under 14 years of age. (87:503)

Carlisle was not alone in receiving young children. It was common at all of the schools. The superintendent of the Greenville, California School, for instance, reported in 1897 that of the girls in his non-reservation school, all but one were under 14 years of age. (88:367) Haskell Institute, Lawrence Kansas reported in 1905 that "mere children" had been admitted that year in order to keep up the required attendance. (89:442)

The diet of the pupils also left much to be desired. Although established primarily to train Indian children in the manner of civilized society, the non-reservation schools definitely lacked, in most instances, the rudiments of a well set table.

Daniel Dorchester, upon assuming the duties of Superintendent of Indian Schools in 1889, discovered that, while the principal duty of that office was to visit and inspect the schools in the Indian Service, not one had been so inspected in the preceding three years. He therefore undertook an extensive inspection tour, travelling 6,000 miles and visiting 20 schools in two months. The following is an excerpt of his report on his visit to Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas:

The food in the hospital is only ordinary rations- army rations- because there is no provision for delicacies. Eggs are not provided. Grease from fat pork, with flour stirred in it, is made into a gravy for sick people for breakfast. (90:321)

According to Pratt, the schools that had army rations were the lucky schools. The ration table sent out by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs was much less generous. For the 25 years of his superintendency at Carlisle, Pratt fed his children on army rations. (15:233)

The quality of food also left much to be desired. Mrs. Dorchester, Special Agent in the Indian School Service, commented in 1892 that it had been two years since she had seen "a wagonload of rotten hams" at any school. Moreover, "wormy fruit by the half ton," and "rancid lard" were supposedly, things of the past. (91:543)

Mrs. Dorchester had her own solution to the poor fare of the children at an Indian school:

For two years I have believed that the quickest and easiest way of solving dining room and kitchen problems is to put ... employes and children all into one dining room, and let them fare alike. Then good-bye to sour bread, half-baked meat, sloppy soups...A white man or woman has some rights which his white neighbor is bound to respect, and when, on the dinner question, he makes common cause with an Indian it is a good day for the Indian. (91:543)

While quality of food was poor to mediocre, quantity was the main problem. It required a bit of initiative to get enough to eat at an Indian school. The report from Hampton in 1882 is one indication of how it was done:

Picking ripe fruit on the place being a forbidden luxury, the Indians anticipate the order, and eat most of it while it is green. (92:244)

It early became the practice at non-reservation Indian schools for the schools to raise part of their food needs themselves. In fact, it became imperative with the amount of money allowed per capita for food. Those schools without a dairy herd, for instance, had no milk; those without an orchard had no fruit. It is in this context that the poor choice of school sites had its gravest consequences. Those schools seated on soil impregnated with alkali, or with an inadequate water supply, and there were many, had serious problems indeed in trying to raise enough food to feed the children.

Sometimes, though, it was just plain lack of effort or concern that resulted in a lack of proper food for the children. The new superintendent of the Albuquerque, New Mexico School reported in 1894:

The fruit trees which were planted here a few years ago at a cost of \$195 are nearly every one dead. In this great Rio Grande Valley, so famous for its fruit, the school never so much as had an apple, a peach, a pear, a plum, nor a grape- yet our Mexican neighbors all around us have an abundance of these. (45:391)

An orchard was not begun at Carlisle until 1907, by which time Pratt was gone. (93:339)

Estelle Aubrey Brown commented on the insufficient diet at the reservation boarding school where she was employed in Arizona. Although the school was many years old, and located in a climate where tropical fruit could be easily grown, there was not one fruit tree of any kind. (63:185-186)

While the children at many schools were going hungry, the work animals throughout the Indian Service were well fed. As Mrs. Brown

pointed out:

When an undernourished girl succumbed to tuberculosis, which happened frequently, she was sent home to die. It was easy to replace her, but a mule cost money. (63:186)

Don Talayesva, a student at the Keams Canyon, Arizona School in 1900 told the superintendent of that school bluntly that he ought to feed the children more. "We work hard," he said, "we need more." (58:112)

Reports of the condition of the diet, and of hungry children, reached Washington but were written off. Estelle Reel, Superintendent of Indian Schools, announced in her annual report for 1905 that it had been:

....brought to our attention through reports of visiting officials, showing that at many schools the food is not properly cooked nor well served and in some cases is insufficient in quantity. As the chemist of the Agricultural Department certified officially that the ration is quite adequate, it is evident that full use is not being made of it. (94:402)

Be that as it may, some 23 years later the Meriam Report was bringing the same charges. It found the children in poor health and it found the diet deficient in quantity, quality, and variety. The report stated:

The effort has been made to feed the children on a per capita of eleven cents a day, plus what can be produced on the school farm, including the dairy. At a few, very few, schools, the farm and the dairy are sufficiently productive to be a highly

important factor in raising the standard of the diet, but even at the best schools these sources do not fully meet the requirements for the health and development of the children. At the worst schools, the situation is serious in the extreme. (5:11-12)

Congress responded to the stark statements of the Meriam Report by passing the first and second deficiency acts, fiscal year 1930, to provide for the urgent needs of hungry children in the government's Indian boarding schools.

The first deficiency act of March 26, 1930 appropriated, above and beyond the regular annual appropriation for Indian Schools, \$1,100,00 for the fiscal years 1930 and 1931. Of this amount, \$195,000 was to be used specifically for the purchase of additional food.

The appropriation act for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1931 also contained an appropriation of \$64,00 to purchase food for pupils retained in boarding schools during the summer months.

In the general appropriation, in the same act, an increase of \$417,000 for the support of Indian day and boarding schools for fiscal 1931, was allowed above and beyond the appropriation for 1930.

In 1931, also, for those Indian boarding schools customarily receiving specific appropriations, an increase of \$1,203,750 was given in excess of the amount appropriated for the preceding year. (46:12-13)

From a food allowance of 11 cents per day for Indian pupils in boarding schools at the time of the Meriam Report in 1928, these additional moneys made possible the expenditure of 37.8 cents per day, an amount which had been carefully determined as necessary for a

minimum proper standard. (46:13)

Even with this more than 200 per cent increase, however, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1930 noted that the per capita allowance for the boarding schools was still below that of most state institutions, notwithstanding the decided improvement that had been made in the past three years. For example, in 1928, appropriations were made at the rate of \$225 to \$250 per capita, depending on the size of the school; for 1929, the per capita ranged from \$240 to \$285; for 1930, \$260 to \$300; and for 1931, \$290 to \$330. At the same time, state institutions which were regarded as reasonably comparable reported per capita figures of from \$300 to \$600, and authorities agreed, according to the Commissioner, upon \$450 as a minimum for which adequate work could be done in feeding, housing, clothing, and educating children under institutional care. (46:13)

As the Secretary of the Interior observed wryly in 1931:

There is considerable propaganda to the effect that the Indian is diseased and dying out. Actually he is slowly increasing in numbers. Like the rest of us, he multiplies with a stable food supply. (65:11-12)

Because Congress was so stirred by the findings of the Meriam Report on the quantity and quality of food available to Indian children in the boarding schools, passing additional emergency appropriations to bring that diet up to what had been determined as a minimum proper standard, it was anticipated that this situation would never again be allowed to happen. This was, apparently, an erroneous assumption.

From a review of the Carson, Nevada School came this report in 1969:

Students were concerned about the quality of the food and shortage of meat in their menu. Worms and bugs were mentioned as reasons for frequently avoiding the cafeteria. Although it had happened in the past, the administration is conducting an investigation to determine whether or not this is a recurring problem. (30:429)

At the Chilocco, Oklahoma School the students also complained about the food. Not only was it said to be poorly prepared, but the quantity was said to be insufficient. (30:301)

The review of Sherman Institute, Riverside, California, revealed the fact that the current expenditure in BIA boarding schools in 1969 was 75 cents per day per student for food- an increase of only 37 cents in the 39 years since the Meriam Report prompted the 200 per cent increase in the expenditures then being made for food. This amounted, therefore, to less than a penny a year increase in the food allowance since 1930.

Moreover, Dr. Svenson, who reviewed the Institute found that:

Most staff members queried had scant knowledge of what goes on in the dining room. It occurred to me that I had rarely seen a more insensitive attitude or a more uncompromising rigidity. Gladys M. Gardner, identified as an education specialist, prepares the menus in Phoenix area office and directs the acquisition of food based upon those menus to be shipped to Sherman. Apparently no substitution is permitted. Miss Gardner, I was told, has not been to Riverside for some time since she is not well. (30:405)

It would seem that Mrs. Dorchester's recommendation, made in 1892, had still not been acted upon.

Deaths were not a consideration of the Meriam Report, nor were they of the 1969 investigation. This problem, it would seem, belongs almost exclusively to the earlier period. The 1969 investigation did note, however, that the growth rate of the Indian population in this country was 3.3 per cent a year, which was three times the rate for the United States population as a whole. This dramatic growth rate, the committee pointed out, has largely been due to the "substantial" improvement in Indian health in the last 15 years following the transfer of the Indian health program from the BIA to the Public Health Service. The death rate, the committee noted, substantially declined after this transfer. (3:55)

One of the severest criticisms leveled by the Meriam Report was at the practice of placing young children in the boarding schools. The report recommended the maximum possible elimination of young children from the schools:

From the educational standpoint the young child does not belong in a boarding school. For normal healthy development he needs his family and his family needs him. Young children, at least up to the sixth grade, should normally be provided for either in Indian Service day schools or in public schools. Not until they have reached adolescence and finished the local schools should they normally be sent to a boarding school...One of the definite objectives of the Service, vigorously pressed, should be the elimination of pre-adolescent children from boarding schools. (5:34-35)

By 1932, Secretary of the Interior Wilbur was stating that the number of children, and particularly the number of small children, had been reduced in the boarding schools. (95:44)

It was anticipated, therefore, that this problem also belonged exclusively to the past. This, however, was another erroneous assumption.

In 1969, 37 years after this statement by Secretary Wilbur, more than 7,000 Navajo children nine years old and under, were found in elementary boarding schools run by the BIA. (3:103)

The reason put forth by the BIA for the existence of these elementary boarding schools on the Navajo reservation, was the lack of all-weather roads. The Senate investigating committee, however, discovered that two-thirds of the children in these elementary boarding schools lived 25 miles or less from the school they attended, and 90 per cent of them lived 50 miles or less. The BIA had not been aware of this until requested to make the survey by the Senate committee. Moreover, the BIA had never requested nor required a study on the Navajo Reservation that would have shown the effect of road construction on proposed school construction and operation. (3:70)

Even though these elementary boarding schools are located on the reservation, some not more than 25 miles from the children's homes, the committee found:

The children rarely get to see their parents. There are no facilities for parents at the school and they are discouraged from visiting the children because it will "upset the child." Parents are allowed to "check out" their children only if the child has not tried to run away. It appears that one person in each school is assigned the responsibility of recapturing the AWOL's. Hundreds of children run away from the school. During the winter, some children freeze to death trying to get home. In the first 6-8 weeks of the school year, children are terribly unhappy and upset, and often cry themselves to sleep at night.

Because of a lack of space, children often sleep two to a bed and at night there is one dormitory aide to 150 children. (3:103)

Not only were there young children at elementary boarding schools on the Navajo Reservation, however. The Pipestone, Minnesota Non-reservation School was an elementary boarding school in 1952, housing grades 1-8. (96:43) In 1961, the following non-reservation schools held grades 1-8: (1) the school at Wahpeton, North Dakota; (2) the school at Santa Fe, New Mexico; (3) the school at Pierre, South Dakota; and (4) Wrangell Institute, Wrangell, Alaska. (32:14-15)

In 1969, the non-reservation school at Pierre, South Dakota housed some 300 children, ages 6 to 16. (30:325) Intermountain Non-reservation School, Brigham City, Utah housed some 2100 students, grades 1-12. (30:365) Seneca Boarding School in northeastern Oklahoma housed some 200 students, grades 1-8. Jones Academy in east central Oklahoma housed 286 students, grades 1-12. Eufala, a dormitory in east central Oklahoma, houses girls grades 1-12. (30:398)

Moreover, one member of the survey team reporting on the school at Wrangell, Alaska in 1969, recommended that, as soon as possible, the school should be limited to children of the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades. (30:381) The Meriam Report had recommended the same thing some 41 years before.

What does the boarding school experience do to a young child? In 1969, Dr. Daniel J. O'Connell, executive secretary of the National Committee on Indian Health, stated his opposition to this practice of placing young children in boarding schools. Calling it a "destructive"

practice that resulted in emotional damage to the child, Dr. O'Connell cited the almost universal agreement among those in the field of developmental psychology to this same view. (3:67)

The Meriam Report had noted the same thing nearly 41 years before:

"One who has observed the devastating effect of the large congregate institution...upon the personality of children," says a leading authority on social case work, "begins to understand somewhat better the relation of natural ties of affection and undivided attention to the normal development of the human being." This is particularly true of the non-reservation school. (5:403)

Through the years, a common device used by the BIA was to place children with "special needs" in the boarding schools. Elaine Goodale Eastman referred to such children at Carlisle. In 1969, this was still one of the criteria used in the placing of children in the non-reservation boarding schools despite the strong injunction made against this practice by the Meriam Report some 41 years earlier:

A common device for the care of orphans or other dependent children is to place them in boarding schools. It is not unusual even in the non-reservation boarding schools to see several little four-year-olds who are there because they have no homes. Children of this age are especially ill-fitted for the rigors of the boarding school...It should not be very difficult to find homes for such children with relatives or friends of their own tribes, especially since the bonds of relationships are strong among Indians and the love of children great. (5:586-587)

It would appear that in the 41 years since this injunction was made, the BIA has never made that effort. The same recommendations made by the Meriam Report in 1928 were still being recommended in 1969.

The Special Subcommittee on Indian Education stated in 1969:

Despite a general agreement that elementary boarding schools are destructive, no concerted effort has been made to do anything about them, and a thorough study of the problem by an independent team of consultants has never been requested or conducted. In May, 1967, the American Academy of Pediatrics Committee on Indian Health requested that such a study be conducted. Nothing has happened to date. (3:70)

VI. CURRICULUM AND PERSONNEL

Initially, the non-reservation schools were known as training schools. The curriculum was divided along two basic lines. Trades were to be taught that would allow the child to leave the reservation and take up his life amidst civilized society. The other half of the curriculum attempted to make inroads against the child's language, habits, and thoughts.

Although for the first two years at Carlisle the school week was divided into two days of work and four of school, by 1881 the system of a half days' work and a half days' schooling was adopted which was to be the pattern of the non-reservation school almost until the time of the Meriam Report.

In the school room, the teaching of the English language dominated. Lieutenant Wilkinson stated that at the Forest Grove, Oregon School in 1881 the first rule, after cleanliness and obedience, was "No Indian Talk." Furthermore, Wilkinson reported that the children were "repeating whole verses, memorized by ear, even before they fully comprehend the meaning." (35:257-258)

Commissioner of Indian Affairs, J. D. C. Atkins, defending this practice, stated in 1887 that the English language, "which is good enough for a white man and a black man, ought to be good enough for the red man." (9:21)

Tribes were purposely separated at the schools so as to suppress communication in anything but the English language. Violations of this rule were subject to punishment. As the superintendent of the

Phoenix, Arizona School stated in 1894:

The greatest difficulty encountered has been to induce the pupils to talk English. We have been compelled to use strict measures in the matter, having fixed punishment for infringement of the rule, and succeeded in making very satisfactory progress in that line. (49:369)

Polingaysi Qoyawayma, a Hopi Indian, reminiscing about her days at the government school at Oraibi, remembered the "stupid, brutal whippings" and the way she and her classmates were "treated like dumb animals because they did not speak the language of the school authorities." (97:174)

In 1897, however, the Indian Office made a reversal of its previous policy. Superintendent of Indian Schools W. N. Hailmann stated:

Until lately the great majority of Indian teachers have labored under the delusion that they can hasten the acquisition of the English language on the part of the pupils by compulsory measures, visiting more or less severe penalties upon the unfortunate children who were caught in the use of Indian speech...

To throw contempt upon the child's vernacular, in which he has heretofore given expression to thoughts and feelings dear to him...is so manifestly unreasonable and so pernicious in its perverting and destructive influence upon the child's heart-life that it is a wonder that it ever should have been attempted by the philanthropic fervor of workers in Indian schools...

There is no doubt in my mind that the unreasonable offensive warfare made in the Indian schools against the Indian vernacular is largely to blame for the apparent stubbornness with which older Indians refuse to learn English... (98:344-345)

The practice of giving Indian students English names was con-

tinued, however. Often the first experience of an Indian child at the government's schools was to have his hair cut and an English name sewn on his shirt back. These English names were sewn on the backs of the shirts of every Indian child throughout the government's school system.

Debating clubs, showy to the outside visitors, were special features of the non-reservation schools. The topics discussed were chosen by the school administration. Topics such as "The Indian Territory Should Be Opened for Settlement"; "The Industrial School for Indians is Better Than the Day School"; and "All Indian Education Should Be in the English Language" were chosen for debate at Carlisle. (99:277)

One of the most distinctive features of the non-reservation schools was its system called "the outing." Developed by Pratt and copied by many of the other large schools, this system placed the pupil "out" to live and work with a white family during the summer months and sometimes for a period of time after the five year term. Called by Pratt "the right arm of the school," this system "enforced participation, the supreme Americanizer." (15:311)

A uniform course of study was introduced February 1, 1916. (100:13) Thereafter, at every school in the government's school system, the same subjects would be covered on the same day. This system did not allow for regional differences or the varying needs of the different segments of the student population. Uniform examinations were a part of this uniform course of study. The same examination, given on the same day, containing the same questions, was given throughout the

government's Indian school system.

The other half of the school day was taken up with industrial training - an euphemism that very quickly meant production and that bore but little resemblance to education or instruction.

A clause in the Indian appropriation act of May 11, 1880 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to purchase from the non-reservation schools all manufactured articles that could be used in the Indian Service, thereby creating a market for the schools' production goods.

(101:27)

The government very quickly forgot, if indeed it had ever thought of it, that the criteria used in judging these schools should be based somewhat on how valuable its training was to its pupils. Instead, in 1883, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs was claiming that the success of Hampton, Carlisle, and Forest Grove was fully attested to by the number and value of the articles manufactured there. Hampton and Carlisle were that year, for instance, furnishing to the various Indian agencies 2,000 pairs of shoes, 3,350 dozen articles of tinware, 22 dozen bridles and halters, and 450 sets of harnesses. (13:25)

Although the industrial training was supposed to be for the benefit of the students, the production goods actually turned out by the schools were, in many cases, in direct competition to the very students for whose benefit it was supposedly begun. Luther Standing Bear, for instance, was trained as a tinsmith at Carlisle. When he returned to the reservation, the trade did him no good as the Indians there already had an abundance of tinware that he had made at school. (34:147)

Moreover, the trades taught by the schools were, in many cases, chosen more for their benefit to the school than for any value they might have to the pupils. The first report from the Genoa, Nebraska School in 1884 is an example of this:

The brick yard but recently started; at first was somewhat disappointed in consequence of the Indian boys failing to do the work required. They seemed indifferent and wanting in strength, and broke down compelling the employment of white labor. But now they are doing better...Brick are needed to build a laundry...Besides, in the manufacture of brick the pupils are instructed in an important industry; it can be made a source of income to the school. (102:252)

More often than not, however, the industrial training offered in these schools, particularly for the girls, was little more than institutional work needed to keep such a large organization going, especially on the limited appropriations.

Carlisle reported as early as 1882 that the girls there were washing and ironing about 2,500 items each week. (103:240)

The superintendent of Hampton, marveling at the amount of institutional work the girls did there in 1883, thought it remarkable how they did all that and went to school, too. He pointed out, however, that they had had many sick girls that year. (104:229)

Forest Grove was reporting in 1884 that the girls who got the breakfast there got up at four o'clock, worked until 8:30 a. m., and then half of them went to the sewing rooms. (105:249)

By 1885, the girls at Carlisle were washing and ironing 5,000 pieces each week besides manufacturing, in the sewing room: (106:443)

<u>Articles</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Articles</u>	<u>Quantity</u>
Aprons	609	Sheets	307
Chemises	204	Shirts	906
Coats	117	Shirts, flannel	440
Drawers	747	Shirts, night	262
Dresses	435	Slips, pillow	500
Dresses, night	192	Towels	938
Skirts	115		

In addition, the following articles were repaired:

<u>Articles</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Articles</u>	<u>Quantity</u>
Aprons	4,436	Pants	373
Coats	230	Underwear	4,707
Dresses	2,170	Vests	51
Hose, pairs	41,177	Overcoats	44

Mending was always done, at all the schools, by the little girls.

In many cases, these were the five, six, and seven-year-olds.

By 1888 the superintendent of the Genoa, Nebraska School was complaining that, in a school supposedly established for the benefit of the Indian pupil, one of the most serious difficulties he was having was the securing of enough girls of a suitable age to do the housework. (107:265)

The superintendent of Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, boasted proudly in 1888 that no white or colored labor was employed in any department, except for mason work. The buildings there were all completed by the pupils, the work on the farm and garden was done by the pupils, meals were prepared three times a day for 300 persons by the pupils, housework was done by the pupils, laundry work was done by the pupils, as well as work in the hospital, sewing, tailoring,

and mending rooms. (108:260)

Superintendent of Indian Schools, W. N. Hailmann finally addressed this problem in 1894. Pointing out the irrelevancy of some of the trades taught to the Indian pupils, particularly shoemaking and tailoring which none of the boys were likely to follow back on the reservation, Superintendent Hailmann was specific on one point:

To employ the children merely as hands or servants in certain fragments of work - the whole credit of which is assumed by the managers... is to make them mere toilers without purpose or hope... (109:346-353)

This pronouncement seemed to have little real effect, however, for two years later the superintendent of the Mount Pleasant, Michigan School was stating that there was too much work to be done on the farm to allow them any time for teaching. (110:376)

Even by 1906, 22 years after it had opened as a training school for Indian youth, Haskell Institute was reporting that a new feature had been added to all the industrial departments. In that year, for the first time, one hour each day was to be devoted to actual class instruction. (111:418-419)

As for the relevancy of the vocational training offered the students, the superintendent of the Salem, Oregon School stated in 1896 that that school believed in a person learning to do at least some one thing well. "Even the slop trade well learned," the superintendent pointed out, "is worth a great deal to a boy." (112:397)

Ten years later this same reasoning was still popular. The Santa Fe, New Mexico School reported in 1906 that over 800 pairs of

shoes had been made in the shoe shop there. The superintendent of the school stated:

....while this trade is not generally looked upon as the best for the Indians, it is one of those trades which teaches the Indian to do something and to do it well. (113:271)

The brief period of reform, under Superintendent of Indian Schools Hailmann, was officially ended in 1909 with this assertion by Commissioner of Indian Affairs Valentine:

Of nonreservation schools, I believe that both Congress and the office should demand at least some approach to self-support, and the appropriations for their benefit could gradually be cut down. It seems to me a condition not capable of explanation that a big school in a fertile section of the country, and equipped to teach trades or stock raising, should not make a substantial income if it is doing its work right. (29:26)

As if the girls didn't have enough to do, the question arose as to how valuable the wholesale training employed in the institutional work of the schools was in teaching the girls how to work in their own homes. It was felt that steam laundries had little instructional value in teaching a girl how to wash in her own home. Therefore, the Indian appropriation act approved March 3, 1903, contained this measure:

That in preparing implements and room for laundry work in all Indian schools arrangements shall be made for doing by hand such an amount of said work as may be sufficient to teach the female pupils the art of hand laundry work. (114:11)

Commissioner of Indian Affairs, W. A. Jones, expressed great surprise when, in bringing this matter to the attention of the superintendents of the schools, he discovered that at one-third of the schools, all the laundry work was consistently done by hand - there were no other facilities than the scrub board.

As Commissioner Jones expressed it:

Take a school of 150 pupils, one-half are girls, and of this number not more than one-third are above 12 years of age. To require this one-third to do all the laundry work for 150 pupils, including their bed linen, table linen, etc., and then go to school half the day, work under the matron cleaning up their dormitories, schoolrooms, dining rooms, etc., attending to the sewing and mending, assisting in the kitchen, dining room, looking after poultry, and the many other things which Indian girls have to do in an Indian school, savors largely of drudgery; therefore, while they are all taught as a part of their domestic training how to wash their own clothes, yet a steam laundry is absolutely essential, unless at least one-third of the girls enrolled are to be bound as slaves to the washtub. (114:12)

Steam laundry or not, the amount of work an Indian girl had to do at an Indian school was definitely hazardous to her health. As the superintendent of the Grand Junction, Colorado School pointed out:

....since moving into the new, light, airy laundry not a single case of sickness has gone from the laundry to the sick room, while for eighteen months before that, while fighting adverse reports for authority to build anew, every fatal case among the girls but one; and every serious case among the girls but this same one, went from the laundry to the sickroom. (115:411)

Despite the long hours of drudgery that Indian pupils were

forced to undergo in the non-reservation boarding schools, supplying all the institutional work needed to maintain these institutions, the idea persisted somehow that these schools were luxurious extravagances in which students were pampered by an overly benevolent government. Commissioner Francis Leupp called them "educational almshouses" in which the pupils were furnished with free food, clothing, and shelter. (33:18) He seemed to overlook, however, the fact that the pupils not only grew their own "free" food, they then had to prepare and serve it. The free clothing they received they had to make themselves. In many cases, they even built their own shelters.

The idea persisted, however. The superintendent of the Chilocco, Oklahoma School reported in 1907:

....the motto of "work, work, work," is so imprest on pupils that they are made to feel in a measure that their education is coming to them as a result of their own labor and efforts, not as a gift from the Government...(116:305)

By 1928, the Meriam Report took a dim view of this "free gift" from the government, stating:

The boarding schools are frankly supported in part by the labor of the students....A distinction in theory is drawn between industrial work undertaken primarily for the education of the child and production work done primarily for the support of the institution. However, teachers of industrial work undertaken ostensibly for education say that much of it is as a matter of fact production work for the maintenance of the school. The question may very properly be raised as to whether much of the work of Indian children in boarding schools would not be prohibited in many states by the child labor laws... (5:12-13)

Moreover, the report stated that the industries taught should not be selected because they supplied the needs of the institution, but should be selected for their relevancy in training the students so they might secure jobs. (5:34)

In the emergency appropriations passed by Congress for the Indian schools after the Meriam Report, part of the additional moneys appropriated went for hiring laborers to take over the institutional work at the schools which had been performed for nearly 50 years by Indian children.

After 1928, Indian students were further spared the learning of shoemaking. In that year the Secretary of the Interior announced that thereafter, all Indian Service leather shoes would be manufactured at the Federal Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas. (31:76) By 1930, for the first time in 51 years, part of the girls' clothing was purchased ready-made. (46:11)

By 1969 student labor had disappeared from the Indian school system. The curriculum employed, however, came in for some criticism. The committee stated in its final report:

The curriculum used in BIA schools is generally inappropriate to the experience and needs of the students. The schools fail to deal effectively with the language problems of the students, there is little understanding of cultural differences, and the vocational training is archaic and bears little relationship to existing job markets. (3:101)

While the schools were no longer engaged in turning out production goods, and student labor had disappeared from the schools,

the relevancy of vocational training was still a problem. Machines and tools used in the metal and woodworking shops at Sherman Institute were of World War II vintage. (30:411) At the Stewart School, Carson, Nevada, the girls could choose from only two fields: domestic service and hospital ward attendant. The girls considered hospital ward attendant a degrading farce, an "euphemism" they said, "for more domestic work." (30:419)

Although all the pupils in Indian boarding schools were Indians, little effort had been made to teach Indian history or an appreciation of Indian culture. At the Flandreau, South Dakota School a course on Indian culture was introduced for the first time in 1969. It was listed as "experimental." (30:339) At the Albuquerque, New Mexico School, a course was also introduced for the first time in 1969. It attempted to trace the contribution of the people of the Southwest to the development of the United States. (30:266) No other schools reported such courses.

As in 1928, the BIA's education budget was found to be grossly inadequate. In 1969, at Sherman Institute, \$1,300 per student per year was allocated. By comparison, Mrs. Clare Taber stated, on behalf of Congressman John V. Tunney, that private boarding high schools allowed from \$2,500 to \$3,600 per student per year. (30:412-413) Moreover, another federally funded educational program, the Job Corps, spent from \$7,00 to \$9,000 per student year for its resident high school level educational program. (3:56)

As has been noted in previous chapters, the administration of these

schools in the early years was, to a very great extent, placed in the hands of the military. Pratt, Wilkinson, and many others remained in the army, being merely detailed to the schools which they headed.

As for the teachers, the most often repeated characteristics in the early years were these: they were underpaid, they were inadequate, and they didn't stay long.

As early as 1887 the superintendent of the Albuquerque, New Mexico School had pointed out the inadequacy of some of the teaching force there. Indian teaching, he said, was "peculiar business" and surely required as much "knowledge, patience, tact, originality, invention and energy" as that needed to teach white children. (19:333)

Daniel Dorchester, Superintendent of Indian Schools, summed up much of the personnel situation as it existed up to 1890:

....the appointment of superintendents, teachers, and other employes, on the nomination and solicitation of politicians, as rewards for party services, more seriously than any other single cause, militates against the welfare of the Indian schools...I cannot help asking why Indian schools should be subject to such political interference, when partisanship is not allowed to touch our public school system...I am surprised to find officials in high positions who have no just conceptions of the character and qualifications needed for good service in an Indian school. It has been said too often in regard to unworthy aspirants for such positions that "any one is good enough for an Indian school." I have personally seen many examples of the disastrous workings of this low and scandalous policy. (117:270)

It took the Indian Service 15 years to act on Daniel Dorchester's recommendation. In 1905, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, W. A. Jones,

reported that political and personal favoritism had largely been removed from the appointment and promotion of school employees (118:23), even though, in 1892, the Indian Service came under civil service classification. The civil service classification extended to physicians, school superintendents, assistant superintendents, teachers, and matrons. (20:65)

However, Estelle Aubrey Brown, a teacher in the Indian school system, commented that even with the civil service examinations then required, she was not asked about her knowledge of Indians, their history or the conditions on their reservation when she took the examination for teacher in the Indian Service. She was not tested on her ability to teach children of another race who knew little of education and were without a written language. Moreover, when the Indian Bureau sent her to Crow Creek, her first teaching assignment, it did not even tell her the name of the tribe she was sent there to teach. (63:48)

It should be noted, too, that Pratt continued in his superintendency at Carlisle until 1904. Despite the civil service classification after 1892, when Pratt was replaced at Carlisle his replacement was a Captain in the Seventh Cavalry.

How did some of these early teachers treat their first, frightened pupils? One former student remembered this experience from her first school days:

Polingaysi remembered vividly the punishment of one of her friends. Because the girl did not stop talking at

once when told to do so, she was placed on top of the big-bellied stove, unheated at the time...and an eraser was shoved into her mouth. She sat there, stiff with fright, head bent in shame and saliva dripping, until the teacher's sadistic appetite had been satiated. (97:28)

Superintendents, too, were sometimes very unpleasant people to have around. The following is a report from the new superintendent of the Fort Stevenson, North Dakota School in 1894:

Employes and pupils had an idea that the chief end of the superintendent's life was making people miserable, and his principal duties, frowning, grumbling, and reprovig. We endeavored to remove these ideas. As an incentive to work a sense of duty took the place of fear. During the last six months of the year there was not a single runaway; during the first six there were eight...We have not transformed this old fort into a paradise... but we feel that there has been a marked change. (119:398)

Perhaps the personnel reveal most clearly the dominant attitude of these schools. Many schools had a person on the payroll whose title was "disciplinarian." If salary is any indication of status, then it is interesting to note that disciplinarians received a higher salary than teachers. In 1887, for instance, the annual salary for a teacher at a non-reservation school was \$600, while that of a disciplinarian was \$900. (120:405-408)

Besides disciplinarians, there was another personnel position peculiar to Indian boarding schools. This was the position of matron. Because the government was engaged in the business of removing children, often young children, from the safety of their families

and placing them in the alien atmosphere of the boarding schools, it was belatedly felt that some type of substitute mothering should be provided. The position of matron was thereby created, where one woman, in charge of all the numerous and sundry housekeeping details, was supposed to be a mother to upwards of from one to two hundred children. Discipline, of course, was one of her major duties.

The personnel at the non-reservation schools were rarely encouraged to learn the home environment, or anything else, about the students they would be teaching. As the avowed purpose of these schools was to stamp out, as far as possible, everything Indian, this was not unreasonable.

Superintendent of Indian Schools, Estelle Reel, for instance, had some rather strange ideas, in 1898, on how best to compensate the Indians for past wrongs:

....the Indian has been ruthlessly forced to yield his valuable possessions and compelled to get out of the way of the juggernaut of civilization, which has driven him from the rising to the setting sun...How can we best discharge the obligation we owe this people? is really the Indian problem. In the first place, the Indian must be separated from all traditions and customs, and he must be stimulated by a purer and more invigorating social and moral atmosphere... (26:346)

It was not until 1904 when Francis Leupp became Commissioner of Indian Affairs that there was any effort to preserve, or value, anything Indian. By then, Estelle Reel did an about-face and parroted her superior officer. Directives were sent to the schools calling for the preservation of certain arts and crafts that Leupp felt were

in danger of being lost because of "a stupid notion that everything Indian is a degradation and must be crushed out." (121:408)

The report from the Santa Fe, New Mexico School in 1906, however, seems to indicate that this policy was only half-heartedly carried out. The superintendent of that school reported that, although the Navajo blankets manufactured at the school were "above the type" manufactured on the reservation and readily sold for \$20 each, this was still "no great money" and that it would be better to devote the time instead to dressmaking, housecleaning, and learning to cook rather than trying to "promote and foster this ancient and crude Indian art of blanket weaving." (113:271)

As Elaine Goodale Eastman, Pratt's biographer, stated:

There is no question that Captain Pratt and his contemporaries, with few exceptions, were disposed to undervalue the indigenous American culture. Even so, was this fact of much practical importance, seeing its disappearance was inevitable, and, in their eyes at least, desirable for all concerned? It was, and is, not so much a question of absolute or theoretical values as of expedience and serviceability. (17:194)

Throughout the early history of the non-reservation school the assumption had always been that the government, by removing the child from the degradation of his home life, was offering to him the superior and uplifting life of civilized society. The Meriam Report, however, in addressing itself to the personnel problem, in reality summed up the whole situation at the non-reservation schools:

Since one of the primary objects of Indian education is to raise the standards of living in Indian homes,

No one would claim, of course, that changing the name

the schools themselves should represent higher standards than at present. Like most of the homes, most of the school plants are overcrowded; they are lacking in privacy; they are lacking in the comforts of life; and some are lacking in cleanliness. The school diet is more restricted than many of the pupils are accustomed to at home...The whole school life is subject to routine and is devoid of most of the niceties of life. These things are bad, but even more serious are the standards of education and training represented by the personnel. In spite of many exceptions...the employees are as a rule not qualified for work in educational institutions. (5:624-625)

The report took special exception to the role of matron, stating that no one could stand in parental relationship to 200, or even 100, children. Moreover, the report stated that most matrons were merely interested in preventing irregularities of conduct, and did so by forcible restraints. In addition to the disciplinary function of the matron, the report also took exception to the office of disciplinarian. Neither of these positions required any educational qualifications. (5:577) The experience of the matrons furnished by the civil service roster, for example, was mediocre. Some had been housewives, some had been housemaids, and a few had held minor positions in correctional institutions or asylums. Hardly any had had experience with "normal children." (5:626)

In response to the criticisms of the Meriam Report the Indian Service, in 1930, officially changed the name of disciplinarians and matrons to that of "advisors." It did not do away with the positions, however. As Commissioner Rhoads pointed out:

No one would claim, of course, that changing the name

changes the type of worker, except in so far as it gives official sanction to a different attitude toward the work. (46:10)

By 1931 the Indian Service was beginning to fill vacancies of superintendents at the schools with professionally trained educators. (65:84)

By 1969 almost all teachers in BIA schools held professional degrees. However, while this is adequate preparation for teaching in most white schools, the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education pointed out that a great proportion of the teachers in the BIA system lacked any training for teaching pupils with the linguistic and economic disadvantage of an Indian child. Virtually no teachers had learned to speak an Indian language, nor were they given any formal help to do so. (3:62-63)

At the Chilocco, Oklahoma School the review team reported that the teachers there were not selected for any special knowledge or skill they might have in dealing with Indian children, or problem children, or even their ability to do remedial work. "They are not," the review team pointed out, "even informed about the special problems they will face prior to accepting a position in the school." (30:420)

Despite the fact that most teachers and superintendents were educators, the Senate committee found, in 1969, that administrators, having control over the policy and resources of the schools had, in many cases, no direct knowledge of education nor of Indians. (3:66)

Moreover, despite the 90 year history of the non-reservation

schools, the final report of the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education stated that, in 1969, teachers and administrators in the government's Indian school system still saw their role as one of "civilizing the native." (3:100) Teachers and administrators rarely visited the children's homes and the committee found that in many schools this was "actively discouraged as going native." (3:102)

As for matrons and disciplinarians, by 1969 their name had become "counselors." They were still responsible for discipline. The 1969 report stated:

In the dormitories, the inadequacy of student guidance is heightened by the many other demands on the counselors' time. Since the majority of the dormitory personnel are responsible for building maintenance and for punishment, as well as for guidance, it is hardly surprising that students rarely confide in them. They must see that floors are mopped, rooms neat, and misbehavior punished. At the same time, each one is expected to be like a father or mother to 100 or more boys or girls, and to provide them with the love and attention they would receive at home. This task, impossible even for the best trained counselor, is usually assigned to untrained persons. Some have personnel problems of their own which manifest themselves in the disregard or mistreatment of students. (30:260)

Richard Hovis, a student teacher at the Chilocco, Oklahoma School spoke about the teachers there in 1969:

The bad teachers are never criticized and the good teachers are never praised. After a while even the most dedicated get a "what's the use?" attitude. They lose confidence in themselves and more than a few develop neurotic symptoms. They do things that would be considered "sick" in a public school situation. (30:322)

As for the improvement brought to the Indian school system by the adoption of the civil service requirements after 1892, the Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education stated that this system had made it impossible for Indian communities to have any control over teacher selection and training. Parents were powerless to do anything about teachers that were "incompetent, abuse their children, or denigrate their culture." (3:102-103)

The committee felt that the situation at Stewart School was typical of all the schools:

Stated succinctly, we feel Stewart is a tragedy...The teachers at Stewart know their task is hopeless... They are indifferent, uncreative, and defeated...The guidance staff attempts to ameliorate the schools' archaic social rules, but must fight dormitory aides who were educated at Stewart and who believe in and enforce strict discipline...The principal believes in trying new approaches and remedial programs, but must work with teachers whom he has not chosen, and a completely inadequate budget. The students must obey rigid social rules characteristic of reform schools, while living under the lie that they are actually receiving a high school education. They have almost no contact with the world outside the barbed-wire boundaries of the campus, and cannot even return to their homes for Christmas. That they remain vibrantly alive human beings at Stewart is neither an excuse for the schools' existence nor a negation of the tragedy... (30:261-262)

The committee pointed out that it was not once or twice that the evaluations of the non-reservation schools ended in this way, but many times.

Senator Edward Kennedy, in his letter of transmittal to the committee print, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations,

in which 13 of the 19 non-reservation schools were reviewed, stated:

....the facts revealed in this report cannot help but be cause for everyone to begin a complete reassessment of the needs of Indian children enrolling in the boarding schools, and the schools' responses to those needs...The findings definitely point to a deteriorating situation, from the standpoint of the schools and the Indian students who must attend them...I hope that the deplorable conditions revealed in these evaluations will soon be past history... (30:v)

Actually, the non-reservation schools have not "deteriorated" to the condition in which they were found in 1969. In most instances, they have always been that way. The tragedy is that the "deplorable conditions" found in the non-reservation boarding schools in 1969, represent, in some instances, an improvement over what they have been in the past.

Others before Senator Kennedy have deplored the conditions of the non-reservation schools. As far back as the 1890's Superintendents of Indian Schools Dorchester and Hailmann had expressed their hope that certain conditions might soon be past history. Commissioner Leupp, in 1907, hoped to see the end of the non-reservation school system itself. In 1969, however, as in 1928, there were still 19 non-reservation schools and attendance at these schools was increasing. The system is not dying out nor can it be expected that many of the deplorable conditions will soon be past history.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Just as it was the purpose of this study to examine conditions at all non-reservation Indian boarding schools, the better thereby to see patterns that would not necessarily be observable by the study of only one school alone, so is it also necessary to see the non-reservation school system itself in the larger pattern of federal Indian policy.

First of all, it is necessary to understand that this study has been dealing with a "means" not an "end." Since 1870 the goal of federal Indian policy has not been the education of the American Indian; but rather, the assimilation of the American Indian. Education itself has been one of the means employed to that end, and the non-reservation school a sub-category of that means.

When Estelle Reel, the Superintendent of Indian Schools, asked how best can the Indian be compensated for past wrongs and offered, as an answer, that the Indian must be separated from all traditions and customs, she was talking about the assimilation of the American Indian. When General Sully, in 1864, pointed out that the best way to exterminate a wild Indian was to civilize him, he was talking about the assimilation of the American Indian. When Commissioner Morgan, in 1889, stated that the Indian must conform to the white man's ways, must conform to them or be crushed by them, he was talking about the assimilation of the American Indian. When, in 1969, teachers and administrators in federal Indian schools still saw their role as one of civilizing the native, they were merely reiterating what, in

fact, has been almost unalterable federal Indian policy since 1870.

Why do non-reservation Indian boarding schools, despite the many deplorable conditions found in their some 90 year history, persist? Perhaps because, since 1870 when the government first took upon itself the education of the American Indian, the goal of that educational system, the assimilation of the American Indian, has apparently remained unchanged. And since the goal has remained largely the same, one of the means for attaining that goal - the non-reservation school - has still had a place in the scheme of things.

Why, only in the 90th year of this 90 year study of the non-reservation school, was only a token gesture given in the curriculum to an appreciation of Indian culture or history? The explanation can only be in the goal of the educational system itself. That goal, in 1969, remained the assimilation of the American Indian.

Why, in 1969, did Indians themselves still have little control over their school system? Because the goal of that system was not cultural diversity, nor Indian self-determination, but seems to have remained, as was its original purpose, the assimilation of the American Indian.

The non-reservation schools have not deteriorated to the condition in which they were found in 1969. In most instances, they have always been that way. The tragedy is that the conditions found in the non-reservation schools in 1969 represent, in some instances, an improvement over what they have been in the past.

The birth of the non-reservation school system had its conception

in the prevailing belief that only by complete removal of the child from his environment, could any change hope to be effective. That same reasoning was still being applied in 1969. For a wide variety of educational, social, and psychological reasons, children, in 1969, were referred to the non-reservation boarding schools because of what the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education called the "outmoded" belief that sending children far from the source of their problems will somehow, "almost miraculously," solve those problems.

At the time of the Meriam Report, in 1928, there were 19 non-reservation Indian boarding schools. Although the Meriam Report had urged the gradual phasing out of the boarding schools, with the substitution of both day and public schools, by 1969 there were, again, 19 non-reservation Indian boarding schools. Moreover, attendance at the non-reservation schools was increasing rather than decreasing. In the 90 year period studied, the peak attendance was reached in 1969.

While the number of Indian school children in schools of all kinds has increased since 1928, the percentage of Indian children in federal boarding schools has remained about the same since 1928. In 1969, boarding schools were still the most prominent feature of the federal school system for Indian children.

The institutionalism of the schools has increased. At the time of the Meriam Report the largest school, Sherman Institute at Riverside, California had 1,048 students in attendance. In 1969, Intermountain School, Brigham City, Utah had 2100 children, grades 1 to 12.

In 1969 the appropriations for the running of these institutions

was still far below any comparable state or private school. Since the publication of the Meriam Report prompted a 200 per cent increase in the amount spent per pupil per day for food, the amount spent per pupil per day for food has increased by less than a penny a year.

From the beginning the schools were a battleground in which warfare was waged against the child's culture, language, and beliefs. Despite the fact that non-reservation schools were run exclusively for Indian children, no course on Indian culture or history was introduced until 1969, and then only two schools reported such courses. Moreover, one of these was listed as "experimental."

Despite the strong injunction against the practice of placing young children in the boarding schools made by the Meriam Report in 1928, and despite the general agreement among developmental psychologists that boarding schools were destructive to young children, the Bureau of Indian Affairs had made little effort to correct the situation in 1969 and continued to place young children in boarding schools as they had done from the beginning.

The degree of militarism at some of the non-reservation schools in the early period is striking. Conducted in abandoned army forts, administered and disciplined by army men or former army men, the pupils, in some cases hostages and prisoners of war, were fed on army rations, and were organized into military companies and drilled in army maneuvers. When they misbehaved they were placed in the guard-house and when they ran away they were called deserters.

The army has been removed from its active role in Indian edu-

cation. While school superintendents in 1969 were educators, the Senate investigating committee pointed out that administrators, in charge of school policy and personnel, in many cases knew nothing of education.

In 1969 the main emphasis of the schools was still on obedience and discipline, as it had been from the beginning. By 1969 disciplinarians and matrons were called counselors. They were still responsible for discipline.

Although sickness and death were frequent at the non-reservation schools from the beginning, it took the federal government 30 years to begin any kind of a campaign to do something about it. At Carlisle, 191 headstones mark this period of the school's history.

Despite official pronouncements to the contrary, corporal punishment has been evident at the non-reservation schools for 90 years.

Non-reservation schools have been described as penal institutions and reform schools since 1903. In 1969, barbed wire actually surrounded one campus.

The physical plants of the schools have remained largely unchanged in the 90 year period covered by this study. In 1969, many were still old army forts, and repairs were still a problem.

Student labor, a fact of life for 50 years, has largely disappeared from the non-reservation schools. Vocational training in 1969 was still classified as inadequate, irrelevant, and outdated.

From 1879 to 1969 vast, over-crowded dormitories have been the pattern of the non-reservation school, in spite of the strong injunction against this practice made by the Meriam Report in 1928.

The federal government has been grossly inefficient in supplying the school system it maintains. It took 50 years and a major investigation before the government was able to deliver the necessary supplies to the non-reservation schools on or before each school term.

The education of Indian children in the government's non-reservation Indian boarding schools has been in stark contrast to the traditional pattern of American education. Not only have these schools largely ignored the needs, values, and culture of the students whom they are supposed to serve, they have not even compared favorably with white schools whose values and culture they have been meant to impose.

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. U. S. Department of the Interior, Indian Schools and Education, Washington: Government Printing Office, January 19, 1932.
2. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1885," House Executive Documents, 49th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1885. Series 2379.
3. Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, 91st Congress. Indian Education: A National Tragedy- A National Challenge, Report No. 501, Washington: Government Printing Office, November, 1969.
4. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1899-1900," House Executive Documents, 56th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 18, Pt. 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899. Series 3915.
5. Meriam, Lewis et al, The Problem of Indian Administration, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928.
6. Adams, Evelyn C., American Indian Education, Morningside Heights: Kings Crown Press, 1946.
7. Hicks, John D. and George E. Mowry, A Short History of American Democracy, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1956.
8. Fritz, Henry E., The Movement for Indian Assimilation, 1860-1890, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963.
9. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1887," House Executive Documents, 50th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1887. Series 2542.
10. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1880," House Executive Documents, 46th Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 9. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880. Series 1959.
11. Lemmon, Burton Carlyle, The Historical Development of the Chemawa Indian School, Master's Thesis, Oregon State College, June, 1941.

12. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1882," House Executive Documents, 47th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1882. Series 2100.
13. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1883," House Executive Documents, 48th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1883. Series 2191.
14. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1890," House Executive Documents, 51st Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1890. Series 2841.
15. Pratt, Richard Henry, Battlefield and Classroom, Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.
16. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1902-1903," House Executive Documents, 57th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1903. Series 4458.
17. Eastman, Elaine Goodale, Pratt, The Red Man's Moses, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1935.
18. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1889," House Executive Documents, 51st Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1890. Series 2725.
19. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Albuquerque, New Mexico School, 1887," House Executive Documents, 50th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1887. Series 2542.
20. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1891-'92," House Executive Documents, 52d Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1892. Series 2934.
21. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Correspondence of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1892-'93," House Executive Documents, 52d Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 13. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1892. Series 3088.

22. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1893-'94," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 14. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893. Series 3210.
23. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Flandreau, South Dakota School, 1894-'95," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894. Series 3306.
24. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Grand Junction, Colorado School, 1894-'95," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894. Series 3306.
25. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Fort Lewis, Colorado School, 1898-'99," House Executive Documents, 55th Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1898. Series 3757.
26. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1898-'99," House Executive Documents, 55th Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1898. Series 3757.
27. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1900-1901," House Executive Documents, 56th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 27. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900. Series 4101.
28. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1908," Administrative Reports, Vol. II. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1908. Series 5455.
29. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1909," Administrative Reports, Vol. II. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1910. Series 5747.
30. Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations, Washington: Government Printing Office, November, 1969.
31. U. S. Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1928, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1928.

32. U. S. Department of the Interior, Statistics Concerning Indian Education, 1961, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961.
33. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1909," Administrative Reports, Vol. II. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1907. Series 5296.
34. Standing Bear, Luther, My People the Sioux, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1928.
35. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Forest Grove, Oregon School, 1881-1882," House Executive Documents, 47th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 10. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1881. Series 2018.
36. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Salem, Oregon School, 1885-1886," House Executive Documents, 49th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 8. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1886. Series 2467.
37. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Genoa, Nebraska School, 1885-1886," House Executive Documents, 49th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 8. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1886. Series 2467.
38. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1885," House Executive Documents, 49th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1885. Series 2379.
39. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Chilocco, Oklahoma School, 1889," House Executive Documents, 51st Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1890. Series 2725.
40. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Grand Junction, Colorado School, 1890," House Executive Documents, 51st Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1890. Series 2841.
41. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Santa Fe, New Mexico School, 1891-1892," House Executive Documents, 52d Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1892. Series 2934.
42. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Pipestone, Minnesota School, 1893-(94)," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 14. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893. Series 3210.

43. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Flandreau, South Dakota School, 1894-'95," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894. Series 3306.
44. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Clonterf, Minnesota School, 1898-'99," House Executive Documents, 55th Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1898. Series 3757.
45. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Albuquerque, New Mexico School, 1894-'95," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894. Series 3306.
46. U. S. Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1930, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1930.
47. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Carlisle, Pennsylvania School, 1904-1905," House Executive Documents, 58th Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905. Series 4798.
48. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Carlisle, Pennsylvania School, 1880," House Executive Documents, 46th Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 9. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880. Series 1959.
49. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Phoenix, Arizona School, 1894-'95," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894. Series 3306.
50. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Perris, California School, 1898-'99," House Executive Documents, 55th Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1898. Series 3757.
51. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Carlisle, Pennsylvania School, 1894-'95," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894. Series 3306.
52. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1895-'96," House Executive Documents, 54th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1896. Series 3382.

53. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Albuquerque, New Mexico School, 1895-'96," House Executive Documents, 54th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1896. Series 3382.
54. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Fort Lewis, Colorado School, 1899-1900," House Executive Documents, 56th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 18, Pt. 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899. Series 3915.
55. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Fort Lewis, Colorado School, 1902-1903," House Executive Documents, 57th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1903. Series 4458.
56. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Department of the Interior, 1912," Administrative Reports, Vol. II. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913. Series 6409.
57. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1891-'92," House Executive Documents, 52d Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1892. Series 2934.
58. Simmons, Leo W. (ed), Sun Chief, The Autobiography of a Hopi Indian, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942.
59. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Salem, Oregon School, 1887," House Executive Documents, 50th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1887. Series 2542.
60. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Fort Stevenson, North Dakota School, 1892-'93," House Executive Documents, 52d Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 13. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1892. Series 3088.
61. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Fort Stevenson, North Dakota School, 1887," House Executive Documents, 50th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1887. Series 2542.
62. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1901-1902," House Executive Documents, 57th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 23. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902. Series 4290.
63. Brown, Estelle Aubrey, Stubborn Fool, Caldwell: The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1952.

64. U. S. Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1928, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1928.
65. U. S. Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1931, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1931.
66. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Special Agent in the Indian School Service, 1889-'90," House Executive Documents, 51st Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1890. Series 2725.
67. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Fort Mojave, Arizona School, 1899-1900," House Executive Documents, 56th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 18, Pt. 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899. Series 3915.
68. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Albuquerque, New Mexico School, 1893-'94," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 14. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893. Series 3210.
69. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Albuquerque, New Mexico School, 1890," House Executive Documents, 51st Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1890. Series 2841.
70. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Perris, California School, 1895-'96," House Executive Documents, 54th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1896. Series 3382.
71. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1893-'94," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 14. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893. Series 3210.
72. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1892-'93," House Executive Documents, 52d Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 13. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1892. Series 3088.
73. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1894-'95," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894. Series 3306.

74. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Fort Lewis, Colorado School, 1905-1906," House Executive Documents, 59th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1906. Series 4959.
75. U. S. Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners, 1927, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1927.
76. U. S. Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1962, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.
77. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Santa Fe, New Mexico School, 1894-'95," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894. Series 3306.
78. U. S. Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Department of the Interior, 1922, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922.
79. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of Hampton Institute, 1881," House Executive Documents, 47th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 10. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1881. Series 2018.
80. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1893-'94," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 14. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893. Series 3210.
81. Personal Correspondence, John J. Slonaker, Chief, Research and Reference, Department of the Army, U. S. Army Military History Research Collection, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, March 14, 1975.
82. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Albuquerque, New Mexico School, 1892-'93," House Executive Documents, 52d Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 13. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1892. Series 3088.
83. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Forest Grove, Oregon School, 1882," House Executive Documents, 47th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1882. Series 2100.

84. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Salem, Oregon School, 1889," House Executive Documents, 51st Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1890. Series 2725.
85. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Medical Statistics of the United States Indian Service, 1893," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 14. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893. Series 3210.
86. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Carlisle, Pennsylvania School, 1881," House Executive Documents, 47th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 10. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1881. Series 2018.
87. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Carlisle, Pennsylvania School, 1900-1901," House Executive Documents, 56th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 27. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900. Series 4101.
88. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Greenville, California School, 1896-'97," House Executive Documents, 54th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 13. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1897. Series 3489.
89. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1904-1905," House Executive Documents, 58th Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905. Series 4798.
90. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1889," House Executive Documents, 51st Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1890. Series 2725.
91. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Special Agent in the Indian School Service, 1891-'92," House Executive Documents, 52d Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1892. Series 2934.
92. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of Hampton Institute, 1882," House Executive Documents, 47th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1882. Series 2100.
93. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Carlisle, Pennsylvania School, 1906-1907," House Executive Documents, 59th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1907. Series 5118.

94. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1904-1905," House Executive Documents, 58th Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905. Series 4798.
95. U. S. Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1932, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1932.
96. Reynolds, Gaylord A., The History of Pipestone Indian School, Master's Thesis, University of South Dakota, August, 1952.
97. Qoyawayma, Polingaysi, No Turning Back, Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1964.
98. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1896-'97," House Executive Documents, 54th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 13. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1897. Series 3489.
99. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Carlisle, Pennsylvania School, 1888," House Executive Documents, 50th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1888. Series 2637.
100. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1917," Administrative Reports, Vol. II. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1918.
101. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1881," House Executive Documents, 47th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 10. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1881. Series 2018.
102. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Genoa, Nebraska School, 1884," House Executive Documents, 48th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1884. Series 2287.
103. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Carlisle, Pennsylvania School, 1882," House Executive Documents, 47th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1882. Series 2100.
104. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of Hampton Institute, 1883," House Executive Documents, 48th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1883. Series 2191.

105. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Forest Grove, Oregon School, 1884," House Executive Documents, 48th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1884. Series 2287.
106. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Carlisle, Pennsylvania School, 1885," House Executive Documents, 49th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1885. Series 2379.
107. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Genoa, Nebraska School, 1888," House Executive Documents, 50th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1888. Series 2637.
108. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1888," House Executive Documents, 50th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1888. Series 2637.
109. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1894-'95," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894. Series 3306.
110. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Mount Pleasant, Michigan School, 1895-'96," House Executive Documents, 54th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1896. Series 3382.
111. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1905-1906," House Executive Documents, 59th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1906. Series 4959.
112. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Salem, Oregon School, 1895-'96," House Executive Documents, 54th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1896. Series 3382.
113. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Santa Fe, New Mexico School, 1905-1906," House Executive Documents, 59th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1906. Series 4959.
114. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1903-1904," House Executive Documents, 58th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904. Series 4645.

115. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Grand Junction, Colorado School, 1893-'94," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 14. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893. Series 3210.
116. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Chilocco, Oklahoma School, 1906-1907," House Executive Documents, 59th Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1907. Series 5118.
117. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1890," House Executive Documents, 51st Congress, 2d Session, Vol. 12. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1890. Series 2841.
118. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, 1904-1905," House Executive Documents, 58th Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905. Series 4798.
119. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Fort Stevenson, North Dakota School, 1894-'95," House Executive Documents, 53d Congress, 3d Session, Vol. 15. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1894. Series 3306.
120. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior, 1887," House Executive Documents, 50th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 11. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1887. Series 2542.
121. U. S. Department of the Interior, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Indian Schools, 1905-1906," House Executive Documents, 59th Congress, 1st Session, Vol. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1906. Series 4959.

APPENDICES

NON-RESERVATION INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOLS OPENED BEFORE 1931

<u>Name</u>	<u>Opened</u>	<u>Closed</u>
Albuquerque, New Mexico	1884	Open in 1969
Bismarck, North Dakota	1908	Unknown
Carlisle, Pennsylvania	1879	1918
Carson, Nevada	1890	Known as Stewart in 1969
Chamberlain, South Dakota	1898	1910
Charles H. Burke, New Mexico	1926	Unknown
Chilocco, Oklahoma	1884	Open in 1969
Clonterf, Minnesota	1897	1899
Cushman, Washington	1912 (?)	1921
Flandreau, South Dakota	1893	Open in 1969
Fort Bidwell, California	1898	1920
		(reservation boarding)
Fort Lewis, Colorado	1892	1910
Fort Mojave, Arizona	1890	1920
		(reservation boarding)
Fort Shaw, Montana	1892	1910
Fort Stevenson, North Dakota	1883	1896
		(burned)
Genoa, Nebraska	1884	sometime after 1930
Grand Junction, Colorado	1886	1911
Greenville, California	1895	1920
		(reservation boarding)
Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas	1884	Open in 1969
Hayward, Wisconsin	1912 (?)	1922
		(reservation boarding)
Hope, South Dakota	1919	before 1926
Morris, Minnesota	1897	1910
Mount Pleasant, Michigan	1893	Unknown
Perris, California	1893	1904
		(merged into Sherman)
Phoenix, Arizona	1891	Open in 1969
Pierre, South Dakota	1891	Open in 1969
Pipestone, Minnesota	1893	Unknown
		(reservation boarding)
Rapid City, South Dakota	1898	Before 1930
Chemawa, Salem, Oregon	1880	Open in 1969
Santa Fe, New Mexico	1890	Open in 1969
Sequoyah, Oklahoma	1930	Open in 1961
Sherman Institute, Riverside, California	1902	Open in 1969
Springfield, South Dakota	1914 (?)	1919

Non-Reservation Indian Boarding Schools Opened Before 1931- Continued

<u>Name</u>	<u>Opened</u>	<u>Closed</u>
Theodore Roosevelt, Arizona	1923	Unknown
Tomah, Wisconsin	1893	Unknown
Wahpeton, North Dakota	1908	Open in 1961
Wittenberg, Wisconsin	1895	1918

NON-RESERVATION INDIAN BOARDING SCHOOLS IN 1961

Wahpeton, North Dakota

Flandreau, South Dakota

Pierre, South Dakota

Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas

Chilocco, Oklahoma

Albuquerque, New Mexico

Santa Fe, New Mexico

Intermountain, Brigham City, Utah

Mt. Edgecumbe, Alaska

Wrangell, Alaska

Sequoyah, Tahlequah, Oklahoma

Phoenix, Arizona

Sherman Institute, Riverside, California

Stewart, Nevada

Chemawa, Salem, Oregon