EDUCATION FOR ACTION

SELECTED ARTICLES FROM INDIAN EDUCATION 1936-43

by WILLARD W. BEATTY

Director of Education, United States Indian Service

and ASSOCIATES

A Publication of the Education Division

UNITED STATES INDIAN SERVICE

1944

INTRODUCTION TO THE *EDUCATION FOR ACTION* SECTION, CULTURE: BACKGROUND FOR LEARNING

The book, *Education for Action*, is a collection of articles from the biweekly newsletter, *Indian Education* that were written between 1936 and 1943. Willard Beatty, then Chief of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' (BIA) Division of Education, initiated the newsletter and edited the book which was published in 1944. Over the 66 years since *Education for Action* was published. There have been changes in Indian/Native life and education. First, there is the now the long-standing policy of Indian Self Determination wherein Indian/Native have assumed responsibility for several schools, except in Alaska. Second, the cultural and language circumstances of American Indians and Alaska Natives has changed. One important change has been the transition from Indian/Native languages to English. Even with English spoken most of the time by Indian/Native children, they still behave according to Indian/Native culture. Even though written between 1936 and 1943, much of the content of the articles on "Culture" have a measure of applicability to the Indian/Native education today, 2010.

The reader should be aware of some dated language uses that relate to the times. For instance, the term "Amerindian" is used to refer to American Indians and Alaska Natives. The BIA Education Division was referred to as the "Indian Service." And, some spellings are different. These language differences are not important to the content of the articles. Non-Indians are referred to as "White." While there are today more Indian/Native teacher and administrators than in 1936-1944, Whites remain in the majority as teachers and administrators.

Willard Beatty believed that professional anthropologist had knowledge important to Indian/Native education and had Ruth Underhill and Gordon Macgregor on his Education staff. There are 17 "Culture" articles of which 15 were written by Beatty, Underhill and/or Macgregor. The content is culturally basic and reflects a serious commitment to the educational importance of "Culture." Much of the content is focused on attacking the negative stereotype of Indian/Natives held by White teachers and administrators that existed in 1944. No doubt a negative stereotype exists today, but fortunately in a much reduced presence.

Personally, while I was working as an administrator at Mt. Edgecumbe High School in Alaska in 1959, Hildegard Thompson and two administrators visited the school. Thompson followed Beatty as head of BIA Education. We asked her and her two associates why there did not seem to be any anthropologist on her staff. She curtly responded that they had difficulty in communicating with teachers and administrators and could offer nothing helpful to the Education program. Times change.

Also, the formatting, especially pagination and columns, follow that of the book which usually left the end of a scanned page uneven. The formatting unevenness does not alter the content of the articles. Use the pdf "Find" command for going to page numbers given in the "Contents".

There is more to come from historical documents which deal with the educational importance of Indian/Native cultures. Beatty also edited another book, *Education for Cultural Change* (1953) which is based on selected articles from *Indian Education*, 1944 – 1951. The culture section is titled, "Chapter 3, UNDERSTANDING CULTURAL DIFFERFENCES." The Chapter contains 24 articles and 50 pages compared to the 1944, 17 articles and 36 pages. Ruth Underhill and Beatty wrote most of these articles, too. The professionalism and academic excellence of the articles started in 1936 continued through to 1951.

Tom (Thomas) R. Hopkins, Ed.D.

2. CULTURE: BACKGROUND FOR LEARNING

II CULTURE: BACKGROUND FOR LEARNING 33
1. Seek and find Beatty 33
2. Who are the Indians? Beatty 34
3. Is change harmful? Beatty 36
4. In-group: Out-group Beatty 38
5. Only one right way? Hulsizer 41
6. Etiquette Underhill 44
7. Indian warfare Macgregor 46
8. The giveaway Underhill 49
9. Generosity outmoded Beatty 51
10. There are no orphans Macgregor 53
11. Our heathen festivals Underhill 56
12. Whites aren't so far ahead Beatty 57
13. The adaptable Indian Underhill 59
14. Indians *will* work Underhill and Beatty 60
15. Pretty good, for an Indian Beatty 63
16. For "Italian" read "Indian" Whyte 65
17. Papago child training Underhill 66

1. SEEK AND FIND

"Indians are just like children—irresponsible, and incapable of serious leadership."

"Indians have a peculiar psychology. You can't treat them like White men. You have to know how to handle them."

"Indian children are very different from Whites. They are sullen, irresponsible, and won't speak up like White children."

"Indian children are shy. They don't have much to say. They don't laugh and play like White children."

THESE and many more words of wisdom and bits of sage advice were passed on to me during the early months of my association with the Indian Service, by teachers, supervisors, reservation superintendents, construction superintendents, missionaries, traders, and others working in one way or another with Indians. Don't misunderstand me. These people did not represent all, or even a large part of the Indian Service personnel, but they did represent a *very* vocal part. The people who believed these things were outspoken and were quick to volunteer advice to a newcomer.

I am glad that many of my first contacts with Indians in schools and on reservations were made when I was still fresh from daily, continuous association with perfectly normal White children of all ages, through the senior high school, and of slightly higher mentality than the average. I was continually forced to compare the problems presented to me by representatives of the Indian Service as peculiar to their work with Indians, with similar problems which I had been encountering day by day for more than twenty years with American White public school children.

I can honestly say that little which was presented to me as an Indian problem differed materially from similar problems which I have encountered in my contact with White children. After a few months reached the conclusion that many so-called "Indian" problems were called that because the persons who encountered them had been with Indians just long enough to forget how White children behave under similar circumstances.

Of course I have visited schools in which Indian children have been shy; in which they have given the appearance of being sullen; in which there have been evidences of irresponsibility. Of course I have met adult Indians who have left jobs to go to dances; Indians who have earned a little money and have taken time off to spend it; Indians who have been very unskilled and clumsy in the doing of simple manual tasks; and Indians who have appeared to have difficulty in offering leadership to their fellows in the

acceptance and following of White ways. On the other hand, I have found schools on the same reservation, or at least in culturally similar adjacent communities where exactly the reverse of all these things has been true. I have found Indian children responding gaily in classroom activities that would lead a visitor to confuse them with youngsters in the best of American public schools. I have met older Indian boys and girls in high school, participating in animated discussions, showing the greatest of interest in problems wholly similar to those which their White brethren in public schools discuss and are interested in. I have found adult Indians carrying the most serious responsibility, doing the most skilled work, responding to problems with the most reasoned and subtle judgment born of observation, experiences, and mature thought.

And out of these early experiences in the Indian Service I reached a tentative conclusion. It is that people who expect Indians to act like undeveloped children, never give Indians much chance to be anything else. Those of us who expect irresponsibility encounter irresponsibility. On the other hand, those who expect spontaneous and wholehearted responses from Indian children, those who expect adult Indians to display maturity and judgment will find their expectations fulfilled.

2. WHO ARE THE INDIANS?

ONE OF the greatest difficulties encountered by many who come from White life into contact with Indians is in realizing that Indians are a diverse people. Somehow, by applying the name Indian to all of the pre-Columbian inhabitants of the continent, we lose sight of the fact that the term covers a greater number of race and culture groups than are found among Whites on the European continent. The term Indian compares more nearly to the terms European or Asiatic, as embracing many people, than is often realized. If we recognize that by "Whites," we mean Italians, Sicilians, Greeks, Macedonians, Bulgars, Iberians, Andalusians, Dutch, Germans, Gascons, Flemings, Austrians, Danes, Welsh, Irish, Scots, English, Norwegians, Swedes, Russians, Georgians, Ukrainians, Poles and many others, we may have a clear comparison with the many distinct and more highly variant races and linguistic or culture groups native to the North American continent.

Actually, there appear to have been between three and five hundred mutually unintelligible Indian languages spoken within the borders of the United States, which upon analysis probably belong to between eight and thirteen distinct root languages. One has to speak in these general terms, because the study as yet given to the anthropological background of the Amerindian* still leaves many facts undetermined. Over the course of time, groups speaking related languages have come to occupy widely scattered areas. By contact between tribes, there have developed similarities in culture patterns among Indians stemming from different language groups. The seven or eight main culture areas into which ethnologists are likely to group Indian tribes in North America, therefore, do not coincide with the basic language groups, as classified by linguists. Culture areas, however, may define Indian groups with similar religious sanctions, similar hunting or marriage customs, or similar beliefs regarding death, and life after death. Because one's ability to understand another

* Amerindian: A term finding currency in scientific studies to distinguish the native American from the native of Indian – the country which Columbus believed he had reached when he landed in the West Indes, and the inhabitants of which are also called Indians. Frequently shortened to Amerind.

person depends largely upon one's recognition of what that person believes about right and wrong, marriage, death, success in personal achievement, or supernatural control of natural phenomena, it is important that members of the Indian Service, and Whites who associate with Indians, understand first of all that Indians differ greatly among themselves in their beliefs regarding such matters.

This isn't as strange as it seems. Whites have become so accustomed to differences of belief among themselves regarding similar matters, that they have developed a tolerance of such differences, within limits, and are now scarcely aware, at times, that they exist. For instance, there was a time when Spain went in for heresy hunting on a large scale, and tortured persons who disagreed with the accepted religious tenets. This was known as the Inquisition, and most of us found it difficult to reconstruct such an atmosphere of fear and hate among people of similar blood and custom, until recent events in Europe whipped up anti-Semitic outbursts, and dictatorial suppression of free-thinking.

Most of the warfare of the middle ages, which is studied in our high school histories, deals with bitter and bloody quarrels about religion, and minor differences of religious belief. Our own country is the result of humanity's protest against making such differences of opinion matters for bloodshed and injustice Yet one has only to read the history of New England to find Roger Williams and Ann Hutchison among a goodly throng evicted from smug New England towns because they dared to disagree with the ruling religious leaders. And in this country, which we have aptly called the melting-pot of White cultures, our churches tend to distinguish our racial origins long after other signs of difference have disappeared. Wesley, of Scotland; Luther of Germany; Calvin of France, but adopted by many English dissenters; Arminius of Holland; George Fox of England, Mary Baker Eddy of America, and numerous others initiated dissenting groups of "true believers" who have made the religion of Christ a veritable house of Babel, even to the Indian. These and others, we have learned to live with, work with, and respect, and we have learned not to discuss with friends such matters of personal belief upon which we might disagree.

While a common type of costume pervades most parts of the United States, our peoples come from areas where national or local costumes were a distinguishing feature of most communities—in the more sophisticated areas limited to festivals and ceremonial occasions, but still recognized and respected. Stemming back to our own pagan past, are the names of our days of the week, our months of the year; Santa Claus, and the use of the Christmas tree both originated in delightful pagan customs, as do many of the fertility rites of Easter, and the harvest festival of Thanksgiving.

In the field of medicine it is much the same. While the allopaths are strongly in-trenched in their control of public and private medicine, elements in the community accept the homeopaths, the osteopaths and the chiropractors as groups having the right to deal with human ills; and a tolerance has developed for those who believe in faith healing, as the Christian Scientists and an array of smaller cults.

Marriage is accepted as a consummation of love by Americans and considered as a business arrangement governing ownership and inheritance of property by Frenchmen. Divorce is an intolerable evil to a Catholic, an unfortunate, but sometimes justifiable step where infidelity has

occurred, to many Protestants, and a reasonable solution to temperamental incompatibility to a growing body of Americans.

Whatever we individually believe about any of these subjects, we are inclined to assume is right. While we may tolerate deviations among our "betters," or those over whom we exercise no control, we are liable to be intolerant and unreasonable in condemning different practices among those whom we assume to be our equals or our inferiors. Indian groups who have developed their practices in such matters in the same empirical manner that all other races have, are equally sure that their habits are right. It must never be forgotten, however, that because of difference in cultural areas, Amerinds differ even more in their beliefs than do Whites and are equally intolerant of other Indian groups whose beliefs differ widely from familiar tribal practices. For instance; The attitude of the Navaho toward marriage may differ utterly from that of the Sioux. Beliefs regarding death on the part of plains Indians may differ greatly from those of Pueblo Indians. The sacred bird of one Apache tribe may become a source of food to another group, or its plumage may be used for personal adornment. These differences between Indians may disqualify the Indians of one tribe for understanding cooperation with the members of another tribe, just as much as the differences between White and Indian beliefs may handicap Whites in dealing intelligently with Indians.

Beliefs of this kind are frequently intimately associated with conduct controls upon which tribal Government originally depended. If we would deal understandingly with the races of people for whose benefit the Indian Service was established, we must make one of our first responsibilities the understanding of the more intimate beliefs, taboos, and ethical controls of the particular tribal groups with which we are working, to the end that we may extend to their beliefs a respect similar to that which we will wish them to accord our own beliefs.

Behavior patterns of the type which have been discussed are seldom matters of direct education. They are, however, subject to modification and adaptation. Through the recognition of the behavior patterns which are controlling the actions of any social group it may be possible to guide in some degree the modifications of these beliefs and actions as the group comes in contact with the different behavior of Whites.

In conclusion, it is important to remember that:

1. There are many and significant differences between Indian tribes in matters of race, language, culture, and belief.
2. Successful cooperation with any group rests upon our understanding of their culture patterns and the respect which we accord their beliefs.
3. Indians are not necessarily better able to understand other Indians than are Whites. It is not skin color but similarity of culture that helps toward understanding.
4. The satisfactory adjustment of our many Amerindian tribal groups to the culture pattern of White America will continue to require study and understanding upon the part of both the Indian and the White employees of the service.

3. IS CHANGE HARMFUL?

AMERIND groups differed in language, physical characterizes, and cultural background before the advent of the White man, even more than the White races of the European continent differed

among themselves. These indigenous differences, important as they were and still are, have been intensified, however, by the influence which the White man has exerted in more or less degree upon every Indian tribal group.

In some instances the impact of the White man has been relatively slight upon customs, work habits, language, and religion. The Papago Indians in Southern Arizona and several of the Pueblos, such as Santo Domingo, and Taos have resisted attempts to modify their indigenous culture. Others, like the Zuni and Hopi, have apparently yielded in part to the pressure of the Whites, only to retain more strongly other of their customs.

On the other hand, the Five Tribes, even during the period when they occupied their original Southeastern homes were receptive to new ideas and new influences. Their social customs led them to welcome the foreigner, and early led to inter-marriage with all of the new races which came to this western hemisphere. These customs continued after the transplantation of the Five Tribes to Oklahoma. Today, except for a very limited number of full-bloods driven to the hills of Eastern Oklahoma, the process of amalgamation between the Indians of these tribes and their neighbors has proceeded rapidly, with the result that many original tribal customs have been either completely forgotten or deliberately discarded.

In some cases the modification of Amerind culture patterns by the Whites has followed intensive missionary activities. At other times it has come about through the penetration of Indian country by White men who acquired Indian land through one means or another and began to live side by side with Indians.

For many years during the intermittent Indian wars the slaughter of Indians was on such a wholesale scale and the ruthlessness of the Whites so intense, that it was thought by some that the Indians would cease to exist. Following on the heels of the wholesale transplantation of entire tribal groups came a susceptibility to White diseases which decimated the Indians at frequent intervals. Trachoma, tuberculosis, and venereal disease proved the most serious enemies to the Indians, but measles, whooping cough, and a variety of other childhood maladies of the White man, proved fatal in epidemic proportions to the Amerind people, who lacked the relative immunity of Whites to many of these diseases.

During this period, and as recently as twenty-five years ago, the Indian was spoken of as the "vanishing race." Complete assimilation or annihilation were freely discussed as the only possible alternatives for the Red man. Now, despite the fact that forty years of medical service to the Indian has not relieved him of the great scourges introduced by the White race, it is recognized that the Indian is no longer a vanishing race.

The birth rate among the Navaho and some of the Pueblo villages is several times that of the country at large. With improved medical care the children born to these people are living to grow up. Except for a few of the least favored tribes, the Indian birth rate today exceeds the death rate. With this increase in the birth rate there is a growing pride among many full-bloods in maintaining pure the Indian blood stream. Destruction or assimilation can no longer be predicted. There is every indication that scattered through the Indian country, there will remain for many years groups of full-blood Indians who have adapted their habits enough to get on successfully with their White neighbors, but who have a strong determination

not to sacrifice their racial integrity. Recognizing this fact, what has been the effect of the earlier ruthless destruction of Indian culture patterns?

The culture pattern of any race is the group thinking that controls the religious, ethical, and social behavior of the individuals within the group. In most primitive societies* the culture patterns are worked out in detail, and permit very little deviation to the individual. Many phases of life which the cultured White man believes are determined by reason and thought are settled for a primitive people by a well established code which is enforced with little or no modification by the tribal elders, and followed by all good parents, in training their children. Continued good behavior by the young rests upon continued maintenance of respect for the old. These culture patterns weld together the members of each tribe and control the personal behavior of its members.

Culture patterns change slowly. Individuals whose conduct differs materially from the standards of the group are likely to suffer ostracism even though ultimately their example may result in modifications of the group pattern. Abrupt changes from the outside which destroy the control of the older group almost invariably result in chaotic disintegration of the personal behavior of the younger members of the tribe, who are still in the process of learning what is customarily desirable.

This social disintegration under the impact of changing culture is not peculiar to Indians. It occurs among White children where the American public school has destroyed respect for some of the older European cultures. The gangster and his "moll" are the product of such culture disintegration in large cities.

The situation would not be so difficult to deal with, if White culture had any uniform pattern to substitute for that of the Indian which it destroys. But in our present stage of social development, the White man speaks with a myriad of tongues, from the minister of the gospel, who preaches a "way of life," to the cow puncher, who "takes what he wants when he wants it." In the face of such facts those responsible for directing Indians' adjustment to civilization, must pause before knowingly destroying the indigenous social controls under which many Indians are still living.

4. IN-GROUP: OUT-GROUP

MOST of us have heard the story of the conscientious old Quaker who, greatly impressed with the peculiarities of mankind, ruminated one evening to his good wife somewhat as follows:

"Sarah, hast ever noticed that all the world saving thee and me art passing strange," and after a moment's thoughtful pause "and at times, even thee art a little queer?"

It is matched by the story of the fond mother who, watching a company of soldiers march by, commented that all were out of step saving her Jim. Both illustrate facts with which we are all in such daily contact that we become oblivious to them. Reduced to abstract terms, each of us is the center of his own universe and judges others by his own standards or prejudices.

Next to this loyalty to self comes loyalty to family. This was more apparent in the days of large families which lived together, or near each other, than it is today. Mazo de la Roche, in her interesting series of Jalna books, dealing with the Whiteoaks Family of southern Canada, gives an amazingly

* Coming of Age in Samoa, by Margaret Meade. Growing Up in Guinea, by Margaret Meade. Patterns of Culture, by Ruth Benedict.

accurate portrait of such a family. We have a chance to see the bickerings and open quarrels within the family group which are immediately forgotten in the united front presented by all to any criticism or attack from the outside. Sociologists have termed such a group within which strong loyalties develop an "in group." The term "out group" then describes those who fall outside the charmed circle.

In man's social relationships he is part of many "in groups." The family is, of course, the first and strongest "in group." This "in group" may be expanded by marriage, although "in-laws" always fall just a little outside the most intimate councils of the family itself.

To a child, his play associates or gang with whom he is in daily social contact, become an "in group" and the fellows in the next block or the adjoining township become an "out group" against whom bitter war is frequently waged. There are of course, frequent shifts in the personnel of such a group, but the general principle remains the same. A little later he accepts the school which he attends as an "in group," although when he first enrolls, those who are to become his immediate associates are likely to treat him as a stranger, and put him through some form of initiation rites. These may range from simple ignominious treatment to outright hazing, and his reactions are closely watched before he gains acceptance. In a variety of ways schools have learned to cultivate "in group" loyalties. No other school is quite as good, and rivalries originating on the gridiron or cinder path may extend through a variety of competitive activities. Within the school itself other "in groups" develop. Organized classes, clubs of various types, and cliques are formed which base their loyalties on similarities of tastes, or prejudices.

Outside of the school other "in groups" develop, such as the church, and ultimately the political party. Colleges, college fraternities, and fraternal organizations outside of the college bid for membership, and demand group loyalties of their members which inevitably arouse feelings of superiority with regard to the organization, and attitudes of critical opposition toward the members of similar organizations, and even antagonism toward those who abstain entirely from such membership.

Graduating from college, or upon leaving school, the youngster begins to find himself a member of either the employing or the employed class. If he is an employer, he automatically accepts certain attitudes toward labor which revolve around the assumption that the employer has the right to purchase what he is prepared to pay for, and which denies to the employee the right to discuss the terms of his employment. Grumbling employees are rebuked with the unanswerable argument that if they don't like the conditions of employment they are always free to resign.

Upon the other hand, if the individual Falls within the employed group, his loyalties are likely to lie with those of organized labor. He begins to recognize the injustices which inconsiderate employers may inflict upon their helpless employees. Faced with the continuing struggle to make outgo and income balance, he becomes concerned with the distribution of the profits of enterprise. He is liable to compare himself unfavorably with the investor who demands returns on mere money, and who in order to get them feels justified in reducing wages in such a

manner as to lower the standards of living of the wage workers. Thus, without considering the matter we often find ourselves aligned with one group and in opposition to another.

Similarly, among business men the "in group" and the "out group" exist. The president, executive officers, and even employees of one railroad or steel corporation may develop a loyalty toward that institution, despite quarrels with regard to working conditions within the organization. Frequently they will go to absurd and sometimes vicious lengths in order to work a disadvantage to a competitive concern. Spying, stealing trade secrets, infringing on patents, and actual misrepresentation of competitors' products may be indulged in, and considered entirely laudable, by individuals who would scorn such practices in their relationships with individual associates. We are frequently reminded of the Puritan New England peddler who could square the sale of wooden nutmegs with the Ten Commandments, and take pleasure in profiting from a "horse trade."

It is an interesting phenomenon of almost every "in group" that it must be particularly antagonistic to some "out group." Religiously, for instance, it is only a short time since Protestants were likely to center their particular antagonism upon members of the Catholic faith. Quite generally, today's Protestant Americans have forgotten the cry of "Papist," with which these religious hatreds were kept alive. Sometimes "in groups" take the form of such belligerent organizations, founded largely on hatred of the outsider, as the Ku Klux Klan, which glorified the Gentile White Protestant, presumably to the exclusion of all others.

Within the last 50 years we have seen the increasing growth of nationalism throughout the world, which has intensified the feelings of critical opposition toward other national groups. Many of the experiences growing out of the first World War served to intensify this nationalism. The new nations resulting from the split-up of the Austro-Hungarian empire largely owed their existence to their ability to arouse strong "in group" feeling among certain elements of the larger population, and similarly to arouse "out group" reactions toward fellow citizens of the empire, toward whom they had previously entertained certain larger loyalties. This intensification of nationalism appears to have reached its most extreme form in Germany and in Japan. In the first country, the Nazi has developed a myth of Nordic supremacy, which carries with it a belief in racial purity and superiority, and which feeds on racial hatred of the Jews and political hatred of the Communists. No individual is immune to these "in group" and "out group" feelings. If you who read this think you are, carefully examine the things which you believe and toward which you feel a sense of loyalty, and the things which you disbelieve and toward which you feel superiority or animosity.

In our relationships with Indians a recognition of these facts is important. To the Whites, upon first encountering the Indians, the very differences in skin color, race, language, politics, religion, and social customs marked off the Indians as an "out group." Many of our early traders justified sharp dealings with the Indians on the ground that they were not White men, and it, therefore, made no difference. Our religious groups rejected the pagan beliefs of the Indians in their entirety and could see little good in them. Gradually, finding continued association with the Indian inevitable, we sought to make him like

ourselves and thus more nearly acceptable to the dominant "in group."

In all of this we lost sight of the fact that the Amerind himself looked upon his tribal group as the chosen people and viewed; other tribes as potential enemies or members of the "out group." The Whites, of course, fell into the "out group" classification.

The word "Illinois" for instance, is not a tribal name but the word of that group of Indians which means that they are "the people." The Navaho call themselves "Dine" which, in their language, also means "the people." Even though the characterization of the "in group" may not always appear in this explicit form, the fact remains that each Indian tribe is an "in group" to its members, and all outsiders belong to "out groups" toward whom various feelings of superiority are entertained, and toward whom, also, latent feelings of antagonism are liable to exist.

Many actions of the Whites toward their Indian friends have served only to intensify such feelings. Let us remember that matters of this kind are not subject to conscious control and direction. They are the result of an unconscious intellectual mechanism. Nevertheless, they are important. It is possible through friendship, fair dealing, and recognition of the similarity of group interests to expand an "in-group" to include members formerly viewed as "out-group." As fellow Americans, Whites and Indians must find common loyalties that will bind them into an "in-group." The great war will result in many joint experiences which will operate in that direction.

5. ONLY ONE RIGHT WAY?

WHEREVER different races are in contact each finds the other lacking in some respects. Where there has been conflict and one race expects to dominate the other there is rather consistent though often unconscious effort to get the dominated race to accept not only actual inferior status but belief in inherent inferiority. A learned Englishman trying to be witty once said in substance: "In England oats is a feed for horses but in Scotland it is the mainstay of the people," the idea being that the English were very superior in that particular matter, the Scots inferior; the truth of the matter being that oatmeal is a very good food for people and that the English along with many other races have learned this and now thank the Scots for developing oatmeal. Eating oatmeal was just as valid an idea in regard to food when it was made a subject of derision, as later when it was accepted. There is a general disposition among people to regard their own ideas as valid, those of others as inadequate and possibly ridiculous. Put to the test of usefulness, in time ideas formerly considered ridiculous may become wholeheartedly accepted.

But have Indians any ideas that are superior which Whites may accept? And if Whites have any ideas valuable to Indians, can Indians ever be expected to learn to use them? There are no doubt many sincere, hardworking Indian Service employees (not to include here the vast majority of members of dominant races working with subordinated races throughout the world) who feel that Indians have few ideas valuable in a modern world and that they do not take on new ones at a rapid rate.

Instances are cited: "Look at the way they have lost their land!" "Why if one of them has anything to eat, all his relatives come and eat it up!" "Can you imagine a house with an air hole right in the middle of the roof and no chimney!"

"They never whip their children, consequently the children boss the parents." "The Indians just stay here on the reservation instead of getting out and going somewhere else."

But are all these ideas a clear demonstration of stupidity or wrong-headedness or are they among the worthwhile elements in Indian life which should be retained? As far as the Indians' land is concerned, on a number of allotted reservations 40 percent of the full-blood Indians have retained their land. This is a higher percentage than has obtained among White homesteaders during the last thirty years. In a number of our better farming states operator-ownership of land has dropped from 100, 90, or 80 per cent to as low as 25 per cent in some instances.

In our best stock barns, authorities now require ventilation from floor to roof. Many of the Pueblo Indians continue to build with the central air-hole in each room. But under pressure from Whites, tight-sealed houses are being built as modern improvements. Unfortunately, these "modern" houses are not modern enough -- a really modern house will provide just as good or better ventilation for humans than prevails in a good stock barn.

Indian parents do not whip their children. Nevertheless Indian parents have a great deal of influence over their children. They try to guide them and they are successful, one would have to admit in a great many instances, in making their children into people much like themselves, which is what parents all over the world seem to be pretty generally trying to do. Indian parents here and there may be asking teachers to whip their children because they believe such form of punishment is expected by Whites, and they can not or will not bring themselves to give physical punishment. But these cases are the exception. The main group of Indian parents continue the Indian way. Modern educational method would seem to be nearer the Indian way than the old White way, in this case. If individualistic (egoistic), suspicious, negative people are what is wanted, the whipping of children is probably one good way to develop them. Immediate conformity in childhood does not guarantee later conformity, but if achieved by force probably produces resistance, resentment and inner conflict. These attitudes have a profound influence not only on child-adult relationship but on the relationships of adults with each other.

Whites now have to pay cash to get their old and underprivileged people taken care of; Indians take care of them as a matter of course. Human needs are more important, think Indians, than economic needs; the latter should always be sacrificed to the former. It would be granted that many Whites have sacrificed too much for economic considerations. Indian behavior may need modification in this regard, but it is questionable whether The present White way is unconditionally superior or should be adopted by Indians. Many Indians are accustomed to sharing food and services among a family and even among community groups. Nor is this always according to the amount of labor put into the project.

While there was stimulation among the Dakota Indians, for example, for each individual to do his utmost, neither his share of food nor the buffalo hide he received nor his prestige depended, within limits, so much on what he did as on how he did it. Thirty years ago local responsibility for care of the destitute was more active among Whites in the United States. The White method at present is to tax those who are successful in earning a living and support the indigent from

public funds. Handling matters of relief locally—the Indian way — is probably superior or in part to the institutional method — the present White way. Possibly a combination of the two is needed, but certainly one cannot consider the Indian method of sharing as wholly out of order. White society, it is said, is built on the principle that individual profit is necessary to maintain efficiency,—but as a matter of fact many of our most successful activities are built on cooperative enterprise. Cooperation, sharing, does not necessarily mean that the individual's best efforts are not put forth. Nor is it proven that the Indian way was not a tactful method for getting the most that could be expected out of each individual without penalizing too severely the willing but less able.

The maintenance of corn-maize plants in a high state of efficiency in each region would have been impossible in a society where production was entirely inefficient. When the Whites came in contact with Indians, practically every group had a corn adapted to its region. Indians learned, adapted, before Whites appeared on the scene and will continue to learn where several reversals of policy do not cause too much confusion.

In 1874 when the total budget, including employees' salaries, on the Navaho was only $5,000, these Indians were raising about 200,000 bushels of corn annually. Ergo, they grew corn undirected and unsupervised. This continued a policy that the Navaho had taken over from the Hopi, perhaps a thousand years before. The corn and other seeds they used were adapted to their high plateaus and other climatic factors.

Probably about 1860, the Minneconjou (Dakota) band under the guidance of their chief had secured regionally adapted corn seed from the Arikaras and had begun to plant-by-the-water. That the Dakota bands here and there planted corn at various times and places after beginning their exodus from Illinois to the Dakotas through the lake region, is evidenced by their legends, by such names as Corn Creek Band, and by the behavior of one isolated group of Dakota who without any White help have carried out one of the most interesting of modern seed acclimatizations.

This demonstration in what can be accomplished by regional selection of seed was carried out by the Sisseton Indians, who fled from Minnesota to Canada after the uprising of 1860. This group carried seed corn with them. Year after year this seed was planted and harvested. To this day, almost eighty years later, before every cabin on their reservation near Griswold, Manitoba, at harvest time are strung up bushels of Indian corn. More than that,—for a number of years American seed houses have recognized that these Indians "had something" in this northernmost corn in existence, and a significant proportion of their corn has been purchased by north-central seed houses to be sold as squaw corn seed; this policy being a recognition by the commercial seed houses of the necessity of getting seed from farther north. Put this demonstration of practical agriculture alongside the corn planting practice of Whites in western South Dakota where year after year unadapted seed is brought from farther south, or if from the north from a more easterly location where different moisture conditions prevail. These fields of unadapted corn will demonstrate failure year after year, while right alongside or nearby in the community, squaw-corn will be fighting successfully against grasshoppers and drouth alike.

If modern science has demonstrated one principle thoroughly it is that of selection and breeding for a purpose. Herefords are the favorite

on Dakota ranges because "they can take it." But apparently in many sections, unintelligent selection of seed by Whites has helped to deteriorate an asset which Indians under their own leadership have held onto.

Among the Navaho, Hopi, Pueblo and among other Indians where native leadership has continued to function, there is a higher level of economic efficiency among Indians than where White leadership has been more in evidence. Whites have told Indians to farm, lease or sell land where none of these was to the "enduring satisfaction" of the Indians concerned. Indian failures in some cases are evidence of their willingness to take White advice and they often "learned" a sincerely offered but mistaken type of procedure. Many employees deplore the changes and reversals of policy within the Indian Service. How much more difficult they must have been for the Indians themselves.

From the evidence one may conclude that there are elements of Indian life which they should retain, and that Indians can learn from each other and from Whites. Indian failure to carry out programs which Whites consider advisable is not necessarily evidence of Indian lack of capacity to learn from Whites. The program may not be workable or the Indians may believe it is not, which amounts to the same thing.

A great deal of emotion is frequently wasted over Indians' reputed inability to learn, or over the inadequacy of Indian resources for activities which Indians will carry on. However, as has been pointed out, Indians have frequently, prior to interference by the Whites, supported themselves with resources which Whites with their superior equipment and greater overhead consider inadequate. There are also countless evidences of great social changes brought about in Indian tribal customs without White interposition. In these days, however, with Indians and Whites alike, there needs to be more localconcern with the efficient development of all available local sources.

It is recognized that the present landholdings of the Indians, their most important economic resource, are often insufficient to guarantee their economic self-sufficiency. This administration is committed to a program of land purchase which will relieve the situation in part. In the meantime, what if "relief" does have to supplement present efforts toward self-support? When sincere effort is being made to utilize local resources to the full, at least humanity is being guaranteed its greatest heritage, and strength—the self respect engendered by carrying out an activity made worthy and purposeful by its contribution to personal independence.—Hulsizer.

6. ETIQUETTE

EVERY people has its code of manners. Whites, who say "How do you do," "Goodbye," "Beg your pardon" and "Thank you," are shocked that some Indian languages have no words for these politeness. Yet that does not mean that the Indians are not glad to see one another, sorry when they offend and grateful for favors. They simply have a different method of expressing these attitudes.

Navaho, for instance, ask one another: "Where do you come from? Where are you going?" These are questions which seem impertinent to some Whites but they are a conventional form of greeting. The question "How old are you?" is one which is likely to follow, for the Navaho needs the information in order to call a new companion younger or older brother. But perhaps there will be no greeting of any kind. The

Navaho and some other Southwest Indians, often observe silence after entering a house. They feel it in, delicate to break into speech without allowing a short period for members of the group to get used to one another.

The idea behind these observances is quite as courteous as that behind the White man's formal phrases. And there are some situations where most Amerinds consider that no phrase is adequate. Why say "Thank you?" The way to show appreciation is to do a return favor, and that quickly. The same holds for "Beg your pardon."

The person injured will believe you are sorry when he sees you perform some real act of restitution. Indians, are as considerate in their own way as the White man. In some cases, the two correspond, and then the White may often find that the Indians are more particular than he. Let one who has been long with Indians ask himself if he ever heard one of them interrupt or contradict or shout across the table. These things, in Indian society are literally not done. As a result, an Indian sometimes appears uncommunicative. This may be because he is defending himself from impertinent questions. Also it may be because he has been taught not to be aggressive and volunteer information. The polite person is quiet and slow of approach.

But while the White person is convincing himself that the Indian has no intention of being bad mannered, what is the Indian thinking of him? Many Indian groups have special codes whose etiquette goes absolutely counter to White usage. And in these groups the White person, while obeying his own standards, may actually be offensive.

Whites, for instance, are used to introducing people by their names and they consider failure to introduce a discourtesy. But in many Indian groups, the mention of a person's name is an offense. A man's name is his private property, and strangers have no right to know it, much less speak it. Sometimes its mention is thought to do the owner of the name a real injury by lessening his power. The census taker therefore may be offering an Indian a series of insults. So may even the kindly visitor who asks of children: "What is your name, dear?"

There are ways around the difficulty if a White person cares to learn them. It is generally quite proper to address a person as "My friends." If he is a Navaho, you can be especially respectful, by calling him "My maternal grandfather" no matter what his age. And if you do want to know his name, for practical reasons, you can get it by inquiring "Where do you live?" When you have that clearly, you can find the name from someone else.

People like the Mohave and many California Indians, not only object to mentioning the names of living people but feel very strongly against speaking the names of the dead. So it is unbelievably rude to ask an orphan child: "What was your father's name?" But if one knew the conventions, he could ask a friend of the family who was "far back on the right" meaning a paternal ancestor or "on the left" for a maternal one.

What is a White person to do when he suspects that there may be some such conventions, of which he is ignorant and that he may be offending without knowing it? Actually, there are few better rules than the old nursery rhyme:

"Politeness is to do and say The kindest thing in the kindest way."

One who goes on this principal will simply

act like a considerate and unselfish person and then explain: "I do not know your rules. Please tell me if I offend for it is not intentional." The group will know soon if he is essentially considerate and they will excuse him just as White people excuse a "break" by some one who did not know the circumstances.

One must admit that this sort of considerate person sometimes appears to be the exception among Whites, rather than the rule. White inconsiderateness may often arise from ignorance—not knowing that there are as many patterns of courtesy as there are races of people. In the Indian Service considerateness should be the rule, not the exception, for it is recognized that Indian customs differ from White. But the attitude of many White people appears to be: "If the Indians have not the same manners as I, then they have no manners." So they feel themselves at perfect liberty to walk into Indian houses uninvited, to push into the front at a ceremony and to stand there talking, though everyone else is silent. This is the sort of bad manners which can be recognized in any language and with any code. The Indian who could forgive an uninformed White man for mentioning the names of the dead, sees no reason for overlooking such forms of selfishness, which could be avoided by everyone.

All in the Indian Service can easily avoid such overt rudeness. We can look around as we would, say, in a foreign cathedral and see what the other people are doing and what seems to be proper. We need not cross the path of a procession or walk over a sand painting. We should not bring cameras to a pueblo where plain signs at the entrances ask that they be left outside. If we want to enter a house or a plaza which seems to be private, we should find someone in authority and ask permission. If we are given any instructions as to the direction in which to go or the place to sit, we should observe them.

We attempt, in our schools, to teach Indians the manners of the White group because they will need them in after life. But our teaching will be much more effective if the Indians know that we ourselves have the essence of good manners: consideration for others.—Underhill.

7. INDIAN WARFARE

WAR AMONG the Amerinds is a thing of the past and its suppression is rightfully approved by Indians and Whites alike. Although its suppression eliminated the cruelty and hardship that sometimes accompanied Indian warfare, it has also done away with very valuable and highly necessary activities in the life of Indians, and among the Plains tribes in particular. It is not intended to imply any naive conclusion that Indian warfare should have been preserved, but to appraise the social and educational maladjustment brought about by the loss of warfare, and the regulation of Indian life on reservations

The discussion of war and its effects in these times, understandingly raises opinions and emotions which make it difficult to think impartially about any warfare. Moreover old-fashioned text-books and histories, written exclusively from the side of the White participants created prejudices and distorted judgments of war among the Indians. Indian-White conflicts were accompanied by savage cruelty on both sides, but there was and has been very little favorable "press" for the minorities who were defending their homelands against aggressors, or for the disadvantage of Indians who first fought by a different code and with inferior arms. Yet the meaning and place of Indian warfare in Indian life,

cannot be estimated from the era which saw the coming of civilized peoples, but only from its conduct in earlier times.

The nature, conduct and motives of Indian warfare were very different in the aboriginal era than they were later, or from war in other parts of the world. It was far more usual among Indians for small bands to raid encampments of other tribes, than for whole tribes to move against each other. Although Plains war was waged to acquire horses or to avenge some previous killing, the motive was not the annihilation of another group, the conquest of land, nor plunder and tribute. Indian warfare of the Plains, or raiding as it is more fairly described, was carried on primarily for individual economic gain and individual social prestige. It followed a code which made it more a sport, rough and bloody as it was, than a serious vicious combat for destruction. War among the Plains Indians is of especial concern to us, because with them it was the chief pursuit and means of a successful life, and because Plains Indians form a large proportion of the Indians with whom we have to deal today.

The social or cultural implications of warfare on the Plains must be considered from its motives and its rewards. The chief motive was the exhibition of bravery, the highest virtue a man could possess. The resulting reward was his glorification and the increased prestige that came from his own boasting or the praises of his people. Acts of bravery and the planning and leading of raids were the stepping stones to chieftainship. Evidence that bravery was the keynote of Plains warfare is found in the system of counting coup a kind of scoring of war feats. This is also evidence that raids were conducted as a game, in which making a coup was to some degree the performing of a stunt. The highest honor went to a warrior who touched a living enemy by hand or weapon. Coups next in importance were for touching a fallen enemy, but were limited to the first four who reached him. Coups of lesser distinction were counted for snatching a weapon from an enemy's hands, and lastly, for stealing a tethered horse. In this system, the killing of an enemy or taking his scalp was of relative unimportance.

Slaughter reduced the enemy or was legitimate vengeance for previous killings of one's relatives or friends, but killing an enemy was not an act for which one was glorified in speeches or songs, and was not recalled as was the counting of coups. In fact, great warriors and chiefs of Plains tribes were renowned for never having killed a man, which argues against the bloodthirsty nature ascribed to Indian people. In carrying out raids or fighting battles, Indian war chiefs did not sacrifice their own party for strategic gains. However there was one notable exception to this lack of emphasis on killing and to the avoidance of death. In every tribe were individuals or a small group who vowed never to retreat, to rush among the enemy single handed, or to fight without weapons. As groups they were known among many tribes as the "Crazy Dogs." Their actions were motivated by a lust for fame, or an attempt to die gloriously in face of certain death expected from some cause other than war. However with many tribes these vows were held only for a season.

Blood and death brought a contamination which Indians feared. Even among the Plains tribes, where an eye for an eye was the practice that followed upon killing, a young man who killed his first enemy warrior had to be purified by a medicine man. Among such non-Plains tribes as the Pima, who lacked no courage in penetrating the mountain fastnesses of the Apache to check

their predatory raids or punish attacks, the killing of an enemy required a subsequent sixteen days of fasting and tabu for purification. Killing had its price and penalties, which made it far from the first or sole aim of Indian warfare.

Scalping, which Whites look upon as one of the most frightful of Indian customs, was not reckoned in the coup system. Scalps were taken as trophies for a war dance, as a symbol of the enemy to deride, and as gifts to old people, but they were not the primary objects for which Indians fought, and by no means were they taken in all fights or by all Indian tribes. The second basic motive for raids was economic gain. The Apache raided for the harvested crops of farming tribes. Raids among the Plains tribes were essentially for horses.

The arrival of horses among them probably gave a tremendous impetus to raiding. Horses introduced by the Spanish in the south, were possessed by only a few tribes at first. Having such a great advantage in raiding "foot-Indians," the first owners were undoubtedly unwilling to trade or give away their horses. It was necessary therefore to capture them. Horses rapidly became the most prominent means of estimating wealth, and great ostentation was obtained by possession of large herds. Horses were also a type of currency for purchasing wives and were the most valued presents in "giveaways." Their great value for war, hunting, transportation and wealth led to continuous stealing of them in raids, which was sanctioned in the reward system. With this as a standard, more importance was given to the capture of a tethered horse, than to the capture of ten or more free-grazing ones.

These facts and the descriptions of Plains warfare, set forth in far greater detail in the very readable and competent studies of the Cheyenne by George Bird Grinnell, and of the Crow by Robert Lowie, give a very different aspect to Indian war and war psychology than is generally held. Because war was the road to the greatest achievements possible within their culture, personal equipment, education, religion, and the men's societies were necessarily supported by, and were integrated with war. When war was finally suppressed, the man's chief activity (with the exception of hunting), the goal of his education, and his means of access to chieftainship and individual success, disappeared. The motive of his clubs, the directions sought by every man in a vision quest, a major reason for the prayers and vows of the Sun Dance —in fact the very point of life itself, were all removed when war was banned. This regulation of but one phase of Indian life distorted other phases, still valuable and necessary in their life, or brought them tumbling down.

Of greatest concern to us, perhaps, is the removal of the old motive and goal of home and group training, or native education. Boys had been taught to ride and run fast, to shoot with bow and arrow at an early age. Their first toys were live horses and wild game. They competed in the skills that would make them good warriors, and counted coups on wild animals, until they were allowed an apprenticeship in war parties. This resulted in good physical training, discipline and direction into life pursuit. Even the more peaceful Pima and Papago trained their boys to be courageous warriors, to be ever on the alert for Apache raiders, to defend

their homes and to attack the Apache when they became too threatening. When warfare was eliminated from Indian life the underlying purpose of all this education was destroyed. Parents soon became lax in disciplining and, preparing their youngsters.

As women's lives were supplementary to men's and their activities and position were bound up to a great extent in the preparations for war and the celebrations of its achievements their training and life activities also suffered. Such virtues as generosity, wisdom, and proper respect of others according to their relationship, sex or age, continue to be held up to young people, but the heart has been taken out of preparing for life.

Viewed in this way it is not hard to understand that family training and discipline of children coming of age has become less effective, and that pre-delinquent and delinquent children have become a serious problem of Indian education. Neither White civilization nor its educational system offers anything which readily supplants the part played by warfare in Indian life. Change has been hard and will continue to be hard, as it always is for primitive people when they are suddenly forced to live in a civilized world, without preparation on either side.

Educators cannot supply new goals and new activities overnight, but they can try to understand the conflicts of their students and the difference in aims of the primitive and civilized life. Today's problem is how to teach the techniques that lead to successful living in their present situation to young Indians; and how to interpret and explain by concrete local situations the change that is taking place, to older children. Success can only come in time as educated Indians accept as valuable the social and economic activities and objectives of the new life themselves, as their ancestors valued the life of the past.—Macgregor.

8. THE GIVEAWAY

"INVEST in leisure for your old age," advertisements tell us. "Take out insurance for the college education of your children."

It is what most White Americans work and plan for. Since their ancestors fought for a living with the weather and the soil of the colonies and the frontier, thrift has been one of their solid virtues, and extravagance a fault. The man who threw his money away and then asked for help has had little sympathy from the self supporting citizen.

"It's only common sense," says the White American. "How else can self respecting people get along?"

Perhaps, then, he talks with an old time Sioux and hears of a plan of life which was just the opposite. He hears of a community where the ideal was, not to be independent but to give and, later, receive gifts; where hoarding was a real sin and extravagance a sensible means of disposing of wealth. Was this also "common sense?" and "the only way to get along?" Let us look at the circumstances which enforced it.

The Sioux of old had little use for wealth. They lived a wandering life where death in war and death from hunger were daily dangers. What they needed were brave men, willing to sacrifice themselves in defending the community, and generous men, willing to share food and goods with the tribe. So they admired, not those who kept—either life or wealth —but those who gave.

For their brave men, they had a system of war honors. On certain occasions they allowed, even required them, to recite their famous deeds and this was their reward, rather than any pay. For virtuous and industrious women, they had rewards similar to those of the men, but in their own field. The generous man did not recite his own deeds but he was praised by others and so highly did the community regard this praise, that men preferred it to wealth. We hear discussion in modern days as to whether the world could get along without money. Would people continue to work? A picture of an old Siouan community might help to answer this question.

In such a community, public praise was the goal of everyone, male and female, old and young. It was no false publicity, for there were penalties for exaggerating one's exploits even in the slightest degree. But to have one's praises sung through the camp was the aim of effort, much as it used to be for knights in old Europe. Fathers desired it for their children just as, in a money civilization, they would want them to have wealth and comfort. But a Siouan father paid out his surplus wealth to get his child honor.

That was the function of the Giveaway. It was a distribution of gifts, performed at every crisis of a person's life to gain him an honorable standing or to ensure recognition for the standing already gained. Thus a father would have his son named by a famous warrior and distribute gifts so that the boy would start his career with good augury. When the boy killed his first buffalo calf, there would be more ; gifts and honor for his deed. So with his first war party and his first scalp. And a daughter might be honored with an elk tooth dress and a sermon on virtue. This was not a mere conceited boasting, for the people so honored were expected afterward to be particularly modest and devoted to the public welfare. It was a way of rewarding their achievement and of keeping the whole community in mind of the ideals to be striven for.

Even if a man had no special hero to honor, he could gain public esteem by giving a feast and making gifts. Sometimes he disposed of his whole surplus in this way. It was the Siouan substitute for organized charity. And the public benefactor who made it possible was highly honored. "He was not afraid of poverty," said the Omaha, a Siouan speaking tribe, "and that is almost as great as not being afraid of the enemy." Particularly the peace chief who did not go to war, but was the shepherd and adviser of his people, was expected to be generous. Whites give great praise to the politician who leaves office a poor man, but the Siouan chief who was not poor would be suspect.

As a result of such ideals, every one gave, and no one was uncared for. It was a system of mutual support, not by dues and taxes but by constant giving, from the richer to the poorer, The person who gave instead of squandering, was investing in the goodwill of the tribe so that he in turn would receive gifts. And, with every giving, the praises of the desirable citizens were sung and the Siouan ideals emphasized.

What happens when a Sioux is asked to give up this system? White Americans might feel his attitude more vividly if they remember what happened after the depression when it appeared that their own ideal of saving was to go into the discard.

"What's the use of working and lead-

ing an honorable life if all the results are going to be taken away from you!"

"We might better throw everything away and have a good time while we can."

Those who voiced these bewildered outcries had based their whole lives on a system of saving. They were bankrupt not only in money but in security, hope, a sense of the value of effort. The whole country, since then, has been concerned with working out some new economic arrangement which will fit the present circumstances and give back security to the workers. The Sioux, whose life was based on giving, have also found that their system no longer fits the circumstances. They are passing through a period of emotional insecurity. They, too, need time and thought for finding a new arrangement, which will fit the new pattern of life.—Underhill.

9. GENEROSITY OUTMODED

AMONG the Amerinds of our plains and woodlands there were, we are told, two outstanding virtues, bravery and generosity. Bravery was necessary to preserve the life of the individual, in battle with the enemy, or in personal quarrels within the tribe. Bravery was necessary to preserve the existence of the tribe in the hunt, and on the long march of its nomadic existence. The brave man communed with the Great Spirit during periods of fasting and self denial and thereby won leadership and recognition from his fellows. In communities in which there was a division of labor and the hunting braves killed for the whole tribe, it was only natural that the generous hunter should be admired and respected, when he shared his kill with those who had none and yet who labored for the tribe.

In an attempt to describe or even understand this attribute of generosity which characterizes most of our Indian tribes, some in more extreme form than others, the White man suffers the serious difficulty of belonging to a culture pattern which rejects the Indians' ideal as fundamentally impractical. Whites do feel concern for their associates, and in periods of national or international calamity are willing to give of their substance to relieve the suffering of others. They have, nevertheless, been brought up to believe that charity begins at home and that if they don't look out for themselves, no one else will.

There are indications that this individuality of attitude is increasing in modern life. The old family composed of its mutually interdependent elements, such as the Whiteoaks of Jalna, so vividly described by Mazo de la Roche in her recent series of novels, is fast disappearing from American life. The United States is becoming a notion of small-family apartment dwellers who have broken away from relatives and dependents. It is therefore extremely hard for Americans to understand the Chinese upon whom all of his kin have a just claim, or the American Indian whose acceptance and toleration by his tribe is measured by his observance of this tradition-old practice of sharing with his relatives down to his last crumb.

Two mutually irreconcilable points of view are joined in struggle. It is all very well for teachers and leaders in Indian schools to tell Indian young people that their success in competition with their White brothers in this country depends on looking out for themselves. Looking at the complicated economic system around them

our Indian young people may believe us when we tell them that it is a case of each man for himself, and devil take the hindmost. But if he is to return and live among his people, as 90 per cent of our young Indians do and must, an Indian youth can't ignore his relatives and live like a White man, without inviting the ostracism of his own race.

Repeatedly Indian young people graduating from schools have been established as successful farmers. They have begun to enjoy the well-won fruits of labor with crops or live-stock, only to find their success an invitation to their less fortunate relatives to join in eating them out of house and home. It is an unusually courageous and able young married couple who can continue to attack with ambition and enthusiasm the job of making a living, when continually deprived of the satisfactions of success.

In this matter it is not the young people to whom we must appeal. They may be the ones who must ultimately base their success upon a change in tribal attitudes, but the change must begin in the thinking of their elders. Those who thoughtlessly condemn the Indian parents or older relatives for moving in to live off the successful youngsters, frequently fail to recognize both the strength of custom and the desperate economic need of many of the relatives. Being themselves without capacity for self-support these older relatives naturally but thoughtlessly turn to their more successful younger relations. They must either do that or depend on government support. After the security of the young people has also been destroyed, there is still the government.

Indian parents are just as much concerned with the success of their children as any White mother or father. They are prepared to sacrifice just as much, their love is just as deep, their ambitions just as high. In this complicated transition of youth from the culture of the tribe, to an environment surrounded at every hand with the White pattern of individual success, we must turn directly to the older Indians for help. It is not a change which can be ordered or directed. It is not something which their White friends can decide for them.

The issue, however, is clear. It should be defined and discussed in realistic terms. If Indian young people are to succeed in adjusting themselves to economic self-support in the United States, which is theirs as much as it is the White man's, they must be free to face the problem of making their own living in competition with those about them. If the older Indians must continue in dependency, let it be upon the federal government. Let them claim their ration of food and clothing, and let the government give it to them. But older Indians and the government alike owe it to Indian youth that they be permitted to enter upon their task of winning economic self-support in a new world, without the handicaps of indigent elders and outworn traditions dragging them down to failure.

It must be repeated that this desired objective only can come about through understanding on the part of the older Indians and their willing acceptance of the new order. It cannot rest upon young people, and it cannot be brought about through governmental orders. Yet upon a solution of this problem rests the economic success of countless Indian young people today in public and government schools, who must soon undertake to earn their own way.

10. THERE ARE NO ORPHANS

TO STATE that there are no orphans among Indian tribes is a seeming contradiction of fact, yet a search among Indians and in Indian-language dictionaries reveals no word for orphan. "Orphan" is a social classification of White civilization and has brought many complications and tragedies to Indian groups.

Because social phenomena and institutions exist in White culture, we assume they must exist in other cultures. To White ways of thinking a child who has lost his or her parents and whose relatives are poor is a child in need of special care by some agency or institution. Some such thinking must have directed the development of Indian boarding schools into semi-orphanages. Such thinking is still reflected in the work of many of those responsible for arranging the care for homeless children, in spite of the fact that the policy has been for some years that a child should be enrolled in an elementary boarding school only if no suitable arrangements could be made for him to live with a relative or in a foster home.

If in determining eligibility for boarding school enrollment or boarding home care it is assumed that "orphans" need our special consideration—and if in many tribes there are no "orphans" in our sense of the word, it is time we re-examined our criteria.

Let us look at the original scene where there were no orphans. To be sure, many Indian children lost one or both biological parents in many tribes, but in every tribe there was some social mechanism to take care of such cases without burdening society in general, or isolating the child from home life. One familiar with Indian life cannot conceive of the tribal fathers sitting down to discuss the pros and cons of a primitive orphan asylum or the need for boarding homes. In fact no such idea ever entered their minds. Primitive visitors to our civilized cities have often commented upon our orphan asylums as strongly disproving our vaunted superiority. They ask, "How could relatives or society in general love children so little as to let them be cared for by the public in such barren and loveless places?"

Parentless Indian children were cared for by their family or kinship group. Relatives formed a closely-knit group with mutual bonds of affection, loyalty and responsibility. The kind of relationship that a child felt for these elders and that elders felt for the child, is expressed in the terminology for kinsfolk. For instance among the Omaha, as well as among many other tribes, "I, a child, call all men my father, who are my father's brothers." "Father's brothers" include many men whom we in White life call first, second, third, or even fourth cousins. "I, a child, also call all women mother, whom my mother calls sister, aunts, or nieces." In such a system a child was rarely at a loss for parents to substitute for lost ones. Although Indians used the terms "father" and "mother" widely, they always could differentiate between what anthropologists call physiological and sociological parents.

In tribes, such as the Navaho, where the clan is a strong social institution, care of children is one of its responsibilities and functions. Parentless children are taken in by close relatives here also, but only by relatives of their own clan. Among the Navaho, Zuni, or Hopi, these would be the mother's relatives.

At the death of parents, children were immediately taken into the families of grandparents or aunts or uncles. It was

less difficult than among White children, for the Indian children could say of his adoptive parents, "These are my father and my mother," and of the children in the family, "These are my brothers and sisters," for in a very real sense he had always thought of them in that way. It was more natural for the child too, for in Indian societies it was frequently customary for children to be sent or given to grandparents or childless relatives. They were never formally "adopted," as Whites think of the term. Adoption was reserved for making outsiders members of the tribe. Since the introduction of individual "property," subject to inheritance, it has been necessary to formalize Indian adoption, which has been done by a recent act of Congress (July 8,1940).

In a great many tribes, it was the obligation of a widower to marry his wife's sister, and for a widow to marry her husband's brother. In fact, it was often the practice in tribes where plural marriages were observed, for a man to marry his wife's sister or sisters. In such systems, children who had lost a parent continued to be cared for in their own homes by a secondary parent already there.

Although laws and customs have weakened some family responsibilities, the strength of the Indian family ties and the precedent for responsibility for one's relatives still flourishes in most Indian areas.

Indian "adoption" is still widely practiced and in some of the less acculturated tribes of the Southwest, "orphans" are absorbed by related families without difficulty. Family solidarity and responsibility have suffered far less from contact with White civilization than have most of the old economic practices and the manufacture of Indian articles and tools. Family and kinship bonds still provide the greatest security for the individual and a basis on which orphan children can be cared for without resorting to Government institutions and removal from Indian home life.

The original acceptance of Indian orphans as children in need, was coupled with the early policy of bundling the children off to be educated in the White man's way. Orphans were sacrificed by the Indians, in the system of forced enrollment, as a lesser evil than sending one's own children. There were usually economic considerations behind this too. At the time of early boarding schools, Indians were poverty stricken and could no longer provide for themselves. Additional children in the family became a real hardship, when the family was completely dependent on rations and clothing from the Government. Perhaps letting the orphan children go to school then was a kindness. It has since become a habit among many Indian groups as a way to relieve economic hardship, and it has been encouraged by Government officials without considering the complete welfare of the child. It continues as a habit today, and from an assumption of necessity.

Because of the dependence that has been built up among many Indian groups and our well-entrenched system, no right-aboutface in the handling of all orphans, by placing all of them with tribesmen, is to be considered. Furthermore, true orphans do exist in many Indian groups today—a fact probably already troubling the reader's mind. In badly disorganized and impoverished groups that border the towns of Wisconsin or California, or in the almost abandoned coal-mining settlements of Oklahoma, Indian society no longer functions to take care of orphan children. Furthermore, environmental conditions are sometimes such that an institutional

or distant boarding home placement appears to be the wiser action. As in nearly all our present-day Indian administration, local conditions must dictate many of our decisions.

This refers, however, to the great majority of Indian reservations, where much of the native Indian social system still functions, where the family organization, the kinship and blood ties are still strong, even though the native economy, dress, and housing have long since vanished. Social workers, education field agents, superintendents, and others who feel responsibility for caring for half or full orphans, should realize that there is a recognized place in Indian homes for these children. Our solution to their placement has been too frequently—off to the boarding school. The boarding school for all its advantages, is not a home, cannot straighten out the personality problems that these parentless children often have, and does not adjust a child to the environment to which he in nine chances out of ten will later return. There are orphans working at a boarding school today who have lived in that environment so long that they cannot make the break and return to the home reservation. Neither are they prepared to enter a White town. For younger children it is especially important that they continue their early life in a home.

It is strongly recommended that the workers charged with these cases learn the native system for handling them, and try to re-enforce and encourage it by finding homes with relatives for children who have no parents to care for or support them. Information regarding tribal customs in such matters may be. secured from the older leaders of Indian communities or often from anthropological reports of the culture group. It would be well to take this problem before a group of parents or older men and women of the community before determining arbitrarily on a solution. The matter of pay will undoubtedly arise, and should be avoided, unless it be most urgent, lest it become the motive for accepting the children.

It is good to attack the problem before the summer round-up of boarding school candidates occurs. The function of the boarding schools should be primarily for practical vocational training of older children and not for social welfare. Let us also learn the responsibilities and interests of home communities before we feel it necessary or desirable to send orphans and "social cases" from the undesirable environment of towns to the unnatural environment of an institution. We should be more interested in leading children into the good environment of their own people and their own surroundings, than just providing temporary escape from a bad environment. If an environment is bad, efforts should be made to improve it. No permanent good can be accomplished merely by removing temporarily a few younger children.

The frequently unfortunate effects of change from Indian family life among the Papago, for example, to the White institutional life of a non-reservation school, from quiet country to nervous city, from plains to forested mountains, from Arctic Alaska to foreign Idaho, should be apparent to any thinking person.

—Macgregor

11. OUR HEATHEN FESTIVALS

THE Indians have so many superstitions!

Do the numbers of people who make this remark, even in the Indian Service, ever think of the mass of tangled superstitions and of heathen practices embedded

in our own life and even in the Christian religion? This is not to say that we need be ashamed of such beliefs, any more than the Indians need be ashamed of the poetic ceremonies which they have worked out through centuries of human longing. All peoples have worked out such ceremonies, to honor some season of the year which was important in their lives as hunters or as farmers. They have glorified some object or some incident that symbolized life as they wished it would be. Finally the season and the glorification developed into a ceremony.

Our White ancestors in the British Isles, in Scandinavia and in Germany, had many such ceremonies before they became Christian. The Greeks and Romans had others. The Fathers of the early Christian church, slowly welding their practices into a systematic whole, could not sweep away these pagan holidays. They did not try. Instead, they placed a Christian celebration at the same date. The practices of Christians and of Pagans for that occasion became fused, so that we, ourselves, often cannot disentangle them.

Easter, for instance,—do we know why the store windows—and perhaps the schoolrooms of the Indian Service—are full of rabbits and of eggs? It is not primarily because this is the date of Christ's resurrection. True, the rabbit is a symbol of plentiful life, but if this were purely a Christian festival we might have chosen something more dignified. The truth is that Easter is an ancient heathen festival named after the Anglo-Saxon goddess of spring: Eostre. Her month was April, when new life begins in plants and animals, and when, in England, birds came from their eggs and rabbits had their young. Then human beings, too, made prayers for new life.

At this same time, down in the Near-East, the Hebrews were celebrating the spring season for an entirely different reason. Centuries before, when they had been taken to captivity in Egypt, their God had smitten the Egyptians with a plague. When the angel of death passed through the streets the Children of Israel had marked their houses, so that he passed them by. So, ever afterward, they had celebrated the festival of the Passover at the season of the Great Plague.

The early Christians, when they began their worship, had no holidays at all. The New Testament says nothing about celebrating any special day, not even Sunday. "The whole of time is a festival unto Christians," said Saint Chrysostem, "because of the excellency of the good things which have been given." Yet people who wish to meet together must set some day and the early Christians, in Syria, home of the Hebrews, where the church began, naturally took some of the Hebrew holy days, turning them to their own uses.

The Feast of the Passover was one which the early Christians identified with the risen Christ, and many European countries still call it by a derivative from that name, like the French Paques and the Spanish Pascua. As Christianity moved up into the heathen countries of the north, it found Teutons and Anglo-Saxons who had never heard of the Passover. But they were welcoming the goddess of spring at the full moon of the Equinox, when the long winter nights were over and days and nights were again of equal length. The Christian missionaries to these heathen allowed them to incorporate some of their old practices with the new celebration of the rising of the Redeemer.

Those feasts of the ancient Nordics were not unlike the spring Powamu festival of

the Hopi, when bean plants are grown in the kivas, amid prayers for fertility. Every pueblo made such prayers at some time during the year, asking that plants, animals and men should multiply. So did many other corn growing Amerinds. Others had ceremonies to multiply the animals, and the Pawnee, in their Hako, worked especially for the birth of children in the tribe.

Some of those Indian ceremonies have become mixed with Christian rites, just as our own ceremonies were mixed a thousand years or so earlier. White people who see the saint's image brought out to watch a Pueblo corn dance have no cause to smile. The saint and the corn are two symbols of human hope, both grown dear by long usage. Whites and Indians both have colored their Christianity with memories from a pagan past.
—Underhill

12. WHITES AREN'T SO FAR

DR. THOMAS BRIGGS of Teachers College, Columbia University, once defined the chief function of the public school as that of "teaching people to do better the desirable things that they are likely to do anyway." This definition has particular pertinence to the schools of the Indian Service. The possibility of effecting any tremendous and immediate transformation in the way of life of a people through education is remote. Drastic modification in environment, brought about by natural changes such as droughts or floods or by the destructive attacks of enemies, may force serious changes within a brief period and bring about great social and emotional maladjustment and along with it, physical and mental suffering. Education, however, proceeds more slowly, and to be most effective, works its changes with the consent and cooperation of the individuals affected.

To bring about step by step the gradual improvements in health, sanitation, economic well-being and intellectual growth, which in culmination we are wont to describe as "civilization," requires first of all a clear and sympathetic understanding of the status of the individuals within a group in regard to each of these social factors. Lacking this knowledge, it is easy to over or underestimate the logical and desirable "next step" in their development.

One of the easiest mistakes a teacher or other leader can make is that of identifying those whom he is trying to influence with himself or with the thing he aspires to be, not recognizing that others may be at a state of development which he himself or his own "social group" occupied at an earlier date.

An outstanding phenomenon of western civilization is the progressive acceleration of modern cultural change. It is difficult for many of us to realize that the slaves of George Washington's plantation plowed with the same kind of crooked stick that was used by the Aztecs or the early Egyptians. The modern metal plow was invented less than two hundred years ago. The doctor who attended Washington during his fatal illness had little more scientific knowledge of medicine and disease than a modern Navaho medicine man. He bled his patient to remove the evil "humours" in his blood when the patient was suffering from pneumonia. As a result, Washington died. The level of "superior culture," from which many Whites look down on the benighted Indian, is in many ways of very recent origin. It may aid us in achieving that degree of spiritual humility which is prerequisite to

fundamental helpfulness between teacher and pupil, leader and follower, to review the material improvements which have taken place in our own life span and within our own personal experience.

The faculty of an Indian Service high school in a western state undertook such a canvass recently. It was a matter of genuine surprise to a majority to realize how recently the commonly accepted "standards of living" had come to the members of the group, the oldest of whom was probably in the early sixties and the youngest a little past twenty.

The question which these people asked themselves was "How many of the commonly accepted conveniences of modern living were lacking from the home where I was born?" In an hour's exploration of that question, the following are a few of the material conveniences which were listed, many of which are today superseded by still more up-to-date inventions:

Water piped into the houses; hot and cold running water; bath tub with connected waste; built in shower bath; flush toilet; chlorination of domestic water; sewage disposal; coal stoves for cooking; enamel sink and drain board; gas for cooking and lighting; welsbach burners; coal oil lamps; gasoline lamps; electricity for lighting; electricity for cooking; hot air heating; hot water or steam heating; ice box; electric refrigerator; horse and buggy; bicycles; automobiles; milk delivered to house; mail delivery; call and deliver laundry; mechanical washing machines; twin beds; electric ironing devices; pressure cookers; dental and medical facilities; hospital facilities; electric fans; white sugar; watches, clocks; brooms; brushes; sewing machines; ready made wearing apparel; fountain pens; plastered walls; wall paper; telephone; radio.

Check the list in relation to yourself, or, better still, make it the subject of a group discussion in your own agency or school and find what your group adds to it. After you find your own group score, compare the conditions of your composite youth with those of the Indian community with which you are working. It is ventured that the advancement of the employee community over the Indian is barely more than the span of years represented by the membership of the employee group. in the light of these facts, assuming that the Service-wide average will be not for different from the record of one school, we should be impressed with the potentialities for improvement and be humbly willing to contribute to its step by step progress. Few of us have jumped from a horse and buggy to an airplane, but have taken a number of intermediate steps. There are today more Whites in this country without bathtubs or medical service, who have never seen an automobile or heard a radio, than there are Indians alive in the Nation. Advancement is relative to opportunity, it is not a matter of race, and the rapidity of social adjustments which have been made by any group has been pretty directly related to apparent advantages to be gained by the change and the opportunity to make it. For example, hot and cold running water, bathtubs and showers, and flush toilets have been dependent upon the development of a plentiful and convenient supply of water. Lighting or cooking with gas or electricity has had to wait on the quantity and cheapness of the available supply.

The attack on typhoid fever, dysentery and other filth diseases has depended upon the establishment of a clear line of connection between the source of infection and the patient. The development of effective means for controlling the

spread of a disease had to wait on recognition of its source.

In all of these things, the White race has been, in many regions, more fortunate than the Indian. Yet the extent to which Whites are profiting from their own potential knowledge and skill is far from universal.

13. THE ADAPTABLE INDIAN

"You can't change an Indian." "Indians don't like new ideas."

These are statements made all over the Indian country, by people who feel they speak from experience. But what kind of experience is it? Does it cover all aspects of Indian life, or does it refer, for instance, to certain features of White civilization such as painting the house, wearing short hair or keeping accounts? These customs the White man considers useful, while many Indians, in view of their own circumstances, have never agreed. But history is full of instances in which the Indian, finding something which he did consider useful, has adopted it, without any teaching at all.

Take his most valuable possession, Indian corn. It was raised in the beginning, say the students, in just one part of America. They are not yet sure which part it was but they know that the continent, all around it, was filled with Indians of different languages, different physique and different customs. Yet all of them learned about corn. When the Whites came, they found it growing as far north as Canada and in all varieties of soil and climate. The people who were not growing corn either could not, or did not need it.

In the same way, the tribes had passed the news about pottery, various kinds of basketry, weapons, clothing, government, ceremonies. It has become a common-place to say that Amerinds in any one .part of the country, no matter how different their language, will have very much the same customs. They have learned from each other. We cannot measure the time required for these various learnings to spread, but one piece of adaptation went on under the very eyes of the Whites. That was the use of the horse. Half the White population of America pictures an Indian as someone who leans from a galloping horse to shoot buffalo, yet the modern horse was unknown in America before 1539. It is true some version of a horse once lived on the continent but he was extinct thousands of years ago. Early Indians carried burdens on their own backs or had them dragged by dogs and they fought or hunted buffalo on foot. When the armies of De Soto and Coronado and their successors marched through the south of our present United States, the soldiers lost their horses, traded them or, as hostility developed, had them stolen. Soon there were herds of wild horses in the Southwest and the Indians saw something that they needed.

By 1682, not 150 years after Coronado, the Kiowa and Missouri Indians were mounted; by 1700 the Pawnee and by 1714 the Comanche. From tribe to tribe the knowledge of the horse passed north, without a White man to carry the news. The Indians fought each other to obtain horses and so the Sioux, the Blackfeet, the Assiniboine became "horse Indians." In 1784 when explorers met the Sarsi, the northernmost of the Plains tribes, they found them mounted. So used were they to horses and so perfectly adapted, that the pioneers thought the Plains Indians had been riding always.

With their horses, the Indians needed

bridles, saddles, stirrups and, sometimes, plows. Most of them had not even seen these conveniences but word of how they looked was passed from tribe to tribe and the Indians invented their own. Museums have an amazing variety of wooden saddles and stirrups, plows made of a tree root, bridles of hair rope—all contrived by Amerindians without any teacher. The new animal induced some tribes to change their whole way of life. The Navaho and Apache spread through the Southwest; the Sioux and others spread over the Plains. The Cheyenne even remember when they left their villages and took to buffalo hunting.

Guns spread almost as fast, though they received a push from the Whites for selfish purposes. The fighting Iroquois traded their furs for guns as fast as they could and it was because of firearms that they could subdue the neutrals and Hurons and be lords of the Great Lakes. Indians of the Southwest, in telling of their tribal history will say: "That was before we got guns." There is no question about that. As soon as they knew of this aid to their hunting and fighting, they got it.

Now a more peaceful example. The Navaho came to the Southwest between 1000 and 1500 A. D., probably nearer the latter date. They were then a wandering tribe of hunters, dressed in skins and cedar bark. No one gave sheep to the fierce nomads but by 1785 they had them. By 1795 they were "weaving wool with much taste." By 1812, their blankets were "the most valuable in New Spain" and by 1875 the surprised Americans found them doing a big commercial business in textiles. No one had set out to teach the Navaho, but they saw something they wanted and learned it. So with their silverwork. Learned from Spanish silversmiths, some time in the early eighteen hundreds, it is now one of the outstanding arts of the Southwest.

Indians, then, have given plenty of proof that they are willing to learn when they see something they want. They need time to be convinced of the fact, for even the useful horse took two hundred years to spread through the Plains. But consider how slow is the spread of central heating through England! It takes time to alter a whole system of living, even for cause. The problem for Indians and for Whites concerned in Indian education, is to find what elements of White teaching will be really useful to an Indian group, not a burden. When its fitness is demonstrated, the Indians themselves will move to learn it.—Underhill.

14. INDIANS WILL WORK

ONE frequently hears the American Indian accused of being lazy, shiftless, and incompetent. To prove this there are pointed out the Indians who adorn the agency areas gracefully doing nothing, but coming back for rations and other charity. There is no denying that many modern Indians have often found life pointless and without purpose, and as a result many of them doubtless have accepted the line of least resistance and made little or no effort. However, we have no justification for assuming that this is a response peculiar to the Amerindian. Each race of people defines its reasons for living. Behavior which earns honor or deserves disgrace, the place of men and women, and the assignment of labor to each, are matters determined by the social pattern of the group.

In one culture it is the men who weave and make pottery and the women who watch the sheep and the goats. In another culture all of these duties fall to the lot of women, and the man hunts, fishes, defends the fireside, and in other ways fulfills his family obligations. In one culture thrift is an accepted objective and personal and public approbation attends the thriftiest man. In another culture generosity outweighs thrift, and goods are accumulated only to be completely dispersed through gift giving.

In the evolution of western civilization we have seen knighthood and war the objective of strong young manhood, while learning and trade were looked down upon. Almost imperceptibly the values have changed until culture and business success now win approbation, and soldierly service takes a secondary place in our ambitions.

It is not always possible to determine why these values become what they are at any one time, but that they are controlling values molding the ambition of young people may be clearly established. Our own country in rather rapid succession has seen the guiding ambition of young college men shift from law to medicine, to engineering, and then to stockbroking, without any clearcut reason for the change.

Our literature is full of stories of youths who have suffered seriously from the frustration of being directed by domineering parents into lines of activity which had ceased to allure the imagination of youth. Shifts in objectives occur so imperceptibly in our own culture that we are only dimly conscious of the changes, but after they have occurred, it is exceedingly difficult for us to reconstruct the thinking of a past age in such matters. The minds of modern boys are captured by the romance of science which has opened vast fields of endeavor totally unknown to their ancestors, and by that token they would find it difficult to develop enthusiasm about training for some of the jobs which were admired a generation or two ago.

Is it possible then, that the American Indian finds those values which appeal to the White man as challenging, to be pointless in the light of his previous culture patterns? If the Indian really could not work as hard as the White, his economic out look would be serious. But every one in the Indian Service knows that Indians can and do work, with amazing concentration. But not always. Educators, then, since they are training Indians for future work, should ask first of all: "What do Indians work at? And why?"

Let us go back for a moment to the times when Indians planned their own work, without advice or influence from the Whites. We might visit a camp of Algonkins in New England. Late autumn has come and the men start on the winter hunt. They go off into the north woods almost without shelter and without provisions. For months, they will walk from fifteen to thirty miles a day or paddle more. They will spend a goodly number of days without food and nights without sleep. They will carry carcasses on their backs weighing a hundred pounds or so and, on all their return trip, will be weighted down with pelts. Hard work! But it is necessary and valuable and, what is more, the Indians were convinced, of the fact.

Now look at a village of the agricultural Pima or Papago. Each man has his field outside the village, sometimes five miles away. He goes to it every morning and he is never so lazy as to walk: he runs. All day he is busy with a pointed

stick or a slab of wood sharpened along one edge which are his spade and his hoe. If it rains, he must stay in the fields night and day, keeping the ditches clear. If the primitive dam breaks, all the villagers must gather to repair it and any one who shirks is fined.

Zuni farmers work as hard, and they bring luck to their labors by a costumed dance which is work as well as ceremony. Thirty or more men are in line, and for half an hour at a time, they keep up a quick prancing step which would leave the average person out of breath in a few moments. They continue it, at intervals, from sunrise to sunset. Yet no one complains of the labor of a ceremonial dance. Rather he considers it a privilege to take part in it.

Now watch a California Mission woman preparing acorns. She gathers them from the trees; she cracks them on a rock and dries the meats for days. Then she pounds them in a rock hollow, with a stone pestle, washes the flour and washes it again to remove the bitter tannin, adds water and, finally, cooks the mixture in a basket by the slow method of heating stones and placing them in the mush until it boils. The whole procedure may take a week. Yet acorn mush was the staple food of the Mission Indians and a woman expected to spend most of her life time on such a job.

One could go on with these examples of the grueling hard work done by Indians in former days. Has such work ceased? The answer is that, where to the Indian himself it seems fitting and valuable, it goes on as before. Pueblo Indians still dance: Papago still work their fields, though with better tools. But the New England Indians no longer have a winter hunt, because it is no longer necessary. And Mission women prepare acorn mush mostly for ceremonies.

What have they done with the energy which used to go into these tasks? White workers sometimes expect to see it channeled easily into school carpentry work, house decoration, labor on community "improvements," or paid labor of any kind into which a young Indian may fall, with or without hope of advancement. But the driving power of the old task came from a conviction of its value in the Indians' own minds. Modern work for the modern Indian must be equally pertinent to command his enthusiasm. For the teacher to think it useful is only half the battle. The pupil must think it useful too.

One well loved teacher had a group of Indians so loyal that they did not wish to leave any of her community classes unattended. When she offered a course like weaving, at which that particular community did not feel they could make a profit, they attended listlessly and worked the minimum. When she offered quilting which they could use, or canning, which they needed, the same Indians worked double time.

The Indian wants, as the White man does, to know that what he is doing is of some use. But the use may be of various kinds. He may feel, like the farmer or the housewife, that he is producing something of actual value in the life he is living. Or he may have the office workers' desired stimulus: an interesting job, with hopes of getting to the-top. Or, like the business man or the politician, he may take satisfaction in planning and directing a project of his own. White men who have none of these stimuli are frequently loafers. Indians may not see any reason for labor, either, and loaf too.

It is the problem of the Indian Service

to know its communities well enough so that the work proposed will be of real—not apparent—use. And if an Indian is to be urged into paid work, we should see that he has some chance at the advancement and responsibility which give paid work its stimulus. The energy of the Indian worker is likely to be in direct ratio to his interest in the job and his conviction of its worth to him.—Beatty and Underhill.

15. PRETTY GOOD, FOR AN INDIAN

NO PHRASE betrays more completely an attitude of White superiority and fundamental hopelessness about Indians, than the commonly heard comment, that something is "pretty good, for an Indian." Be it a piece of craftwork, the building of a house, a painting, or the carrying out of a responsible task, a thing which is only "pretty good" is relatively worthless. If we add to this condemnation, the further reservation that it is above the expected performance of Indians, we have indeed damned the Indians.

The facts of the matter are, of course, that the Indians' best is frequently beyond the Whites' skill to imitate. The beadwork on buckskin of the Sioux, which is carefully applied by stitches within the skin, that don't show through to the under side when done by a master crafts-woman, cannot be exceeded in uniformity and beauty. The Washoe woven basket is only one of many which are marvels of skill and artistry that defy imitation. In a thousand ways, and with the greatly inferior tools of a primitive environment, the Amerind has demonstrated unexcelled skills, many which, under the impact of White culture, have been given up and replaced by inferior products produced by White men with machinery.

Where their training has been adequate, Indians are today driving caterpillar tractors, maintaining complicated road machinery, repairing automotive equipment, making intricate airplane parts, cutting and laying stone, designing and sewing clothes, and doing dozens of other things as well as Whites. True, not a sufficiently large proportion of Indians demonstrate such skills today. Frequently their training is at fault; many times the teachers in our Indian schools, expecting little, are satisfied with much less than their students are capable of producing. At other times expecting too much at first, and not recognizing that Indian children do not have a background similar to their own, teachers of Indians become discouraged, and begin to lower their standards of ultimate achievement. And in many other cases, the objectives which we assume to be adequate reason for the expenditure of energy, are meaningless to Indians in the light of their racial inheritance.

The White tourist who buys a shoddy bowl, a poorly made basket, a badly carved and painted totem pole, a cheap partially machine-made bracelet, or a poorly woven rug, just because it has been made by an Indian and is cheap, is undermining the sense of craftsmanship which was inherent in the Indian who first made his products for his own or for ceremonial use. Teachers in Indian schools who expose for sale the unskilled craftsmanship of inexperienced Indian children are also contributing to this breakdown in standards of craftsmanship.

The medieval White craftsman served an apprenticeship of years, during which time he performed the lesser and cruder operations, before he was found worthy to

make and finish an object by himself. When that time came, he was ready to became a journeyman, in which capacity he practiced his trade for another span of years, before becoming qualified as a master craftsman, who in turn might undertake the training of apprentices.

Something of this oldtime emphasis on the acquisition of skills through continuous and careful practice of these skills on objects, many of which will have no commercial value and should be used at home or destroyed after making, is needed in training our Indian young people. For the present, our schools should place less emphasis upon the academic and the theoretical, and provide more opportunity for the practice of necessary manual skills.

A survey of Indian economic conditions on ten allotted reservations of five western states, in which thirty-five thousand case studies were made by the Indian Service several years ago, revealed that the average cash income of each individual was a little less than forty-eight dollars a year. Faced with such conditions, we cannot indulge in sentimentality in planning the educational program of our Indian schools. Our first question must be: What can we train this Indian boy or girl to do, which will produce capacity for self-support, or a cash income? In some parts of the country we must recognize that prejudices exist which close certain avenues of activity to Indians. In many cases, we may help remove these barriers by increasing the skill with which our Indian graduates perform their tasks, Despite prejudices, people are inclined to buy that which is better, whether it be a product or a service, if it compares favorably in price. In all cases, such perfection of skill must be obtained from frequent practical repetition to the activity.

Our Indian farmers-to-be must be given the opportunity to farm for several years under practical conditions, and with as little adult interference as possible, while still enrolled in our schools. To this end, our agricultural schools are utilizing to the full (as rapidly as possible) the school reserves of farm land. At other schools additional land is being leased, and in still others the purchase of additional land is proposed.

Potential Indian cattlemen must be given similar experiences to the end that they are graduated because they have. carried a man's responsibility successfully, in dealing with cattle. Boys and girls interested in poultry raising must care for practical flocks of chickens, and produce a result which will improve the family larder or the family income. Weavers must be encouraged to produce continuously, yards and yards of material; pottery makers must make and fire hundreds of individual pieces; carpenters and bricklayers must build actual houses, and not toy models. And in the doing of these things, we must expect, as an end result, a degree of skill and assurance that will enable these students to compete effectively in the labor market of their area, at graduation.

What shall we teach? That would appear to be a matter to be determined by the vocational possibilities of a given area. Fiji Islanders might easily be taught stenography and typewriting, but there would be little home market for these skills after they were learned. An analysis of the vocational training results of one of our schools through a study of more than a hundred graduates selected at random from the graduating classes of the last ten years showed that certain types of training had failed to equip these students for economic

self-sufficiency.For several reasons, there just weren't openings for Indian boys with certain skills in that area. It is a fair conclusion that these shops had best be closed, and other skills taught which bear a more direct relationship to opportunities for employment.

These statements are not to be interpreted as indicating that the teaching of English, or social studies, or some phases of mathematics, or art, or science should be stopped. But we must face the necessity of reorganizing our teaching of these subjects in terms of very practical needs.

But in all of our Indian school teaching, we must do what we do so thoroughly and well; we must offer such complete opportunity for continuing practical experience, that the work of our students will be "well-done"—regardless of race. And if we are to be fair to the Indian, we must disabuse ourselves of the notion that hF is in any fundamental sense, inferior.

16. FOR "ITALIAN" READ "INDIAN"

A NEW journal, "Applied Anthropology," made its public bow at the end of 1941. It carried an interesting article on the role of the settlement house in urban areas which contained an analysis of why the settlement house in a foreign language part of the community was not wholly successful. Several paragraphs paraphrase so closely the reason why many missionary efforts in Indian areas and many governmental efforts for Indians fail, that they appear worthy of quotation:

"The social worker's conception of his functions was quite evident. He thought in terms of a one-way adaptation. Although in relation to the background of the community the settlement was an alien institution, nevertheless, the community was expected to adapt itself to the standards of the settlement house. Some people made this adaptation; most people did not.

"The settlement does not belong to the district. It is run by people who are socially superior and who look down upon Cornerville people. It caters to a select group of people who are encouraged to consider themselves superior to their fellow inhabitants of Cornerville. It favors those who are willing to accept the middle class standards of the social workers, and discriminates against those who refuse to be disloyal to the standards of Cornerville society...

"We can conceive the primary function of the settlement house in terms of social mobility. It does not deal directly with the prevailing social organization of Cornerville but only with the deviants from that organization. It accepts those who already are maladjusted in terms of the local society, it rewards them for breaking away from the ties of Cornerville, and it encourages them to better their social and economic positions. Since upward mobility almost always involves, movement out of the slum district, the settlement is constantly dealing with people who are on their way out of Cornerville. It does not win the loyalty of the great majority of the people who look upon the district as their permanent home. Even among the small group of college men, in whose activities the social workers take particular pride, there are those who are less than completely loyal...

"Even the college men are lower class people until they have advanced upon their careers, and they are always Italians. Evidently it is very difficult for social workers

to overcome the common prejudices against lower class people in general and against Italians in particular. They may sincerely believe that they have no such prejudice, but their actions betray them ...

"It is certainly possible to defend the functions of the settlement house even as I have outlined them. It may perform a useful service in stimulating social mobility, even though that service is limited to a small fraction of the population. However, there are many people, including social workers, who feel that the primary function of the settlement house should be to promote a program which would benefit the rank and file of the people and win their loyalty....

"In the literature of group work, there is considerable discussion of leaders and leadership. 'Leader' is simply a synonym for group worker. One of the main purposes of the group worker is to develop leadership among the people with whom he deals. As a matter of fact, every group, formal or informal, which has been associated together for any period of time, has developed its own leadership, but this is seldom recognized by social workers. They do not see it because they are not looking for it.

"For purposes of action, the only good definition is a functional definition: the leader is the man who customarily originates action for a group of people. Those who are leaders in this sense have loyalties quite different from those which the social worker honors. He may think that they should not be leaders and that he must do nothing to increase their prestige. Nevertheless, any practicable plan for community improvement must begin by recognizing the existing social organization and working through it....

"The social worker feels that the indigenous leaders of the community are not sincerely interested in improving local conditions. It is my impression that they are just as sincere in that respect as the social workers. They have not accomplished more because their actions are limited by the nature of the social and political organization into which they fit. The person who studies the social and political organization will discover what these limitations are and will then be able to formulate a program in realistic terms. Within the limitations, the leaders are free to act, and in some cases only a catalytic agent is needed to set a community program in motion. If the social worker can present his ideas to the right people, the people who already have positions of power and influence, he can serve as that agent...

"There is a widespread belief that if the social worker makes his program interesting enough, people will automatically join in and participate. I think that is an illusion. If he is to be effective in dealing with the community as it exists, he must begin by learning how it is organized and adjusting himself to it. Only then will he be able to convince the people that his organization belongs to them and is designed to serve their interests."

—William A. Whyte.

17. PAPAGO CHILD TRAINING

1T WAS a one room adobe house of the Papago Indians, that ancient, agricultural tribe of southwestern Arizona. The house was earthen floored, unfurnished, except for the neat piles of blankets and dried corn against the walls. From the outdoor kitchen, the housewife had brought in a pan full of embers around which the family squatted with their guests, ready for a winter evening of joking and tale telling. There were the

father and mother, neither one speaking English, four or five children, a number of male relatives who had dropped in from neighboring houses, the grandfather and some female relative of his, known in the Papago system as grandmother.

The heavy door was open above its sill, built almost a foot high to keep out the summer flood water. It was cold and the person nearest the door was a little boy of two. Softly came the voice of a man near him. "My nephew, shut the door." The child was not this man's nephew as Whites would put it. He was the son of a fourth cousin; but Papago places all the relatives of one generation in one class.

The baby lumbered to the door which swung so high that he could barely reach it. He gave it a puny push and it did not budge. No adult rose up to say, "I'll do that, dear." The baby's parents did not even turn around and the "uncle" repeated, "Shut the door." The task was not actually beyond the child's strength, although it was hard. He pushed again and the door moved. "Shut the door." The voice was gentle as Papago voices always are. If one had not seen the speaker's cowboy boots and big shoulders, one might have thought him effeminate. "Shut the door."

With each command, the door moved a few inches and finally, with what must have been, for the child, herculean efforts, it was shut. No one rushed to congratulate and pet the baby. The mother and "grandmother" smiled but made no move. The baby came to the fire, taking his place among the men. He was a member of the working unit.

The incident is typical of child training among the old fashioned Papago. These were hard working, practical people who, for centuries, have lived in contact with dire necessity. Wresting a living out of some of the hottest and driest country in the United States, the men worked hard at tilling their tiny fields of corn, beans and squash. Now they have added the care of cattle. Women picked and used almost every wild thing that grew. Even children were expected to work as hard as they were able.

The result was that the youngsters learned through activity, in a system surprisingly like our modern project method. The difference was that Indian projects were not made of whole cloth with education as their sole aim. Usually they were necessities, where the child's work had real value. Knowledge of this value constituted his reward, for Papagos are not effusive. They gave children no more encouragement than adults—and no more blame. In order to understand their training, then, we must know something about how the adults were treated.

Papagos were and are democratic, with the complete and functioning democracy possible in small groups of people who share one ideal. Each village was a self-governing community, made up of smaller self-governing communities, the families. The motivating force for all of them was family loyalty and the desire to be an honored member of the group. By family, we do not mean the classical father, mother and three children of modern statistics. Papagos have an "extended" family in which the grandparents with all their brothers, sisters and cousins are grandparents, most of the relatives in the next generation are uncles and aunts and those in one's own generation are brothers and sisters. Hence in the door incident the command of the "uncle," whom a White family might have thought an intruder.

Generally, a number of these relatives lived together. The usual group is grandparents, with their sons, sons' wives and sons children. Daughters marry and go to another family. So the elders in authority were not merely a father and mother, sharply silhouetted against the young children. They were a number of people, ranging all the way from young adulthood to age. The resulting division was not between old and young. It was between the males, who did men's work, and the females, who did women's work. Children lined up as apprentice members of the two working groups. Their play was imitating the activities of their elders. Instead of feeling themselves a separate and sometimes inimical group from these latter, their whole ambition was to discard the toy bow and arrow for the real one, to carry a full jar of water instead of one that was empty.

From infancy, they were the companions of adults, on a surprisingly equal basis. The one room house contained little that was breakable, so that it was seldom necessary to tell a child, "Don't touch." Older people lived so simply that they did not have to exile the children to separate meal hours and separate food. Nor did they leave them home while they, themselves, pursued adult activities. The whole group kept together, through ceremony, business, or family discussion.

It is not possible to invite a Papago couple to dinner and expect them to come without their three or four youngsters. Nor can parent-teacher meetings be conducted "free from children." The youngsters, therefore, cannot be discussed behind their backs. They at least know what the problems are, even if they keep politely silent during the talk, as younger adults do.

The whole family was, in fact, a business concern, with the older members as acting heads. Not that they gave orders! Their position was that of experts, directing their assistants by right of superior knowledge. In a community where methods of procedure differed little from year to year, the oldest person was the most knowing. His directions were issued in the form of suggestions, talked over before the whole family. Any of its members had a right to make a counter suggestion, if he did it politely and respectfully. "But few disagreed," say the old-fashioned Papago, any more than a man disagrees at a club meeting, where he sees the desires of the members all set in one direction. Thus, in former days, the family decided about marriages, about which son should go to hunt and which to till the fields, even as to whether one child should go to live with some aged relative, needing help.

Yet suppose a child did disagree? Then the grandfather, or several of the older members, dealt with him by talk and persuasion. Their argument was not, "When you are older you will understand how necessary this all is." Rather they said, "We all have to work, you as well as we. If one of us fails, the family may starve." There was no difference in the talk given to a child or to an adult. Another form of persuasion was the appeal to family pride. "If you don't do this, the village will look down on us. They will say we have a lazy child or man." Since the family was the very core of a man's life, furnishing his associations till death, family status mattered. With a girl, the appeal might be, "People will look down on your husband's family. They will be sorry they took you."

And if a person still would not conform? "Well-then, we would do his work for him since it

had to be done. But we would look down on him. Everybody would look down on him. And he would know it."

This group disapproval was the main punishment, for child and adult both. Otherwise, the elders relied on admonition, endlessly repeated until, as one old woman said, "You don't know whether someone said it to you or whether you just knew it yourself." The old people did, they say, sometimes douse a child in cold water to stop a temper tantrum. If they felt seriously about his misdoings they threatened him with supernatural punishments but this threat hung over adults too. They never made a child go without supper, for the giving of food to friend and stranger alike was part of their code. And they never spanked. Many Indians, unless they have been to a White man's school, find this form of punishment incredible. Nor do they understand when urged by the White authorities to "make" their children do this or that. The children will do it if trained and persuaded.
Until then, patience.

It might look as though such lack of restraint could open the way to all sorts of obstreperousness, even to a revolt of youth. Yet teachers in Indian schools say this is not the case. Universally, they report that Indian children are for more cooperative in their behavior than Whites of the some age. Making trouble for trouble's sake is an idea unknown to young ones trained to cooperate with a group.

It might seem, too, that the system would tend to submerge individuality. However, it gives individuals outlets quite unconsidered by our own scheme. Children, for instance, have unrestricted ownership of their own property. This, of course, is simple, consisting in former days only of clothing, a tool Or two and some implements for games. Yet children bartered these things or destroyed them without rebuke—just so they took the consequences. Conversely, when an Indian child has refused to sell some toy of his to a collector for an enormous price, the parents have not interfered. If the child would rather have his crude little bow than ten dollars, very well. If he will sell it for ten cents, obviously not enough, then also very well. He will learn.

This freedom is carried into every activity which does not vitally affect the group. Will the child go to the White doctor? Will he stay at the hospital? Will he be vaccinated? Will he go to school? These in the present Papago feeling, affect the life of the individual and he is to decide. White officials have been amazed at the patience with which Indian parents await the decision, even of a youngster. Few understand the quiet statement, "He does not seem to want to." This does not mean that the parent is helpless. It means quite often that the process of persuasion is not complete. Perhaps the decision of the whole family is still in doubt.

Every observer has noted the peaceful expression of the typical Papago face. Among the many causes for the serenity of soul behind such an expression, can one be the lack of youthful conflict? There is security in feeling oneself an important member of a group, even though this may sometimes mean the forgetting of personal preferences. Observers speak, too, of poise and self-reliance. Perhaps this is a natural development in those who have been fed on the expensive tonic of responsibility.—Underhill
From *Marriage and Family Living*. Nov. 1942.