

3. UNDERSTANDING CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

EDUCATION
FOR CULTURAL CHANGE

SELECTED ARTICLES FROM INDIAN EDUCATION 1944-51

by WILLARD W. BEATTY

Formerly Chief, Branch of Education

and ASSOCIATES

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

1953

INTRODUCTION

Willard W. Beatty was Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Education Program from 1936 – 1951. He initiated a biweekly newsletter, *Indian Education*. In 1944 he selected articles between 1936 and 1943 from the newsletter and produced the book, *Education for Action*. When the Administration changed from President Truman to President Eisenhower Beatty left the BIA. But before he left he again selected newsletter articles from 1944-1951 to produce the book, *Education for Cultural Change*. Since the books were printed by the Vocational Department of Chilocco Agricultural School in Oklahoma, they were also instructional assignments and it took two years for the publication to be completed.

The "Culture Section" from the 1944 *Action* book has already been scanned and is available on the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, Alaska Native Knowledge Network. With this "Culture Section" from the *Culture Change* book there are now a total of 85 pages of excellent writing on cross-cultural education available to educators world-wide.

The policy of Indian Self-Determination (see article No. 2 on "Self-Determination" written probably 20 years before 1966) has now matured from its beginning at Rough Rock Demonstration School in 1966. Nowadays, Indian/Native tribes and schools have assumed responsibility for several schools. 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. Both the 1944 and the 1953 books have Sections on "Culture and Education" and the content of the articles on "Culture" are basic in content and relate well to these days of Indian Self-Determination.

The *Cultural Change* Section has 24 articles all of which relate to culture and education. The Table of Contents, which follows, indicates that 13 were written by Beatty and 7 by the anthropologist Ruth Underhill while one was co-authored by Beatty and Underhill. After reading all the 24 articles, it is suggested that they be used in Teacher Education programs, especially with non-Indian/Native teachers. The titles of the articles indicate what topics they address. Beatty was highly educated professional thinker whose knowledge of human behaviour was extensive and relative to cross-cultural education. Underhill, was a celebrated anthropologist and was on the Education staff for several years. It is interesting to note that the quality of intellectual content of the BIA Education Program dropped off precipitously following Beatty's departure.

All of the articles express respect for Indian/Native cultures as reflections of human behaviour.

The reader could possibly start with Ruth Underhill's article No. 6, "Culture Has Nothing to Do With Blood.," wherein she states:

As has been previously pointed out, science recognizes no such thing as superior and inferior people. There are healthy intelligent people in every human group and there are also the opposite. Race mixture as far as biology is concerned is no worse and no better than the individuals who are involved. (p. 95)

With this fact in mind, the discussions of cultural differences have basic meaning that directly address negative stereotypes held by non-Indian/Natives.

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". Since the scanning eventually ended in text, even using the Adobe Reader, the cut-and-paste word processing procedure can be used in any part or all of the pages.

Table of Contents

Chapter 3—UNDERSTANDING CULTURAL DIFFERENCES	83
1. Who Segregates Indians? Willard Beatty	83
2. Self-Determination, Willard Beatty	87
3. Discrimination Decreasing, Willard Beatty	89
4. Believe in Indians, Willard Beatty	91
5. Indian-White Equality, Ruth Underhill	92
6. Culture Has Nothing to do with Blood, Ruth Underhill-Willard Beatty	93
7. Like Seeks Like, Willard Beatty	96
8. The Indian Grievance, Ruth Underhill	99
9. Indians and Money, Ruth Underhill	100
10. Man Can Save Himself, Willard Beatty	102
11. Kinship is Important, Willard Beatty	104
12. Something to Live For, Willard Beatty	107
13. Laziness, Willard Beatty	111
14. Civilization is an Intellectual State, Willard Beatty	113
15. Acculturation by Adjustment, Vernon Beggs	115
16. What do Whites Owe to Indians? Ruth Underhill	117
17. Indian Home Conveniences, Ruth Underhill	120
18. Housing Met Needs, Ruth Underhill	121
19. Had Indians Had Iron! Ruth Underhill	122
20. Better Race Relations Needed, Theodore Haas	124
21. Most of Us are Merely Consumers, Willard Beatty	125
22. Adversity Can Stimulate, P. W. Danielson	127
23. Let's Be Fair to White Americans! Willard Beatty	128
24. The Great God Time, Willard Beatty	130

1. WHO SEGREGATES INDIANS?

A GOOD DEAL is constantly being said about the segregation of Indians. By segregation is meant keeping Indians from associating with, and ultimately merging with, the rest of the population. It is asserted by advocates of amalgamation that the Indian Service is maintaining "the reservation system" in an effort to perpetuate segregation and to prolong the life of the Indian Service. It is often argued that we "should turn the Indians back to the states, where they belong." Let us examine the facts.

That Indians face segregation is undeniable. Where do they face it? What does the Indian Service have to do with it? How would turning the Indians over to the states help?

1. For many years Indian children were excluded from public schools. Their white neighbors claimed that the children were dirty, diseased and unfit for their children to associate with. The Indian Service, by cleaning up the children, and teaching them and their parents proper hygienic practices, by instituting health examinations, by persuasion and by assisting to meet the cost of educating Indian children, gradually broke down this segregation, and today Indian children are attending public schools where these exist near the Indian country, and they are now seldom segregated. In a few school districts, Indian children are still placed in separate rooms or in separate buildings. Some white parents still object to their children playing with Indian children after school.

However, nearly every minority group faces this type of segregation somewhere in the United States—and in many states it is sanctioned by state law. Further change in public attitude will only come about as the churches and other private agencies go to work on the problem.

2. In a number of states Indians off the reservation are not welcome in the better hotels, the better restaurants, the better stores. Many of the towns where this segregation takes place border large Indian reservations and are economically dependent on Indian trade, on the business supplied by Federal employees, or upon expenditures made by the Federal government on behalf of Indians.

Despite the Indian liquor law, these towns tolerate bootlegging to Indians and perpetuate local governments which protect the bootleggers, while regularly arresting and fining the Indians for drunkenness, and often conniving at robbery if the Indian possesses any ready money or jewelry. The presence of these drunken and debauched Indians is then used as an argument in favor of segregation.

This is a matter over which the Indian Service has little control. Its special officers attempt to enforce the liquor law by arresting vendors on and off the reservations and frequently find little or no cooperation from the local police. During World War II the

army and war contractors objected to the absenteeism which this debauchery caused, and in some instances brought to bear enough pressure to obtain some state aid in the enforcement of the liquor law.

Every minority group faces the same thing. The dregs of white society batten on the exploitation of those unable to defend themselves. If the states do nothing to protect the Negro, the Mexican and other similar groups, why should anyone assume that help would be given to the Indians if the Federal government withdrew?

3. Proponents of assimilation assume that intermarriage will ultimately merge the Indian with the white, and that Indians as such will disappear. However "miscegenation" or intermarriage of Caucasians with other races, is prohibited by law in 26 states, including some of those with large full-blood Indian populations. This is a barrier that neither Indian Service regulations nor Federal law can change.

4. Indians, who go to many cities to work, find that they must accept housing in the slums, for they are not wanted in the better parts of town. They are not welcome in the better churches; their children are not encouraged to attend the local schools; they are not welcome in the better hospitals; they are often excluded from the better theaters. When a slump comes, they are the first to be laid off, and find it more difficult to obtain work-relief or public assistance than white people do.

Though it receives no funds for the purpose, the Indian Service makes some effort to get the children of these Indians into public schools, and offers some help in extremity in getting the out-of-work Indian families back to their reservations when the going gets tough. Despite the fact that

Indian workers when permanent residents are as much entitled to unemployment benefits as any others in these communities, the practice is to refer unemployed Indians to the Indian Service. It is the general public which segregates the Indians and there is little which the Indian Service can do to affect public opinion. A few states are becoming aware of the injustices done minority groups and are considering the adoption of fair employment practice statutes. A few states have adopted such statutes.

5. Indians who obtain training in the skilled trades find it difficult to obtain work, for they are excluded from membership in many AFL unions. The CIO is more liberal and the industries dominated by CIO unions have been much more generous in accepting Indians. This is a matter over which the Indian Service has no control. For the last few years, as a result of this employment block, many Indian Service vocational schools have emphasized training for trades in which a favorable union attitude exists.

6. Indians who leave their reservations for employment, and who come in conflict with public law enforcement agencies, often find themselves treated with little regard for their constitutional rights. They seldom have the funds to employ legal representation, and in practice many courts still discount the testimony of Indian witnesses. To protect Indians from discrimination because of race or language handicap, Indian tribes may establish and maintain their own law codes and their own courts to cover offenses committed on reservation lands. Most do so. It is within the power of the tribes to vote to adopt the state laws as tribal law and enforce these statutes on the reservation areas. Few have yet taken such action.

7. Some Indian Service employees join the chorus of those who want to do away with reservations to relieve the Indian of "enforced segregation". Unfortunately for their sincerity, these are often employees who never entertain an Indian in their own homes nor accept entertainment in the homes of Indians. Segregation, after all, is a matter of behavior, not a question of the place where one lives.

It is seldom the minority group that chooses segregation—it is the majority group that withholds social participation, denies the right of free residence, and otherwise refuses to accept the minority on a basis of equality. Indian segregation is not a matter of law or of reservations. It is still in the realm of social non-acceptance. The abolition of the reservations would accomplish only one thing—it would deprive the Indian of a place of his own where he can be self-supporting or to which he can retire and enjoy the mutual respect of his fellows.

8. Indian population is growing faster than Indian land resources. Many Indian tribes wish to acquire more land—some have tribal funds which they are willing to spend for this purpose. Interior Department Appropriation Acts, for the last several years, however, contain these provisions: "Acquisition of land for Indian tribes:... Provided, That no part of the sum (a gratuity appropriation) herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, Washington and Wyoming, outside of the boundaries of existing reservations; provided further that no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the states of Nevada and Oregon either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian

reservations." The second proviso is also extended to the purchase of land with tribal funds.

Sitting in solemn conclave, far from the Indian country, many good people deplore the segregation of Indians. To make their indignation effective they must disapprove of something, and the Indian Service is a handy whipping-boy.

So it is sometimes resolved that reservations should be abolished and the Indian Service immediately dissolved. Such simple solutions ignore the facts.

1. Indian reservations belong to the Indians. They are all the land left to them out of a continent. Little by little the government or the white neighbors of the Indians have whittled away their land base. Each time, they have been traded out of the best of what they had left, and each time the government has solemnly assured them that they would be left in undisturbed enjoyment of what was left. The government also solemnly promised to teach them how to make profitable use of their remaining resources according to the white man's pattern.

The schools and the extension workers of the Indian Service are the agencies promised by the government in fulfillment of this pledge. Between 1940 and 1948 these agencies have increased Indian use of Indian land resources from 33,505,000 acres to 38,541,000 acres. Financially, in the eight years following 1940 the annual income of Indians from the use of these resources increased from \$13,895,000 to \$31,970,000. To abolish Indian control of what is left of Indian resources would be the culminating treachery of the white man.

2. All Indian children living in areas served by public schools enrolling neighboring white children, now attend these schools. This now

includes half of the children with a quarter or more Indian blood. About 30,000 Indian children attend Federal schools. Those living in remote areas where there are no public schools or who are orphans or come from broken homes, are cared for and educated in Federal boarding schools. Indian children living in the heart of the Indian country in the continental United States and Alaska, where there are no whites and no public schools, attend Federal day schools. Some pupils in Indian Service vocational high schools are there to seek training for self-supporting jobs which they cannot obtain in the academic programs of the public high schools where they live.

3. Indian real property is held free from taxation, by treaty, by law, and by some state constitutions. This was part of the payment which the states and the nation made when taking over tremendous acreages of Indian land. Many state and local services are withheld from Indians, ostensibly because of this absence of tax revenue. In most Indian areas the land value is so low that, were it on the tax rolls, it would not produce the tax revenue to support the roads, schools and hospitals needed to serve the Indian population. Many of the states with Indian population have, during the past two decades, adopted homestead exemption laws—some applying only to veterans, others to the entire population—by which the land owner is relieved of property taxation on his homestead to an assessed value of \$2,000 to \$4,000. Few Indian homesteads even approach this value.

While the Federal government does supply the public services on most Indian reservations, commonly found in the white community, it does so because these services would not otherwise exist.

4. About 75 per cent of the largest Indian tribe in the United States is non-English speaking, and the government as late as 1950 was providing school facilities for less than half its children of school age. By a treaty between the Navajo Indians and the Federal government, signed in 1868, the government agreed to furnish a classroom and teacher for every thirty children of school age. There were in 1950 more than 24,000 children of school age—and the government had facilities for less than 10,000. This failure of the government to carry out its obligation has been set forth in every report of the Indian Service for more than ten years. Eventually, the government must fulfill its obligation, which is not one that can be passed over to the states of Arizona and New Mexico, both of which have limited taxable resources, without continuing provision of Federal assistance.

The tragic failures which have accompanied previous radical decisions to "free the Indians," such as the courts of competency which followed the allotment act, have probably made the Indian Service a little slow to relinquish supervision of Indian resources, even when the owners exercise good judgment in many other relationships.

Experience has proved that, for every high minded friend of the Indian who is demanding his "freedom," there are several high-pressure whites who are all set to get his money or land away from the Indian as soon as he is "free" from Federal guidance. The fun that has been made of the rich Indians driving Rolls-Royces had some foundation in fact. It is of historic record that whenever a per capita payment of tribal funds was due, the vultures moved in to get it away from the Indians as rapidly and painlessly as possible. Great strides have been made in the last generation in equipping

Indians to safeguard their finances, but the job is not yet complete.

Continued safeguarding of Indian property, for varying periods of time which will depend on the state of advancement of the particular Indian group, would seem advisable. The person of the Indian is no longer restricted by the Federal government.

It would appear that the cost of education and health services for many Indians must be borne by the Federal government for many years to come, if not permanently. If Indians are to take their places as independent, self-supporting citizens, further economic assistance in the form of loans for capital investment is needed for varying periods of time. As rapidly as possible, the Indian Service should withdraw from those areas where Indians can take care of themselves.

Willard W. Beatty

2. SELF-DETERMINATION

GENERAL RICHARD H. PRATT, founder of the Carlisle Indian School, is said to have expressed the opinion that the Indian problem could be quickly solved if the Indians of the United States were distributed one to each county throughout the country. The suggestion was quite rightly disregarded as impractical. Yet the proposal that Indians should be forced to leave their homeland and mix with the rest of the population is one of those perpetually recurring ideas which are annually brought to the attention of the Indian Service in one form or another by persons who call themselves friends of the Indians. Actually had the Pratt suggestion, or any of those stemming from it, been carried out in part or in its entirety, it would have been as effective in disposing of the Indians as were the old plainsmen, who took pot shots at every Indian whom they saw. True, a few Indians

would have intermarried with the dominant race, but the vast majority would have passed from the scene at the end of their lives, either without issue or with illegitimate issue. This may appear to be a harsh statement, but it is based upon the observation that racial groups breed through intermarriage primarily with members of the same racial stock. Even those white races which have come to America in large numbers have tended to intermarry largely within their own racial stock (German to German, Irish to Irish, Pole to Pole) save for a scattered few on the periphery who interbreed with the members of the other stocks with whom they are drawn into active contact.

In the days of the frontier when white adventurers and traders were pushing westward without women, mixed marriages with Indians were not uncommon. Today, statistics from many reservations show that persons of large percentages of Indian blood are marrying toward the fullblood group, rather than with whites.

Had the importation of Chinese and Japanese women to the United States not been permitted in the days when exclusion was an active issue, the Oriental problem in the United States would have ceased to concern us in one generation, because there was practically no intermarriage between the Orientals and whites, and the abstinence was voluntary upon the part of both races.

Similarly, a companion suggestion from friends of the Indians pops up repeatedly, urging that Indians be forced or enticed off the reservations and into "normal civic and community relationships." Such suggestions are almost always made by urban whites who think of "normal civic and community relationships" as entirely limited to living and working in cities. Such people fail to recognize that there are attractions in rural

life which are considered as preferable to urban living by large numbers of whites as well as Indians. An amazing thing is that these well-wishers of the Indian expect these policies to be put into effect without regard to the wishes of the Indians, "for their own good," and in disregard of Federal promises to Indians, renewed in treaties and incorporated in the constitution of many western states, to reserve land for Indian use, free of taxation, forever.

There are two kinds of people, utterly different in their objectives, who have combined to rob the Indian of these lands which are rightfully his. The first are the acquisitive white men who believe themselves capable of making more productive use of the land than are the Indians. These men have for generations agitated for reduction in the amount of the reserves, limiting Indians to fewer and fewer acres, in the sincere belief that they would not make adequate use of even this limited area—adequate, that is, in the sense that the white man would use the land. Such men have been ably seconded by the virtuous friends of the Indian who, in their desire to promote his rapid assimilation, have argued that if the Indian didn't have land on which he could continue to live, he would have to abandon his rural existence and enter the cities and accept a job—which would be good for him.

No one is ever disturbed when a white man elects to retire from the city and set up on a sheep or a cattle ranch, or is content to be a forest ranger or otherwise identify himself with isolation in a remote area. We seem to be able to understand and justify white men who are willing to live their lives out as traders to the Indians in the heart of the Navajo reservation or to the Eskimos on some wind swept point in Arctic Alaska. They are

making money at what they are doing, and we take it for granted that some day they will get tired of making money and come back and spend it in an urban environment. If some one elects to stay out there in the wilderness, that, we assume, is his own business. Yet we believe that there is something queer about Indians or Eskimos who have always lived in these remote areas, who give indication of really getting fun out of continuing to live there.

And while we criticize Indians and other minority groups for keeping to themselves, we ignore the prejudices with which the majority constrict their movements. The "better" residence districts, and the "better" hotels and apartment houses are often closed to Indians, Orientals and Jews, so that in order to obtain a place to live, they must congregate in areas which have already been "spoiled" by the fact that previously space has inadvertently been sold or rented to others of their race.

The little Tokios, the little Italys, the Chinatowns and the Indian districts (such as Hill 57 in Great Falls, Montana) of our towns and cities were not formed by the free will of the inhabitants. Once a family of the minority group gained a foothold, their neighbors of the major racial group began to move away and the depreciated property, its maintenance neglected, became haven for the other members of the minority group. Prejudice and segregation are two-sided. While many Indians prefer a rural life, a great many would move into our cities if they could feel secure in their acceptance. When white towns in Indian country take down their signs "Indian trade not wanted," "Indians not served," and Indians are accepted as desirable tenants without discrimination in the better residence districts,

Indians will feel greater sincerity in the proposals of those who urge assimilation.

During the war years thousands of Indians patriotically left their reservation homes to join the war effort--only to find that they had to accept housing in the poorest and least acceptable sections of the cities where they settled. Those who have seen the conditions under which they were forced to live are not surprised to find that hundreds at the conclusion of the war returned happily to their reservation homes—where at least the living conditions were no worse, and they were among friends who love and respect them.

Because Indian lands were subject to action by Congress, the Indian has possessed a title far less secure than that of any homesteader, whose rights could be challenged only (in the case of severe emergency) by the right of eminent domain. Changing Congressional opinion, in the formation of which the Indian has played little part, has often ruthlessly revoked the solemn title to land originally reserved to the Indian.

Basic policy of the Indian Service throughout the 1940's assumed that the question of whether an Indian should continue to live on his ancestral acres in South Dakota, Minnesota, Arizona or Alaska is his own affair; that he or his tribe owns the land and has every right to continue living on that land; that where conditions have changed the means by which it is possible to earn a living on it, the Education and Extension Branches, through their field representatives, have the responsibility to teach Indians the skills needed so that they may continue to make a living from their own resources if they want to do so. Similarly the Indian Service has the responsibility to give training and attempt successful placement of Indians who want to leave the reservation.

Let no well-wisher of the Indian assume that he is working on behalf of what the Indians in the main want for themselves when he argues that they should be further dispossessed in order to speed up the process of assimilation into normal civic and community relationships. Indians by the tens of thousands are electing to remain on the land, and ask for the chance to make a living there. They should be protected in that right.

Willard W. Beatty

3. DISCRIMINATION DECREASING

AMERICANS ARE PRONE to self-criticism. It is probably a very good trait, for it is the necessary preliminary to change and improvement. One who is self-satisfied has no incentive to improve. However this tendency frequently results in establishing the impression that we are worse than we are--and sadly deficient in comparison to other nations.

Some years ago, representatives of the United States and Canada concerned with the Indian problem met under the auspices of Yale University and the University of Toronto, in the latter city, to discuss matters of common interest. Each half-day session was given over to two prepared speeches—one by a Canadian, and one by someone from the United States, followed by general discussion. The Canadian speakers, presenting the "official point of view," tended to report a satisfactory solution of most of their problems. The Americans tended to start off with an outline of the problems with which they were confronted and end with a review of proposed solutions, or solutions in process. Finally, near the end of the conference, the late Dr. Charles

Loram of Yale was presiding one morning. His opening statement was somewhat as follows: "Our opening speaker today will be Dr. _____, of Canada, who will assure us that all is well with the world; to be followed by Mr. _____ of the United States, who will speak on the topic, 'It's we, Oh Lord, standing in the need of prayer.' "

So, in the matter of racial discrimination, we in the United States are very much aware that in many phases of personal and official life many Americans draw the color line. The fact that many Americans also discriminate against all kinds of "foreigners," and much prefer English-speaking Anglo-Saxons is recognized, but not so strongly advertised. Our self-consciousness about this discrimination is often attributed to our protestations of democracy. This is probably not the case at all, for the classic example of democracy is ancient Greece—where there were fully as many completely disfranchised helots or slaves, as there were citizens during the heyday of Greek democracy. England, which is also quoted as a birthplace of modern democracy, is certainly a hotbed of class-distinction and social discrimination, for all its political democracy.

While American critics of our discriminatory practices are interested in political democracy, most of them are even more interested in economic and social democracy which will guarantee to all the right to compete for a job on the basis of qualifications and fitness, not on the basis of race; the right to patronize restaurants, hotels, stores, pullman accommodations and other public services equally with other citizens and not face discrimination because of skin-color.

Conditions in the United States have been bad; it is pleasant to report that they are improving. Because of increasing awareness of the situation,

the publicity accorded discrimination in this country might easily lead to the impression that things are getting worse.

In the United States, most discrimination is racial—and primarily places the darker races at a disadvantage. Discrimination because of skin-color, however, appears to be pretty general throughout the world, despite the reputedly more generous treatment of American Negro soldiers in England and in France. Even among most of the dark-skinned races, there is discrimination in favor of those who are lighter complexioned. Favoritism toward those of lighter color holds true among many American Negroes—and it holds true throughout India, and Japan, two of the larger dark-skinned nations.

What we in America don't realize, is that in most of the rest of the world, the kind of discrimination which we worry about because of its effect on our minority of dark-skinned citizens, is extended to most of the people who perform manual labor. Even in England, the laboring man recognizes and respects "his betters." Most other nations just don't know what we in the United States are talking about when we discuss "democracy," because they don't even pretend to believe that those who labor with their hands are in any way the equal of those who work with their minds--and both these working classes are some distance below those who don't have to work at all.

That interesting volume entitled "*My Indian Family*," by Hilda Werther, which is commented on in article 7 following, presents very ably this situation, of discrimination in India—and does the job well because the author isn't writing a social tract, but is just telling about her life among the Indian people. She finds herself

to be an unusual white person, because she treats her Indian associates, whether Hindu or Moslem, as her equals—and then finds out that she can't do so entirely, because many of those whom she must employ, occupy different social grades among their own people, and must be so treated even by one coming from the outside.

Despite our American racial discrimination it is undoubtedly true that those of every race who have immigrated to the United States have encountered less discrimination and experienced greater opportunity as citizens or even residents of the United States than they had in the countries from which they emigrated. This should not be a cause for complacency in our own thinking, but certainly should be an answer to those who tend to over-stress the undesirable conditions which still exist in this country. It is essential that every citizen of the United States work for the day when it can be honestly said that no citizen of the United States need suffer social or economic discrimination because of race, religion or color. But while we are striving to achieve this desirable status let us not sell America short in a world in which discriminations of all kinds are widespread in every other nation.

Willard W. Beatty

4. BELIEVE IN INDIANS

ONE of the articles appearing in an early issue of *Indian Education* commented on the necessity for employees of the Indian Service to believe basically in the competence of the Indians with whom they work. At that time, there were a good many people who drew their salaries from the Indian Service who were inclined to consider that Indians at best were a rather second rate breed. Their weak points were stressed, and their illnesses, their lack of education, and their inability

to succeed in the normal activities of American industrial life were interpreted as being due to some basic lack within the Indians themselves. The fact that Indian inabilities were the results of their never having been given the opportunity to do these things, that ill-health resulted from ignorance of basic facts about health and hygiene that are possessed by many white Americans and that Indians lack the capital to get into business did not seem to enter into the thinking of such people.

In the 14 years that have passed, the Indian Service has done a great deal to equalize many of these aspects of Indian and non-Indian life. The Indian children who were refused admission to public schools 14 years ago because they were dirty, ill-kempt and diseased, are welcome today because they are clean and fully as healthy as the white children with whom they associate. Once they know what is expected, most Indian parents have been more than anxious to keep their children that way.

As rapidly as the medical branch has reached Indians suffering from trachoma and applied the necessary curative techniques, Indians have been happy to be freed from this disease. As rapidly as Indians have gained confidence in Indian Service hospitals, as able to arrest tuberculosis, Indians have come for hospitalization in larger numbers than we have been able to accommodate. As rapidly as Indians have become convinced that the schools of the Indian Service or the adjacent public schools can furnish skills and knowledge to their children which will better their economic status, Indians have come for an education in larger numbers than can be accommodated with present facilities. To

the extent that we have been able to demonstrate to Indians the advantages of civilization and the superior comforts of civilized living, they have sought to acquire these material aspects of our culture as industriously as non-Indians.

It has been difficult for many non-Indians to fully appreciate the fact that many Indian groups start near zero in our culture and need careful, sympathetic and intelligent guidance to prepare them to use the valuable elements of our culture and that they need successful experience in manipulating those elements and the economic opportunity to acquire them before such use can become general. Those who work with Indians must believe in them, and their belief will be amply justified.

Willard W. Beatty

5. INDIAN-WHITE EQUALITY

CAN AN INDIAN do anything a white man can do? Yes, say the scientists. There is no proof that any group of people—Indians, Solomon Islanders, Negroes or whites has less mental capacity than any other group. Within any group there may be bright and dull individuals or even family lines that stand out. There is no such thing as inferiority of a whole people.

The average man raises his eyebrows and some visitors to Indian reservations have raised them very high. If an Indian can do everything, they object, why doesn't he do it? Where are the Indian doctors, lawyers and businessmen? Why are so few young people interested in high school, much less college? The worker in Indian education grows accustomed to being told by the old timers: These people are like children. They can't learn much after they are twelve years old.

Our answer to this objection has been too brief. It is not enough to say that the speaker is

wrong, because some of his facts are right. The full blood doctors and lawyers are few, the businessmen almost non-existent. True, many Indians do not care for that kind of success and that is another subject. But what of the ones who do care? They have had the same opportunity as a white boy to take a job and put themselves through college. In fact, they have had more help than most white boys can expect. Yet the facts are plain and the average onlooker wants to know: What is the matter with the Indian?

In answering him, we need to make it plain that an Indian's inborn capacities, like those of any other human being, are potential only. They can become actual under favorable conditions, just as seeds grow with rain and sun, or children learn to talk if they hear human speech. Without such incitement, the best seed and the brightest child will fail to develop. The incitement, for what our world calls success, comes from a drive that is generated in white children almost from birth, a drive compounded of desire, belief in oneself, a sense of public approval and a conviction that success is possible.

These are not an Indian's birthright. Once he believed in himself because of a vision or a series of ceremonies which could make success certain. With that conviction gone, he must generate his belief almost without help. His people will not approve, for they fear and distrust the kind of success he plans. The few white teachers who encourage him will seem a pitiable support in a world which thinks Indians are children. How can he have conviction of success? The scores of achievement stories

which have built up the hopes of his white neighbors have never applied to Indians. Often he has recognized this fact by high school age, and it is no wonder his enthusiasm drops.

"Give a dog a bad name and hang him," is an ancient proverb based on true psychology. Social scientists of today would word it: "Give a whole group an inferior position and it is very hard for any individual to overcome it."

For instance, take the position of women in the 1880's. Then, it was believed by men and women alike that no female brain could understand politics or business. Women would faint at any excitement and they "would make monkeys of themselves" if they tried to "ape" men. Therefore very few of them did try. Most succeeded in being exactly as helpless as the world thought them, and the case was proved.

Yet women's work today proves that the whole idea was pure bunkum. The fluttery female of the 1880's could have been an air pilot or a Rosie the Welder if she and the world had wished it so. The change has not been in the female brain, for evolution cannot work such miracles in less than a hundred years. It has been in the woman's own attitude and in that of the world around her.

The same thing has happened with another "inferior" group, the southern Negro. Observers have averred sincerely that he was "childish," unable to go beyond grade school, and fit only for manual labor. Statistics show that when these very same Negroes have moved to the north, in an encouraging environment, away from the drag of membership in an inferior class, their very I.Q.'s have jumped. They are moving into one professional position after another and the obstacle to their going further is not their own ability, but the attitude of the white group.

Equality, then, depends on social factors as well as an innate ability. The arguments against many a minority group would crumble if it were recognized that its capacities cannot show themselves until given opportunity. Okies, hillbillies, and foreign born immigrants, can all look like undesirable elements while subject to ill health, poverty and social ostracism. Indians also can find themselves in a dead-end road if they are emotionally unprepared for life in the white world; if whites discourage them and if they feel themselves beaten before they have begun. It is this lack of incitement which constitutes one of the real problems of the Indian Service today. We have not found the way to prepare an Indian emotionally for our version of success. We have not given him confidence. Nor has the country as a whole consented to release him from his position in a "child-like" minority, regarded with pity and patronage. Such a situation is not changed overnight. It will take years of effort by both whites and Indians, but at least we see in what direction the effort should trend. We see that criticism of an Indian's "incapacity" is really a criticism of the white group which gives his capacity no chance to grow.

Ruth M. Underhill.

6. CULTURE HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH BLOOD

ANYONE FAMILIAR with the Indian Service has come to take for granted references to blood quantum in dealing with Indians. There are probably several reasons for this. First, it is much easier to trace physical relationships. If somebody's grandfather was an Indian that fact can be established with relative ease. The cultural

effect of having had an Indian grandfather is much less easy to measure. It has been inevitable that contrasts should be drawn between Indians and whites over the long period of time they have been in contact with each other, and because the white constituted the dominant culture in terms of numbers, military prowess, industrialization, and possession of written records, it has been inevitable that Indian response be measured in white terms. If it is accepted that the white culture pattern is right, then Indian deviation from that pattern is automatically considered a little less than right by the average individual. Sometimes this under-valuation of Indian culture has been so forcefully presented that even Indians have accepted it and have come to consider their own culture as inferior rather than just different.

It is generally recognized today that personality is the outgrowth of both inheritance and environment. While the influence of both factors always has been recognized as present to a degree, the relative importance of nature or nurture has been variously estimated. Throughout most of our historical contact with the Indian it has been generally assumed that the presence of white blood influenced an individual toward the white way of life. When referring to the literature dealing with the measurement of intelligence among non-Caucasian races one can find the late Dr. Thomas Garth averring as recently as 1928 that Indian intelligence, as measured by standard tests, coordinates directly with the degree of white blood. Garth's figures are undoubtedly correct. It was his interpretation of these figures which was fallacious.

He ignored the fact, for example, that both white and Indian cultural influences are at work in a home in which the father is white and the mother

Indian, that where a half-blood is married to a white, the white influences are invariably predominant, as neither parent is likely to possess the complete Indian pattern. Where an Indian, whatever degree of blood, is taken away from the reservation and raised in a predominantly white atmosphere from birth, there is a complete absence of the Indian cultural pattern and therefore a complete acceptance of the white cultural pattern. These facts, which should be self-evident, are further supported by the fact that in almost every Indian tribe during the last four hundred years there have been periods during which one or more whites have been absorbed into the tribe, and by maturity have been so completely assimilated as not to be distinguishable from Indians. This should establish quite clearly that this matter of culture is inheritable only through cultural contact, not through the blood stream.

Fortunately Dr. Thomas Garth, who has been quoted earlier, lived to penetrate his own error and in a later volume drew the inevitable and correct conclusions; first, that standard tests of intelligence are not measures of native ability but of cultural experience.. Second, that individuals reflect the culture with which they are most familiar. A simple analysis of the most famous intelligence test, the individual Binet-Simon, reveals that it measures intelligence by the degree to which the child is able to respond to questions which reflect familiarity with the elements of his environment. One or two questions from the test will serve to illustrate this point: In one a child is supposed to be able to distinguish between a number of common coins. Manifestly before this can be done it is necessary

for the child to have been exposed to these coins. Some years ago this was apparent at a summer demonstration school of an eastern college where a small negro girl from the slums outpointed the sons and daughters of college professors in her familiarity with the coins. To her they had been a matter of daily experience, when she ran errands for her mother. The other children knew them simply as "money" but had had no experience with the individual coins.

Another is the shoe lace test, which would be of significance only in a culture that had string and tied bow knots.

As has been previously pointed out, science recognizes no such thing as superior and inferior people. There are healthy intelligent people in every human group and there are also the opposite. Race mixture as far as biology is concerned is no worse and no better than the individuals who are involved. A stupid and physically degenerate white man married to a healthy and intelligent Indian, Negro or Oriental would contribute to degraded offspring, while the mating of two intelligent and healthy people regardless of race tends to produce intelligent and healthy offspring who share the traits of both parents. There is nothing more inherently undesirable in the intermarriage of one of the darker races with one of the lighter races, than there is between the marriage of a Scotsman and a Russian, or a Swede and a Spaniard. However, because of skin pigmentation or hair structure, the parent of the darker race leaves an indelible imprint on the offspring. It is, therefore, much easier to refer to the offspring of such mixed marriages, as "mixed bloods."

However, when we speak of blood mixture we are not thinking of anything biological. We

really refer to the clash of ideals and habits which break a clear pattern and leave an individual without birthright membership in any group. For years people have always talked as though this was a misfortune. As a matter of fact, it may also open a door of opportunity to human understanding which is often out of reach of a person who is thoroughly at one with his surroundings.

A clear-cut pattern of behavior and a firm set of beliefs are very comforting things. They develop most often in a group which keeps to itself, untroubled by outside contacts. Think of our early Puritans. Think of a pre-war village in England or, indeed, in China. Here the whole group was in agreement, not only about religion but about the little acts of daily life. A child born into such a community is likely to find his parents in agreement. There is only one way to do things and, if he does not follow it, his punishment is universal disapproval. Most likely he does follow. He is spared mental conflict but he makes few excursions into the new. The same situation holds in our Indian communities spoken of as full blood.

But suppose one of the parents comes from another culture! There will be difference of opinion about even the simplest things, such as whether girls should go out alone or what kind of food tastes best. The child grows used to the idea that the plan of life is not settled. He may try both ways. He may have to take sides in a parents quarrel. He may even escape from direction and find some new line for himself.

This is the sort of medium in which pioneers are developed. Let the parents be good, healthy people, so that the child's heredity is not one of disease. Let the environment be moderately encouraging and you have all the elements for advance and

for new adjustments. This very thing happened in the early history of the Five Tribes. Even before the American Revolution, Cherokee, Chickasaw and others had intermarried with English and Scots traders, hardy, adventurous men who were glad to settle down with the tribes. Their "mixed blood" children were also hardy and adventurous. They took the lead in learning English and studying white ways. It was due to such pioneers that, a little later, new constitutions were written and the "mixed blood" Sequoyah thought of making a Cherokee alphabet. There was nothing tragic in this mixture, even if it did mean a change from ancient Cherokee ways.

Such changes are inevitable, no matter how we regret them. We may wish, out of sheer curiosity, that the mixtures of early America could have been all Indian. We would like to know what would have happened had the Iroquois set up an Indian-United States or the Aztec an Indian empire. But world upheavals rarely give us this logical satisfaction. Life for native Americans took a sudden new turn, as it is turning again today. We cannot ask that the Indians be isolationists, any more than the United States can be. Instead, we can realize that their culture adaptations started long ago and must continue.

This being the case, let us get rid of the superstition that mixed blood and mixed culture are tragedies. Instead, they are experiences which come to every people in the world and often they bring new strength. What Englishman resents the successive waves of Picts and Scots, Danes, Romans and Normans who brought new customs to his country? Yet the process was often painful, as all of us remember from reading *Ivanhoe*. What was the Renaissance except a colossal "mixing," when people from all Europe began moving about,

stimulating each other with their different ways of life?

Culture mixture is bad only if the people who carry it out are bad, or if they have no decent opportunity. Here is the real challenge for the Indian Service. We—and many of us, whether we identify ourselves as whites or Indians, are ourselves "mixed bloods"—should help provide that opportunity. We should hope that some of the new ideas produced will not be conventionally white, any more than they are conventionally Indian. Those who work out this change may be of any degree of blood but they will proceed on the belief that change is not harmful if it meets the true needs of a people.

Ruth M. Underhill
Willard W. Beatty

7. LIKE SEEKS LIKE

WHENEVER AMERICA gets into a war, the "hundred percent Americans" become exceedingly conscious of the racial groups within the Nation. During the first world war, it was the descendents of our European enemy states about whom we became concerned. During the second world war we were even more concerned about our citizens of Japanese ancestry. It has been pointed out as though it were a strange and vicious thing that these racial groups are inclined to band together in colonies wherever they settle.

Several decades ago there was a certain pride in the tone of voice with which the average American referred to the Chinatown, the Little Italy, the German section or other racial community within our various cities. We were proud that New York was one of the largest Italian cities in the world, that one of the biggest Greek cities in the

world was on American soil, and similarly felt that in attracting these people to America we had not only offered them opportunity, but that we ourselves were the gainers by their coming.

Although there is little evidence that the majority of these non-English speaking groups were anything but loyal to America in her times of trial we did learn to fear and hate the German fifth columns within our midst, and in the same way we became suspicious of those who spoke a language which we couldn't understand or who differed from us in physical appearance. It was easy to believe that they might not be as good Americans as those around us who talked English and who looked like the rest of us.

More recently, those who call themselves "friends of the Indians" have been making quite an issue of the fact that Indian groups within the United States are continuing to live together on the lands which they reserved for their own use, after selling the rest of their heritage to white Americans and that when Indians do move to urban areas there is a tendency for them to live together. The wartime slogan of the west coast "abolish the little Tokyos" has been modified to "abolish the reservations—absorb the Indian into the main stream of American life." To these "friends of the Indians" it appears unwise and possibly even vicious for people to wish to live near friends and to have the support of understanding associates. Such an attitude toward a normal human tendency to "group" is, as a matter of fact, merely foolish. The tendency of persons of like interests to live together is natural and has always existed. It is not a tendency limited to Indians or to Japanese, Chinese, or even Germans.

When some of the economists of the last century believed that a utopia on earth was possible, their first move was to gather together people of like thought and establish a colony. When the Mormons were persecuted in New York their response was to stay together, move west, and establish themselves first in Illinois and later in Utah. From this point they have spread out into other colonies scattered through much of the Southwest.

The tendency to "group" has not been limited to persons of similar race, but has extended to persons of similar beliefs, whether religious, political, or otherwise. Persons of Catholic religious belief for example, regardless of race, are encouraged to practice segregation, sending their children to parochial schools, joining Catholic organizations, parallel in objective to scouting, civic clubs or veterans groups in the general population, and limiting their reading to approved Catholic literature. Even when an average-American moves from one city to another, he is very likely to look up friends within his new home city with the thought of settling in the same residential area, if for no other reason than that his wife and his friend's wife are likely to be happier if they have someone to associate with who represents similar interests and sympathetic understanding. Many newcomers to an area seek out the church of their home town affiliation; others join the local branch of the Rotary Club or the Masonic chapter.

It is easy for other citizens to think of a group of Indians who have moved into Rapid City or Denver or Omaha and who make their homes in a single part of town, as representing an undesirable manifestation. Probably in the cases cited they may be, because during the last few years it has

been difficult for them to find desirable homes in which to live and they frequently have been forced into a slum area, occupied by members of their single racial group. In the same way the immigrants to New York City during the last century did the same thing.

As the newcomers gained their economic feet, they gradually moved on into more desirable sections of the city and their abandoned slums became reception centers for the next and less adjusted wave of immigration.

Because Indians elect to live near other Indians, who receive them with courtesy and treat them with respect, they are accused of contributing to undesirable segregation, without due attention being given to the fact that everyone likes to be received with courtesy and treated with respect and is likely to go where he can count on such a reception. But the funny thing is—the very people who are criticizing the Indian for this kind of behavior are guilty of exactly the same thing. Many of them have bought homes in a residential area where they have been assured that the property will be restricted solely to persons of similar social or economic standing.

Where, on an Indian reservation, does one find the white community mixing in with the Indian community if it can avoid it? Here and there on reservations throughout the Indian country are to be found little colonies of white people who have built their homes close together and who associate together almost entirely. There may be some excuse for the fact that federal employees live together. When the government builds a community at a boarding school or at an agency it is a matter, of economy to concentrate the buildings, for it simplifies the question of water distribution, sewage disposal and centralized

heat. However, these physical aspects have nothing to do with the people with whom the occupants associate. Yet it is doubtful if very many federal employees, very many traders, or even very many missionaries have developed a social relationship with the Indians, in whose communities they live, that is similar in any way to the association which takes place among the whites in the same area. The white on the Indian reservation remains the alien in exactly the same way that the Indian in town remains the alien and for exactly the same reason—he feels more comfortable in isolation among his friends than he does in assimilation with those he doesn't understand. In each instance the individual is pursuing his original way of life and he is loath to change, and change he must if he is to associate with and not give offense to persons of the other race.

One of the most interesting analyses of this problem of assimilation appears in a book recently published in this country dealing with the same question in India. Its title is *My Indian Family*. Its author is Hilda Werther; the publisher, John Day Co. The book itself is an elaborate diary of two white women—a mother and her daughter—who went to live in rural India. The daughter married an educated Moslem Indian whom she had met at college in England. The young man is partially westernized and is a scientist employed by the Government. The town to which they go after returning to India is a mixed Moslem-Hindu community where very few western whites have ever lived. The book is a story of the effort of these two white women to adjust themselves to the Indian community. It is full of wise and careful observations as to the differences and the causes of the differences between the various racial groups

living in the town and with whom they must associate. If we white Americans, interested in the wellbeing of our American Indians and concerned with their acceptance of our ways and our culture, could approach the problem with even a fraction of the intelligence displayed by these two European women in India it would lead to a more rapid solution of the Amerindian problem. Whether we do or not, it should be remembered that people group together because they want friendship, sympathy, and understanding, and that until these things can be obtained from others than their racial associates, people of similar race will continue to be drawn together.

Willard W. Beatty

8. THE INDIAN GRIEVANCE

INDIANS ARE A PEOPLE with a grievance.

There is no doubt of its rightfulness nor of the fact that American whites—or some of their ancestors—are deeply to blame. The problem which confronts the modern Indian Service, however, is not that of sitting in judgment on past wrongs. It is the problem of helping Indians to live successfully in today's world. And in the course of such a task, the question naturally arises: "How much good did a grievance ever do anybody?"

Psychologists are pretty unanimous in their answer. A grievance that cannot be righted is best forgotten. We are all familiar with the stories of warped personalities whose lives have been devoted to revenge or to mourning. They gave pain to themselves and to everyone else. Even a final achievement of revenge left them helpless for happiness or constructive effort. The remedy, say the experts, is to drain off emotions of revenge into some other channel. And let it be a constructive one!

The teacher of Indians has a great responsibility in this respect. Young people come to him oppressed with a sense of hopelessness and his temptation is to sympathize: "You are a mistreated people. We whites can never make it up to you." Does that help? Or should he respond in a robust vein. "All that is past. There are thousands of other people who have suffered, and some more unjustly than you. They have picked themselves up and gone on and in proportion as they have done that, they have been respected."

Perhaps the teacher's own conscience rebels at such apparent cruelty. Yet it is a fact that people can receive too much sympathy, even in a just cause. Sometimes the best attitude is that used in certain nervous illnesses: a jolt, a prod, an invitation to action. A teacher, for instance, might call Indian student's attention to the millions of other people in the world who have suffered unjustly. What about the American South, conquered and harshly treated by its own blood brothers. Southerners had a better right to complain than the Indians, conquered by strangers. Yet they were left to pull themselves out of black depression by their own efforts and they have done so. Their success has involved forgetting enmities and pulling together with the other citizens of the country.

How many others have lost land and even a way of life, through no fault of their own? The farmers dispossessed by dust storms in Iowa and Oklahoma number many more than all the Indians in the country. Yet efforts made to help them have been infinitesimal compared with those made for the Indians. How about people who lost land through unpaid mortgages or through a mere change in real estate values? Often they were ruined by events as inevitable as the sweep of

colonization which turned Indian hunting acres into agricultural land. Think, too, of the failures in business! Many a hard worker has gone bankrupt when his only fault, perhaps, was that he did not foresee the trend of events any more than the Indian saw it.

No one has gathered these losers into a pitiable group, worthy of mass sympathy. Usually, they have been treated as individuals, on the American pattern, which means that they are expected to stop pitying themselves and try again. Justice is not considered. The fact is, when we survey the situation, that most suffering is unjust. This does not mean we should use the fact as an alibi! We are awakening to a sense of social justice wider than we have ever had before and involving the responsibility of all those who have toward those who have not, regardless of who is guilty. Granted that all teachers should be aware of this obligation of a majority group toward a minority. Granted they should not shirk the fact that shifts in our government policy have meant broken promises to the Indians and suffering that was sometimes unnecessary. We return to the proposition that the sufferer derives no good from dwelling on this fact.

Doubtless every adult has experienced some treatment which he regards as unjust. Most teachers will need to do little more than look into their own lives to get a perspective on the case. Have they been able to assimilate the experience and go on? Has it rankled so that constructive action has bogged down? The answer can help them steer an Indian in the right direction.

Ruth Underhill

9. INDIANS AND MONEY

WHEN DISCUSSIONS about the differences between Indians and whites arise, no subject

causes more violent argument than that of money and possessions. "Indians don't know how to handle money," says the white. "They never save, never look ahead. They have no idea of how much they have nor how to budget it." "Whites," counters the Indian, "think of nothing but money. They are always grabbing and saving. They never give freely and happily as we do." It seems absurd to suggest that these two attitudes are really aspects of the same thing—a method of self-support. Yet a discussion group which delved to the roots of the matter might come to that very conclusion.

First, what about Indians' handling of money? It is true that the tribes have no background of experience in such a technique, for even the well known wampum had very little use as currency until the whites came. Indians rarely handled so many goods that they had to represent them by tokens, as the whites represent goods by money. Therefore, counting assets was not the quick and accurate matter it has become since money was introduced. The Indian rarely knew just how much he had. Nor could he guess or predict what he would have in the future, a condition which is essential to budgeting. Many tribes in the United States area lived on wild foods, using the plants and animals in season. Much of their meat and fruit had to be eaten as soon as it was obtained because it was hard to keep. So it was a matter of thrift for people to eat as much as they could when food was available and then live on their stored energy when food was scarce.

A certain amount of drying and storing foods could be done but it rarely made provision for more than a few months ahead. Even the farming tribes could not provide for more than a year or two in the future. Therefore, at least as for as food

went, the Indian was acting wisely if he kept up his physical strength for the present and did not worry about what would happen next. This necessary attitude, once established, set the pattern for attitudes about other possessions. They were all to be used freely, without too much thought for the morrow.

Moreover, no man could plan fully for his own goods because they were not his exclusive property. Much of his harvesting and hunting had been done with the help of others and so the product had to be shared with the whole group, competent and incompetent alike. Just as he expected to give, he expected to receive. Each man knew he would not starve unless the whole tribe starved. He might even receive fine gifts at someone's feast, but he could not tell when. No use to plan on building up a fortune. The circumstances of life for most Indians did not permit it.

This whole picture is in contrast to the one which has seemed "normal" to the white men for hundreds of years and, perhaps, thousands. A general statement on the subject must be qualified in many ways. Still, we can say broadly that, in the white man's world, where counting is done in money and not in goods, it is possible to have a much more exact estimate of one's possessions than Indians ever had. Converting goods into money also makes it possible to save, so that a crop need not be eaten immediately, lest it be wasted. On this basic plan of saving, the white man has built up his money system, and we will grant that the habit of counting and saving has become prominent—even too prominent—in his activities and his teachings.

Does it mean that the white is innately stingy while the Indian is innately generous? Many

Indians, disgusted with the treatment they have received in the white man's world, have insisted that this is so. In contrast to the white man's behavior, they point to the Indian's habit of lavish hospitality, even to strangers. They tell how a hunter was sometimes not allowed to keep any of the meat he himself killed because the principle was that his skill must be used for others. They tell how the most successful members of a group always helped the poor without being asked for contributions. The greatest joy of a successful man, in some tribes, was that of giving a feast and distributing to his guests all that he possessed. In reply, the white might counter that he sees little of this fairy-tale generosity among Indians of the modern world. They appear to behave much like whites. Can this be because they find themselves in the same situation as whites? Can it be that the generous acts of old Indian days, beautiful and kindly as they were, had nevertheless an economic side? Were they brought about by the situation, as the white man's habit of saving has been brought about? If that is the case, young Indians, weighing the change of behavior they must make in the business world, will have some historic facts to guide them.

Consider the giving away of food—and sometimes of other goods and services. Actually, this was a kind of tax. Indian groups, as we have often emphasized, had little formal government. Yet a whole group often needed to work together at hunting, farming or at the ceremonies which it was believed, made these activities successful. Therefore, the whole group must be kept in healthy and active condition. If some members were sick or starving, their work was lost to the tribe. Therefore, the successful hunters and farmers were expected to support the poor by gifts.

The modern business man does much the same thing except that his gifts go to the government by way of income tax. The government then uses some for the needy and some for the public works which, in ancient times, were built by tribal labor.

There was an economic side, also, to the entertainment of strangers. In the days before hotels, a traveler had often to depend on the hospitality of people he might meet. It was a general custom among Indians that any one who was not a proven enemy, should be entertained and fed. This meant that the host, in his turn, might find a resting place when he traveled. The white man, who has to pay his way at a hotel, does not feel the same obligation to care for strangers.

Even the give-away feast will fall under our general rule. This feast was a disposal of surplus—and the surplus often was food which would not last too well. Rather than attempting to keep it against the danger of spoilage, the owner invited his friends to eat their fill. Grant that this was a delightful occasion, bringing honor to the host and spreading goodwill through the group. Also, it was an economic investment. The man who had practically beggared himself at the give-away would be invited in his turn to other give-aways, over and over again. In fact, he had insurance of food and shelter for the rest of his days.

The white man misses much of the beauty of personal giving. This is the defect of the large and changeable group where he lives and where he cannot know personally all the people who run banks or issue stocks. He invests in these institutions because he, also, wishes to have food and shelter in the future. The Indian calls him stingy. Yet, actually, he has merely divided his investment into separate compartments. Some goes into taxes for which he expects public services.

Some goes into the bank to insure his future. Some goes into the community chest and other charities for which he expects no return but goodwill. If the Indian should count up the number of his gifts resulting goodwill only, their proportion to his total assets might be no larger than in the white man's case.

It seems plain, then, that we cannot invoke any inborn virtues and vices to account for Indian and white behavior in this situation or in others. Centuries of necessity have shaped the habits of each group and, perhaps, shaped them too firmly in one particular mold. Indians, who could not count upon the future, need not have gone quite so far in their failure to plan ahead. Whites need not have elevated thrift and budgeting into such an ideal. Where the two racial groups come into contact, as they do on Indian reservations, there is room for much fruitful discussion. How is the Indian to indulge his traditional generosity under modern circumstances? Can he, perhaps, substitute church contributions or a mutual benefit society for the old give-away feast? How is the white to put more personal kindness into what he does for others?

Indian students and their teachers can get many profitable discussions out of this subject. They might find it interesting to look into the ways used by different people to pay their duty to society and to care for the old and poor. What are the faults and virtues of each method? What better methods can we work out in our own country and on our own reservations?

Ruth Underhill

10. MAN CAN SAVE HIMSELF

IN DISCUSSING POLICIES affecting Indians, the term "wardship" frequently appears. There was undoubtedly a time when it may have accurately

described the relationship between the Government and the Indian. Today it no longer describes the relationship which exists, and its use creates a misconception as to what is and should be that relationship.

The government no longer has any control over the person of an Indian. As a citizen he may come and go as he pleases to the extent any other citizen can. He can work anywhere he can get a job, at any kind of job he can get. Any wages he receives are his to spend or save, as is the case with any other citizen.

Much Indian property is still restricted, however. In many early treaties, Indian leaders had the foresight to demand two things when they sold part of their land to the Government: First, that permanent title to the remainder should be guaranteed by the Government; Second, that such reserved lands should be free of taxes so long as held in Indian ownership. This restricted, tax-free status is, therefore, part of the purchase price paid for about two and one-half billion acres of these United States.

Many of the land cession treaties also recognized that white encroachment was depriving Indians of their accepted way of making a living. With the loss of the buffalo and other game animals or deprivation of their farming lands (many tribes engaged in limited agriculture), a new way of life became inevitable. To bridge the transition, the Government often promised rations of food and clothing **until such time as the adjustment to a new way of life was achieved.**

Sometimes the promise of food and clothing was phrased in this indefinite manner. Sometimes such issues were promised for a definite period of years. Never did the Government representatives envision a never-ending dependence of Indians on

Federal largess. No reputable Indian leader either foresaw or desired such a status to overtake his people. All looked forward to a time when the Indians, adjusting to new customs and a new economy, would again become entirely self-supporting.

The great mistake made by the Government—through its representatives in the field and, even more, through its representatives in Congress—was to underestimate the length of time it would take to accomplish such a transition and, even more, to underestimate the training and resources which would be required to make over a race.

Here and there, Indians were given livestock, wagons, a plow or some other capital items needed by a would-be farmer or a livestock man. Here and there, a farmer or a livestock man or a blacksmith was sent out to the reservations to help the Indians learn the use of their new tools.

Interestingly, the most successful "livestock Indians," the Navajo, got their incentive to save and not eat their sheep and goats from their own leaders like Narbona and his son-in-law, Manuelito. The great cattle period of the Sioux, from about 1890 to 1917, was the result of saving the cows and heifers issued by the Government as beef ration (on the hoof). It is estimated by contemporary superintendents that the Pine Ridge Sioux once owned 40,000 head of beef cattle and many fine horses.

The Pueblo and Papago Indians have never thought of any other way of living than by self-support. This was also true of the Pima until the whites took their irrigation water and let them wait, half starving, for 40 years while a new irrigation system was built (largely for them). During this period they acquired depend-

ency, and ultimately demanded more from the Government (in terms of free water) than had ever been promised.

Much of the uncertainty that has produced dependency among many of the tribes in Oklahoma, the Great Plains, and the Pacific Slope has grown out of the changeableness of the Government and its representatives. The Sioux, who had learned to save cattle and to look to this new way of self-support, were practically forced to sell their cattle and horses during World War I. The army needed livestock, but even more influential in the decision was the conviction of the whites that by farming, better use could be made of the land.

Not content to take time to teach the Indians how to farm, after their livestock was gone, the white man demanded that the land be used even if the Indian couldn't use it himself. So leasing was conceived, and often forced on reluctant allottees. When it rained, much of the Indian land was amazingly fertile, and the land rents sufficed to support the Indians in idleness. This was not something they had sought, but something forced upon them.

With the return of the drought cycle, white lessees went broke, and deprived of their lease money, Indians either starved or sought a continuation of Government rations. Without adequate rain their lands were unsuited for farming and, with the grass destroyed, no longer valuable for grazing.

Let it not be said that these conditions were of Indian making. Indians were the victims of others' bad judgment, without the training or the power to resist effectively.

When made-work projects rescued the unemployed whites from idleness, these same

projects gave a new lease on living to thousands of Indians. The Indian Division of the Civilian Conservation Corps gave not only jobs and an income to thousands of Indians; it belatedly offered effective on-the-job training to these same men who for years had lived, untrained, in enforced idleness.

The Indian Service employee who thinks of himself as doing things for Indians that normal citizens would be expected to do for themselves, perpetrates an injustice against the Indians he would help.

Indians alone can save themselves. No paternal government or generous and "guilty" white man, attempting restitution of rights lost to the Indian by white ignorance or cupidity, does the Indian a favor by "giving" him anything.

The Indian Service has been maintained to train and help the Indian to help himself. That is why it operates schools and such adult education projects as extension, forestry and irrigation. That is why it employs public health nurses and operates hospitals. When, through these services, Indians are educated or trained or prepared for self-support, the Indian Service is true to its basic purpose.

When Indians are encouraged by Indian Service employees, missionaries, non-Indian friends or politicians, to become dependent on government handouts, they are being hurt and deprived of their inalienable right to make a living for themselves. Willard W. Beatty

11. KINSHIP IS IMPORTANT

MANY PEOPLE interested in Indians are constantly talking nowadays about the absorption of Indians into "The Main Stream of American Life."

Pressed for an explanation as to the meaning of the phrase, one is usually told that Indians should be released from their reservations and allowed to mingle with the rest of the population, getting a job here or there, and getting out of the present orbit of their lives. Such an explanation betrays serious misinformation on the part of the speaker, both with regard to the present status of Indians and with regard to the way in which human beings, whether they be Indians, Scandinavians, Italians, or Mormans, behave.

In the first place, today's reservations are not concentration camps, and no Indian is required to remain on a reservation any longer than he wishes to do so. It is true that there was a period while the Army was subduing the Plains tribes when Indians agreed to remain on their reservations and the Federal government agreed to keep whites off. Even then the land placed in reserved status was usually selected by the Indians because it was the place where they wanted to stay. In a few instances, particularly rebellious bands were placed on reservations where they did not want to be. This was the case of the Northern Arapaho when they were placed on the Wind River Reservation. This was also the case with Geronimo's Apaches when they were moved to Oklahoma. But even these restrictions were removed many, many years ago. Today, an Indian reservation is a block of land where people of similar race own individual pieces of land which adjoin one another, or where the entire band owns the land in common. Owning and operating land in common is an old Indian custom. However, it is a custom not limited to Indians. There have been many colonies of non-Indians in the United States who were bound together by race by religion, or by a common philosophy who have bought and

owned land in common, and who have continued to operate it that way for many years. While it is true that a large number of these community enterprises have ultimately broken down, divided their assets, and become more individualistic, there are still, large numbers of people in this country who are held more closely together by common religious beliefs than those which were bound by racial similarity, or similarity of philosophical belief. The Amish in Pennsylvania and the Mormans of Utah are two examples of groups which have lived and worked together through many generations. In a number of cases, their land is owned individually, but the group works collectively. The Catholic Church, which for centuries sponsored religious colonies (monasteries) in Europe, has also acquired land and sponsored the organization of similar religious colonies, operating collectively in the United States.

The Indians do not pay taxes on their reserved land, but neither does the church pay taxes on its reserved land.

The next false assumption is that people in general move freely about the United States, establishing homes where they wish, finding jobs where they please, and in general, being accepted socially into the new communities where they go. Superficially, this is an accurate picture of a small number of Americans. They are found largely in cities, and many of them are not particularly happy in this isolated freedom which they are exercising.

By far the great majority of Americans are bound very closely by the ties of kinship, friendship, and community. That just about describes the American small town, and the American small town is much more numerous than the American city. This solidarity of the small

town probably varies in direct relation to the age of the community. The longer a small town has been in existence the greater solidarity there is between the families who are living there. Despite the impression of many people to the contrary, these family and community ties of the small town in America are probably increasing rather than decreasing. We must never forget that America for generations was a pioneer country, and that the pattern of American life was one of adventuresome movement. The country was settled by those who were not satisfied to remain in a rut but who insisted upon moving forward into the unknown in search of better fortune. We must also remember the great period of American immigration when the peoples of the world flocked to our shores. However, it would be unwise to assume that these people came individually or even in small families. While there were times when an individual came first, as a forerunner, to find out something about American life and opportunities, such individuals were usually followed by their own families and often by their kinfolk and by friends from the villages or areas where they had lived in Europe.

American life does not so much resemble the patterns of a Harris tweed of different racial, religious, or social strands evenly interwoven, as it does an old patchwork quilt—with a colony of Germans here, of Italians there, of Norwegians in the next county, and of Dutchmen below them. Each of these communities has a closely knit center tending to preserve the strength of kinship and customs. Where these communities fringed out and intermingled, intermarriage followed. As the reproductive rate produced a growth in numbers which the community resources could not assimilate, the bolder and the more inquisitive spirits moved further from the central orbit.

Sometimes the movement was simply toward the establishment of another nucleus in a less settled area to which the overflow might move. Such movement, which is also typical of Native American life is illustrated today in the many daughter villages of Laguna among the Pueblos, Oraibi on the mesas, or even in Alaska where Savoonga is a daughter village to Gambel on St. Lawrence Island. Among white Americans the proliferation of Mormon villages is an example. Sometimes such expansion was a result of deliberate efforts to establish outposts and thus stake claims to greater land areas than the initial group could possibly occupy and use at the moment. Sometimes, as in the case of the Mormons, it was combined with an effort to proselyte faith.

Regardless of our broader democratic ideals, it is still clear that the intruder into any one of our small communities is initially viewed with doubt.

In the larger cities, of course, a different pattern exists. In some areas, families living in apartments do not even know the next door neighbor's name, and years may pass before a greeting is exchanged by those who use the same front door. Such people maintain the lifeblood of friendly inter-change with associates whom they meet in other of their daily activities. Because of the mobility of transportation within large cities, it is possible for them to come together from widely separated parts of the city for the needed human exchanges of friendship. Such life is a highly sophisticated product of industrial society, and it is not the type of thing that the rural white American indulges in with any large amount of satisfaction. Whether it is a healthy development is open to question, because the great

majority of those who indulge in that kind of life association are childless and often rootless. It is, therefore, hardly the type of life to recommend to the American Indian whose strength is founded upon close kinship association, many children, and the warmth of family life with many opportunities—ceremonial or social—to foregather with his friends, his clanmates, and the members of his race.

Any planning for the rehabilitation of American Indian groups which have found the land resources of their tribe inadequate for economic self-support must be based on the opportunities for families and friends, to live sufficiently close together to maintain that social and family integrity, without which human beings often lose their zest for life. It is not enough to find a Navajo, a Sioux, or a Papago a paying job away from his reservation where he may be on the verge of starvation. It is essential that we find him, and many of his kind, jobs in the same area where they can establish or reestablish the bonds of kinship which are an essential part of the great pattern of human life. And it is equally important that we find adequate places where they can establish a home and live comfortably with their families.

Willard W. Beatty

12. SOMETHING TO LIVE FOR

IN MODERN AMERICA we have almost forgotten the importance of the family in the structure of society. Yet from most primitive times the family, rather than the individual, has been the unit of social inter-the city and of wage paying industry, in contrast to rural life and subsistence econo-relationship. Only with the development of my, has the economic and social importance of the family diminished.

Initially, no individual could have competed on equal terms with wild nature from which man was forced to win a living. Several men, working together, were needed to protect each other from human and animal enemies. Several persons working together, were needed to share the many duties of the farmstead; to perfect the manifold skills needed to keep the home community functioning. Because women were the child bearers, there naturally arose a division of function, by which the women took over the work around the house or home, where of necessity the children remained during their early years, while the men did those things that took them into the fields and forests.

Making a living then could not be done in a forty-hour week. Up before the sun, and still at work so long as there was light with which to see at night, was the order of the day for each individual. In this struggle for existence, victory went to the larger and better integrated families. Their members lived longer, ate better, and were feared and respected. An injury to one was treated as an injury to all, which was a source of the medieval feud—but was also the source of great strength. The old fable of the fasces, where in union lay strength, was recognized as true of the family.

Viewed from our present state of family disintegration in which increasing emphasis has been placed on individual rights and privileges it would seem to many that in the old days a great price was paid by the individual for his membership in the family. Then the family made the decisions as to what was best for the individual. The family decided what work he would do, whom he could marry, how his children should be educated, where he should live, when he

should fight, and a thousand other things in day-to-day life which we of the present jealously regard as personal concerns.

At the beginning, the family was man's first protective organization. The family furnished the only civic services which existed. Safety of life and limb and of private property depended upon the strength of the family to resist the depredation of others. There was no law, there were no policemen, no army, no fire department, no public health service. As the family grew, retaining around the chief or older leader the sons and brothers with their wives; or the sisters and daughters with their husbands (determined by whether the structure was patriarchal or matriarchal) it took on the aspects which we now call the "extended family" and often became a village by itself. In such a case, inter-marriage within the family (or clan as the still larger family was often called) was forbidden, and the family sought among the youth of neighboring families or clans for wives (or husbands) which would strengthen the home family, and establish allies within the family of the bride or husband.

In the old days, the size of village communities was automatically limited by the number of people who could produce a living from the neighboring resources. In an agricultural community this was controlled by the availability of fertile land within reasonable walking distance, where an adequate amount of food could be grown. In Alaska, it is still controlled by the fish or sea mammals to be caught within a reasonable area. When the size of the community threatened to exhaust the food supply, the community split, and a new community was formed. This process is still going forward among the natives of Alaska,

and within a lifetime has been operative among the Pueblo and Papago Indians.

So long as an individual performed his assigned tasks within the family, he was fed, clothed, and protected. Such an organization had no place for the drone, but on the other hand it offered security to its members in an unfriendly world. For the world was unfriendly. A man who was not a member of the family group was by the very nature of society at that time, an enemy—someone who sought to live at the expense of the efforts of the organized family. Often there were organized groups of such marauders. Among our own southwestern Indians this role was occupied by the Apache and their cousins the Navajo until well after the arrival of the white man. That this existence of predator and victim indicated a primitive pattern of haves and have-nots is beside the point, for with the nomadic and predatory tribes, family organization was fully as important as among the more sedentary groups.

Each individual member of such a family was not only secure but, equally, he was important. Nothing is more necessary to the individual psyche (or inner man) than security and self-importance. A man who knows where to turn for protection from the things he fears, and knows that he is a valued member of a group, possesses those assurances which make for mental health. It is the absence of such assurances which produces emotional instability.

A great many silly articles are written each year suggesting that modern man is more subject to mental disease than his ancestors. Actually little change has taken place in the physical or emotional structure of men and women. But a tremendous change has taken place in the type of social organization within which modern men and

women must function. The disappearance of the organized family in modern America has left the unprotected individuals who make up modern social groups a prey to fear and insecurity and without any protective assurance that they are of any importance. This organized family which gave man invaluable protection, and contributed to his self-esteem, received in return intense loyalty. The individual merged himself with something greater than he could ever hope to be, and took on added stature in his own estimation as a result. What to modern man appears an exaggerated concern with clan derivations among the Irish and the Scots may be all that remains of the intense loyalty which bound these early groups together—but it was the kind of thing that made even the least of them a man in his own right, able to strut occasionally because he was a "chip off the old block."

In our own day, the Sons or Daughters of various groups often band together and gain artificial importance, because they trace their heritage back to families which had importance during a significant period of our nation's history. Freemasonry, fraternal organizations like the Elks, Moose, Odd Fellows and the like and even luncheon clubs are an effort to build up protective social relationships for those who have no important family to lean upon. And the much criticized college fraternity gives a feeling of protection and belonging and even snobbish self-importance to individuals who might be nobody without such an association.

As society became more complicated, new agencies developed. Associations of families grew into larger villages when conditions made this possible. Other villagers were never as close as one's own family—but were a lot closer than members of other villages. The anthropologist

calls these intimate protective groups of which we are a part "in-groups"; and those on the outside whom we fear and who fear us, are "out-groups." As young people grew up, even in olden times, they gradually became members of larger and larger "in-groups" (the family, the clan, the tribe, etc.), each a little less intimate, giving less protection, less admiration, and calling forth less loyalty, but nevertheless extending the area within which these protective and rewarding qualities were paramount. And as the world evolved, agencies developed within society which began to extend these good things to undreamed of lengths. The great religions, like Christianity, Mohammedanism, and Buddhism stress brotherhood among groups who had always previously thought of each other as natural enemies. Unfortunately for the world, each of these religions demands complete and universal acceptance, and has been ready to exterminate competing religions to obtain it. Political governments such as those of Rome, the British Empire, and the United States have extended the feeling of brotherhood, and the rule of law and order within their borders, to such an extent that certain protections, formerly furnished by the family, are now available to man living alone through his residence in a city or citizenship in a state or nation.

Such tremendous "in-groups" shed approval on a limited few, but furnish to many the opportunity for loyalty to or identity with something bigger and more important than the individual can ever be. At the same time, unfortunately, they reduce the individual to a state of anonymity that is damaging to his universal human need for admiration and a sense of importance.

These generalizations have a direct bearing on the problem of Indian education. The Indian children in our schools come from that level of society wherein protection, approval and self-importance are still on the family level, and one's loyalty is to the family. Nothing which has happened on most of the reservations, or even among the dispersed tribes, has—served to provide an Indian child an identification with the larger "in-groups" to which their white neighbors have through the generations become a part. Surrounded as they are by an "out-group" of whites—often an unfriendly or at best a neutral one,—the Indian who is torn away from his family or clan may easily find himself emotionally lost. Certainly he will find himself without the protection and the self-importance which make life tolerable, and stimulate ambition.

Here is where many of our older schools were harmful in the extreme, for they did their utmost to destroy the faith of the child in the family, the home, the religion, and the other factors which had stood for security, for admiration, for cooperation, and for love, and to which he had given his loyalties. We aren't often as brutal about it today as we used to be, but when we send an Indian child to a boarding school we often deprive him of the strengths which he has found within his in-groups, and seldom do much to build up a new sense of security and belonging or, through participation in the formulation of group ideals, erect a new structure of loyalties.

It is at this point that an opportunity opens to our schools, which used to be fully exploited in many smaller white schools. It is the opportunity to build consciously into the pattern of the school those feelings of security, those contributions to self-esteem, and those claims of loyalty to

something which in the aggregate is bigger and finer than any of its parts. The way lies open to our schools to become an "in-group" which may be the necessary step between the home and the community. To succeed in such an achievement, the school must realistically build standards of behavior which demand sacrifice of individualism on the part of its individual members, but which in return give to each individual the confidence that he has the support of hundreds of his fellow classmates who are living up to the same standards, and the pride that comes from being one of a group which wins approbation by its code.

This is not an unrealizable ideal. Certain schools throughout the ages have achieved such reputations. In fact that oft-ridiculed attitude of the British civil servant, that he was true to something British even though he served his country in the heart of Africa, is the product of such training. Call it "old school tie," or what you will, it gives protection and strength to the individual. It may result in a pride in stuffy things, which seems to be at the bottom of British self-criticism, but it can just as well be pride in honesty, strength, loyalty, the will to work, and other equally fine things.

Such attitudes are seldom imposed successfully from above. They are cultivated by group understanding and sharing. In most schools where such pride and loyalties exist, they have become of such importance to the children that they, and not the faculty, pass on the sense of importance to newcomers—the feeling that they have become part of an organization with pride, with standards, with loyalties, which will give protection, and demand in return undying loyalty to that thing which is bigger and better than any single individual, and which is the result of unselfish mutual loyalties and standards.

Most schools fail to become this unified in-group, because they allow themselves to remain an agglomeration of competing but smaller "in-groups," which war on each other in a small way. A newcomer instead of being absorbed into the greater entity "the school," becomes for a while—during that period when he can least afford the emotional strain—the victim of aggression, and the goat of all the little "in-groups." If things run their normal course, and he stands up under the hazing he receives, he may be enthusiastically or grudgingly absorbed into one or other of these groups.

But the time when the child most needs the protection of an "in-group" is when he first arrives, and is homesick for loss of the protection of the home. Much homesickness could be prevented if the whole school took pride in being an "in-group" that quickly absorbed a newcomer, and gave him the protection, and the approbation which even the least of us needs, demanding at the same time adherence to the ideals and standards which underlie the solidarity of the group.

In any association of people, groups are constantly forming—for good or for evil. The school staff, which assumes such group formation is not taking place or that the nature of pupil groups will always be desirable and healthy, is kidding itself.

In the absence of guidance there will inevitably develop a number of competing groups, rather than a unified student-body. In such a case, some of the children will always be on the outside, suffering from insecurity. Some of the unsupervised groups are liable to engage in predatory activities within a school, as similar groups do in life outside. Because that happens in unsupervised conditions is no justification for its

being allowed to happen in a school. We may be preparing children to live outside—but that is no reason to tolerate unhealthy social conditions within a school, any more than we encourage measles or TB in a school, simply because they occur outside. When we encounter them, we immediately apply the best corrective we have available. We face the same obligation in degree of "in-group" protection and help which will strengthen each individual child. the matter of social organization.

It is the duty of principals, advisers and other persons concerned with guidance work to develop student body sentiments which will make for the kind of loyalties, and the *(an unexpected end TRH)*

Willard W. Beatty

13. LAZINESS

ONE of the frequent charges against Indians by those who meet them casually, especially those Indians who lounge around agency offices looking for a handout, is that Indians are lazy. If one were to gather together the cartoons about Indians published by magazines and newspapers in the United States over a period of any one year, the majority of these would be found to surround this general non-Indian assumption that Indians are basically lazy and do nothing they can escape doing.

The assumption that Indians are lazy is wholly false, and indicates a lack of full information on Indian life. There are two reasons which account for the appearance of laziness on the part of numerous Indians, who, as a matter of fact, are quite industrious much of the time.

The first is that Indian culture has never been on an eight-hour day, during which the people work, in season and out of season. Indian culture was geared to the cycles of the plants and animals,

just as is the case with the modern American farmer. A farmer has periods of intensive activity and then periods when there is not very much he can do. Indian farmers today face the same experiences that white farmers do. When it is plowing time and when it is harvest time, there is a great deal of work to be done, and the farmer works from dawn to dusk. During the winter or the rainy seasons, there is not much to be done, and many Indians take it easy just as many farmers take it easy.

The same thing is true with Indians who engage in the livestock industry, caring for either cattle or sheep. Somebody must watch the sheep, but watching the sheep is rather a sedentary activity. However, many Indians while watching sheep improve their time by spinning or carrying on other handicrafts in the interval while the sheep are grazing within eyesight range. In handling cattle there are also long periods during the year when the cattle take care of themselves. However, there are periods at roundup and at other seasons of the year when tremendous activity from dawn to dusk is required. The Indian never slacks at these times.

Indians generally are much more dependable and put forth much greater effort than most white men, when activity is involved, and take their leisure just as white people do when leisure is permitted.

The second reason requires some understanding of present day Indian life. The members of many Indian tribes today are on a nutritional level considerably lower than that of most whites. The measured nutritional intake of Navajo Indians, for example, in many, many cases is for below what was considered minimum among displaced persons or prisoners of war during the

last world war. This fact alone limits the physical activity which it is possible for these Indians to engage in.

Any person's physical output is limited by the fuel which he is able to furnish to his body machine. The studies of nutrition which have been made in Indian areas all show that the average Indian is making for better and more economical use of the energy which he receives from his limited food than would be the case with whites under a similar diet. As the caloric intake of Indians increases, their physical activity increases, and the amount of work which they can do also increases.

When we first began to take large numbers of adolescent Indian children from the Navajo reservation to educate in off-reservation schools, the doctors who examined the youngsters, advised strongly that they be restrained from active sports or tiring physical activities for a year or more until their nutritional intake, on the higher level that was possible in our boarding schools, built up their bodily strength. The medical advice was that if these Navajo youngsters began strenuous physical activity before reserve strength had been built up, they would be more susceptible to tuberculosis and similar diseases than they would be after their metabolism had become established on a higher level.

The Indians of the Andean altiplano in South America are also often misjudged. Visitors to Peru and Bolivia are almost immediately impressed with the number of Indians in the mountain areas of those countries who have the habit of coca chewing. Coca is the plant from which cocaine is obtained. The dried coca leaves are chewed with a small pellet of lime which releases the cocaine in minute quantities. When swallowed, this dulls the

pangs of hunger. These Indians operate on a much smaller caloric intake than would be true of white people and are actually half-starved much of the time.

A number of missionary groups which have gone into South America, have attempted to discourage the coca chewing habit through religious exhortation. However, in areas where the Indian diet is somewhat equivalent to that of whites, the coca chewing habit appears to terminate automatically. Few of the urban Indians employed in domestic work in the mountain cities of these two countries are cocoa chewers. Day laborers who must buy their food from the niggardly income they receive for their work, and can not draw upon the table leavings of the more fortunate people for whom they work, chew coca.

One of the easiest things in the world is to condemn people for being different from what is currently "socially acceptable" without looking into the reason for the difference. Work is a natural function of human living and no people are so consistently unhappy as those who have been deprived of the privilege of working. This is not to say that people enjoy overworking, but they do enjoy participating in normal creative activity. Indians are no exception.

Willard W. Beatty

14. CIVILIZATION IS AN INTELLECTUAL STATE

WHAT IS CIVILIZATION? Looking around us it is easy to reply in terms of electric lights, automobiles, bathtubs, steam-heat, telephones, and the countless machines and gadgets with which machine power has surrounded modern life. There may be those who are more impressed with things of the mind, who will point to books, schools, Christianity, and the art and music of today.

However, if we contrast the state of the savage or the barbarian (as the terms are applied to the American in his native state, or the African, or the Indonesian) we will find that many of the differences between living conditions among the uncivilized and ourselves are largely ones of degree.

Is civilization, then, only an advanced degree of human living, of which savagery and barbarism are the preliminary steps? Or has some fundamental change taken place in man himself, which was a necessary preliminary to the rapid physical changes which now characterize "civilized" living? Somewhere along the line of man's development two intellectual adjustments occurred, which must of necessity have preceded the physical changes of which we are so much aware.

First, was a recognition of the need to record and transmit knowledge. Without knowing what has transpired, conscious and deliberate change is impossible. Every culture which has advanced, has invented a method for recording events and ideas, and then has provided some systematic means for transmitting this knowledge to the oncoming generations. Sometimes this "education" has been limited to a preferred few. More recently, in democratic society, it has become recognized as the right of all. The transmission of existing knowledge, however important, is a static stage in human development. The growth of civilization has demanded something more.

Second, was the birth of the scientific spirit—the readiness to examine and analyze, critically and curiously, the world about us. It is the scientific spirit which has brought about the changes, which, viewed in their entirety, we call civilization.

The progress of civilization is far from complete, and it would be a mistake to assume that it is only physical, though the physical changes have been most rapid and most clearly evident. And it must be recognized that no war ever fought by man has been more continuous and more complex than that which has existed and which continues to exist between those who are intellectually curious, and those who oppose change. Established law, established administration and established religion have united throughout the ages to resist new ideas, whether these ideas concerned a better plow, a better means of transportation, or a better approach to education or medicine.

Some years ago on the Papago Reservation, it was proposed to build a well and a school in one of the more conservative areas.

Representatives of the government met with a group of local Indians to discuss the proposal. As was traditional, the district chief spoke for the Indians. He explained that traditionally the Papago had gotten their water from charcos (artificial pools), filled at intervals with water diverted from the temporary rivers which result from heavy rainfall in the mountains. The white man's custom of driving wells in Mother Earth was both sacrilegious and immoral. The Papago wanted no wells. Schools, also, were deemed dangerous. As they were designed primarily for children, a school at his village was unnecessary, because they "had stopped making children." The rest of the audience remained silent, and the baffled white men left.

After a few weeks more of dry summer, the charco of that village dried up, and a few days later the reservation superintendent was invited to return to discuss the need for a well and a school. The chief was not present, and the young men

explained that when the charco dried, he and his family had moved to a nearby community that had a well. They explained that while he was present, he was by custom the spokesman of the group, and they could not contradict him. Now he was gone, and was himself taking advantage of a well, they wished to invite the government to drill the proposed well in their community. As for the school, when the old chief said they had stopped making children, he was speaking only for himself. Perhaps a school for their children would be a good thing.

Well and school were both built. The chief returned, when the period of drought was over, and having found the well-water of the neighboring community had sustained his family without ill effects, accepted the new well, and permitted his people to make use of it also. The school was of less evident benefit, and he successfully opposed the younger members of the community in their desire to send their children. As yet, no children from this village attend the school.

In this the old chief and his adherents are not essentially different from their white brethren who have opposed universal public education (or in some parts of the country today, the education of negroes), who still oppose small-pox vaccination, and who some years ago when the automobile was young, attempted to block its use by all kinds of hampering legislation. It is the same kind of thinking that produces the pronouncement that "the little red school house was good enough for me, therefore it is good enough for my grandchildren." "A mid-wife was good enough to usher my children into the world, why should my daughter or daughter-in-law need a doctor, or go to a hospital?" "Babies have always died in this village from intestinal ailments, and they always will.

Flies have nothing to do with it." "Seeds planted in the full of the moon will germinate, others will not." One of these statements came from a wealthy suburban community, another from a rural white town, a third from an area of the rural south, and the fourth from an Indian community—but is there any essential difference between them?

If there is one thing which should be clear to anyone concerned with the future of mankind, it is that education for a civilized world cannot be satisfied to deal entirely with what is already known; it must prepare for the continued exploration of the unknown. And the unknown isn't limited to radio and television, radar and atomic energy, sulfa drugs and penicillin, and the millions of lesser physical phenomena which research will harness for the use of mankind, in the years to come. It embraces such problems as: how to speed up the application of new knowledge in the fields of education, medicine and social welfare; how to demonstrate that slum clearance in city and country, better nutrition for the peoples of the world, greater cooperation and less suspicion and conflict between peoples, will do more for mankind than the discovery of hybrid corn or methods for artificial insemination of cattle; how to overcome the intellectual barrier of "national sovereignty," so as to permit the formation of a world state for the control of atomic energy.

True education can never be limited to what is in a text-book. The experiments in the science laboratory should never be taught merely as ways of proving what we already know; but as an adventure in research and discovery. Reading, writing and arithmetic are only the tools of education: real education will depend on what is done with these tools to unlock hitherto unknown areas of science, or the human mind. This is the

true application of the scientific spirit, to which mankind owes such individual freedom as already has been attained.

The truly "civilized" man takes nothing "on faith." Every assumption or belief is subject to verification or disproof. The fact that one has always done things a given way, is probably the best possible reason for re-examining both one's reasons and one's methods, to see if a better way can't be found. Education, psychology and medicine are no more static than airplanes and radio. One must stand constantly ready to overhaul one's knowledge and one's thinking, in all intellectual fields. This is not an age in which to depend on outworn beliefs or ancient attitudes. Modern ideas are as much needed as modern automobiles or washing machines or radios.

Willard W. Beatty

15. ACCULTURATION BY ADJUSTMENT

MINORITY GROUPS are usually so designated for one or more of three principal reasons. They represent a small proportion of the total population. They exhibit physical differences characteristic of their race; their native culture differs from the culture of the dominant group. This status is accorded to Indians because of the obvious application of all three criteria.

Aside from conscious attempts at annihilation or indifference to the fate of a minority, one of two philosophies usually dictates the treatment accorded them—attempted assimilation or communization. The means employed to achieve these ends may vary greatly but the goal is fairly clear. In the case of the Indians, a century of repression, segregation and so-called education served only to deculturate rather than acculturate them. Confined for many years to their

reservations, their barren acreages reduced by two-thirds, exploited by whites, decimated by poverty and disease, continued use of their native language, customs, religion and institutions discouraged, and forced to live on Government doles, their population steadily declined and they seemed much nearer annihilation than assimilation.

The proponents of communization believe that in the Indian culture there exists something unique and worth while. They would preserve the racial entity of the Indians, segregating them and subsidizing them until such time as they might achieve economic self-sufficiency and social autonomy—a culture within a culture.

Without debating the two philosophies, one recognizes a common fallacy. Neither takes into account the wishes, the capacities, or the adaptability of the Indian himself. Such disregard is paternalistic regimentation at its worst. Both strike at the very roots of a culture, the inviolability of personality. Instead, society must concern itself less with preconceived goals and adopt a policy of **adjustment**, based on sound psychological principles, respecting the integrity of personality and working through the people themselves to help them achieve their own peculiar destiny. Certainly no new personality and no new culture is built on the deliberate wreckage of another. Once racial pride, self-respect, and cultural integrity have been destroyed there remains little upon which to build either a new culture or an integrated personality. Only when recognition of the survival value of the best elements of a minority culture is substituted for the cultural arrogance of the majority, which assumes there is nothing worth salvaging in the heritage of the minority, is there provided a stable base for

adjustment either through assimilation or in parallel development with the major culture.

Adjustment to another culture can be achieved only as the members of the minority group retain their self-respect, their pride of achievement, and their recognition of those elements in their culture which have enduring worth. These factors not only serve as a foundation upon which a minority may hope to build for adjustment, but also may make worth-while contributions to the majority culture.

It is by no means certain that an untended melting pot brews the best assimilative compound for any immigrant group, even when it possesses common racial antecedents. Some direction, some planning, some conservation of national heritage might produce a more virile citizenship than does insistence upon abandonment of all of the old mores and immediate acceptance of a new life. This is emphatically true where a distinct racial and indigenous element is involved.

The change is too great, adjustment too difficult, and hostility too likely. The dominant racial group must recognize this principle. It must not only accept but also insist upon the retention of those elements which possess survival value. Nor is it enough to substitute passive tolerance for prejudice and intolerance. Any dynamic program of adjustment must be founded upon the doctrine of identical rights, identical interests, and identical aims. Mutual respect for personal integrity and recognition of mutual contributions of culture are necessary ingredients of any formula for the adjustment of two racial cultures, whether they are to fuse as one new culture or continue as two mutually enriched co-existed cultures.

This, too, is the essence of internationalism. This is the problem of small nations everywhere.

Internationalism cannot mean submission to one major culture. This is nationalism in its most pernicious form—the dominance of the "master race." Internationalism must mean a family of nations founded on mutual respect, mutual interests, mutual concessions, and mutual surrender of anti-social aims.

Actually people do not think or respond to stimuli as nations, but as individuals. Nationalism or internationalism can only reflect the cumulative outcome of individual thought, emotions, attitudes, and aspirations. And the principle of identity reduced to this individual basis means identification, the ability to put oneself in another's place, think as he thinks, feel as he feels, revere as he reveres. It means recognition of common rights, mutual respect for personal dignity and integrity, and recognition of a common purpose—the goal of harmonious adjustment.

Whenever individuals from the minority group elect to adjust by moving into the dominant culture, they invariably fall into one of three categories.

Some who are suddenly confronted with the demands of the new culture are so over-awed and disillusioned that they beat a hasty retreat to the security of their tribe and its familiar institutions.

Others take the long view and endure the rebuffs and discriminations of the new social order so that they may insure for themselves and their children the ultimate advantage they have envisioned.

A third group who leave their own culture because of maladjustment or discontent frequently carry their own personality inadequacies into the new culture and find themselves equally at variance there. They find themselves in a No Man's Land—outcasts from both cultures.

Unfortunately some Indian veterans of World War II who had new and violent experiences completely beyond the comprehension of their families and officials, and likewise abnormal for the peace time conditions of the dominant culture, found themselves in this class. It is not strange that this maladjustment should occur. Frequently members of the white man's world with similar experiences find readjustment difficult or impossible.

Unless proper safeguards are erected at non-reservation and boarding schools, they may also contribute to the membership of this group. If training for adjustment to the major culture is superficial, and then the pupil returns to the native environs, the same unacceptance by both cultures may result. In either instance, resentment, insecurity, and a sense of persecution are the bitter fruits. Vernon Beggs

16. WHAT DO WHITES OWE TO INDIANS

"YOU TOOK our land," Indians have been heard to say, with an attitude of deep resentment and tragedy. "This whole big country was once ours."

The white man, in a good natured mood is likely to agree, and when events do not suit him, he may propose: "Let's give the country back to the Indians!"

Does that mean that Indians have a rightful claim to the area of the United States, with all its oil wells, its mines, its railroads, cities and factories, its 86,735,000 acres* of corn and 117,321,000 acres of wheat and oats? If this is so, there was never such a gigantic robbery in history. If, it is not so, the situation ought to be cleared up, at least in the Indian Service, where Indians and

* "Crops and Markets," 1950 Edition, Vol. 27, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

whites hope to work together as understanding friends. What then, did whites take from the Indians and how does the debt stand now?

They took certain lands, like the island of Manhattan and some of the State of Pennsylvania, for which they paid. Not much, it is true, but land owners have sold cheap and regretted it both before and since then. They took other land, which was paid for—later. They took some, like the Black Hills, for which they did not pay, though they had promised. Debts like that need to be settled and the Indian Claims Commission is preparing to take up the subject, for promises must be redeemed if a nation is to keep its self-respect.

Can money payments really make up to the Indian for the loss of a whole continent where he once roamed unhindered? That is the real crux of the question and the reason for bitterness. A hunting life looks idyllic, at least as we see it through our civilized eyes. Yet how could it have been possible for a whole continent, replete with mineral resources, to be left as a paradise for hunters when other parts of the world sometimes had 700 people to the square mile? If non-Indian Europeans had not flooded in to occupy the land, someone else would have done so. The Indians would have lost their great hunting tracts, by conquest, by purchase, or by being simply crowded out. The question is, what compensation was really due them for this loss?

There are over 3½ million square miles in the United States and it has been calculated that, when the whites first came, there were about 800,000 Indians. That was over 4½ square miles for every man, woman and child. True, some of the land was uninhabitable mountain and desert, but, on the other hand, some of the settled Indians occupied much less space. The farming Pueblos used

scarcely more land than they have today. Around the salmon streams of the Northwest, the fishing Indians were gathered to a density of two persons to every three square miles. Even that looks magnificent to the Indian of today, when less than 400,000 occupy 88,000 square miles, counting both reservations and public domain. One-fifth of a square mile per person!

Yet what did the Indian of old actually get from the vast tracts over which he was once lord? We are speaking now of pre-white days, when there were no horses and no guns. All hunting was done on foot, with snares, traps or bow and arrow. In some places, hunters got together to surround a group of antelope or buffalo—a job of many days hard work. Or, a few might go out alone after deer or elk. In any case, most of a man's time was taken up in simply getting enough meat for the family. There were less productive areas where the food was mostly wild seeds, rabbits and birds. Here, both men and women spent their lives tramping over the country, gathering up all possible food. In no case could they save enough to feel rich. When there is no refrigerator to keep the extra food and no white man to take the skins and other products in trade, hunters get little more than their food from day to day. Or, counting dried food, let us say, for a few months ahead. That was enough in ancient times, when people had never heard of anything better. Yet it would scarcely satisfy any young Indian of today.

Even the farming Indians lived in a way which, today, we would call poor. No United States Indians made a real business of raising crops except the Pueblos and Pimas. They, indeed, had stores for a year or two ahead. Also they had cotton clothing and beautiful pots, enough to keep comfortable and to trade for some dried meat and

skins. But was this wealth? Other Indians left the farm work mostly to the women, while the men hunted. Dr. A. L. Kroeber, of the University of California, has calculated that eastern Indians used only 1% of the tillable land. What could you expect when the soil was hard and the tools were no more than sharpened sticks or, now and then, a deer's shoulder bone?

We do not mean that this was the Indian's fault. He did not have the tractors, the steam shovels, the smelters and dynamos, not even the spades, hammers and pickaxes which would have gotten the mineral wealth out of the rocks, plowed up the soil, or diverted the rivers into huge irrigation projects. News of such things had not reached him, any more than news of cattle and iron tools had reached European whites four or five thousand years ago. It is the opinion of most students that the great inventions which, produced our modern industrial age, were developed only once. A fortunate coming together of materials, climate and opportunity gave civilization its start in Egypt and Mesopotamia about 3000 B. C. Slowly the use of new tools spread over Europe and Asia, the ancestors of American whites being among the later ones to learn. Indians never had the chance to learn at all. Isolated by oceans, they had no inkling of the new way of life which made hunting obsolete. To them, the oil fields of Oklahoma, the coal mines of Pennsylvania, even the sites of such cities as Los Angeles and New York were just so much hunting land and not the best, at that.

So what whites took from the Indians was simply land for hunting, gathering, and a little planting. In other words—a chance to make a living. It would be easy to return them that much. Any Indian who chooses to work now as hard as

his ancestors did at hunting and tillage could certainly get food enough to keep his family alive, some new clothing every two or three years, and some rough kind of shelter. For that was all his labor netted him in economic terms before the white man came.

In terms of human happiness, however, the case is different. The Indian's daily work, in former times, was something he liked and for which he felt competent. It required initiative and responsibility. It gave self-respect and a standing with his group. Half clad and dirty, even hungry though he sometimes was, the Indian hunter felt inferior to no one. He was a member of a self-governing group. Such opportunities for advancement as existed, were open to him. It is these imponderables whose loss goes deep. After whites have made the country productive enough to support 150 million people, justice may not demand that they give it back to Indians for the use of a few thousand. Justice does demand, though, that the Indian should be able to get as much interest and achievement out of life as he used to.

Here, whites are really to blame. It is the custom of most people to assume that "whites" in this case, means the government. "If only our government had . . ." they say, and thus shrug off responsibility. It is true that the government which is, after all, only the representative of public opinion, made many mistakes in its care of Indians. One such error was taking all responsibility away from the Red Man and leaving him to be guided by a white agent whom he could not understand. In the early days, when some of the tribes maintained the attitude of enemies, such authority was necessary. However, as older generations became inactive and new ones appeared, new planning was needed. Our

government was young and confused, faced all at once with a country expanding by leaps and bounds. No one had the time or the psychological knowledge to consider how Indians might best be helped toward citizenship. The outworn, paternalistic policy continued. So a generation of dependents, some resentful, some indifferent, was produced.

We of the Education Branch are well aware that teaching which does not encourage initiative is destructive of true learning. We cannot blame the Indian for having failed to learn the lesson of adult citizenship under such poor conditions. The Reorganization Act and the new policies in education are the government's moves toward righting this psychological wrong.

Other moves are necessary, however. One of the essentials of democratic government is that all action is not left to the central authority. The citizens themselves take responsibility for bettering the national life. So far, our average citizen has done very little on the Indian question except to blame the government. Yet some of the rights we owe the Red Man are in every citizen's power to bestow. The Indian should have a chance to earn a living without discrimination because of his race. He should be able to vote; to be served in restaurants and stores; to live in any community he may desire. It is rights like these, enjoyed to the fullest, which can give back some of the satisfaction he once derived from boundless roaming. This debt we owe the Indian and it can be paid only by all the citizens of the United States, working together.

Ruth Underhill

17. INDIAN HOME CONVENIENCES

EVERY STUDY that is made of Indian resources or Indian reservation life stresses the lack in the Indian home of conveniences which Americans generally like to think are typical of American home life in general. We are told in accents of shocked surprise that Indians lack running water, that they lack sanitary privies, that they lack electric lights and a vast number of other things which the middle-class American family, living in an urban area, considers indispensable. These lacks are of course unfortunate and it is desirable that steps be taken to correct them.

Returns from the 1940 census, shows, however, that Indians are not unique in this regard. More than eighty percent of all American farmers are without running water. Almost seventy percent are without electric lights. The important conclusion is that Indians are not exceptional in the absence of conveniences in their rural homes, and that they are pretty much like the rest of the rural population of the country. This doesn't mean that we shouldn't work for change, but it does mean that we should not treat Indians as though they lack these things because they are benighted Indians.

It is interesting to note that in many, many parts of the Indian country, as the opportunity for improved home living is presented to Indian families, a very large number of them take advantage of the opportunity to improve their homes. It is hardly the fault of the Indians that they live on lands where water is scarce and where the development of an adequate continuous water supply is expensive. Even the Federal Government, with its resources, has had to build several schools on the Cheyenne River Reservation in areas where no domestic water has been developed and water is hauled by truck

several times a week to keep the schools supplied. On the Navajo Reservation it has often been necessary for the government to drill wells 1,500 and 2,000 feet deep in order to obtain water. Frequently, the cost of the well for a Navajo day school has exceeded the cost of the rest of the school construction. A \$15,000 well is far beyond the economic resources of a Navajo family.

Where a concentration of population permits the reasonably economic piping of domestic water into many homes, whites and Indians alike usually take advantage of it. Where isolation and the problem of developing an adequate sanitary water supply is unduly expensive, whites and Indians alike usually get by with a hand-pump or a well, with a spring, or with a nearby stream. Granted that these leave much to be desired from the standpoint of convenience and even from the standpoint of sanitation, it should be recognized that the bar to better things is a financial bar and not one of deliberate negligence.

Ruth Underhill

18. HOUSING MET NEEDS

THE DESCENDANT of white pioneers, looking back on log cabin or sod hut, is accustomed to feel pride in the ingenuity of his ancestors. He is not ashamed of the fact that they lived without plumbing or tableclothes. They did the very best they could, granted the tools and materials at hand, and he rightly puts the emphasis on their hardihood and skill rather than on appearance.

A modern Indian should have the some kind of pride. He would not wish, today, to live in a wigwam or tipi. Yet these dwellings, at the time when they were used, were the best possible adaptation to the surroundings. Those surroundings offered very little in the way of building materials. The Indians had no metal tools

and they had to attack the American continent practically barehanded. They could not shape their environment by sawing, blasting and transporting materials for long distances. They had to use what was at hand and the result was a complete adaptation of small branches, bark, grass clay, and skin. Whites, with their furnaces and electric fans, have been surprised at the success achieved by these simple means.

Take the Eskimo dwelling on the windswept northern coast of Alaska. Here the need was for tight walls which would keep out the chill and the Eskimo used the best insulation available—they dug down into the earth. White pioneers, with a different tradition, objected to houses which "looked like nothing but caves" because their walls were of earth halfway up and their roofs of skin or driftwood, covered with sod. Yet they had the even temperature of a basement and could be heated by one small, seal oil lamp. Moreover, when the family moved out for their summer fishing, the whole roof was taken off and the house sterilized by three months of sunlight. When the whites and the "civilized" Eskimo tried building above ground with tar paper and boards, the result was bouts of pneumonia. Finally, it was admitted that the earth was the best insulation, short of modern materials and furnaces.

Then take the Pima and Papago in the hottest part of our country. Here the need was for shade and air circulation. The Indians, it is true, built a little adobe house for winter use, but their solution for the desert summer was the arbor. Their dry land gave them only a few little crooked trees but these served as posts while the roof was made of the only wood that was really plentiful, the slender ribs of the giant cactus. These were piled crosswise until they formed a solid covering. Then

the little desert bushes were heaped over them to a depth of two or three feet. That meant real shade, where the galvanized' roof of the white man's temporary hut only reflects the heat. Moreover, the desert always has a breeze from some direction. The white man's house may not have a window in the right place, but the Indian arbor is open to every breath of air. Whites, themselves, admit it to be the best arrangement short of electric fans and air conditioning.

In the same way, we could survey the tipis of the wandering Sioux, made from the skin of the very animal they hunted, so that every by-product was used. We could see economy in the birch bark tipis of the forest Algonquians, the elm bark wigwams of the Atlantic seaboard or the brush wickiups of the Apache. All these were more or less moveable or at least renewable. Even if a family came back to the same house for some months every year, there were other months when it was left open to wild animals or to enemies. Many groups abandoned or destroyed a house when the head of the family died.

So the house had to be kept down to essentials. Indians did not invest their time and artistic skill upon it, but put these instead into their permanent possessions, pots, baskets, quilled robes, and painted parfleches. Students have marveled at the craft which was lavished, even on a storage pot. They must realize that people who cared so much to have beauty in their surroundings would have had it in the house structure, had that been practicable.

It was practicable in a few instances and here we find Indians taking full advantage of the possibilities. The Pueblo people, with their cornfields, were able to live in one place all the time. They built permanent dwellings out of the

very soil on which they were placed. Wherever they could get sandstone, workable with stone tools, they had houses of masonry. They had large mural paintings, at least in their ceremonial chambers.

Another fortunate group was the Indians of the Pacific Northwest. They had the one big tree in all America which was workable with stone tools—the western red cedar. The amount that was done with cedar gives us some idea of what might have developed had oak and pine not been so resistant. The Northwest Indians built huge plank houses, slinging the wall boards from the uprights by vine loops, like Venetian blinds. They carved and painted their house pillars and some of them evolved the totem post and totem pole, house decorations on a magnificent scale.

None of these solutions for living are any longer necessary. Still, there seems no need to scorn them, any more than our own age would wish to be scorned by a future one which substituted plastics for wood. Indian schools, studying these early forms of housing, need to put the emphasis not on queerness or picturesqueness, and certainly not on inadequacy. The point to stress is the way in which these dwellings completely filled the needs of a people on the move, giving them more comfort than white pioneers often managed. The wickiup, wigwam and tipi are proof of a remarkable ability to use everything in the environment, as far as Indian tools could handle it. They are a part of American history, quite as much as the log cabin or even the colonial mansion. Ruth Underhill

19. HAD INDIANS HAD IRON!

"THE WHITE MAN must have something that we haven't," lamented an Indian teacher of Indians. "Why did he conquer us so easily? How has he

been able to take the whole continent? My boys," he added, "feel that. They think they are beaten before they start."

It is time the white man should step down from his position as almighty conqueror for, after all, it was not he who conquered the continent. It was his tools. Suppose the Indians had had the gun and the white man the bow and arrow? There can be little doubt that Indian courage and strategy would have been equal to the occasion. Suppose the Indian had had an iron plow, instead of the pointed stick with which the Pueblos did their planting. There might then have been square miles of land under cultivation instead of tiny corn patches. Indians could have lived permanently near these fields and, if they had steel saws, axes, hammers and nails, they could have had houses, and even cities. It would not have been so easy then to move them out of the way of white settlers. In short, the continent was conquered by gunpowder and iron and any group of men who owned these things must have been the master.

Why did not the Indians own them? The answer does not have to do with "race." the possession of tools is not due to the character of any local group, but much more to its surroundings, its opportunities and above all to its chance to learn from others. The Indians, for many thousand years before Columbus, had been cut off from Old World contacts. Improved ways of living started in Egypt and, long before three thousand B. C., had been spreading through Europe and Asia. But the stimulus which caused new movements over all that great land mass, could not reach the New World. The Indians were as unlikely to invent iron tools as a Chinese village of today would be to discover penicillin. They did not know

the problem involved nor the apparatus to be used in solving it.

No one can calculate how much of the advance of civilization is due to learning, copying and making little adaptations, rather than to any striking new invention. Somehow, in the temperate, grassy lands about the eastern Mediterranean, the first steps were taken toward planting grain and taming sheep and goats. We know that neolithic Europe had trade routes from the Baltic to the Mediterranean and in Asia from the Euphrates to the Indus. When the first steps in progress had been taken, it was easy for the outer zones of savage people to adapt these ideas, changing the grain from wheat to rye or rice, and the animal to the pig, horse, camel, even water buffalo or reindeer.

It would be hard to give credit for this vast movement to any group. We might better marvel at the way ideas take root and grow, almost as if they were living organisms. Once the Old World had made sure of its food and clothing, in the shape of cereals and domesticated beasts, inventions appeared in geometrical progression: copper, bronze, iron! Historians used to think that it need not be so. The point is that once smelting is known and people have leisure and possessions enough to use tools, the most available metal will be worked up. So iron came into use in the Hittite Empire and, by 1400 B. C. the whole of Europe was using it for tools.

That includes the ancestors of the whites, who were not Hittites. They had the luck to be in the path of progress, even though they lived in distant marginal lands, which were the swamps of Scandinavia and Britain. They made good use of iron, perhaps because their civilization had not gone so far as to have specialized in other

directions. Iron may be called the starting point of the industrial system which they finally worked out. Later, gunpowder was invented in China. Finally, men who had made an adaptation of both these things, were able to use them for subduing a continent.

Looking at history from this perspective, the Indian has little reason for feeling "beaten before he starts." He had the bad luck not to be in the path of material progress—if you can call it bad luck to be spared an industrial revolution and a hundred years war. But he is in the path of progress now. If it is tools which conquer, he has every tool that the white man has. And he has as good a right to wield them, for he has learned their use, just as the white man did. Moreover he and the whites both are now in the act of acquiring a whole new set of equipment. An entirely new period of conquest is in order and conquest which the world hopes is along peaceful lines, rather than those of war. The Indian, with his modern training, can take full part in it, if he so wishes.

Ruth Underhill

20. BETTER RACE RELATIONS NEEDED

UNTIL RECENTLY the American Indian policy was largely designed to settle problems arising out of the relations between settlers and traders and the Indians. These relations were very good at the beginning. The Indians welcomed the first settlers and taught them the secrets of the New World necessary for survival, such as how to grow corn, potatoes, beans, and other new vegetables, and how to track wild game. This kindness and hospitality followed the Indian habit of measuring success by the amount of service which was rendered others.

In return the white man gave or traded commodities unknown to the Indians, such as

kettles, knives, clothing, fire arms, ammunition, liquor, horses and cattle. These contacts between two races and cultures enriched the lives of both. Unfortunately, bad race relations soon replaced good race relations, and started an American tradition of prejudice and discrimination. Forts soon dotted the frontier and a series of wars replaced the early peaceful relations. These clashes of arms brought renown to many early Presidents, including Washington, Jackson, and Harrison. It gave experience to our Army and inculcated initiative and resourcefulness in the individual soldier. It gave the armed services their first experience in military government of a conquered people. But it exterminated whole tribes and destroyed the homes, economy and way of life of other tribes. The cause was mainly the desire to seize and occupy the land of the Indians.

Even the friendliness of some Indian tribes, like the Cherokees of Georgia and the Mandans of the Plains, did not protect them from the aggressive whites whose culture was essentially material and whose usual measure of success was the acquisition of property by the individual. Our treatment of both the friendly and hostile Indians was justified on the ground that we were a superior race, but we know now that there are no superior races. We justified the high incidence of disease among them, which probably killed off more Indians than bullets, on the ground that they were naturally subject to the ravages of disease. We now know that increased appropriations for medical services will improve their health and increase their life expectancy. We have made much progress, and a race lamented as dying is now the fastest growing minority in our land.

The effect of our bad race relations is the main reason for the difficulties in solving the Indian problem. They caused the Indians to

lose most of their lands, including their best lands—a loss which is continuing to the present moment. It is clear that too many people live on too little land and that some of the surplus population on Indian reservations must be aided to fulfill their desire to join the main stream of American life. Temporary employment at ill-paid and insecure seasonal work, as migratory, agricultural or railroad workers, will not be enough. Permanent jobs must be secured. This means that the Indian Bureau must aid Indians, especially the young, who wish to locate, to overcome their present handicaps sometimes the lack of vocational training, lack of a common language, difficulty in adjustment to non-Indian environment and nonacceptance by some non-Indians, which, together with the frequency of large families, make it difficult to secure employment with adequate income, as well as decent places to live in the period of housing shortages.

A beginning has been made with the initiation of an employment program for the Navajo Service. In view of this trend the Indian Bureau should embark on an organized program of public relations and relocation which should include the promotion of better race relations.

A start has been made in this direction within the last few years. A program submitted by the Papago Tribe, and the proposed Navajo program of the Bureau recognize the necessity of relocating a high proportion of the members of these tribes. The Bureau, which personifies the Federal government to Indians, is now endeavoring to

safeguard some of the civil rights of Indians, to emphasize the importance of assisting Indians to participate more in the activities of state and local governments, and to battle for their right to receive the some services accorded to other citizens. More and more of our efforts and those of the Indians must be directed toward many urban centers suitable for settlement. There lie opportunities for Indians to live in communities where there are higher expenditures for public services like health, education, and social welfare, than in most of the rural regions where they now live. If properly enlisted, private organizations in many of these centers will be quick to assist in public relations and race relations.

President Truman in his 1949 inaugural address laid down a program for bringing modern technology and other services to the backward people of the world. A similar program is also necessary to assist some Indian groups to master their physical and economic environment, and assist the surplus to secure employment off the reservation. How can the nation pose as a great champion of oppressed minorities when the people to whom we owe a special legal responsibility, the Indians, do not yet receive as much governmental services as non-Indians, though their needs are greater? Our success in Indian Affairs would establish precedents, and help in the development of plans for improving race relations which would be applicable to all races in this country and beyond our borders.

Theodore H. Haas

21. MOST OF US ARE MERELY CONSUMERS

WHEN NEWSPAPER headlines screamed the destruction of Hiroshima and it became apparent that an American atom bomb had wrought the

greatest destruction of any man-made object in history, countless Americans stuck their chests out and identified themselves with the scientists whose discoveries resulted in this development. Even those who felt that it would have been better for the world if there had been no atom bomb felt pride that American scientists had made the discovery. Probably not more than one American in 500,000 possesses the scientific understanding to know how an atom bomb works, much less knows how to make one. That fact does not stop the rest of us from assuming a certain amount of racial pride in its discovery and invention. However, in an extreme case such as this, most of us are quite willing, when confronted with a challenge, to acknowledge that we know nothing about it.

We aren't quite so honest when it comes to confessing that the most many of us can do with an automobile is to steer it, or that common gadgets like an electric motor are unsolved mysteries to the masses. Despite the fact that most of us know nothing about forming steel sheets or covering them with vitrified enamel we easily feel superior to the less fortunate nationals in Europe, South America, or Asia who don't have built-in bathtubs.

Sometime ago, one of the more popular magazines printed a quiz intended to explode certain fallacies and popularize certain facts. One of the questions dealt with whether the Negro and the American Indian were of equal intellectual stature with the white races. To attract attention the question was phrased as to whether the American Indian races had produced any geniuses. The psychologist who wrote the article answered his own question in the negative. When he was taken to task for his statement his "clever" explanation was that not more than one genius was

born to every half million in the population, and as there weren't a half million American Indians in the United States the chances they could produce a genius were about a billion to one. In the face of such reasoning it would probably have been useless to point out that the discovery of the maize plant and its interbreeding which has adapted it to every latitude within the temperate and torrid zones, and to every altitude on the continent where Indians lived, represented a work of genius fully as significant as the work of Burbank or the invention of the wheel or the later modifications of the electric motor which produced a street car and other adaptations of the power drive.

Regardless of the color of a man's skin, the thoughts which have advanced the world have sprung from minds which were free to investigate and explore, untrammled by superstition. Every race under the sun has experienced its periods of intellectual sterility when the power of the church or of the state challenged the right of individual man to think creatively. The dark ages failed to produce ideas, not because the people living at that time were any less intellectually competent, but because they were living in an age when it was dangerous to think. Intellectual freedom is the price of advancement.

Even the capitalists of America have learned that theoretical research is the foundation stone of profitable invention. It is probable that Albert Einstein can't drive a nail straight, and for all around practicality he is probably a babe in the woods, yet his untrammled thought revolutionized modern physics and laid the foundation for the release of atomic power. However, Einstein is an example of how for the human race has traveled in a few generations. For him to begin to do creative thinking it was

essential for him to master a background of mathematics and physical facts wholly unknown to the world half a century ago.

Lewis Carroll, whose *Alice in Wonderland* and its sequel, *Through the Looking Glass*, have charmed children of two continents presented many amusing paradoxes in the two fables. One that comes to mind as of particular pertinence at the moment is the meeting of Alice and the White Queen, near the outer edge of the chessboard. The Queen grabbed Alice's hand and they began running madly. Alice finally caught her breath enough to inquire where they were going, only to be told that in that particular square it was necessary to run as they had been running just in order to stay in one place.

Modern education is in much this position. Regardless of how desperately hard we try to produce an educated generation, the intricacies of science are unrolling so rapidly that many of the things which we teach as facts while children are in the elementary schools have become amusing historical antiquities before the children reach college. While the white man may have been several jumps ahead of the American Indian when Columbus planted the standard of Isabella in the New World, it is well to remember that the greater part, if not the whole of the experiences which we call culture, are acquired characteristics which have to be learned in each generation by whites as well as Indians.

While we have yet to record an Indian Einstein in recent years it is well to remember that Einstein was by birth a German Jew, a minority group that has had about as tough a time in the old world as the Indians have had in the new.

What this chiefly proves, is that intelligence and achievement are not an Anglo-Saxon, nor an

Italian, nor a Teutonic, nor a Jewish, nor an Indian monopoly. While some of the geniuses of the Roman World were exercising a leadership which continues to influence the western world, the ancestors of the Germans and the English were still savages in the forests of northern Europe. Intelligence and achievement are the end result of education in a favorable environment, upon the unique raw material which is capable of response. The pattern of history certainly gives evidence that the raw material may appear in any race. If at the time it appears the members of that race are exposed to educational opportunities which encourage free thinking, the combination may result in immeasurable advances for all mankind.

While we bask in satisfying identification with the geniuses of our own time and race, let us not forget that most of us are simply riding on their coat-tails. History does not support the delusion that genius prefers any particular skin color or racial strain; and most of the geniuses have sprung from what the aristocrats among us would like to think of as "common clay." Willard W. Beatty

22. ADVERSITY CAN STIMULATE

WHEN THE EARLY PIONEERS settled the Great Plains of the Midwest they had no automobiles, trucks or tractors. Only a few were fortunate enough to have horses. They depended entirely upon oxen to plow their fields, seed, cultivate and harvest their crops and haul their produce to the market. They lived in crudely built sod houses and they cooked their food and kept their houses warm by burning dried cow manure which was collected by the women and children from the pastures where the cattle grazed. Most people living in the bountiful Great Plains area

today have long forgotten the struggle their grandparents endured.

The average person of today thinks of a cow in terms of milk, cream, butter, cheese, and ice cream—not so, the people in Germany. When the war ended the Germans found their power sources depleted and their scientists went about searching doggedly for new sources of power and to their amazement the lowly cow came up with the answer. A German scientist has developed a device which converts cow manure into fuel. Methane gas is extracted from the manure and it has been found to have a higher caloric value than gasoline. The gas is now on sale in the commercial markets and it is used in stoves, tractors, trucks, and automobiles; and that isn't all, it is cheap.

The manure from one cow produces a sufficient quantity of methane gas to supply fuel for the cooking needs of an average family. With 20 cows a farmer can obtain enough methane gas to operate his tractor for 120 days—incredible but true!

Indian Service employees have never been expected to do the impossible. No agriculture teacher or extension agent has been required to produce a hen that will lay two eggs in one day or to develop a breed of turkeys with four legs; nor is there any record that any employee has been directed to develop a dog that can talk. But the Indian Service does expect us to put forth every effort in training the Indians to get a better education, improve their health, make use of their resources and raise their social and economical standards so they can take their places on an equality basis with their neighbors.

Are we using our imagination and ingenuity in guiding the Indians in the use of their latent and potential building materials which are available on

every reservation; in the conservation and use of their land resources which are now leased to the whites; in the introduction of adapted varieties of vegetables, fruits and farm crops; in the improvement of their livestock; and in the preparation of young people who must earn their living either on or off the reservation? These and many other problems are staring us squarely in the face and whether we believe it or not there is a solution, if we but look about and search for it.

All of them will be finally solved by the Indians themselves if we will inspire them, encourage them, work with them, and last, but not least, provide them with the knowledge, the know-how, the tools and the resources they will need to get the job done. Then, and only then, will the Indian Service be able to write its final chapter—Case closed.

P. W. Danielson

23. LET'S BE FAIR TO WHITE AMERICANS!

HISTORICALLY, the peoples of the world have been in a state of continuous flux. The ambitions of military leaders, or natural conditions such as continued droughts or floods have set tribe after tribe, or nation after nation on a career of expansion or displacement. Coveting the lands or the resources of their neighbors, they have gone forth on a campaign of conquest and often enslavement. Many times the conquered people have been dealt with as domestic animals or other chattels, and ownership of them has changed hands with possession of the land.

The coming of white men to America was therefore no new type of migration. The pushing around which they gave to the Indian inhabitants of the New World, differed only in degree from the pushing around which the various Indian tribes

had experienced at the hands of other and momentarily more powerful tribes, since the beginning of man in America. One difference characterized the settlement of North America. While the whites were determined to establish a foothold in the new country, they began to do it through the orderly process of purchase and exchange.

While one may argue that such discretion was dictated by weakness rather than moral conviction, the fact remains that early in the settlement of the American colonies, individual negotiation with the Indians in the purchase of land was forbidden, and land acquisition from the Indians was reserved exclusively to representatives of the government. A Royal Proclamation of October 7, 1763, made this the policy of the British crown, declaring: "the several nations or tribes of Indians ... who live under our protection, should not be molested or disturbed in the possession of such parts of our dominion and territories as, not having been ceded to, or purchased by us, are reserved to them."

Thus began the most extensive real estate deal in history, in which the Government of the United States purchased more than two and a half million square miles of territory, for the equivalent of not less than a billion dollars. The history-book emphasis on the purchase of Louisiana or Alaska, and the various other territories acquired from Spain, France, Britain, Russia or Mexico, had little to do with transferring land titles. Land not privately owned by citizens of these nations, was still held by the Indians, and property rights of both whites and Indians were safeguarded by the treaties. All the United States gained from these purchases was the right to govern and tax--and of

equal importance, the right to buy land from the Indians.

Although it must be confessed that in many instances pressure was exerted to persuade the Indians to sell their lands; and in some cases whites took and used the Indian land long before it was paid for; the fact still remains that negotiations eventually took place, and a deal was made.

In some instances the deal was a cash transaction. In by far the larger number of instances, the land was paid for by a promise of educational and health services, the supplying of fabrics, tools or livestock, and the reservation of adequate amounts of land (selected from the lands under negotiation, or offered in lieu thereof) in a tax-free status for continued use by the Indians. The Indian tribes now under the supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs are those with whom such treaties were made, and the Bureau is the Federal agency designated to carry out the obligations assumed by the Government.

Because of the tax-free status of Indian lands, there has been a reluctance on the part of state or local governing bodies to assume the expense of school, health or welfare services so these have generally been assumed by the Federal Government, either through actual operation of institutions, or through the subsidization of state or local units to perform the service.

These facts are briefly reviewed because they are basic to an understanding of Indian policy in the United States. They are often ignored or forgotten by many Indians, and by those who pose as friends of the Indians.

The sentimental idea that Indians have been treated very badly is only partly true. Badly as whites have treated them—Indians have been treated worse by other Indians; and whites have

been much worse to other whites in some parts of the world, than white North Americans have been to Indians. In the century old drama of mass migrations, the spread of whites across the American continent marks the dawn of a new ideal in such race relations. The people of the nation have not always lived up to their own professed ideals—but the ideals were expressed, and they have exerted a powerful effect on American thinking—and on the thinking of the whole world. American behavior toward the native peoples of the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, the Phillippines, Guam and other Pacific Islands has set a new standard which is guiding the conduct of the United Nations toward less industrialized peoples. The world is getting more civilized—and white-Indian relations have played a big part in the advance.

Willard W. Beatty

24. THE GREAT GOD TIME

AN INTERESTING and amusing article appeared recently in which the author made the point that many cultures worshipped certain gods publicly and quite other gods privately. In American culture, he pointed out, many of us avow Christianity and publicly worship Jehovah. Whereas an even larger proportion of us actually worship the pagan god **Time**. This he proceeded to prove, by pointing out that most of us wore the symbol of **Time** in amulet form as a wristwatch, a lapel pin, or a pocket piece. Each home of a **Time** worshipper has an icon, with a clock as the godhead. **Time** worshippers consult their oracle frequently throughout the day and sometimes throughout the night, especially when planning

anything of importance. In all of this, we treat the god Time with much the same ceremony that an aborigine observes with whatever fetish or symbol is part of his cultural background. The article, of course, was a satire, and the author had his tongue in his cheek. However, he unconsciously pointed out a contrast between Indian and non-Indian culture which is important for us to consider.

The non-Indian culture of the United States indeed worships **Time**. The greater part of the working public must report to work at a given hour in the morning, and work until a given hour in the afternoon. Breakfast is eaten at a regular hour in the morning, lunch at a certain time around noon, and supper at a certain time in the evening. In fact, many of us even have a definite hour in mind when we shall go to bed and when we shall wake up the following morning. All of this represents a cultural acceptance of a factor in life which is completely foreign to Indian thinking or Indian experience. For them the sun and the seasons furnished a calendar of sorts which dictated agricultural and hunting activities, because they coincided with the growth of plants or with the movements of animals. There were no North American Indian cultures where people did the something from morning to night, day after day, for a period of days. When a job had to be done, it was done intensively for many hours and for many consecutive days. When it was finished, the workers might rest or dance or play or celebrate in one way or another in the period before the next job had to be done.

The moment a group of Indians, however, comes in continuing contact with whites, quite a different situation arises. Even the little Indian child who comes to school is expected to get to school by a given hour in the morning, to function

on a program which is pretty largely controlled by the clock, and to return home by some predetermined clock time in the afternoon. One of the difficulties of running Indian day schools is the fact that very few Indian homes have clocks by which they can coordinate the rising and feeding of the children with the arrival of a bus which is to take them to school. Some of the earlier Indian day schools which were located in communities, had the typical old school bell which was rung sufficiently ahead of opening time so that the families could be awakened, and have time to clothe, feed and clean up their children, so that they were ready for school.

On reservations like the Navajo or the Papago or in the consolidated day schools in some of the northern reservations, the families live too far away from school to hear a bell, even if it is rung. When the Navajo day schools first started, the disregard of the Indians for time resulted in many of the more conscientious bus drivers not following the bus route at all, but driving from hogan to hogan so that they could haul the children out of bed and get them into the bus and ultimately to school. Hours were often spent in the process. Reference to this time conflict was made at a congressional committee hearing some years ago and was offered as an excuse for the irregularity of attendance at the Indian day schools. It was amazing to discover how completely the explanation failed to impress congressmen, who appeared to be utterly unable to understand a culture which did not run by the clock.

It would appear perfectly clear that one of the first things which must happen to Indian children who are expected to adjust to non-Indian life, is to become accustomed to our clockwork civilization. It is believed that not nearly enough emphasis on

the importance of Time in non-Indian culture is made in many of our schools. That we are a "Time worshipping" civilization is so obvious to us, that we never stop to think that it may not be equally obvious to the children.

The suggestion has been made, occasionally, that it might be interesting for a school to invest in a few inexpensive watches, or even alarm clocks, and use them as awards to the children, who would be permitted to take them home and undertake to introduce their families to the great god **Time**. It is doubtful that the suggestion has ever been taken seriously, because teachers as well as congressmen have great difficulty in really accepting the fact that many, many Indians do not live by **Time** as we do. These suggestions are made not because it is believed that **Time** is necessarily the most desirable of our deities, but because anyone who is going to succeed in American life has got to recognize that all the rest of us do make periodic obeisance before his shrine. No one who fails to do so, has the remotest prospect of fitting successfully into our culture. It would be interesting to see what could be accomplished by a dozen inexpensive watches, to promote among day school children the regularity which we consider so important.

It is clear that the average boarding school is so slavish to clocks that it does not make much difference whether individual children have them or not. They are called in the morning by a whistle or siren; they go to meals at some kind of a signal; report to school by another signal; and frequently change classes on the basis of some similar notification. They should be thoroughly indoctrinated as to the importance of Time, at least in the lives of the staff of the school.

As many of our boarding school youngsters do pass out into competitive American life, this is

3. UNDERSTANDING CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

132

probably a pretty good experience, but it is clear that the day schools do not furnish anything parallel to it, and it may be of considerable importance to develop some device which will make our Indian youngsters conscience of the importance of Time in their increasing contact with the non-Indian world.

Willard W. Beatty.