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In recent years, Native American educational issues have come to the forefront of instructional concerns. Numerous theorists debate the diverse learning styles and cultural incompatibility of Native American students mainstreamed into traditional "Americanized" classrooms. These assertions are often supported by referencing the histories of Native American education, claiming that Nineteenth Century schooling was academically inadequate and culturally threatening to Native American students. While such observations are helpful, they provide only superficial insights into the structuring and development of these systems. Therefore, extensive consideration of those controlling these systems and their motivations is essential to a reflexive evaluation of previous Native American educational efforts. Thus, a systematic examination of one Native American educator, Richard Henry Pratt, and the ideologies influencing
his work, will provide valuable insights into the multiplicity of factors effecting early, Native American school systems.

Supporting evidence for this project includes numerous historical overviews, government documents, educational research, Pratt's personal publications and studies of prevalent nineteenth-century ideologies. Historical documentation by Jon Reyhner and Jeanne Eder is supplemented by readings from a variety of other sources including the recently published work of David Wallace Adams. In addition, governmental documentation of schooling regulations and Bureau of Indian Affairs' conference minutes provide insightful clues to the curricular requirements and instructional regulations governing Pratt's school, the Carlisle Indian School. Due to a dearth of primary sources, insights into Pratt's ideology have been gleaned from consideration of dominant rhetorical, theoretical and educational movements of his age.

This thesis traces the inception of the Native American boarding school system back to Richard Henry Pratt and his founding of the Carlisle Indian School in 1879. Pratt's goal was to provide Native American children with the skills needed to become assimilated into "Americanized" society. He proposed a half-day work, half-day school schedule to impart vocational and academic training while instilling practical habits of learning. Pratt's program succeeded because it complemented the United States government's deculturation agenda while catering to the leading ideologies of the late 1800s.

A more probing consideration of factors which may have influenced Pratt's pedagogy begins in Chapter One. This chapter examines two rhetorical theories which were prevalent in nineteenth-century American schools—Scottish Common Sense Realism and Current Traditionalism. This chapter examines
each rhetoric and its major figures while speculating about the factors implicated in the rise and eventual fall of each. Chapter Two moves into a focused consideration of Pratt's military and educational career with special emphasis placed on the founding, curricular developments, and eventual closure of the Carlisle School. The concluding chapter compares materials from chapters one and two, demonstrating ties between nineteenth-century rhetorical movements and Pratt's educational practices. These correlations support the argument that Pratt's instructional approaches were not haphazardly construed; but, rather, were consistent with the rhetorical, educational and ideological climates of his day.
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Introduction

In the triumph and turmoil of the post-Civil War period, the age old "Indian Problem" came to the foreground of United States governmental concerns. After more than a century of conflict with Native American tribes, a new approach to quelling hostilities was proposed—civilize the savages. The plan for civilization was twofold: deculturate the tribes and assimilate them into mainstream, white society. Americanized education was exalted as the vehicle of change that would expedite assimilation efforts. The U. S. Board of Indian Commissioners reported:

As a savage we cannot tolerate [the Indian] any more than as a half-civilized parasite, wanderer, or vagabond. The only alternative left is to fit him by education for civilized life. The Indian, though a simple child of nature with mental faculties dwarfed and shriveled, while groping his way for generations in the darkness of barbarism, already sees the importance of education. (Reyhner History of Indian Education 194)

Thus, the pursuit of systemized, Native American educational programs began. In 1878, Richard Henry Pratt proposed a boarding school experiment which complimented the government's deculturation agenda. Later heralded as the "Red Man's Moses," Pratt emerged as the primary voice on Native American educational issues from the late 1880's until his retirement in 1903.

The Carlisle Indian School became the embodiment of his proposal and served as a model for government boarding school programs. Founded on November 1, 1879, the Carlisle School was the first off-reservation,
government funded boarding school for Native American children. Officials viewed Carlisle as an "educational experiment" to determine the educability of Native Americans when removed from tribal influences.

Pratt's timely educational proposal met the demands of multiple constituencies. Philanthropists perceived efforts to educate Native Americans as the key to transforming "noble savages" into "civilized," productive, United States citizens. Military officials also were growing increasingly concerned over expenses incurred battling plains tribes, while politicians felt a renewed pressure from their supporters to address the continuing "Indian Problem." Education, specifically Pratt's boarding school project, appeared to be the long sought solution to each of these concerns.

Educators promised that academic instruction and industrial training would dramatically metamorphose Native American children into accomplished farmers and factory workers, eager to participate in the body politic--all for a fraction of the price needed to maintain battle wearied U. S. military troops. Pratt's theory that children could be more quickly diverted from tribal ways when removed from family influences distinguished him from other educators. Pratt's charismatic fervor and widespread philanthropic support brought his proposal to the forefront of the assimilation agenda.

Regrettably, Native Americans were not consulted regarding the government's grand educational scheme. This disregard for Native Americans' rights was consistently demonstrated throughout the nineteenth century and beyond. Thousands of Native Americans had been killed in the Indian Wars while others were forced westward as expansionists relentlessly
pressed toward the Pacific Coast. Settlers and prospectors proclaimed it as their "Manifest Destiny" to seize Indian territories, imposing Anglo cultural and religious practices on Native Americans. In the midst of this societal upheaval, many tribes became the victims of broken treaties and were interred on reservations. Reservated Native Americans depended on the government for food due to the virtual extinction of the buffalo and the seizure of century old hunting grounds, forever changing their nomadic patterns of life.

It was to these conquered, starving, disease ridden peoples that Pratt made his initial student recruitment campaign. Pratt visited the Sioux at the Rosebud and Pine Ridge Reservations meeting with Spotted Tail and other tribal leaders. He claimed, "If you, yourself, had education you might be owning the Black Hills . . . Because you were not educated, these mountains, valleys, and streams have passed from you" (Pratt Battlefield 223). As a result, eighty-four Sioux children were among the one hundred and thirty-six pupils enrolled in Carlisle's inaugural class (228). As many as 1,200 students attended the Carlisle Indian School each year until its closure in 1917.

While numerous educators and historians have discussed the plight of Native American educational programs in the 1800s, few have paid systematic attention to the ideologies of school reformers like Pratt. This project proposes to explore Pratt's "ideology" to gain insight into his "understanding and motivation" (Kaestle 124). The term "ideology" will be relegated to uses in keeping with Clifford Geertz's article "Ideology as a Cultural System." He states that ideologies "are, most distinctly, maps of problematic reality and matrices for the creation of collective conscience" (64).
Thus, all people display ideological thinking. This may be manifested through the complexities of evolving governmental legislation, printed personal statements or the "unuttered social beliefs implicit in individuals' actions" (Kaestle 125). Geertz clarified his point by noting, "Whether, in any particular case, the [ideological] map is accurate or the conscience creditable is a separate question" (64). Therefore, comments regarding Pratt's ideology will generally be limited to critiques of his compatibility with nineteenth-century paradigmatic structures rather than judgments of the impropriety of his agenda.

Consequently, this thesis will trace Native American boarding schools back to Pratt and the Carlisle School to examine the educational ideologies at play that ultimately led to the failure of this "educational experiment." Some critical questions remain: What influences led Pratt to his educational theories? How did these influences relate to the "manifest destiny" mentality of the 1800s? Why did Pratt's boarding school experiment appeal to such a broad spectrum of individuals and agencies? It is the objective of this thesis to investigate these questions. This project will examine nineteenth-century rhetorical theories and note how these may have influenced Pratt's ideology and his boarding school experiment. The following chapters will explore these issues by noting correlations between major theoretical movements, nineteenth-century socio-political transformations and Pratt's experiences as an educator.
Chapter One will examine two rhetorical theories which were influential in nineteenth-century American schools—Scottish Common Sense Realism and Current-Traditionalism. This will include consideration of corresponding educational theories and prevalent ideologies that influenced the rise of these rhetorics. Chapter Two will continue by tracing Pratt's military and educational career in relation to governmental legislation regulating Native American education. Emphasis will be placed on the founding, curricular developments and eventual closure of the Carlisle Indian School.

The final chapter will demonstrate ties between Pratt's pedagogy and nineteenth-century theoretical movements. Correlations will demonstrate how his philosophy was touched by a wave of Scottish Common Sense Realism, and his practices toppled by the flood of Current-Traditionalism. Chapter Three will further propose that Pratt's approaches were not haphazardly construed or formed in a vacuum. It will be demonstrated that his views were consistent with the rhetorical, anthropological, educational and political climates of his day. Likewise, the decline of Pratt's popularity will be tied to shifts in the intellectual domain toward a mechanistic, assembly-line mentality.
CHAPTER ONE
The Nature of Rhetoric

In *Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges*, James A. Berlin defined rhetoric as a "social invention... [arising] out of a time and place, a peculiar social context, establishing for a period the conditions that make a peculiar kind of communication possible" (1). A rhetoric is accepted because of its compatibility with the prevailing mood and temperament of an era and changes to accommodate social conditions. Berlin also noted that no rhetoric is permanent nor is it embraced by all peoples at the same time. In fact, multiple rhetorics may be in competition for societal allegiances (ix, 1). This variance adds to the complexity of discussing the prevalent rhetorics of any given age.

All rhetorics are based on conceptions of human nature and reality, the knower and the known, and the nature of language. Rhetorical systems differ in the way each defines these conceptions. Walter J. Ong termed the conceptions underlying a rhetoric as a noetic field. Berlin described this as:

A closed system defining what can, and cannot, be known; the nature of the knower; the nature of the relationship between the knower, the known, and the audience; and the nature of language (*Writing* 2).

Therefore, the noetic field underlying a rhetoric determines how the four rhetorical elements--reality, writer/speaker, audience, and language--are perceived and defined. Established ideas about the nature of these elements
and how they work together create "the codification of the unspeakable as well as the speakable," otherwise known as a rhetorical system. Consequently, rhetoric is at the center of a culture's activities and is ultimately implicated in all a society attempts (Berlin Writing 1,2). Since rhetoric also serves as an indicator of change in a society, careful consideration of nineteenth-century rhetorical movements will help to situate Richard Henry Pratt's position on Native American education and provide an explanation for later disillusionment with his educational theories.

**Nineteenth-Century Rhetorical Movements**

Two major rhetorical movements contributed to the rise and eventual fall of the Carlisle Indian School—Scottish Common Sense Realism and Current-Traditional Rhetoric. Scottish Common Sense Realism flourished in the United States from the beginning of the 1800s through the Civil War period. It was influenced chiefly by the works of Hugh Blair and George Campbell. These rhetoricians maintained a mechanistic view of reality that was positivistic in nature. Current-Traditionalism was strongly influenced by Scottish Common Sense Realism, but relegated its approaches to only the most mechanistic features of Blair and Campbell. Its three major voices included Adams Sherman Hill, Barrett Wendell and John Franklin Genung. Prior to providing an indepth review of these two rhetorics, it seems advantageous to examine the noetic field contributing to the successes of each.

Scottish Common Sense Realism was formed in contentious rebellion to the English educational model which limited studies to classical courses and catered to the well-born, well-bred elite. In the 1800s, American
educational proponents mimicked this trend. This may be attributed to the similarities between eighteenth-century Scotland and the fledgling American nation. First, it is important to recognize the political correlations. Both Scotland and the United States had a history of conflict with England, but Scotland succumbed to English rule. The 1707 Act of Union joined Scotland to England and yielded Scottish political and economic independence (Horner 85). Yet, the Scots fiercely maintained their educational freedom. In contrast to the English model of education, the Scottish approach contained a philosophic and democratic flavor compatible with the United States' socio-political atmosphere and was consistent with views of equality and individualism flourishing in early America.

Second, Scottish universities were rooted in a contentious concern for democratic and humanistic values. This led to a strong liberal arts program designed to cultivate an informed citizenry. Renowned Scottish educator George Jardine noted that education should prepare "young men destined to fill various and very different situations in life" (Horner 88). Unlike the English, Scots did not exclude students seeking non-professional occupations and encouraged even "lower class" citizens to pursue an education. Francis Jeffrey defended this system against criticism from Dr. Ben Johnson asserting, "I think it is a great good on the whole, because it enables relatively large numbers of people to get . . . that knowledge which tends to liberalise and make intelligent the mass of our population" (Horner 87).
The Scottish system attained this goal by providing mass, democratic, liberal education. Students at Edinburgh and Glasgow received exposure to a variety of courses including Newtonian theories, German philosophy, economics and agriculture. This breadth of disciplinary instruction appeared to be indicative of Scottish schools which also were among the first to include studies in medicine and English literature (Horner 86). ¹

Much like the Scots, educators in the United States upheld democratic values by attempting to make education available to all citizens and incorporating liberal studies programs. ² This approach was in keeping with a new emphasis on the "equality of man" and a rising admiration for the "self-made man." These views were intrinsically rooted in Constitutionally based notions of human equality and stemmed from a "republican polity" which valued individual character, personal industry and private ownership of property and businesses (Kaestle 128). American educators perpetuated these beliefs in individualism and equality, owing much of their independent philosophy to eighteenth-century Scottish influences.

Scottish educators had deftly opposed the English system of education and defended the validity of liberal arts instruction rather than classical specialization (Horner 87,88). The Scots also supported "rhetoric, discussion, and writing as a way of learning in conjunction with lectures" (87). In support of rhetorical instruction, one educator further noted, "A man may be capable of great reflection, but if he cannot communicate it to others, it can be of but little use" (88). Consequently, rhetoric retained a central role in the Scottish arts program.
Scottish Common Sense Realism

The Scottish School of Philosophy and the doctrine of "common sense" paved the way for the coming rhetoric, appropriately termed, Scottish Common Sense Realism. Theories of human nature developed by John Locke and David Hume profoundly influenced the Scottish School. Locke had argued that the human mind was a *tabula rasa* or blank slate and could only be developed through experiences with the external world. In this model, the mind was made up of two major faculties, the understanding and the will. The understanding was thought to be cultivated through the associative principle of ideas. Ideas were produced through reflection on sensory experiences. Associations or connections made between new and previous ideas, in turn, produced an understanding of things. Action was produced when the will was compelled to act on a prior understanding. Belief in this process was referenced as a mechanistic faculty psychology because it noted the independent or mechanistic functions of each of the human faculties. Later, David Hartley, author of *Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty, and His Expectations* (1749), added memory, imagination and affection to Locke's list of faculties (Golden 9-11). This expanded list composed the primary faculties of human nature as recognized by Scottish philosophers.

A second epistemological theme influencing eighteenth-century rhetoric was the doctrine of "common sense." Thomas Reid interpreted "common sense" to be a scientific phenomenon that occurred when self-evident laws of nature were recognized and understood (Golden 11, 12).
He felt that these phenomena were trans-cultural, thus providing a point of common judgment between peoples of all nations. These commonalities were noted as "the first-born of reason" and served as the final arbiter of disputes, especially those involving judgment and taste (12).

The rhetoric resulting from a union between the Scottish School of philosophy and the doctrine of "common sense" first impacted the Scottish educational system in the 1700s and, in turn, dominated American educational trends in the 1800s. Scottish Common Sense Realism (SCSR) was derived from this fervor for a philosophically grounded, democratic educational system. This rhetorical movement was uniquely compatible with Scottish, and later American, "economic, religious and even aesthetic experiences" (Berlin Writing 6).

SCSR was based on principles of human nature consistent with the Empirical philosophy of Locke and Hume, and, therefore, was in conscious opposition to Scholasticism (Berlin Writing 20; Golden 9, 10). This rhetoric was mechanical in nature locating reality in the external world (Berlin Writing 62). Reality, in this paradigm, existed in two distinct realms: the spiritual and the material. The spiritual was deemed most important, but transcended discussions. This was due to the belief that perception and understanding of the spiritual were intensely personal, between the individual and God, and existed beyond the language needed for disclosure.

The material realm could be understood through experiences with the world of sensory data. Reality was discovered through observation. This placed particular faith in the senses' response to external stimuli.
Observance of the material world, like the spiritual, was seen as a personal endeavor and held little regard for others' observations. This perspective maintained that ideas were produced from the literal impressions that sensory data made on the mind (Berlin Writing 6,7). Thus, observers gained understanding of the world by making associations between new impressions and past ideas. This mechanistic view was derived from Locke's doctrine of association which enabled reason to unite ideas that may otherwise seem unrelated (Golden 9).

To communicate an idea, the writer or speaker recreated the experience by appealing to an audience's faculties. Clearly recounting all the details of an experience was an essential part of effective communication. This led to an emphasis on style to reproduce the "content of experience in the minds of the audience" (Berlin Writing 8). But instilling an understanding of experience served no purpose without the assurance that associations could be made with prior ideas. Hence, the rational process needed reinforcement through an emotional appeal. Hume suggested that the emotional appeal would initiate action by relating a past "lively idea" with a "present impression." Promoters of SCSR consented to Hume's claim that "reason is and ought to be the slave of the passions" by emphasizing appeals to the senses and faculties (Golden 10). ³ Blair and Campbell thought this was best accomplished through persuasive oratory because it addresses itself to the total person (Berlin Writing 62).
Accordingly, SCSR rejected the syllogism on the grounds that it did not demonstrate or strengthen connections between ideas. The power of inference was declared "a talent given to man by God" which made it possible to determine if perceived associations were coherent (Golden 9). Thus, SCSR consciously opposed Aristotelian logic and deduction in lieu of scientific logic and induction. The experimental and highly personalized nature of induction predicated a rejection of Aristotle's finite number of truths as well as his concepts regarding large universal truths. In the Scottish Common Sense Realist's perspective, truth existed beyond language, apart from the signs used to express it (Berlin Writing 21). Rhetors swayed from classical attempts to communicate truth in exchange for attaining a desired response from the audience. The purpose of written or oral discourse in this model was to appeal to experience in order to gain the assent of the will (8). Supporters of SCSR adhered to Locke's assertion that the will was the "principle determinant of action" (Golden 9, 10). Advocates of SCSR--most notably Hugh Blair and George Campbell--became the controlling voices in eighteenth-century American writing classes.

Hugh Blair

Hugh Blair (1718-1800) was the most popular SCSR rhetor of the seventeenth century. Born in Edinburgh, Blair received his M. A. degree from the University of Edinburgh in 1739 and accepted his first pastorate in 1742. By 1758 his eloquent preaching "won his appointment to the most prestigious pulpit in Scotland, the High Church at St. Giles" (Golden 23). Blair embarked on his teaching career in 1760. Due to the widespread acclaim of his lecture
series, George III named Blair the first Regius Professor of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres at the University of Edinburgh in 1762 (24). The circulation of ill-construed class notes led Blair to publish his lectures on the eve of his retirement in 1783. His text, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, provided a practical guide to rhetoric. It was printed in sixty-two complete editions and fifty-one abridgments during its first century of circulation (140).

In Lecture I, Blair recognized rhetoric as the most highly cultivated art form in the civilized world (Blair 30). This bellettristic bias appealed to the American nationalistic desire to develop a cultural identity and foster a "unique American poetic voice" (Berlin *Writing* 25). Blair's lectures also served as the primary text for American literary studies courses through 1835 due to his inclusion of literary criticism.

On a whole, Blair sought to provide a practical means to propagate rhetorical development. Therefore, his text proved to be more instructional than theoretical in nature. He maintained a firm grounding in SCSR. Blair argued that rhetorical precepts grew for the principles of human nature. He also held to the empirically based assumption that individuals gained understanding through observation and personal experience. Blair's primary contribution to education--using literature to study composition--stemmed from this assumption. Since all understanding was experientially based, a person was unable to properly compose without first reading and understanding the compositions of others. Blair firmly maintained that a student who mastered the "principles of literary criticism . . . [would] have mastered the principles necessary to produce a text" (Berlin *Writing* 8).
In keeping with this perspective, invention existed outside the realm of rhetoric. Blair claimed that invention came only "from a thorough knowledge of the subject, and profound meditation." He further stated, "I am afraid it is beyond the power of art to give any real assistance" with invention (Berlin Writing 26). In fact, Blair offered very few suggestions to enhance the writing process outside of his interest in style.

This obsession with style led Blair to create practical methods for maintaining English "purity". He stressed perspicuity and precision as key issues to attaining an eloquent style (Blair 66). The chapter entitled "Directions for Forming a Style" covered six points on style development. First, familiarity with the subject was essential. Since imitation was not a part of the composing process, prior knowledge was of utmost importance. Next, he prescribed frequent practice in composition. Third, he belabored the necessity of being acquainted with the writings of others. Points four and five warned students not to imitate others' style and admonished them to adapt their style to the audiences' needs. He concluded with a warning not to become engrossed in the issues of style "as to detract from a higher degree of attention to the thoughts" (86).

Blair's pedagogical contributions proved to be more long standing than his instructions on composition. He saw the educator's mission as two fold--to discipline the student through drills and exercises and to give general principles to which the student must strictly adhere. Consequently, Blair emphasized memorizing and translating in the practice of speaking and writing English because "mental discipline" could be strengthened like
muscles through exercise (Berlin Writing 31). His insistence on frequent writing assignments and integration of literature into composition studies dominated approaches to teaching writing in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Blair's practical teachings were profoundly influenced by the theoretical notions of his contemporary and friend, George Campbell.

George Campbell

George Campbell (1719-1796) was born in Scotland and attended Marischal College prior to his ordination in 1746. In 1759 Campbell became Principal of Marischal and was elected Professor of Divinity in 1771. Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric was more theoretically oriented than Blair's text and profoundly influenced his contemporaries. After its publication in 1776, it reached the public through twenty-one major editions (Golden 139, 140).

Campbell saw rhetoric as science, based on a scientific body of principles, grounded in human nature. He recognized "certain principles in our nature, which, when properly addressed and managed, give . . . aid to reason" (Campbell 205). Campbell labeled these four principles or faculties: understanding, imagination, memory and passions. He asserted that an argument must first and foremost be understood by the audience. Information was therefore shaped by the "capacity, education, and attainment of the hearers" (205). When describing imagination, Campbell referenced "those qualities in ideas which gratify fancy, are vivacity, beauty, sublimity, [and] novelty" (206). For an orator's success, the understanding and
imagination had to tap into memory, thus making the necessary associations to produce convictions.

Note that Campbell viewed these faculties as functioning independently of one another. Each had to be influenced by a separate, but equally mechanistic, real world stimuli. So, a speech could not venture into persuasive discourse until the understanding, imagination and memory had been tapped. "If it is fancy which bestows brilliancy on our ideas, if it is memory which gives them stability, passion doth more, it animates them" (210). Campbell made the passions of primary importance to his rhetoric. Discussion of the passions comprised eight of twelve sections in Chapter VII of the *Philosophy of Rhetoric*.

Campbell's mechanistic view noted real world principles which correlated to each of the mental faculties. He then suggested which approaches were best suited to address these various principles. This gave rise to one of the earliest arguments for forms of discourse. "[E]xposition appeal[ed] to the understanding; narration, description, and poetry to imagination; argumentation to reason; and persuasion to all of these, but especially to the emotions and the will" (Berlin Writing 7, 8). He also asserted the value of oral delivery to better influence the emotions and will.

Knowledge was extralingual in this mechanistic faculty psychology. Truth was discovered through careful observation and meaning was located in the sensory experience itself. Consequently, Campbell was consciously opposed to Aristotelian logic, focusing instead "on a 'knowledge of things' gained by examining nature" (Berlin Writing 20). Like Blair, invention was
taken out of Campbell's rhetoric and arrangement was barely addressed. He claimed that rhetoric's primary concern was "with shaping the message discovered outside the composing process so that it had the desired effect on the audience" (21). This "message" could be learned through sensation, memory and imagination, as noted earlier, but could only be reproduced through concrete language (23). This led to his emphasis on style, sprinkling his text with terms like perspicuity, energy, and vivacity (8).

Campbell's concern then moved from conveyance and style to proper usage. He realized usage was a matter of social custom and considered it "under three heads: reputable use, national use, and present use" (Berlin Writing 23). Stressing the need for grammatical purity, Campbell also devoted a section to the woes of barbarisms, solecism and impropriety. Bliss Perry, Professor of English at Harvard from 1907 to 1930, observed that Campbell's "idea of correctness . . . was an impossible and sterile idea; it strove for a correctness which never existed on sea or land" (Brereton 302).

Though not as popular as Blair, the theoretical and psychological nature of Campbell's text laid the groundwork for the coming rhetoric, Current-Traditionalism. In the meantime, Blair and Campbell enjoyed widespread success from the early 1800s through the Civil War period. Their texts were the standard curriculum in American college writing classrooms during this time. Following the war, Samuel P. Newman and Henry Day rose to influence. Berlin recognized these rhetoricians as "American Imitators" of Scottish Realism because their views and practices were so closely aligned with Blair and Campbell's. "The Americans who ventured into the field--
primarily clergymen, since American colleges were run by clergymen—were operating within a pervasive [SCSR] paradigm" (Berlin Writing 35). Still, their texts escorted Scottish Realism into the classroom and played a crucial role in secondary and college level curriculum through the 1880s.

**Scottish Common Sense Realism in America**

The noetic field at the base of SCSR complimented the postbellum academic community by accommodating prevailing societal expectations. Historian Carl F. Kaestle states that the ideology of mid-nineteenth-century America "centered on republicanism, Protestantism, and capitalism"—what he terms "native, Protestant ideology" or traditional, Protestant ideology (127, 128). These three sources of belief were so "intertwined" and "mutually supporting" that, Kaestle assents, "it [is not] useful or accurate to use them as separate sub-headings for areas of belief and conduct" (127). Ironically, those who opposed any feature of this tri-structural ideology were accused of undermining the entire system and, thereby, hastily dismissed.

This "blessed trinity" undergirded ideals of individualism, societal morality, economic prosperity, the supremacy of euroamerican culture, and the "grandeur of American destiny" (Kaestle 128). Conformers to this ideology were "promised meritocracy, education, material progress, and cultural superiority" (134). Kaestle asserts that the "cosmopolitan" strain of this movement advocated "government action to provide schooling that would be more common, more equal, more dedicated to public policy, and therefore more effective in creating cultural and political values of Protestantism,
republicanism, and capitalism" (135). SCSR was cradled snugly beneath these unwritten social mandates.

The interdependent nature of this ideology, and its adherence to Hume's theory of cause and effect, contributed to a reductionist mentality. Empirically based, this view claimed that:

- From the perception of individual things, the mind readily advances to the thought of classes of things: detecting throughout the world resemblances and contrasts, laws and principles, causes and effects; it begins to group things together, to generalize, to discover qualities essential and qualities accidental, to form, in a word, scientific conceptions of things.

  (Berlin Writing 66)

Reductionism resolved that "everything is correctable" if properly submerged in traditional, Protestant culture. Consequently, each problem that stood in the way of America's "manifest destiny" could be resolved through governmental intrusion, adoption of the capitalistic work ethic or a good dose of religion.

The inter-reliance of this system was due to the nature of the supporting noetic field. This common foundation contributed to accentuating likenesses between parties, despite their obvious differences. Kaestle traces the correlations explaining that:
Protestant Christianity favored republicanism, republicanism emphasized individual industry, industry required private property, private property provided opportunity, which spurred initiative, which in turn fueled progress, which demonstrated the superiority of Protestant culture. (134)

Therefore, citizenship, hard work, success, wealth and eternal bliss were proclaimed as part of the chain-reaction promise of traditional, Protestant ideology. This set a precedent for the spirit of national expansionism which sparked the Mexican War, Indian Wars, and heated the flames that led to the Civil War. Many deemed it "the will of God" for the United States to attain control of all of North America. This expansionist mentality was spurred on by a free economy and booming industrial opportunities that situated America as the "New Canaan."

To further illustrate this point, Kaestle quotes from Thomas King's 1850 sermon honoring capitalism (railroad expansion), God and family.

Providence had another and higher use for those iron tracks and flying trains. After the mercantile heart had devised and secured them, God took them for his own purposes; he used them to quicken the activity of men; to multiply cities and villages, studded with churches, dotted with schools and filled with happy homes and budding souls; to increase the wealth which shall partially be devoted to his service. (133)

Ironically, the recitation of these and similar values by preachers, politicians and educators inevitably contributed to the continued marginalization of
Indians, Jews, African-Americans, poor whites and others excluded from this paradigm. The unseen paradox beneath traditional, Protestant ideology was the ongoing exclusion of individuals outside white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant circles. Even those who recognized this paradox often resorted to actions which were culturally biased. Well-intended missionaries, philanthropists and educators stepped in to abolish any racial barriers by stressing the equality of all humanity, then called for mass conformity and cultural assimilation. Supporters of de-culturalization efforts often referred to Lewis Henry Morgan's theory of social evolution to justify rash assimilation efforts.

Morgan was the most recognized anthropologist in late nineteenth-century America. His promotion of social evolution was widely accepted "as the general explanation of human development" (Hoxie 17). This view described the movement of human history from "simplicity to complexity." Morgan taught that "societal development occurred in three stages—savagery, barbarism, and civilization—and that all people could be placed in one of these levels" (17, 18). His theory further intimated that societies who did not advance, would move toward extinction—thus the popularized reference to Indians as the "Vanishing Americans."

While social evolution did not necessitate an inequity among the races, it placed highest value on democratic-capitalistic, "civilized" ideals. Thereby, Native Americans, African Americans, and other members of the underclass were prodded into educational programs designed to speed their advancement up the social evolutionary scale. Educational supporters were compelled to lead those from "underdeveloped" cultures on this treacherous
journey, firmly believing that failed efforts would result in the literal death of an ethnic enclave. Thus, cultural genocide was the salient aim of schools programs for Native American, as well as African American, children.

By the early 1880s, institutions catering to the underclass frequently integrated Calvin Woodward's new theories of manual education. Woodward was a professor at Washington University in St. Louis when he published his theories espousing the use of vocational training to instill habits of learning. He advocated "symmetrical training" which included exposing students to "habits of work and concentration that could be transferred to academic areas" (Hoxie 68). In keeping with the spirit of SCSR, his approach did not negate the value of liberal arts education. In fact, Woodward suggested that a blending of vocational and academic instruction would enhance intellectual endeavors by honing a student's ability to reason or use "common sense." One could speculate that Woodward's theory also influenced programming at Indian schools in the 1880s.

While most institutions continued to offer only vocational or academic tracks (not both), government funded Native American boarding schools found it beneficial to blend the two. The students attended class a portion of the day, then participated in vocational training. During their on-the-job training, students assisted with the daily operational needs of the institution and produced mercantile products sold to help fund programming. This approach to Native American education, proposed and implemented by Richard H. Pratt, was heralded as the key to minority assimilation. Initially implemented at the Carlisle Indian School, it became the model for over
twenty-five off-reservation Native American boarding schools as well as influencing the Hampton school which educated ex-slaves.

However, by the last decade of that century, the popularity of Pratt's "educational experiment" was beginning to wane. Some educators who opposed this system stated that it was unrealistic to provide minorities with any knowledge that did not have direct correlations to manual employment. These argued that even if these students had the capacity to learn, which was widely disputed, they would never be accepted into white-collar positions due to prejudices against the Native American peoples. One opponent of minority education efforts noted, "If you give them so much education, they won't want to pick crops for a living" (Cardenas 380).

As a consequence of this change, William Hailman, Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1894, promised to replace Pratt's holistic approach with a vocationally oriented curriculum. He initiated this project by pledging to replace "schoolroom pedantry" with "really vital work" (Hoxie 180). Yet this re-evaluation of educational programming did not appear to be the result of isolated change. On the contrary, disillusionment with Pratt's idealistic educational views seems to have been indicative of a shift away from traditional, Protestant ideology.

The Fall of Scottish Common Sense Realism

Following the postbellum period, American higher education started to undergo tremendous change. "Most schools began to see themselves as serving the needs of business and industry. Citizens demanded it, students demanded it, and, more important, business leaders--the keepers of the
funds—demanded it" (Berlin Writing 60). Colleges filled positions traditionally held by clergymen with men of affairs. Many of these leaders responded to the needs of a growing economy by catering to a new, scientific world view. Thus, educators began preparing students for this life, rather than the next (58, 59, 61).

These changes in socio-political conditions preceded the shift to Current-Traditional rhetoric. While the new noetic field embraced Scottish realism, it rejected the Scottish educational model in favor of the new German one (Berlin Writing 59). Transition to the new model necessitated a redefinition of purpose and new curriculum. Educators who once stressed mental discipline and breadth of exposure to train the mental faculties now purposed to "individualize and specialize" (Berlin Writing 60, Leupp 121). This approach emphasized an individual's ability to succeed when unhindered by institutional indoctrination and time-consuming course work unrelated to occupational pursuits. The result of this new "job oriented" education was the elective system. Under this system, students had the liberty to select their classes, and could limit academic exposure to areas of personal interest. This contributed to the continuing emphasis on the "meritocracy of middle class professionalism" by combining the individualistic insistence on excellence with the capitalistic demand for numbers (Berlin Rhetoric 36; Writing 60).

The elective system obviously led to the re-negotiation of disciplinary boundaries. Departments were developed to address the sciences and other new areas of study, while the study of rhetoric was sub-divided among
several courses. Berlin noted this move as the "manifestation of the assembly line in education" (Writing 62). Oratory and persuasion were relegated to speech classes, later to be housed in Communication Departments. Creative writing, poetry and other appeals to the imagination and emotion were addressed by the literature division of the English Department. Composition courses addressed the remaining faculties, understanding and reason (Berlin Writing 59-63).

The German model relegated Scottish Common Sense Realists' philosophy into compartmentalized concepts. Once these theories had been reduced to bite-size pieces, they could be antiseptically dissected. That which was deemed excessive was discarded, leaving only a bare mechanism to operate the intricacies of language, writer/speaker and reality. This "bare bones" mentality was at the center of current-traditionalism.

**Current-Traditional Rhetoric**

Current-Traditionalism may be called the first truly American rhetoric. It began at Harvard in 1891 when a Board of Overseers was asked to evaluate the English A course. The Board concluded that Freshmen writing skills were deplorable. These findings were printed in the Harvard Reports and focused on the most obvious surface issues of students' texts: spelling, grammar, usage, and even handwriting (Berlin Writing 61). These reports dramatically shaped conceptions about composing and influenced the texts of Sherman Hill, Barrett Wendell and John Franklin Genung.
Current-Traditional rhetoric, like SCSR, located reality in the external world. Thereby, reality could be discovered and validated through scientific methodologies. In this paradigm, truth was observable and existed "prior to the individuals perception of it" (Berlin Rhetoric 36). Therefore, current-traditionalism, often referred to as the scientistic approach, served as a "rational and empirical appeal" to the appropriate faculty (Berlin Writing 66). It also accepted the mechanistic faculty psychology indicative of SCSR, but "removed ethical and all but the most elementary emotional considerations" from the rhetorical domain (63). Consequently, this approach limited the scope of appeals to the understanding and reason. The highest manifestations of these appeals were found in exposition and argument.

To successfully create an expository or argumentative appeal, the writer was to "rid self of the trappings of culture which distort perceptions" and operate as an objective, detached observer (Berlin Writing 63). This information, collected through inductive methods, was to be reported (not interpreted) in a straight-forward style. Invention, in the Aristotelian sense, did not play a role in composition because science observed rather than invented meaning. The audience was also disregarded. An objective writer should not be swayed from the truth to accommodate the audience. Style was the key to good composition (63, 64).

To attain the correct style, a writer was to recreate an experience through a logical appeal to the appropriate faculty--reason or understanding. "Sign and thing were arbitrarily connected, and the writer's task [was] to select the sign that best captured and contained the thing in-itself"
(Berlin Writing 63). Therefore, "good" style could be summed up as finding the "best" words to match an observed phenomenon.

Barrett Wendell's text, English Composition, best situated the current-traditional emphasis on style. In the Introduction, Wendell allocated Style as the "term which shall express the whole subject under consideration" (3). He further noted, "As critics of style we must not concern ourselves with substance . . . and confine ourselves to considering how [the writer] has expressed it" (x). After relegating all of composition studies to a discussion of style, Wendell addressed the three necessary components of style. These components included: clearness, the text must be understandable; force, the ability to hold one's attention; and elegance, the part of style that pleases taste (193-272). Close attention to style obviously echoed Blair and Campbell's concern for perspicuity and precision. These issues were consistently addressed by A. S. Hill and Genung as well as Wendell. Like the rhetoric of their predecessors, current-traditionalists' preoccupation with style led to the discussion of modes of discourse: narration, description, exposition, and argument.

Ironically, current-traditionalists swayed from Scottish Realist's infatuation with persuasion as the highest form of rhetorical art. Genung recognized persuasion as one of the modes of discourse, then banished it from the rhetorical domain. He claimed that persuasion necessitated "close contact of personal presence" and presupposed a speaker in close proximity to the audience (Berlin Writing 67). This limitation to an oral model excluded
persuasion from Genung's writing based rhetoric. A. S. Hill also dismissed the importance of persuasion by listing it as a sub-class under argument. Meanwhile, Wendell eliminated persuasion and the rest of the modes from his text, choosing instead to focus on the building-blocks of style: words, sentences and paragraphs.

In keeping with the mechanistic, faculty psychology of current-traditionalism, Wendell stated that "words are the names by which good use has agreed that we shall describe ideas" (41). Emulating Campbell, he noted the woes of using Barbarisms and/or Impropriety, then stressed careful consideration of the denotation (thing named) and connotation (thing suggested) of words selected. Next, Wendell defined a sentence as a "series of words so composed as to make good sense" (76). Further elaboration included strict grammatical correctness; principles of Unity, Mass and Cohesion; and, again, the effects of both connotations and denotations. The paragraph was the third structural necessity addressed. Adopting Alexander Bain's position, Wendell claimed, "A paragraph is to a sentence what a sentence is to a word" (120). He stressed maintaining central ideas, placing key points "conspicuously," and the "unmistaken relation of one sentence to the next" (viii).

A. S. Hill and Genung also accentuated the essentials of word, sentence and paragraph construction. The topic of arrangement was central to this discussion. While invention was deemed outside of the composing process, the inventio of management or arrangement was of primary concern to issues of unity and coherence. Practical teachings on arrangement
were included. Students were encouraged to "select a subject, narrow a thesis, make an outline of the essay, write the essay and edit it for correctness" (Berlin Writing 74). This approach relied on an empirical view of rationale to insure the logical order and progression of ideas.

Donald Steward quoted Richard Young's summarization of "the most salient features of current-traditional rhetoric" as:

Emphasis on the composed product rather than the composing process; the analysis of discourse into words, sentences, and paragraphs; the classification of discourse into description, narration, exposition, and argument; the strong concern with usage (syntax, spelling, punctuation) and with style.

("Some History Lessons" 16)

The reductionist tendencies of current-traditionalism were not only telling of changes in college writing classrooms, but positivistic trends in American society. This surge of scientifically and technologically based ideologies had a profound influence on late nineteenth-century educational systems--including government funded, Native American educational programs.
Chapter Two

This Chapter will examine Native American education from 1879 to 1918. Special emphasis will be given to Richard Henry Pratt and his educational philosophy. This will include close attention to the political, social and educational influences which affected the founding of the Carlisle Indian School in 1879. Due to the vital roles played by Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) officials, a chart listing administrations and corresponding legislation can be found in Appendix A, page 114.

In recent years, numerous authors have examined the plight of Native Americans attending the government boarding school system. A variety of aspects have been considered including failed assimilation efforts and socio-political factors influencing these institutions. Notable historians such as Jon Reyhner, Jeanne Eder, Fredrick Hoxie and Francis Leupp have addressed key political and educational figures contributing to the Indian educational system. Yet David Wallace Adams' text, Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928, published in 1995, is one of the most comprehensive resources on off-reservation Indian boarding schools. Wallace provides a thorough consideration of R. H. Pratt, the inception of his Carlisle experiment and also examines anthropological theories prevalent in the nineteenth century.

At the onset of this chapter, it is important to point out that the Carlisle School's opening appears to have been symptomatic of the United States Government's attempts to address the century old "Indian Problem" through
"Americanized" education. Evidence suggests that Pratt’s efforts were overseen by the BIA and were heavily influenced by Congress and the War Department.

**Government Policies**

In 1866, several Native American leaders meeting with Washington officials were given a prophetic glimpse of the future. "The Great Spirit has decreed that nothing will stop this glorious clearing of land and building of cities all over the country" ("World Apart" 14). This proclamation, spoken by Secretary of Interior Columbus Delano, warned of the coming wave of white settlers. What Delano did not foresee was the trail of inhumane government policies, broken treaties and senseless slaughter that would be left in the wake of westward expansion.

After years of vicious fighting, the United States government turned to a more subtle weapon—education. Peace keepers saw themselves as trading education for land (Reyhner *History of Indian Education* 40). Thereby, monies to fund Native American education were designated in treaties and incorporated into annuities. U. S. officials guaranteed tribal leaders that education would bring equality, prosperity and peace. Yet what was promised to insure the salvation of a people necessitated the death of their culture.

The tendency to view education as the solution to tribal/ U. S. governmental conflicts evolved out of previous encounters between Christian missionaries and Native Americans. Education was initially espoused as a civilizing force by Catholics and Protestants. Their evangelical fervor led to
the establishment of numerous schools for Native American children and adults. Missionaries' successes contributed to the government's educational interests. In 1819, Congress passed the Indian Civilization Act providing partial funding to those, including church affiliates, willing to work as educators among the Indians (Reyhner *History of Indian Education* 27). This Act marked the beginning of the government's financial commitment to Native American education.

Finances proved to be a key motivating factor. Through countless conflicts and the loss of both Native American and Anglo lives, the government had discovered that educating Indians was notably more cost effective than fighting them (Dawes 29). Officials felt that "by educating the children of these tribes in the English language . . . differences would [disappear], and civilization would [follow] at once" (Atkins "English Language" 198). This cultural genocide was simple, cost efficient and also more palatable to traditional, Protestant ideologies than perpetuating the mass slaughter of the Indian Wars.

Research suggests that nineteenth-century political generosity toward Native American education often masked the U. S. obsession with westward expansion. Establishment of the trans-continental railroad and telegraph seemed to testify to the taming of the vast frontier. One final obstacle remained--"barbarous" natives. Education was promoted as the ticket to "civility." Yet achieving U. S. "manifest destiny" necessitated not only the civilization of, but also the relocation of eastern tribes. 9
The Bureau's relocation efforts were vindicated by Chief Justice John Marshall. In 1831 Marshall had declared that Native Americans were "in a state of pupilage; their relation to the United States resembled that of a ward to his guardian" (Hoxie 214). Thus, the BIA emerged as counsel and executor overseeing tribal monies, land and other peripheral issues while continuing to serve as negotiator between the U. S. and its "wards." 10

Statesmen of that day rarely, if ever, addressed the complex motivating factors behind the founding of reservation schools. They also appeared to overlook conflicting agendas at work within the BIA—that is, functioning as Indian advocate while operating under the guise of the War Department. Yet some opposing interests apparently were noted. As a result, in 1849, the BIA was passed from the military department to the newly developed Department of Interior. This move made a logical division between the BIA and the War Department, yet the two appear to have continued close collaborations on Native American educational issues until the early 1900s.

In 1867 the Peace Commission, appointed by President Grant, called for what has been interpreted as "cultural, and specifically linguistic, genocide" (Reyhner "History of Indian Education" 41). They suggested that "schools should be established, which [Native American] children should be required to attend; their barbarous dialect should be blotted out and the English language substituted" (Atkins "English Language" 198-99). The Peace Commission proceeded to assert:
Through sameness of language is produced sameness of sentiment and thought; custom and habits are molded and assimilated in the same way, and thus in process of time the differences producing trouble would gradually [be] obliterated.

(Report of the Indian Peace Commission 199)

The government's educational goal was to take native children, subsisting in "blind ignorance, the devotees of abominable superstitions, and the victims of idleness and thriftlessness" and assimilate them into mainstream, white culture (Reyhner "History of Indian Education" 45). Henry Teller, Secretary of Interior, 1882-85, declared that the Indian should be "compelled to enter our civilization whether he will or whether he wills it not" (Hoxie 52). One official further asserted that educators could,

Impress on the minds of the Indians the friendly and benevolent views of the government towards them and the advantages to them if yielded to the policy of the government and cooperating with it in such measures as it may deem necessary for their civilization and happiness. (Layman 123)

Consequently, BIA schools were established to teach Indian children to speak English and to embrace the culture of their "friendly" European conquerors.

These educational and fundamentally ideological debates were often informed by the leading anthropological theorists of that day who "accepted social evolution as the general explanation of human development" (Hoxie 17). Lewis Henry Morgan's categorization of Native Americans as barbarous
thereby justified "the idea that cruel policies such as removal or punitive warfare were unavoidable steps along the road to progress" (18). Government boarding schools, like the proposed Carlisle Indian School, were thus seen as a necessary and inevitable step for Native Americans to avoid extinction by becoming assimilated into "a civilized society."

Due to declining birthrates among tribes and increasing concern among humanitarians for the "Vanishing Americans," Secretary of Interior Carl Schurz asserted that civilizing Native Americans was "an absolute necessity, if we mean to save them" (Hoxie 14). He also mocked earlier calls for civilization or extermination.

The thought of exterminating a race, once the only occupant of the soil upon which so many millions of our own people have grown prosperous and happy, must be revolting to every American who is not devoid of all sentiments of justice and humanity. (14)

Mounting hostilities in the west, including the annihilation of Custer's troops in the 1876 Battle of Little Big Horn, had sparked Schurz's address of the century old dictum, "The only good Indian is a dead Indian" (Pratt Battlefield 134). Yet his attack on extermination sympathizers also served as a ploy to ward off War Department encroachments to regain control of the BIA. In addition, he appeased inter-departmental hostilities by accommodating military officials with his new Civil Service proposal. This proposal provided positions for Army personnel in peace times by integrating them into BIA jobs (Reyhner History of Indian Education 45).
Surviving documentation suggests that the continued interaction between these two governmental branches was mutually beneficial. The War Department wished to maintain a heavy hand in Indian affairs, while the BIA needed an inexpensive work force to serve in remote school settings. Consequently, many BIA school teachers and administrators were "often poorly trained" commissioned military men "fresh from the Indian wars" (Hirschfelder 95). As would follow, most Native American schools were operated on a military model and provided highly disciplined environments to assist in the transformation from "young savages" to civilized Indian-Americans.

The Carlisle Indian School was no exception. Pratt founded the school in the twelfth year of his military commission. His history as a preacher, small town businessman, and army lieutenant brought an interesting blend of experiences to the classroom.

Richard Henry Pratt

R. H. Pratt was born in 1840 in Logansport, Indiana, bordering the western frontier. Following the murder of his father, Pratt left school at the age of thirteen and worked as a "printers devil," later apprenticing as a tinsmith to support his mother and three younger brothers (Utley ix). He also had strong religious convictions and was ordained by the Presbyterian church.

In 1861 Pratt was drafted to serve in the Civil War. Following four years of conflict, he settled back in Logansport with his wife, Anna Laura Mason (Hoxie 54). After two years of financial frustrations, twenty-seven-year-old Pratt closed his failing hardware store and joined the army. He was commissioned to the western frontier as Second Lieutenant to
the Tenth United States Calvary—a "newly organized regiment composed of Negro enlisted men with white officers" (Utley x). Pratt's association with the Presbyterian church may have influenced his commission. It appeared that men with religious or philanthropic ties were most frequently placed in charge of minority troops due to their presumed civil sensibilities.

For the next eight years Pratt served in Indian Territory and Texas battling various Native American tribes, eventually contributing to the collapse of the Southern Plains tribes. Pratt was involved in a number of campaigns and smaller skirmishes, during which his superiors noted that he could deftly organize and deploy allied Indians scouts (Hoxie 54; Utley xi). Pratt's battlefield career ended in 1875 when he was selected to accompany seventy-two Kiowas, Comanches and Cheyennes—ringleaders of the Red River war fighting—to Fort Marion in St. Augustine, Florida (Fritz 164, Hoxie 54). These warriors were to be held as prisoners of war for an undetermined period of time.

**Fort Marion**

The time Pratt spent with the prisoners in St. Augustine played a major role in the development of his pedagogy. In fact, there is evidence to suggest that Pratt's educational theories were formulated around his experiences at Fort Marion.

After their arrival on May 21, 1875, the following months in Florida proved to be difficult for both the prisoners and Pratt. Initially, aid was commissioned from nearby St. Francis Barracks. These infantrymen guarded the Native Americans and were apparently very cruel and irresponsible. The
guards limited prisoners to a small, boarded-up area at the center of the fort, kept them in shackles, and deprived them of shelter from the Florida sun "so that their only view was up toward the sky" (R. H. Pratt Battlefield 117-18).

The tremendous heat and humidity coupled with limited movement proved to be a hotbed for disease and depression. 11 Pratt reacted to this harsh treatment, providing suitable quarters, U. S. military uniforms and a hair cut for his prisoners. 12

Following this incident, Pratt seemed to become more aware of his liberties as warden. Originally, Pratt's orders had been vague. He was simply "instructed to oversee the incarceration of the Indians" (D. W. Adams 39). In time, he began to realize the freedom he enjoyed in the absence of any direct supervision from military superiors. In light of the leniency extended to him, Pratt gave in to a nagging idea—he would attempt to civilize his savage prisoners.

First, Pratt developed a program whereby select prisoners served as guards rather than relying on Infantry recruits. Native American guards proved to be more dependable and much more effective with fellow prisoners. As a result, the U. S. soldiers were soon relinquished of their duties and replaced by fifty inmates who guarded themselves without any "material mishaps" during their incarceration (Pratt Battlefield 118-120).

Next, Pratt instituted a training program for the prisoners following a military regimentation. They quickly acquired the skills taught. It seemed that the expediency with which they learned these duties may have served as a
springboard for Pratt to pursue more intellectually stimulating forms of instruction. Later, community volunteers began teaching English; then they progressed to teaching a variety of subjects including basic math, geography and debate. In return, the Native Americans taught archery and demonstrated tribal culture through drawings and dance exhibitions.

Pratt expanded this prison experiment by encouraging local merchants to employ his prisoners. He proposed that the work would help the Indians pass their time in captivity. These "civilized warriors" polished sea pearls and strung beads for minimal wages. Monies earned could be spent at local shops or placed in individual savings accounts which had been opened by Pratt to help foster the ideals of capitalism. "Soon the Indians were making canes and bows and arrows, painting scenes of traditional Indian life, and receiving the full amount when items were sold" (D. W. Adams 41).

By the second year of captivity, prisoners were hired out as orange pickers, baggage handlers and horse trainers. Pratt taught that with obedience came freedom and felt that the work program exhibited his teaching. An editorial letter, printed in the New York Daily Tribune, agreed. "Captain Pratt's success is due to the fact that he has taught these Indians to obey; that he has encouraged them to labor; he has given them, in its best sense, a Christian school" (Pratt Battlefield 164).

Subsequently, the Indians, clad in neatly pressed military uniforms, became a familiar sight to the residents of St. Augustine. Numerous tourists also visited the fort to watch the prisoners perform well-timed military drills and examined other aspects of Pratt's experiment. Thereby, the Native
Americans not only added to the local economy, but became a notable addition to the community. The prisoners even gained special recognition from the Mayor for helping exterminate a raging fire which had threatened the downtown area.

After three years of imprisonment the warriors were released to return home. Seventeen of Pratt's "noble savages" instead chose to attend the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute near Old Point Comfort, Virginia (Evelyn Adams 52). Pratt accompanied the prospective students from St. Augustine and spent three months observing and participating in the school's programs. The Hampton Institute had been founded in 1868 by General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, a Congregationalist minister who had also commanded minority troops. Armstrong's intent was to provide practical education for ex-slaves. The school was based on an "industrial model which gave black children [an] ... 'education for life'" (Reyhner History of Indian Education 71).

Exposure to these formal educational efforts "heightened [Pratt's] evangelical view of his work" and bolstered his educational theory that Indians could be taught as easily as white or black men. It is important to note that if Pratt had "interpreted his orders narrowly, the Fort Marion affair might have simply become an interesting but minor incident in the story of Indian-white relations" (D. W. Adams 39). Instead, this bold experiment gained the attention of a nation and situated Pratt as the "singlemost important figure on the Indian education scene" for the next twenty-five years (51). Plus, the programs implemented at Fort Marion became the framework
around which boarding schools’ curriculums would later be structured. Indeed, Pratt's “idea” gave birth to formal, off-reservation, Native American educational efforts.

Meanwhile, skeptics were doubtful of Pratt's progress with the tribesmen at St. Augustine, questioning an "Indian's ability to throw off the trappings of savagery and absorb the teachings of the white man" (Utley xii). Others questioned the validity of a pedagogy developed while in charge of Indian prisoners and mockingly jested that Pratt had stumbled upon his educational theory of Native American educability (Evelyn Adams 51).

**Pratt’s Response to Opposition and Government Policies**

Due to "Pratt's uncompromising nature and his tendency to adhere to absolutes," he had "nothing but disdain for those who criticized his methods" (D. W. Adams 51). During his service on the battlefield, Captain Pratt had seen first hand the confusion and conflict caused by poorly implemented government policies. He sharply criticized the "scant and lax methods" of "politically appointed superiors, ignorant of Indians and what was best for them" (Pratt *Battlefield* 179). Many other military officials shared Pratt's disdain for the bureaucratic "Indian system." In a meeting with Pratt, General Sherman confessed, "Most of our dangerous duty on the frontier in suppressing Indians was forced upon us by the maladministration of these incompetents" (240).

Pratt's text, *Battlefield and Classroom*, listed numerous indictments against government officials and their sightless policies. He recalled situations where Indian beef rations were diseased, annuities were
mismanaged and funds were misappropriated. Pratt was also one of the few men who questioned the duplicity of roles—supreme conqueror verses benevolent guardian—played by the U. S. government.

The dual system of civil and military control over the Indians was full of vexatious complications and lack of harmony. The army was witness that the government through its Indian Bureau was sadly lacking in keeping its treaty obligations, which goaded the Indians to rebel against being reservated . . . plainly portending disaster to them, for the white man's advantage. (31)

Insightfully sympathetic to the plight of Native Americans, Pratt observed, "It was perfectly human for the Indians to attempt to maintain their freedom [by fighting] . . . when it was the only door of escape available." He further exonerated warring tribes and military officials by claiming, "The responsibility for what happened was therefore not on the aggressive or resisting units, but in the quality of government supervision which precipitated the conflicts" (33). Thus, blame for the injustices of the Indian Wars, removal, and reservation system was placed on the heads of nameless faces in a self-perpetuating, bureaucratic hierarchy.

Pratt vocally opposed all government policies that supported tribal systems. This included hostility toward the reservation system, reservation schools and the government's recognition of tribes as independent nations. The "reservation system worked at 'colonizing' Indians," whereas Pratt would work to "individualize them" (D. W. Adams 53). Therefore, he assertively promoted the Americanization of each Indian. Pratt claimed that his efforts
were rooted at the heart of the democratic system—the Declaration of Independence. He stated that the self-evident truths, "'that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights' . . . meant nothing unless it included the native Indians" (Battlefield 268).

Pratt's plan to "include" Native Americans incorporated providing off-reservation educational opportunities with granting United States citizenship to all tribal members. He contended that this would bring Indians into contact with euroamericans, thus speeding their desire to "change from aboriginal to civilized life" (Battlefield 269). Pratt's ultimate goal was to see Native Americans scattered among white communities and assimilated into the dominant culture.

Pratt consistently condemned Indian officials for ignorantly imposing "what they felt was best" on Native Americans. Yet, paradoxically, he never questioned his own ability to do so. An obvious product of traditional, Protestant ideologies, Pratt concluded that his approach provided the only feasible answer to the vexing Indian problem. He fought desperately to see these plans were carried out, recognizing the Carlisle classroom as his battlefield. In a letter to President Rutherford B. Hayes, Pratt wrote:

I know I am at this time 'fighting' a greater number of 'the enemies of civilization' than the whole of my regiment put together, and I know further that I am fighting them with a thousand times more hopes of success. . . Here a Lieutenant
struggles to evolve order out of a chaos of fourteen different Indian languages! Civilization out of savagery! Cleanliness out of filth . . . and see that all the interests of his government and the Indian as well are properly protected and served. (Battlefield 251)

In this last, great Indian War, Pratt was coming for the children (D. W. Adams 333).

**Founding Carlisle**

In the Spring of 1879 he initiated this plan by meeting with Washington officials and requesting the use of the abandoned barracks at Carlisle, Pennsylvania to house the school. Secretary of Interior, Carl Schurz, was supportive of Pratt's educational experiment "to test the feasibility of educating Indians in boarding schools located far from tribal and parental influences" (Hirschfelder 95). Secretary Schurz worked in cooperation with Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Ezra A. Hyat, and Secretary of War, G. W. McCrary, to secure use of the barracks and funding for Pratt's project. 14

Pratt's timely appeal for the establishment of an off-reservation boarding school not only complemented Schurz's personal conviction that Indians could be educated, it also accommodated War Department concerns. First, it did so by placing a military officer in charge of the project. Second, officials noted that the children's presence in the east would guarantee the good behavior of their families (Pratt Battlefield 220). Pratt's appeal also opened the door for the 1882 government authorization approving the use of
abandoned military forts and stockades for schools, as well as the continued commission of military officers as teachers and administrators (Hirschfelder 95).

By slightly revising the phrase "the only good Indian is a dead Indian," Pratt's motto for Native American education became: "Kill the Indian in him and save the man" (R. H. Pratt "Advantages of Mingling" 35). "He [had] convinced [his fellow countrymen] that different skin color and different cultural background did not automatically produce an inferior being" (Utley xvii). According to Pratt's memoirs, he also believed that the only differences between Native Americans and whites were the civilizing forces that he felt were innate to education.

Further, Pratt claimed that complete assimilation of Native American children was only possible if they were devoid of tribal influences and "environed . . . in the best things of our civilization" (R. H. Pratt Battlefield 213). At the 1883 Baptist World Convention the pulpit chairman jokingly noted that although Pratt was not Baptist, "In Indian matters he is a good enough Baptist for us to listen to." Pratt, an ordained Presbyterian, began by replying, "In Indian civilization I am a Baptist, because I believe in immersing the Indians in our culture and when we get them under, holding them there until they are thoroughly soaked" (335). He set out determined to accomplish this task.

After another meeting with Commissioner Hayt, Pratt was directed to recruit 120 students, seventy-two of whom were to be acquired from the discontented branches of the Sioux Indians at the Rosebud and Pine Ridge Agencies. Pratt objected to being sent to these hostile factions who had "not
yet taken up the school idea"; but Hayt "was insistent that [he] must go to Spotted Tail and Red Cloud, because the children would be hostages for the good behavior of their people" (Pratt Battlefield 220). 15

On his first recruiting trip, Pratt reported to have traveled nearly 1,000 miles by train and boat, enduring the final 100 miles to the Rosebud reservation in a two-seated spring wagon (Battlefield 220-222). There he met with the leading chiefs and requested their cooperation with government educational efforts. Pratt debated with Spotted Tail, stating, "You signed that [treaty], knowing only what the interpreter told you it said . . . Because you were not educated . . . [the Black Hills] have passed from you" (223). After assuring his loyalty and friendship to the tribal leaders, the chieftains encouraged sixty-six children to return with Pratt.

At Pine Ridge another sixteen children committed to attend the school and two others "sneaked aboard" the Missouri river boat that transported the children. This brought the total to eighty-four Sioux children in Carlisle's inaugural class of 136 pupils from four tribes. Pratt reported that the Sioux responded in a celebratory mode, sending their children adorned in their finest clothing and giving gifts to their envoys as well as fellow tribal members (Battlefield 224-29).

Students' First Weeks at Carlisle

When the train arrived in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, the Indians were greeted by throngs of onlookers eager to see the "young savages." The New York Daily Tribune reported that the incoming pupils were as foreign "to the ways of civilization as so many freshly captured wolves" (D. W. Adams 49).
After the children were marched through town to their new home, the Carlisle Indian School, they were superficially "transformed" from their tribal ways. Boys were provided U. S. military uniforms and their hair was cut, while girls were given "proper" dresses and their previous "Indian" clothing destroyed. Students were then given "Americanized" names to replace those given by their families. These were selected from either the girl's or boy's list on the black-board (American Experience; Standing Bear). This outward transformation was captured by before and after photographs which were widely circulated as a testimonial of Pratt's successes. By the end of the first academic year, Pratt's "immersion technique" was viewed as a huge success. The Board of Indian Commissioners enthusiastically supported these efforts, stating:

The progress of the pupils in the industrial boarding schools is far greater than in day schools. The children being removed from the idle and corrupting habits of savage homes are more easily led to adopt customs of civilized life and inspired with a desire to learn. (Reyhner History of Indian Education 46)

This added an aura of validity to Pratt's claim that "Indians were like other people and could be as easily educated and developed industrially" (Pratt Battlefield 214). Homer Price, Commissioner of Indian Affairs during the Teller incumbency, was very impressed with Pratt's de-culturalization efforts (Prucha Americanizing 295). He claimed that,
... some time in the near future ... with the aid of such industrial, agricultural, and mechanical [boarding] schools as [are] now being carried on, the Indian will be able to care for himself, and be no longer a burden ... to the Government. (Hoxie 59)

**School Days**

Carlisle students entered a completely foreign environment. In an attempt to counter Native American nomadic lifestyles, they were placed on highly regimented, military schedules. Some educators believed that introducing the children to "habits of discipline" structured to compliment the "American work ethic" would transform them into "socially productive citizens." Consequently, students awoke to trumpet reveille at 6:00 AM and proceeded through a tightly scheduled day of chores, classes, calisthenics and religious services. The curriculum included math, sciences, history and an emphasis in English. Vocational training varied from tinsmithing (which Pratt taught), to sewing, and included periodical instruction from visiting professors in fields such as electricity and chemistry.

Pratt was so pleased with the students' progress in the various subjects and vocations that he encouraged officials to open other boarding schools following his half day of academics, half day of work, schedule. In 1883, eighteen off-reservation boarding schools had been opened. By the turn of the century, over one-third of the 17,708 students in Indian boarding schools were attending campuses modeled after Pratt's Carlisle programs (D. W. Adams 55, 57).
These educational efforts were proclaimed as the "means, above all others, [by which] the Indians would be turned into patriotic Americans" (Prucha Americanizing 191). Encouraging Native Americans to become active citizens was a far cry from the 1818 House Committee on Appropriations dictum that "either . . . those sons of the forest should be moralized or exterminated" (Hirschfelder 94). This devaluing of Native American cultures pervaded the political and educational atmosphere and informed approaches to literacy instruction at government boarding schools, including Carlisle. "Above all, Pratt sought to equip the children with an ability to speak, read, and write the English language, for this was the most vital prerequisite to a satisfactory adjustment to the white man's world" (Utely xiii).

**English Education**

Carlisle came to strictly abide by an English Only policy. Earlier, however, Pratt's memoirs imply that he had indulged in various forms of bilingual instruction. He hired an interpreter from the Rosebud Reservation to assist the students and himself with the awkward silences encountered during the first months at Carlisle (Pratt Battlefield 200-229). Commissioner of Indian Affairs, J. D. C. Atkins, deemed such accommodations inappropriate, expressing his disapproval of any catering to tribal languages. Atkins based this assertion on the 1880 Indian Bureau's regulation stating that, "All instruction must be in English . . . and the conversations of and communications between pupils and with the teacher must be, as far as possible, in English" (Atkins "English Language" 199). Thus, English instruction was placed at the center of Indian school curriculum.
Mandatory use of the English language also served as the driving force behind a cultural "wedge" intended to separate Native Americans from their ancestral ties. Indians were viewed as "a savage people speaking [a] strange jargon that [settlers] did not understand" (Dawes 25). Therefore, overcoming the language barrier was seen as a primary factor for Native American assimilation into mainstream society. Even reform sympathizer William Strong advised that Indians "should not maintain their own language" (39). Views on English language proficiency may be summarized best by Commissioner Atkins when he asserted,

> Every nation is jealous of its own language, and no nation ought to be more so than ours, which approaches nearer than any other nationality to perfect protection of its people. True Americans all feel that the Constitution, laws, and institutions of the United States, in their adaptation to the wants and requirements of man, are superior to those of any other country; and they should understand that by the spread of the English language will these laws and institutions be more firmly established and widely disseminated. Nothing so surely and perfectly stamps upon an individual a national characteristic as language. (Atkins Annual Report xxi-xxiii)

Because of widespread acceptance of this ethnocentric view, it became "a matter not only of importance, but of necessity that the Indians acquire the English language as rapidly as possible" (Atkins "English Language" 200).
Atkins proceeded to clarify that "the main purpose of educating [Native Americans was] to enable them to read, write, and speak the English language" (200).

Ironically, the BIA's English Only mandate was in conflict with nineteenth century educational research. Secretary Schurz had been notified that Alfred L. Riggs, a successful administrator, was "of the opinion that first teaching the child to read and write in their own language enables them to master English with more ease" (Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners 77). Nevertheless, in 1886, Commissioner Atkins reiterated that students "should be taught the English language only" threatening the withdrawal of federal financial support and the removal of Indian students from offending institutions. This measure went one step further to forbid giving "instructions" in the student's native tongue (Atkins "English Language" 189-91).

Under these more extreme regulations students who were caught conversing, singing or storytelling in any language other than English were chastised. Sometimes this punishment included public humiliation (the most abhorrent form of retribution among some tribes) or whippings (Reyhner History of Indian Education 10). One student recalled "getting a stroke of a leather strap with holes in it" every time he spoke "Indian" (50). Pratt's approach to discipline may have differed from traditional corporal forms (Battlefield 244; D. W. Adams 141).

Pratt's memoirs noted that the students took pride in being able to endure great pain. Therefore, Pratt found it more effective to embarrass or publicly humiliate students who had broken campus regulations.
He held Saturday night meetings that facilitated his system. At the beginning of each meeting, students who had spoken "Indian" were to stand and confess their offenses (Standing Bear). Under extreme duress, one young woman could not bear carrying her offense until the appointed time. She wrote:

Dear Sir Capt. Pratt:

I write this letter with much sorrow to tell you that I have spoken one Indian word. I will tell you how it happened: yesterday . . . before I knew what I was saying I found that had spoken one [Sioux] word, and I felt so sorry that I could not eat my supper . . . and the tears rolled down my cheeks. I tried very hard to speak only English. --Nellie Robertson

(D. W. Adams 141)

Although Pratt's Saturday night meeting served as a confessional, it was originally designed to help develop facility in English. At these meetings students would answer prompts with phrases they had memorized in class. For example: Pratt, "How shall we solve the Indian problem?" Assembly, "Abolish the reservation system! Abolish the reservation system!" Then Pratt or another Carlisle affiliate would deliver a speech to coincide with the slogan memorized (Gilcrest 52, 53).

The meetings may have had some affect on students' oral English skills; but, it is more likely that the ideologies inherent to the memorized slogans or imbedded within the evening's sermon had a greater influence on
the students. Propaganda of this nature laced many of Carlisle's programs, from the Saturday night meetings to the school motto: "God helps those who help themselves" (Pratt *Battlefield 323*).

In light of the "civilizing forces" at work within this system, some "students' uncanny ability to dutifully go through the motions of compliance while inwardly resisting" was particularly unnerving to educators (D. W. Adams 231). Estelle Brown, a teacher at Crow Creek, described her Indian students as "mute, graven images." Although she could overlook her own "inability to understand their mentality," she was "unable to cope with their refusal to respond to my efforts" (D. W. Adams 231). The children's "muteness" seemed to have embodied their refusal of Americanized education.

Seemingly unaware of any flaws within his pedagogy, Pratt continued constructing programs "guaranteed" to assimilate his students. The Outing Program was one of his favorite creations. It was designed to further enhance students' English skills while introducing them to euroamerican home life.

**The Outing Program**

The outing program placed Carlisle students in the homes of local families during holidays and summers. Many of these families were Amish and operated small farms. Pratt required that prospective host homes submit both application and references to qualify for a student placement. Once placed, students worked for minimal wages plus room and board. They were allowed to spend a small percentage of their earnings and the rest were
placed in individual bank accounts to be withdrawn upon graduation from Carlisle (Standing Bear).

Rationale for this program was provided by Pratt's philosophy that Native Americans must be separated from their cultural ways to become civilized. He attempted to keep children away from their families for spans as long as three years. Pratt felt sure that exposure to typical American households would squelch the children's desires to return to the reservation—or go "back to the blanket."

This innovative program also assured opportunities for students to utilize skills acquired in Carlisle's vocational classes and introduced them to the "capitalistic work ethic." Secretary Schurz supported Pratt's outing system, stressing the necessity of placing Native American children:

In immediate contact with the towns, farms, and factories of civilized people, living and working in the atmosphere of civilization . . . [where] there are various shops and . . . [farms] for the instruction of the boys, and the girls are kept busy in the kitchen, dining-room, sewing-room, and with other domestic work. (Hoxie 19)

Indian Reform Movement advocate William Strong further asserted that through programs of this nature, Indian children would adapt to "the trades and employments of civilized life . . . [and] the Indian problem would be solved" (41). This rampant optimism undergirded Pratt's outing program. These "successful" integration attempts were heralded as the means by which each Native American could learn "to stand on his own" (Dawes 29).
Yet, the outing system served a multiplicity of less innocuous purposes, most of which benefited white families at the expense of Native American students. First, area farming profited because these placements provided the community with an inexpensive labor force. This greatly contributed to the local economy. Student workers supplied excellent short-term laborers, especially during planting and harvesting seasons.

Next, the successful nature of this program insured additional visibility for and promotion of the Carlisle school. Temporary infiltration of capable Native American youth into local communities appeared to vindicate Pratt's educational theories proving that Indians could be educated and "cease being a disturbing element in society" (Schurz 15). Pratt received local, state, and national attention applauding his outing system, thereby promoting his educational experiment.

On one hand, Pratt's utilization of child labor was abhorrent. On the other hand, child labor laws had not been passed and Pratt's operation appeared to have been self-sustaining rather than profit-oriented. In fact, the Fair Labor Standards Act, regulating child labor practices, was not passed until 1938. This was following two earlier Supreme Court rejections of laws regulating child labor—in 1918 and 1922. Yet, issues regarding child labor practices were only one drawback to Pratt's program.

The outing system's most detrimental influence may have been the deculturalization of Native American students. Pratt's memoirs suggest that his program was intended to serve as a chasm between Carlisle students and their heritage. Therefore, students were separated from any semblance of
their ancestral ties. Supporters of de-culturalization efforts again referred to Morgan's theory of social evolution to justify investments in the individual Native American while despising their "savage" culture.

While addressing the Lake Mohonk Conference, an Indian rights gathering, William Strong also promoted the physiological separation of Native Americans from tribal associations. Strong stated,

I am one of those who think it desirable that the Indians should be dispersed or diffused throughout our population; that they should not be preserved on reservations . . . but be brought into contact with the better portions of our communities . . . where they might be brought under good influences, and ultimately Americanized. (Hoxie 39)

Despite the practicality of Pratt's outing program and lengthy exposure to euroamerican values, many Carlisle graduates wished to return to distant reservations to live with their families.

Caught Between Two Worlds

Jobs on the reservations were scarce, so the returning tribal member often faced a life much like the one prior to departure, with one exception. Children away at boarding school missed out on years of training in skills valued by their tribe. One chief stated that students returning from the white man's school could not track game, fight or understand proper behavioral expectations. Navigating this difference was immensely difficult--few succeeded. The majority of students ended up caught between two worlds.
Upon returning home, one Iroquois student was halted by these words: "What have we here? You are neither a white man nor an Indian. For heaven's sake, tell us, what are you?" ("World Apart" 14). Most returnees were warmly welcomed back into their families, but struggled to find employment where they could use their trade school or academic training. Other students rejected tribal ways and were ashamed of how their families lived--some even refused to speak in their native tongue. Well educated with few options, Carlisle graduates were often rejected in a predominately Anglo society and unfitted for life with their families.

**Collapse of Holistic Educational Approach**

Skepticism flourishes when Pratt's de-culturalization efforts appeared to be failing. Graduates from the Carlisle School frequently returned to their reservations and "went back to the blanket" (Oswalt 578). Pratt's philosophical fall from favor was countered by stronger, more opinionated BIA officials. Administrators such as John H. Oberly, Thomas J. Morgan and William N. Hailman developed their own educational proposals to address the continuing Indian problem. They also had the power to impose these programs on Indian schools across the country. These new pedagogies impacted issues that ranged from filling empty dormitories to regulating classroom curriculum.
Maintaining Enrollment Quotas

Multiple factors contributed to the vast numbers of students channeled into boarding schools in the late 1880s and early 1890's. Several include: 1) government legislation demanding compulsory school attendance of Native American children; 2) laws permitting the withholding of rations to gain consent from parents for children to attend boarding schools; 3) per student school funding; and 4) little regulation of boarding school recruitment efforts.

In 1892 compulsory attendance requirements were approved giving Indian agents the "right" to accost Native American children. Naturally, families hid their children from these empowered truant officers. To counter parents' unwillingness to comply with the national mandate, an 1893 Act was passed that approved the withholding of food rations to gain consent from parents opposed to relinquishing custody of school age children (Hirschfelder 96). Competition for the relatively small numbers of available children was often fierce. This was further complicated by "per-capita funding" incentives.

Young Indians were sought out, captured, placed in wagons or on trains and shipped to the school of their reservation agents choosing. This created a trail of horrors and hatred between Native Americans and the salvation promised them through education. Families that continued to conceal children were literally starved. Heinous crimes against these impoverished peoples flourished under the guise of educational enhancement until the 1893 Act was repealed on August, 15, of the following year (Hirschfelder 96).
Due to these rash abuses, Congress outlawed the withholding of rations and prohibited sending students out of state without parental consent. Yet many institutions relied on deceitful tactics to boost attendance. These may have resulted from corruption rampant in the BIA, compulsory attendance legislation and limited available funding. The competitive nature created by government policies may be best exemplified by a Sioux father who asked a missionary teacher: "How much will you give me if I let my boy go to your school? That other teacher says he will give me an overcoat!" (Leupp 131).

It appeared that Pratt rejected deceitful recruitment tactics. Instead, Pratt recruited students by sending junior administrators or teachers accompanied by older Carlisle students to western reservations. Subsequently, the Carlisle School had more than ample numbers to secure government subsidies. This was probably due to the nation-wide prestige gained by Pratt's pilot project. As early as 1890 over 1,000 students were being educated in the old army barracks, the majority of whom were elite, tribal leaders' children.

**New Curriculum**

In-spite of Carlisle's high visibility, approval of Pratt's efforts waned in support of a more vocationally oriented curriculum. Initiation of these programs began as early as 1888 under the Cleveland administration. Commissioner of Indian Affairs, John Oberly proposed that boarding schools be constructed on reservations. These were to follow Pratt's half day class, half day work schedule. Oberly also requested that a special series of
textbooks be devised by Indian office experts for use in this national system. Incumbent President Benjamin Harrison then selected an educational expert, Thomas Jefferson Morgan, to serve as Commissioner and enact Oberly's plans.

Contrary to Harrison's expectations, Morgan dramatically amended Oberly's proposal. In 1891, Morgan instituted his own educational agenda which promoted public school integration. Additional per-capita funding was promised to schools willing to accommodate Native American students, provided that fair and equal treatment be guaranteed. Morgan's Superintendent, Reverend Daniel Dorchester, pushed for the 1892 and 1893 compulsory attendance acts to insure that Indians attended these predominately white schools. This produced the rash recruitment tactics which plagued Indian families.

Turmoil of this nature continued as BIA administrators often disagreed on the methodological approaches best fitted to speed assimilation efforts. Programs also lacked a cohesion of vision as each successive Commissioner enacted his own idealized curricular plan. This placed Native American educational policies in a state of perpetual flux until the emergence of a self-perpetuated, bureaucratic system. This foundling bureaucracy rose to power in the late 1890s under the McKinley administration. Led by Commissioner of Indian Affairs, W. A. Jones, and Indian School Superintendent, William N. Hailman, national school reform programs promised to replace "schoolroom pedantry" with "really vital work" (Hoxie 190).

Roosevelt followed McKinley in 1901, selecting Jones to serve another four-year term as Commissioner. Jones announced, "the groundwork of all
instruction in Indian schools is the systematic inculcation of the principles of work." Estelle Reel, who had assumed the responsibilities of Superintendent in 1898, produced a new curriculum which "infused academic coursework with practical, job-related applications" (Adams 315). Thereby, commitment to vocationally oriented programming came to the forefront of instructional concerns. *Outlook* magazine chastised past government officials for exposing Native American children to "the same sort of book education . . . as [was] set before white children" (Hoxie 194). Reel's programming accommodated these ethnocentric views. Yet, her curriculum so drastically amended previous plans that Thomas Morgan attacked her program as a "discredit to the whole Indian school system" (197).

Despite the efforts of earlier "liberal educators" like Pratt, who supported a more holistic approach to Native American instruction, by 1902 instruction of Native American students in literature or the arts was seen as "seed sown on stony ground" (194). The Carlisle school "no longer worked to transform the children who arrived there," but began concentrating educational efforts only on English literacy instruction and the training of farmers and factory workers (Hoxie 194; Fritz 164-166).

During Roosevelt's second term, he appointed Francis E. Leupp as the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs and Reel was reinstated for one final term as Superintendent. Leupp joined Reel's vocational crusade with one profound philosophical difference. In his first *Annual Report*, Leupp "attacked believers in racial equality" (Hoxie 198). He concluded that minorities were hereditarily inferior, claiming "Nature's Work" had placed the white man as
"lord" over other races. Psychologist G. Stanley Hall perpetuated these bigoted assertions by contrasting the races to life cycles, noting "some races never mature" (199).

Leupp's motto for Native American education was "individualize and specialize," creating an assembly-line mentality in government funded Native American schools. Leupp jeered,

Now, if anyone can show me what advantage will come to this large body of manual workers from being able to reel off the names of the mountains in Asia, or extract the cube root of 123456789, I shall be deeply grateful. (D. W. Adams 315)

Native Americans were viewed as only needing enough English education to read local newspapers or understand property contracts and enough math to avoid being cheated by grain dealers or store owners.

Incoming officials such as Cato Sells and Harvey Pearis built on the ideological foundations of their predecessors. Thereby, a complex bureaucracy matured, nurtured by an intermingling of political and educational agendas. Consequently, "by 1916 all but a few select schools followed a curriculum divided into four levels--primary, prevocational, junior vocational, and senior vocational" (D. W. Adams 315).

By the time it was closed in 1918 to be used as an Army "rehabilitation program for veterans of World War I," the Carlisle Indian School had evolved into a trade school specifically chartered to "prepare students for the mechanical trades and apprentice them to Ford Motor Company" (Evelyn Adams 53, Hoxie 204). These drastic changes in
curriculum at government boarding schools marked the disillusionment of educators and government officials who had trusted in literacy education to serve as the catalyst for Indian assimilation.

**Pratt's Fall from Grace**

Although Carlisle had been operating at full capacity (1,200) from the mid-1890s though the turn of the century, Pratt's philosophy fell victim to Jones' thriving bureaucracy. It has also been noted that Pratt's career met much the same fate. In 1903 Pratt was "summarily retired by President Theodore Roosevelt" even though he was two years below the mandatory retirement age (Pratt *Battlefield* 337). As editor of *Battlefield and Classroom*, Utely noted that this forced retirement has been ascribed to a previous feud over Civil Service reform, dating back to a time when Roosevelt headed the Civil Service Commission. Nonetheless, Pratt remained as Superintendent of the Carlisle Indian School as a dispatch of the Department of Interior. He was conferred the rank of Brigadier General for Civil War service and was honorably discharged in 1904, officially ending his military and classroom career. In his later years, Pratt remained active in Indian affairs issues while compiling a history of his military career. Pratt lived to see a portion of his ambitions met as Indian veterans of World War I obtained citizenship in 1919. Regrettably, he died just two years prior to the 1924 Curtis Act which declared all Native Americans to be citizens of the United States (D. W. Adams 146).
Pratt's final speech as a commissioned military officer reportedly proclaimed, "Better, far better, had there never been a Bureau. Then self-preservation would have led the individual Indian to find his true place, and his real emancipation would have come speedily" (Pratt Battlefield 336).

Pratt never realized that his plans for Indian education perpetuated the bondage of the people he fought so desperately to liberate. Native Americans would continue battling for equality and freedom of cultural expression, despite the efforts of well-intended reformers, into the later part of the twentieth century.
Chapter Three

Native American educational histories have become widely discussed in recent years for various reasons including the resurgence of tribal cultural awareness. In his essay "Ethnography as Narrative," Edward M. Bruner attributes this resurgence to a change in historical narratives. Previously, many viewed Native Americans' conditions at present as disorganized, the past as glorious and the future as assimilation. More recent paradigms see the present as the resistance movement, the past as exploitation, and the future as cultural resurgence. In light of this change in ideologically weighted models, numerous historians have begun reevaluating the means by which American Indians were exploited. Countless wars, language barriers, inter-tribal hostilities and the removal of eastern tribes into western territories had devastating affects on tribal life. Yet, pieces of their native cultures survived despite such oppositions. Education proved to be a more divisive tool.

Educational reformers of the late 1880s proposed new techniques to expedite the genocide of native cultural ways. Through Americanized education, native Indians often became liminal figures even within traditional tribal structures. To gain a perspective on this phenomenon, numerous modern researchers have investigated the oppressive effects of government boarding schools, the relationship of government intrusion to educational trends and the often conflated motives of Native American school reformers. Although "tidy" summaries remain elusive, exploration of the proposed altruistic, yet often self-serving, motives of reformers may lend a more
productive critique of nineteenth-century Native American educational ideologies.

The final chapter of this thesis proposes to embark on this endeavor by considering the ideologies at play in the work of one Native American school reformer—Richard Henry Pratt. This exploration will include discussion of the propositions that compose an ideology, the rhetorical functions inherent to each, and consideration of who believed or promoted these views. To accomplish this task, rhetorical and socio-political information from Chapter One will be contrasted with educational trends and Pratt’s experiences as documented in Chapter Two. Correlations between these materials will provide valuable insights into the complex motivations and intrinsic ideologies which fused to compose Pratt’s educational philosophy.

While it may be difficult, or impossible, to reconstruct an indisputable model of Pratt’s ideology, recognizing the relationships between historical situations, Pratt’s formal expressions (letters, speeches, publications), and his "workaday world" will create a reflection of his social outlook. Due to the "mirror-like quality" of this outlook, it will "reflect the moral and material aspects of [Pratt’s] understanding" which, in turn, will indicate his ideological stance (Apter 15). The "interpretive task" of this thesis is, then, to try to distinguish between Pratt’s sincere convictions, his forced acquiescence to governmental policies, and other incidental correlations. Luckily, Pratt’s memoirs are not laced with politically correct sensibilities. His dogmatic assertions and directive commentary on a wide range of issues insure ample materials from which to navigate the murky waters of the interpretive domain.
Ideology Defined

Since this endeavor is rooted in a specific perception of the term "ideology," it is imperative to define its scope of reference for the purposes of this project. As briefly mentioned in the Introduction, Clifford Geertz essay "Ideology as a Cultural System" will provide the background for a working definition of ideologies. Geertz claims that ideologies are "maps of problematic reality and matrices for the creation of collective conscience" that "render otherwise incomprehensible social situations meaningful" (64).

Recognizing the noetic tenets of an ideology helps explain its often intangible, yet overpoweringly influential nature. This nature is more concretely noted through observances of social actions. Martin Seliger writes that an ideology expresses "sets of ideas by which men posit, explain and justify ends and means of organized social action" (Kaestle 124). Carl F. Kaestle summarizes these points by noting that "ideology is the aspect of formally expressed culture that defends and explains social institutions and social relations" (125).

Kaestle's essay provides a concise definition of ideology which acknowledges its theoretical complexities and practical manifestations. He summarizes ideology as:

A set of compatible propositions about human nature and society that help an individual to interpret complex human problems and take action that the individual believes is in his or her best interest and the best interest of society as a whole. (Kaestle 125)
Therefore, to gain insight into Pratt's ideology, one must reconstruct compatible sets of propositions regarding his perceptions of human nature and society. This framework can be built though reflection on major rhetorical movements for clues into his views on human nature, and consideration of socio-political trends which will reflect his social outlook.

Rhetorical Movements:

Scottish Common Sense Realism and Pratt

Conceptions of human nature are at the base of rhetorical studies. Also, since rhetoric is at the center of all a culture's activities, it serves as an indicator of change in society (Berlin Writing 1,2). Consequently, careful consideration of nineteenth-century rhetorical movements can shed light on the noetic fields influencing Pratt's perceptions of human nature. It may also clarify rationale for the decline and eventual rejection of Pratt's projects by the early 1900s.

No movement was more widely embraced in the mid-1800s than Scottish Common Sense Realism (SCSR). As established in Chapter One, Scottish Common Sense Realists' perception of human nature was profoundly influenced by Locke's theory that the mind was made up of two major faculties: the understanding and the will. This led to the development of a mechanistic, faculty psychology as espoused through the texts of George Campbell and Hugh Blair. Campbell recognized "certain principles in our nature, which, when properly addressed . . . give aid to reason" (205). These "principles" were listed as understanding, imagination, memory and passions and could be best influenced through an emotionally charged
argument. Behind this notion was a belief that the human faculties would respond in an "appropriate" and predictable manner when information was presented. For example, if someone successfully argued that a stove was hot, the "common sensical" response would be to avoid touching the stove. Pratt's memoirs imply that his views were in keeping with this element of SCSR.

Pratt was convinced that government officials, and all other sensible U. S. citizens, would support his boarding school program if they had a clear understanding of his plan. Pratt wrote, "It was surely only necessary to prove Indians were like other people and could be as easily educated and developed industrially to secure the adoption of my views" (Battlefield 213-214). He relied on speeches and publications to thereby "prove" the validity of his educational project. The Carlisle School published several promotional newspapers to circulate knowledge of the students' progress—presupposing that "surely" people would respond positively once these successes were known.

Pratt also utilized other mediums to "secure the adoption" of his views. Apparently believing that a "picture was worth a thousand words," Pratt provided photographs as proof of the validity of his educational philosophy. Students' photo sessions were strategically executed just following the exhausting journey from their reservations to Carlisle. Unbathed and disoriented, these students were haphazardly arranged and then photographed. These pictures showed them in their tribal attire and depicted them as bewildered, dirty savages. Later, the same students, neatly clad in school uniforms and sporting the latest hair styles, modeled for a second photograph. These "before and after" shots were widely circulated as a
testimony of the miraculous transformations which occurred at Carlisle.

Pratt's memoirs include a letter to Congressman T. C. Pound stating:

I send you today a few photographs of the Indian youth here. You will note that they came mostly as blanket Indians... I am gratified to report that they have yielded gracefully to the discipline... [of] our school rooms... Isolated as these youth are from the savage surroundings of their homes, they lose their tenacity to savage life, ... and give themselves up to learning all they can. (Battlefield 248)

Audiences, like Pound, who viewed this dramatic change were expected to induce (through Locke's associative principle) that these examples were indicative of the civilizing forces Pratt's plan could bring to each Native American child. In a speech at the 1893 Lake Mohonk Conference Pratt declared:

If this [civilized] condition has been reached in only one or two cases, it is sufficient to indicate [or induce] that it may be repeated in all their cases... how weak, foolish and silly [of] us not to adopt at once the simple, common-sense means {boarding school education} by which they rose.

("Remarks" 278)

Scottish Common Sense Realism's grounding in a mechanistic, faculty psychology and theories of induction provided the basis for such notions.
Pratt and Notions of "Truth"

Pratt also had tendencies toward other characteristics of this rhetorical model. According to SCSR, truth was extralinguial and could be acquired through "a 'knowledge of things' gained by examining nature" (Berlin Writing 20). Thus, truth, and thereby knowledge, was discoverable through careful observation with meaning existing in the sensory experience itself. Pratt appears to have agreed with this idea that experience was the key to "true" knowledge. Pratt valued personal experience above all other forms of learning. This perspective was revealed through his attitude toward those posing as Indian affairs experts who had never spent time among the Native Americans. In the following excerpt from Pratt's text, he attributes credibility to a missionary, Sheldon Jackson, because of his experiences among the Sioux while subtly derailing the views of an east coast minister.

Dr. Jackson was strongly in sympathy with the Carlisle movement, realizing by observation and experience the vast benefits it would be to the Indian peoples . . . Dr. Sunderland, being in Washington and observing things from that standpoint, had ideas which were best expressed by his statement that he would build a wall as high as the sky around every Indian reservation. (Battlefield 276) (italics added)

This acceptance of experience as the key to truth was also demonstrated in other venues of Pratt's life. For one, Pratt believed that his own experiences with the plains tribes gave him the authority to speak on their behalf. Pratt wrote, "I hope to make plain the righteousness of my long
contentions and the result of my experiences along this line" (*Battlefield* 100). To better situate this claim, he spent the next one-hundred pages citing his experiences with Native Americans including his relationships with allied scouts, work with the prisoners at St. Augustine, and encounters between tribesmen and "incompetent" government officials.

Note that Pratt never questioned the ethics or morality of his conclusions inferred during these experiences. This further implies that Pratt viewed his interpretation of personal experiences as indisputably "true." It may also demonstrate his compatibility with SCSR's citation that truth was observable through encounters with the material world.

Pratt also denied credibility to his opposition by pointing to their lack of "real life" encounters with tribesmen. Francis Paul Prucha, editor of *Americanizing the American Indians*, noted that "Pratt struck back intemperately at his opponents" (277). He consistently vindicated his own positions by reciting personal experiences with the Plains tribes while admonishing others for speaking from experiential ignorance. Pratt even prescribed a remedy to this situation suggesting that the BIA move its headquarters to Indian territory.

I advocated placing the Bureau of Indian Affairs on the Sioux or Navajo Reservation, in direct contact with its responsibilities... and demand that it... [lead a] charge into the promised land of our American citizenship... to prove the impotence of the Bureau to conclude its job. (*Battlefield* 283)
Pratt's accusations were probably well founded. Noted historian Jon Reyhner concurred stating, "Of course, many of the policy makers in Washington had never been west of the Mississippi" (History of Indian Education 41). These "policy makers" lack of experience remained a point of contention throughout Pratt's tenure as an administrator at Carlisle. Pratt's continued accentuation of the value of experience also influenced his educational philosophy.

**Pratt's Educational Philosophy**

Next, Pratt's educational philosophy appears to also have been rooted in the idea that experience leads to true knowledge. But in this case, the "truth" he most frequently advocated was the supremacy of euroamerican culture. Just as Pratt was convinced that government officials would "surely" support his plan once duly informed, he firmly believed that Native Americans would abandon their cultural ways once they experienced "the best things of our civilization" (Pratt Battlefield 213). In his 1891 address to the Friends of the Indians at the Lake Mohonk Conference Pratt explained, "[Indians] opportunities to see and hear and know are so limited that they are not to be blamed if they make little progress in the arts of civilization" ("Way Out" 272). Notice again that he associated experiences, seeing and hearing, with an ability to grasp the "arts of civilization." Pratt later claimed, "We make our greatest mistake by feeding our civilization to the Indians instead of feeding the Indians to our civilization" ("Advantages" 268). Consequentially, he demanded that children be provided the opportunity "to see and thus to learn" the white man's ways (Battlefield 214).
Carlisle's Outing Program stemmed from the belief that experience was the key to truth, knowledge and civility. Pratt best described his propaganda laden programs when he announced:

Carlisle fills young Indians with the spirit of loyalty to the stars and stripes, and then moves them out into our communities to . . . demonstrate to the nation that he is a man. ("Advantages" 268)

This quote refers to the outing system and the duplicity of "experiential" roles it fulfilled. First, it immersed Native Americans in white culture, supposedly assuring that they would embrace civilized life through this exposure. Acceptance of euroamerican values further implied a rejection of tribal associations.

Next, the outing program provided an opportunity for eastern families to have firsthand experiences with these "transformed savages." Several presuppositions were considered inherent to these experiences. For one, host families were to infer from encounters with their Carlisle student that Native Americans could be successfully educated and successfully integrated into communities. Secondly, from this knowledge, families were to grasp the corresponding truth that Native Americans could become "useful citizens" (Pratt Battlefield 215). Pratt stated that hosts' reactions to student workers proved this to be true. "The whites learn that Indians can become useful men and that they have the same qualities as other men. Seeing [Carlisle students'] industry, their skills and good conduct, [hosts] come to respect them" ("Way Out" 274).
Pratt's Curricular Approaches and SCSR

Not only was Pratt's educational philosophy rooted in concepts consistent with SCSR, his curricular approaches were as well. Many of the classroom practices at Carlisle were in keeping with the theories of Hugh Blair and George Campbell. For example, Blair stressed using literature as a tool to learn proper form and style through imitation (Berlin Writing 8). Pratt incorporated concepts of imitation into lessons by having students write letters home modeled after sample letters. Each week he read several students' compositions at the Saturday night meetings as examples of very good or very poor writing.

Blair and Campbell also emphasized memorizing and translating to gain more advanced writing skills (Berlin Writing 31). They saw imitation and repetition as keys to the memorization process. Forms of this emphasis were integrated into Carlisle's programs through the memorization of transcribed passages and slogans which were recited in unison at the Saturday meetings. Pratt also used methods correlating to these theories when he had students trace letters of the alphabet and later words, building up to the transcription of sentences (Gould 4). It was assumed that these sentences would be more easily memorized following numerous transcriptions. Memorized sentences could then be written or recited as a demonstration of students' language proficiency.

Next, to further develop solid writing skills, Blair had stressed the importance of drills and exercises as well as the memorization of general principles. Blair justified these by claiming that the mind could be
strengthened like "muscles through exercise" accentuating the importance of frequent practice (Berlin Writing 31). Consequently, the use of drills, exercises, and classroom recitations were customary at Carlisle. In *My People the Sioux*, Luther Standing Bear recalled one instance when he was asked to read a passage for his classmates. He mentioned feeling uncomfortable as he stood to read this segment. Later this discomfort turned to embarrassment as he was compelled to repeat the same process seven times. At that Saturday's meeting, Pratt related this incident to the entire student body, noting that Luther had read the text without a single error seven consecutive times.

Regarding writing style, both Blair and Campbell stipulated that students begin with a focused thesis and write on a narrow subject, not embarking on broad or general discussions (Blair 86, Campbell 206). Surviving letters, articles and essays written by Carlisle students strictly adhere to this model—despite their frequently rough grammatical structures. Blair then added that teachers were to read and correct the written pieces and return them to students to be rewritten correctly. This method of instruction also appears to have been a standard process at Carlisle.

While many of these methods of writing instruction are standard practices in twentieth-century classrooms, they were relatively new approaches in the 1800s. For that matter, attempting to educate minorities was considered a revolutionary concept in Pratt's time and was generally overseen by religious, rather than governmental, representatives. As argued in Chapter One, these perspectives were influenced by the work of
nineteenth-century Scottish educators. In most other countries only clerics, clergymen, and the upper echelon were thought to have any uses for skills such as reading or writing (Horner 85). Those who were allowed or could afford to attend school generally had a basic knowledge of reading and writing—often in several languages—prior to enrollment. Educators were to develop and hone these skills through instruction in classical languages, philosophy and theology (87,88). Teachers relied on lectures, usually presented in Latin, to advance student's knowledge base. In turn, students most frequently demonstrated mastery of concepts through oral debates and defenses (88). In contrast, by the 1700s, Scottish educators had begun giving lectures in English, supplementing readings with writing assignments, and incorporating written exams to test students proficiency (87). Their methodologies set the stage for American educational efforts in the 1800s.

Although this brief glance at educational histories is rudimentary and overly simplified, it reinforces claims regarding Pratt's adherence to SCSR. Likewise, it demonstrates that correlations between Scottish educators and Pratt's curriculum were more than mere coincidence. The fact that other schools were also incorporating such techniques simply exemplifies the sweeping acceptance of SCSR in nineteenth-century America. Further, these connections support the assertion that Pratt's educational experiment was more than a well scheduled, off-handed epiphany. 20 His proposal coupled innovative instructional approaches with anthropological, sociological and educational theories of the 1800s to form a promising solution to the nation's Indian problem.
Pratt’s Compatibility with Nineteenth-Century Intellectual Movements

At the forefront of Pratt's innovative ideas were Calvin Woodward's new theories of manual education. A professor at Washington University in St. Louis, Woodward's theories espoused the use of vocational training to instill habits of learning. This included "symmetrical training" that exposed students to "habits of work and concentration that could be transferred to academic areas" (Hoxie 68). Pratt believed that labor programs at St. Augustine proved the benefits of integrating academics with employment opportunities. He adopted this type of approach providing both industrial and academic training at Carlisle. The Outing Program, Pratt's most acclaimed innovation, was gleaned from a culmination of his own belief in cultural immersion and labor programs compatible with Woodward's theories.

Pratt's memoirs indicate that he also agreed with the theories of renowned anthropologist, Lewis Henry Morgan. Morgan's theories of social evolution stated that cultures progressed from savagery to barbarism to civilization. His theory appears to have stemmed from Locke's tabula rasa concept. According to Morgan, individuals were born as blank slates and then encoded through interactions within their societal systems. These peoples, as a whole, then evolved into more complex societies until becoming fully civilized. According to Morgan's theory, most Native Americans had advanced from savagery to barbarism and needed to progress toward a civilized state or face eminent extinction. Morgan's categorization of Native Americans as barbarous thereby justified "the idea
that cruel policies such as removal or punitive warfare were unavoidable steps along the road to progress" (Hoxie 18). Therefore, government boarding schools, like the Carlisle Indian School, were seen as a necessary and inevitable step for Native Americans to become assimilated into "a civilized society" and, thus, avoid extinction.

Pratt concurred with Locke and Morgan's views noting, "It is a great mistake to think that the Indian is born an inevitable savage. He is born a blank, like the rest of us" ("Advantages" 268). He proceeded to express the importance of "civilized" cultural influences, claiming:

Transfer the infant white to the savage surrounding, he will grow to possess a savage language, superstitions, and habit.
Transfer the savage-born infant into the surroundings of civilization, and he will grow to possess a civilized language and habit. These results have been established over and over again beyond all question. ("Advantages" 268-269)

Pratt's categorization of Native Americans' cultures as "savage" and white culture as "civilized" exemplifies his predilection toward social evolutionary theories. Paradoxically, this ethnocentric view also illustrated his belief in racial equality.

Throughout his writings Pratt acknowledged the equality of all humanity citing the Declaration of Independence to validate his claims. He wrote, "our Constitution forbids that there shall be 'any abridgment of the rights of citizens on account of race, color, or previous condition" ("Advantages" 262). His thrust toward equality also lead him to question the
commissioning of "Negro and Indian" troops, promoting, instead, the integration of military service-men (7). In the opening chapter of his text, Pratt noted, "One thing the Major and I discussed freely . . . [was] the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution then pending . . . which affirmed that 'all men are created equal'" (7). Pratt also consistently affirmed the government's responsibility to promote human rights issues, including those regarding Native American educational opportunities. 21 Herbert Welsh, the first Chairman of the Board of Indian Commissioners and founder of the Indian Rights Association, once remarked, "General Pratt was, in my opinion, the greatest moral force effecting the great change that has taken place in the minds of our citizens touching the Indians" (D. W. Adams 1, 9; Prucha Americanizing 277).

Pratt's championing of civil rights issues was also in keeping with post-Civil War sentiments. Many abolitionists had turned their attentions to Indian rights issues following the War. Harriet Beecher Stowe was among those supportive of Pratt's work. Stowe assisted with efforts to educate the prisoners at St. Augustine during her winter stay near Fort Marion (Pratt Battlefield 154-155). 22

Pratt's perspectives were not only compatible with Woodward's, Morgan's and nineteenth-century notions of equality, but with the spread of Calvinism that accompanied the great revivals of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. As a Presbyterian minister, Pratt himself was a proponent of Calvinistic doctrines. The complimentary nature of SCSR and Calvinism also seemed to meld with concepts of manifest-destiny, as noted
earlier. Pratt's assertion, "Inscrutable are the ways of Providence" was indicative of SCSR and Calvinism's refusal to question the spiritual. Meanwhile, this assertion espoused the unquestionable inevitability of the mysteries of God's will. The apparent refusal to question circumstances (because God was in control of American progress) fed reductionist tendencies which claimed that all problems could be solved through a healthy does of Christianity, education or governmental programming.

The naive notion that "for every problem, there is a solution" found tidy answers through the implementation of "ideologically correct" government programs. Consequently, when hostile tribes impeded westward progress, United States troops quelled the resistance. When fighting became too expensive, treaties insured peace. As expansionists desired Native American territories, past treaties became cumbersome, so they were broken. Angry tribes were quieted through interment to relatively small tracts of land. When officials discovered that the reservations were unsuited for providing adequate food sources, rations were provided. After reservated tribes neglected "white man's ways," education was assuredly the key to assimilation. Simple answers, rooted in manifest-destiny doctrines, promised quick-fix, sure solutions for the continuing "Indian problem."

By 1890, Pratt's educational project emerged as the embodiment of the government's new "quick-fix" philosophy. At the root of Pratt's emphasis was English literacy instruction. Officials claimed that, "English language capability is fundamental to Indian progress" (Reyhner History of Indian Education 117). The Board of Indian Commissioners also stated that Indians
must acquire "our own vernacular [English], the language of the greatest, most powerful, and enterprising nationalities beneath the sun" (Prucha Americanizing 200).

**English Only Mandates**

The BIA teaching manual claimed, "It is evident that the first step in any program of instruction must be to develop in the children the ability to speak, understand, and think in the English language" (Reyhner History of Indian Education 110). As stated in Chapter Two, government regulations strongly reinforced this point. In fact, the 1887 Commissioner of Indian Affairs declared:

No books in any Indian language must be used or instruction given in that language to Indian pupils in any school where this office had entered into contract for the education of Indians... The instruction of Indians in [their] vernacular... will not be permitted in any Indian school... You will see that this regulation is rigidly enforced. (Atkins "English" 202).

English only supporters found vindication for their mandates in the theories of noted ethnologist John Wesley Powell. 23 As the successor of Lewis Henry Morgan, Powell reportedly set the terms for informed discussions of Indian affairs in the 1880s. Like Morgan, Powell supported social evolution and proposed that the debt owed the first Americans could "be paid only by giving the Indians Anglo-Saxon civilization, that they may also have prosperity and happiness under the new civilization of this continent" (Hoxie 24).
To achieve this purported "happiness," Powell argued that Native Americans should be separated from "everything most sacred to Indian society" (Hoxie 24). Thus, his theories justified "the Removal," separating tribes from their lands; boarding schools, separating children from their families; compulsory school attendance policies, dictating Native Americans' educational options; and English only regulations, separating students from their first language.

**SCSR Ties to the English Only Movement**

The government's English only mandates may have been influenced by Campbell's text *Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Campbell had recognized usage under three distinct categories: reputable use, national use, and present use. He also called for a rejection of linguistic impurities and barbarisms (Berlin *Writing* 23; Brereton 303). Although Campbell was actually referring to "incorrect" or "poor" language uses that flourished with the rise of the middle class when he referenced "barbarisms," his rules appear to have been inappropriately expanded to include an intolerance for any language other than English (Brereton 302). Campbell's preoccupation with standard usage was indicative of Carlisle's classroom methodologies as well as nineteenth-century proponents of the English only literacy movement.

Many of Pratt's contemporaries also viewed English literacy education as the key issue influencing Indian assimilation. Thus, numerous political figures stressed the necessity of absolving Native American languages. These officials generally emphasized that tribal acceptance of the English language was a necessary phase for social evolutionary progression.
The most well documented promoter of "English Only" literacy education was Commissioner of Indian Affairs, J. D. C. Atkins. He situated his argument by noting the civilizing forces inherent to the English language: "The first step to be taken toward civilization, toward teaching the Indians the mischief and folly of continuing in their barbarous practices, is to teach them the English language" (Atkins "English Language" 203). He reinforced this view by claiming, "No unity or community of feeling can be established among different peoples unless they are brought to speak the same language, and thus become imbued with like ideas of duty" (Atkins Annual Report 23). Atkins also noted, "To teach Indian school children their native tongue is practically to exclude English, and to prevent them from acquiring it" (Atkins "English Language" 201). He clarified these points by asserting that "their barbarous dialect should be blotted out and the English language substituted" (198-99).

Likewise siding with Atkins and other cultural evolutionists, Pratt assumed it was for the greater good of these indigenous peoples to be freed from "savagery" through language instruction. Pratt's rationale for emphasizing English literacy education appears to have been based on his encounters with warring tribes during his western military campaigns. In an early experience with the plains tribes, he observed that an intertribal peace had occurred among the "linguistically connected" Pawnee and Wichita tribes (Battlefield 99). If Pratt had applied the inductive method to his observation, he would have concluded that linguistic connections played a
role in the allied relationship between Indian nations. Therefore, he may have inferred that language similarities preceded peaceful cohabitation.

On another campaign, Pratt had recognized "Comanche" as the "court language of our southwest Indians" (10). His recollection of the experience implied that the camaraderie instilled by this common language provided an avenue for peace talks and a bond which led to confederations and unified tribes. Whether or not this was actually the case cannot be determined from the remaining documentation. However, the concept that a common language promoted peaceful cohabitation was implicit in his earliest educational venture with the prisoner-students at St. Augustine. Pratt noted of this endeavor:

Promoting English speech was among the earliest and most persistent of our efforts in order to bring the Indians into best understanding and relationship with our people. *(Battlefield 121)*

This passage itself insinuates that the acquisition of English speaking capabilities would ease tensions by instilling an "understanding" of euroamerican and speeding peaceful "relationships."

Regardless of the root of Pratt's philosophy, he plainly stipulated the value of English education in his earliest Carlisle recruiting trip. Pratt had thus admonished Spotted Tail while visiting the Rosebud Agency:

Your ignorance against the white man's education will more and more hinder and restrain you and take from you . . . as long as you are so ignorant and unable to attend to your own affairs. *(Battlefield 223)*
Note, first of all, that Pratt labeled Spotted Tail, Chief of the Burle Sioux, "ignorant" because he was unable to speak or write English. In this instance, literacy equaled competency. This comments on the tendency of "literate" peoples to create the criteria used to determine what constitutes "literacy" and to deem those outside of these criteria as uneducated or "ignorant."

Valuing Literate over Oral Cultures

In his essay "Literacy, Orality, and the Functions of Curriculum," William A. Reid recognizes the ongoing conflict between notions of literacy and orality. He demonstrates the tendency of "literate" groups to define reality in literacy-based, objectified terms whereby oral perspectives are undermined and a connection is established between "levels of attainment in literacy and access to positions of authority" (13-15). Donald Rothman notes that colonial figures often "express the naive belief that literacy in and of itself will be liberating" (123). Pratt blindly adhered to the notion that literacy was liberating, not only from "ignorance," but also from poverty and discrimination. Pratt told Spotted tail:

Cannot you see that it is far, far better for you to have your children educated and trained as our children are so that they can speak the English language, write letters, and do the things which brings to the white man such prosperity, and each of them be able to stand for their rights as the white man stands for his?

(Battlefield 223).

In this passage it becomes more evident that Pratt embraced a world view in which the "literate claim authority to set the terms of survival and success"
(Knoblauch 75). Therefore, Pratt equated literacy with freedom, power, salvation, and success.

Second, note the direct correlation between education and literacy. This line of thinking assumed that all those who were educated would acquire literacy skills and thus overcome "ignorance." By supporting such notions, Pratt promoted a "pernicious half-truth" substantiating the unquestionable importance of literacy in "absolutionist and ethnocentric terms" (Knoblauch 75). In his essay "Literacy and the Politics of Education," C. H. Knoblauch recognizes the inclination of early educators to "sacrifice the humanizing understanding that life can be otherwise than the way we happen to know it" (75). Pratt is a prime example of unevaluated prejudice toward others based on his own culturally laced notions of literacy.

Many Americanized notions of literacy included ideals of proficiency that required thinking in English as well as speaking English. Numerous politicians, educators and philanthropists forwarded this concept of English literacy proficiency. At Carlisle, Pratt too accentuated the importance of thinking in English. He stated that one of the primary goals of the outing program was to compel his students "to think in English" ("Way Out" 274). Other educators concurred with this ambition.

John Simon stated, "There is a close connection between the ability to think and the ability to use English correctly" (340). Simon added the following rationale for his claim: "The person who does not respect words and their proper relationships cannot have much respect for ideas--very possibly cannot have ideas at all" (344). Due to ethnocentric views compatible with
Simon's ideas about language, English proficiency remained a primary issue in government mandates regulating early Native American education.

**English Only Conflict**

Ironically, the government's "English only" mandate was in conflict with nineteenth century educational research. Secretary of Interior Schurz had been notified that Alfred L. Riggs, a successful administrator, was "of the opinion that first teaching the children to read and write in their own language enables them to master English with more ease" (*Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners* 77). Consequently, Riggs promoted bi-lingual instructional approaches. Many educators agreed with Riggs stressing that successful teachers learned native tongues (*Reyhner History of Indian Education* 49).

The Friends of the Indians also debated the English only mandate. The use of native languages in the classrooms was the central issue at the 1887 Lake Mohonk Conference. These philanthropists determined that instructions given in "Indian" were essential to teaching English. It was noted that most instructors "use the [native] vernacular to teach the English, to convey the idea of good English." One representative asserted, "How are you going to teach the Indian the word 'soul' or 'God' or 'heaven,' or any invisible thing without it? . . . you have to use the native language to convey the idea" (*Proceedings* 100). Yet despite such notable opposition, government mandates stood firm.

Just four years following Rigg's plea to Schurz, J. D. C. Atkins ignored the voices of educators and philanthropic groups with this beguiling remark:
"So far as I am advised, there is no dissent [regarding English only mandates] either among the lawmakers or the executive agents who are selected under the law to do the work" ("English" 199). This tendency to reject conflicting evidence and publish only complimentary information was telling of the bureaucratic system that flourished under what Pratt termed "a permanent double-headed Bureau oligarchy" (Pratt Battlefield 293). Thus, English only mandates continued well into the twentieth century.

Repercussions of English Only Mandates

Possibly the most devastating repercussion of language restrictions was the silencing of Native American school children. Research suggests that students—including those at Carlisle—may have spent years in virtual silence due to three major factors. First, they kept silent to avoid corporal punishment for speaking in their native tongue. Second, they were afraid of being humiliated for misusing the English language. In many tribes, jeering laughter was more insultingly detrimental than harsh words or physical altercations. Third, silence may have provided a subversive avenue for rejecting the "white man's" education. In her research of Indian school children, Janice Gould has concluded that students "actively and passively resisted the process of forced assimilation" (10). One could only imagine the dismay of the school teacher who received the following poem from her Native American pupil:

If I do not believe you
The things you say
Maybe I will not tell you
That is my way
Maybe you think I believe you
That thing you say,
But always my thoughts stay with me
My own way.

(D. W. Adams 231)

Students may have relied on such subversive uses of English to maintain their own identity while enduring massive de-culturation efforts.

**English Literacy Education--A Politically Situated Entity**

In *Right to Literacy*, Beth Daniell notes that "the use of language and literacy generally tells us more about the social and political relations in a particular situation" than do the progressive claims of national leaders (192). Therefore, careful examination of Pratt's uses of English literacy training should provide insights into other complex, motivating factors. To begin, correlations between Pratt and more widely recognized proponents of literacy education may prove enlightening.

Pratt's recognition of literacy education as the key to assimilation was similar to that of Joseph Stalin who was born in the year of Carlisle's conception, 1879. Stalin's educational model positioned literacy education as a systematic program to homogenize the indigenous population. Stalin used literacy to promote "massive industrialization and forced collectivization, a tool in the creation of a centralized state, rather than a means of human liberation" (Daniell 192).

Pratt's use of English education had been founded on much the same purpose, to create a homogenized society. His approach was threefold. Pratt's first goal was to end inter-tribal hostilities. He suggested, "Schools should put all tribes together to destroy antagonism" (Prucha *Americanizing* 226).
Once tribal differences had been resolved, he wanted to decimate tribal identities. Pratt and J. D. C. Atkins were in total agreement on this point. Atkins stated, "The object of greatest solicitude should be to break down the prejudices on tribes among the Indians; to blot out the boundary lines which divided them into distinct nations, and fuse them into one homogenous mass" ("English" 199). Atkins added, "Uniformity of language will do this—nothing else will." This mass, homogenized through a common language, English, could then be labeled "Indian" rather than continuing tribal differentiations.

The third step in Pratt's plan went one step beyond Atkins'. Pratt wished to assimilate all "Indians" into euroamerican society. Consequently, Native American cultural differences could be absorbed into the "great American melting pot." The oppressive reality which was institutionalized through his efforts—including Carlisle, the outing system, and a network of off-reservation boarding schools—is especially ironic in light of his professed intentions to liberate these indigenous peoples.

**Politically Charged Notions of Literacy**

Pratt also neglected to reflect on how "literate" systems were perpetuated. Knoblauch states that concepts of literacy are politically charged and reaffirmed by fellow "literate" participants. He states:

People who are measured positively by the yardstick of literacy enjoy their privileges because of their power to choose and apply that instrument on their own behalf, not because of their point of development or innate worthiness. (75)
Pratt, on the other hand, believed firmly in his "innate worthiness." Verified by his standing as a literate American, a military officer and a Presbyterian minister, he seemed to have been unaware of the oppressive, imperialistic agendas at work in the midst of his "benevolent" scheme.  

Two other basic questions Pratt neglected to consider were his notions of liberty and freedom. Consumed by a thoroughly Americanized world view, Pratt did not see that his idea of freedom differed dramatically from those of recently conquered Indians. He neglected to grasp simple correlations between past events and the Indians' current plight. For example, Pratt could have found similarities between eighteenth-century America and the Indians' right to educate their own children. After the liberation of the confederate states from English rule, colonists' desired to express their freedom through divergent forms of education, government, and commerce. Likewise, Scotland fought viciously to maintain educational autonomy. Why would Pratt have thought that Native Americans should have been any different in their desire for educational independence? Pratt's lack of critical reflection upon such examples—as well as his unreflective notions of literacy—heaped intellectual enslavement on the very people he sought to liberate.

Further, the curriculum incorporated by Pratt at Carlisle cultivated the devaluing of Native Americans' oral systems. Reid notes this intrinsic link between 'literate' behavior and [school] curriculum." He states,
The work of the curriculum, then, is not to introduce to modernity those who would otherwise lack the ability to make sense of their world, buy actively to destroy, or at least severely modify, the cultural and intellectual resources they [the illiterate] already possess. (15)

Pratt boldly affirmed his intentions to use Carlisle's curriculum to fulfill just such a purpose. In fact, Pratt's motto "Kill the Indian in him, and save the man" suggested his desire to decimate every trace of "Indianness"—albeit oral traditions or hair styles—from his students ("Advantages" 261). Pratt then decidedly clarified, "Carlisle has always planted treason to the tribe and loyalty to the nation at large" (Battlefield 268). This "loyalty" included acceptance of white man's education and "Americanized" notions of literacy.

Knoblauch asserts, "The concept of literacy is embedded, then, in the ideological dispositions of those who use the concept, those who profit from it, and those who have the standing and motivation to enforce it as a social requirement" (Knoblauch 74). Consequently, Pratt's concept of literacy was tellingly revealed through his curricular focus on English instruction and his willingness to divisively separate children from their cultural heritage. Evidence reveals that Pratt supported an ethnocentric, Americanized view of literacy which devalued difference—linguistic or cultural—and sought to create a homogenized nation, "Under God with liberty and justice for all" (that is, "all" who conformed to his social outlook). The question then resurfaces, what was Pratt's social outlook and how can his educational practices shed light on the systematic nature of his agenda?
In the Introduction to this thesis, Kaestle was quoted as challenging researchers to examine the ideologies of school reformers. It is ironic, then, that his essay "Ideology and American Educational History" sheds light on the dominant ideology, or social outlook, to which Pratt appears to have ascribed—traditional, Protestant ideologies.

**Traditional, Protestant Ideologies**

The socio-political strains and advancements of 1800s "set the stage for the rise of systematic (political, moral, economic) ideologies" (Geertz "Ideology" 64). The most prevalent of these ideologies in the nineteenth-century was what Kaestle termed traditional, Protestant ideology. As examined in Chapter One, traditional, Protestant ideology "centered on republicanism, Protestantism, and capitalism" creating a system that stressed the ideals of individualism, societal morality, and economic prosperity (Kaestle 127). Kaestle stressed that these three sources of belief were so tightly fused that those who questioned any aspect of this "blessed trinity" were accused of undermining the entire system (128). Therefore, Pratt's inability to reflexively evaluate his educational plan may be attributed to the very nature of traditional, Protestant ideology.

In his essay "Official English: Another Americanization Campaign," Joseph Leibowicz points out:

> Because language issues can easily be loaded with otherwise unsavory or unacceptable agendas, elements of the Americanization movement were able to transfer language from
a shield against linguistic chaos into a sword against nonlinguistic difference as well (107).

Leibowicz continues, "The apparent solicitude for the national language exhibited by many Americanizers was a mask for racial, economic, and political hostility toward users of other tongues." So, in keeping with traditional, Protestant ideology, the Americanizers' promotion of English education included presuppositions regarding capitalism and republicanism. Consequently, education was not an end in itself; but, as Secretary of Interior Schurz stated, "Education for patriotic American citizenship" (7).

Likewise, Pratt's acceptance of English only education agendas was dramatically infused with "Americanized values" consistent with traditional, Protestant ideology. Leslie and James Milroy attribute the political factors inherent to literacy education to the nature of language, noting that "language is embedded in a social matrix" (51). This implies that concepts of language usage are also rooted in societal expectations. Milroy and Milroy proceed to note that societies, such as Pratt's, may equate a decline in proper usage with a "sliding morality" (53). In fact, this appears to have been indicative of Pratt and other nineteenth-century educators who were so wrapped up in traditional, Protestant ideology that they equated speaking English with embracing Christianity, capitalism, and U. S. citizenship.

Regarding this "sliding morality," in the essay "Ideology and Discontent," David E. Apter notes that the "vaguest of ideologies can be made to shine in the reflected glow of moral indignation" (16). America's traditional, Protestant ideology was no exception. Accordingly, many
reformers, including Pratt, despised "savage" languages, communal cultural practices, "heathenish" religions, and "primitive" traditions.

Proponents of this ideology responded most indignantly to the communal cultures indicative of Native American tribes. "The Indian must be imbued with the exalting egotism of the American civilization so that he will say 'I' instead of 'we' and 'this is mine' instead of 'this is ours'" (Atkins "English" 200). The purpose of this "egocentric" focus was to promote capitalistic ventures. In fact, manifest-destiny dogma promoted this idea that God had ordained capitalism. Merrill E. Gates, President of Amhurst College and a member of the Board of Indian Commissioners in 1884, stated, "Nay by rations dealt out whether needed or not . . . we have taken from the compelling instruction that grows out of [God's] laws, 'if a man will not work, neither shall he eat!'" (47). Henry L. Dawes concurred claiming that whites must,

Take [the Indian] by the hand and set him upon his feet, and teach him to stand alone first, then to walk, then to dig, then to plant, then to hoe, then to gather, then to keep. The last and the best agency of civilization is to teach a grown up Indian to keep.

(Dawes 29)

Here Dawes clearly associated the concept of "keeping" with capitalistic ventures such as farming, land ownership, and financial savings.

Many euroamericans also despised tribal religious practices and other "heathenish" ways. Moreover, this self-righteous indignation fueled concepts of moral superiority. Reformers flaunted the superiority of new ideas over tribal "oral" traditions by constructing a utopic vision of the future. This vision
insured total assimilation, whereby peace and prosperity in the nurturing womb of an industrial paradise were promised to those who would conform to "American" ways.

Pratt situated himself as a prophetic messenger of this promise to the Indians—hence his recognition as the "Red Man's Moses" (Eastman). He vowed to lead them from the savage wilderness into a land flowing with the milk and honey of capitalistic progress. Pratt cited a belief in human equality and the Declaration of Independence as rationale for these "well intended" goals. Apter notes that "Ideology helps to make explicit the moral basis of action" (17). In retrospect, one may assert that traditional, Protestant ideology fueled Pratt's "moral crusade" to liberate Indians from "the throes of barbarism." His proposals met the needs of both politicians and philanthropists while providing a "white-washed" version of hope to Native Americans. Pratt's plans also offered definitive answers—answers that were rooted deep in the heart of this developing nation's ideology.

The Ideology of Development

Apter notes that "ideologies employed in development seek to transcend negativism and to define hope in programmatic terms" (16). Pratt's Carlisle experiment embodied Apter's description. He confronted the negatives of war by offering a peaceful solution. He denounced conceptions of racial inferiority by acknowledging cultural inferiority. He re-channeled opposition to Native American schooling expenses by noting the cost-effectiveness of education in contrast to conflict. By so doing, Pratt transcended much of the "negativism" directed toward Native Americans.
Pratt then offered hope embodied in "programmatic" terms through offreservation, government funded, Native American boarding schools. Pratt avidly promoted this concept and Carlisle was conceived. Completely compatible with traditional, Protestant ideology, this project matured giving birth to a nation-wide network of twenty-five schools modeled after Pratt's pilot project. For fifteen years Pratt enjoyed the ideological compatibility of his project to dominant trends. Then, subtly and mysteriously, things changed. This change signaled more than simple disillusionment with Pratt's plan, it was indicative of a shift in the ideological posturing of a nation.

The Rise of Current-Traditionalism

Current-Traditionalism followed at the heels of SCSR and seemed to emphasize the most mechanistic features of Campbell and Blair's work. Berlin noted that this new rhetoric flourished as most schools began to view themselves as educating to serve the needs of business and industry. Therefore, public school curriculum was devised to meet the individualized demand for excellence and a capitalistic demand for numbers. Across the country, trade schools became more prevalent as an alternative for those less interested in fields requiring post-secondary schooling.

Native American educational programs underwent much the same phenomenon. The BIA gleaned only the most superficial features from Pratt's programs to form a new curriculum. This marked the movement from a holistic instructional approach to a vocational orientation. As this transformation proceeded, instruction of Native American children in geography, literature, and the arts was seen as seed sown "on stony ground"
Oesch 100

(Hoxie 194). This stream-line approach may be attributed to the increasingly mechanistic features of Current-Traditionalism.

Current-Traditionalism was a scientistic approach promoting a detached, observant method of writing. This implied that writers could separate themselves from socio-political ties and objectively report "the truth" from the obvious facts observed. This approach to writing removed the ethical and most of the emotional issues from the text and focused on an appeal to reason.

In much the same manner, Indian educators began situating themselves as educational professionals rather than emotionally invested crusaders, as Pratt and his peers had professed to be. This new, more logical approach to Native American education had varying affects on the Indian school system. First, morality debates seemed to subside as racial equality issues fell from the spotlight. During this time, many philanthropists began focusing attention on women's rights, overseas tensions, and alcohol sales. Almost simultaneously, a resurgence of racism flourished to the extent that Commissioner of Indian Affairs; Francis E. Leupp, publicly attacked believers in racial equality (Hoxie 198). Corroborating officials noted that it was "Nature's work" that the Indian remain a savage and the whites serve as "lord" (Hoxie 199). Other researchers, professing to have removed ethical and emotional issues from clouding their perspective, determined that Native Americans were "hereditarily inferior" (199).
Consequentially, Current-Traditionalism appears to have had devastating affects on Native American education. By the early 1900's, Indian boarding schools no longer focused on blending educational and vocational instruction, instead specializing in industrial studies. Carlisle was no exception. English acquisition and vocational training emerged as the curricular focus; and, by the time it closed in 1918, Carlisle students specialized only in mechanical trades and apprenticed at the Ford Motor Company. For years Congress resisted closing the twenty-five schools modeled after Pratt's plan because they "represented significant economic boost to the economies of the cities where they were located" (Hoxie 104). Yet as international military efforts increased, financial support was transferred from education to war efforts. These, and other, drastic social changes marked the end of Pratt's domination of Indian educational issues as well as the end of his career at Carlisle.

Closing Comments

Nineteenth-century Indian educators, including Pratt, and their methodologies have come under particular scrutiny in recent years. In retrospect, early Native American educational strategies were intolerant of difference, overly reductive and inhumanely unjust. The atrocities committed against the Native American peoples under the guise of government funded education were appalling. Yet it seems a little too easy to criticize and condemn these educators from the comfort of a 100 year buffer.
In lieu of heaping criticism upon criticism, this project purposed to examine the socio-political and ideological influences that prepared a society to readily accept Pratt's ethnocentric notions of Indian education.

It would seem unobservant not to notice that the practices Pratt instituted at Carlisle were in keeping with modern theories of the late 1800s; or that prevailing ideologies permeated the intellectual atmosphere creating an environment in which Pratt's proposals would be embraced. Pratt's educational views also aligned with governmental ambitions to "make [the Indian] a safe and useful factor in our body politic" (Pratt "Advantages of Mingling" 35). Further, this thesis affirmed that Pratt's ideas themselves were embedded in the dominant rhetorical, educational and ideological theories of his time.

Therefore, critical evaluation of the societal tenets that may open people to ethnocentric and exclusivist views seem to prove more fruitful than the simple derailing of voices trapped within these ideologically constructed frames. While we cannot neglect the injustices brought upon the Native American peoples by educators like Pratt, examining rhetorical and ideological components of his educational philosophy can shed light on future endeavors instead of simply glaring back into the darkness of the past's atrocities.
Notes

1 While Scottish schools were studying English literature, Oxford and Cambridge were concentrating on Greek and Latin studies and deemed English literature, or folk literature, undeserving of serious consideration. Cambridge did not introduce an English literature course until 1904. In contrast, Edinburgh announced William Edmonstone Aytoun as the first English Literature Department Chair in 1845. Harvard followed suit presenting Francis J. Child as its first English literature chair in 1876. This illustrated the American tendency to comply with Scottish educational trends and implies that these two countries held similar ideological aims (Horner 86).

2 Horner further asserted, "When humanists fail to take seriously the general liberal arts part of their educational program and fail to see rhetoric at the heart of the arts education, they abrogate their commitment to democracy" (94).

3 Hume's obsession with emotional appeal went far beyond Locke's tendency to see the will as the prime motivating force in human nature. Consequently, Hume's theories were often points of conflict and concern for the three major proponents of SCSR--Blair, Campbell and Whately. In fact, Campbell's Dissertation on Miracles was a "treatise designed to
answer the skepticism of Hume” (Golden 139). Meanwhile, Blair defended Hume against charges of heresy (Golden 23).

4 Campbell's *Philosophy of Rhetoric* was composed over a fifteen-year period. Campbell endured a rigorous composing process including multiple drafts, submissions to friends, critical responses and numerous revisions.

5 In Brereton's collection, Perry proceeded to note his disdain for Campbell's stringent grammatical system asserting, "It was an attempt to cultivate taste by a negative process." He went on to state, "The tone of this censure is curiously like the red-inked comments of their present-day [1935] descendants" (302). This also seems to recognize the foundational structures Campbell created for Current-Traditional rhetoric.

6 The term "current-traditional rhetoric" was first coined by Daniel Fogarty (1959), but it became widely recognized by composition professionals through the work of Richard Young. His article "Paradigms and Problems: Some Needed Research in Rhetorical Invention" (1978) characterized the salient features of current-traditional rhetoric as quoted on page 31 of Chapter One from Donald Stewart’s article.

7 Bain was the first to recognize the paragraph as a small theme, consisting of an opening introductory sentence, several supporting points,
and a conclusion (Mulderig 95-97). His "paragraph theory" dates back to 1866, but has influenced modern classrooms as well as modern theorists (Connors 64). Mulderig notes that "Bain anticipated Frank D'Angelo's recent comment that the rhetorician must 'relate the structure of thought to the structure of discourse'" (99). This is a reflection of the psychological nature of Bain's work. Bain, a renown psychologist, combined theories of psychology and rhetoric to explore the sequences of mental phenomena and how these could be traced through writing patterns.

8 The *inventio* of management was first investigated by Richard Whately (1787-1863). Whately is often listed along with Campbell and Blair as a notable influence behind Scottish Common Sense Realism. He diverted slightly from their stances by reviving Aristotelian rhetoric including deduction and an amended approach to invention—the *inventio* of management. His texts, *Elements of Rhetoric* (1828) and *Elements of Logic* (1826), were widely circulated and served as standard text in many American writing classrooms through the advent of the twentieth-century. *Logic* enjoyed even more popularity than *Rhetoric*, going into its ninth edition by 1850. Yet, it was his *Rhetoric* which gave him fame and influence (Golden 273). For more information see: Berlin Writing 28-31 (rhetorical theory); Golden 273-276 (concise biography); and Whately *Elements of Rhetoric*. 
9 During "the Removal," missionary schools were temporarily suspended and re-opened in new locations with additional funding from "substantial treaty annuities" set aside for educational purposes (Evelyn Adams 35). Many treaties, drafted by the War Department, included clauses requiring that a portion of the tribal annuities be invested in education. The Bureau's educational system was borne through the combined efforts of missionary educators who often served in these schools; the Commissioner of Indian Affairs; and War Department officials. Funding for these schools was propagated through treaties mandating the education of young Indian children.

10 Native American education came to the forefront of BIA concerns in 1870 when $100,000 was budgeted for the development of new schools (Reyhner History of Indian Education 44). This also influenced the 1873 repeal of the Indian Civilization Act which deterred funding to church-affiliated Indian schools (27). With this repeal, the BIA became increasingly involved in the direct operation of Native American vocational education and boarding schools.

11 The possibility of dying within sight of the Atlantic ocean held a special horror for these Native Americans, many of whom believed that their spirit had to cross four rivers to get to the "other world." The ocean would have
posed an insurmountable obstacle to their happiness in the next life
(American Experience).

12 Cutting their hair was especially reprehensible and frightening to the
Cheyennes who saw this as a sign of mourning and death.

13 Henry E. Fritz implied that Pratt did not have a formal strategy for his
educational efforts at St. Augustine. He wrote that industrial training was
provided "in preference to the dullness of simple confinement" (164). Still
others question the impact of the prisoners successes while in Florida on
Pratt's future accomplishments. Evelyn Adams records that Carlisle was
proposed by E. A. Hayt due to "the satisfactory work of the Indians at
Hampton" rather than because of Pratt's instructional or lobbying efforts
(52). But in a letter from Hayt to Pratt he wrote: "You are entitled to the
credit of establishing the School. You found the empty barracks, you got
the consent of the Secretary of War to use them, you fussed around the
Interior Department until you got sufficient steam to propel the enterprise.
You got the children together, in fact did everything but get the money"
(Hoxie 266). This seems to summarize the extent to which Pratt was
responsible for the conception, birth and nurturing of the Carlisle Institute.

14 This fluency of communication between the Department of Interior
(Schurz) and the War Department (McCrary) may have been symptomatic
of the militaries' continued involvement in BIA affairs. Even as late as the
1900s, politicians and BIA officials had not addressed the conflict of
interests in the War Department's ties to Native American education. Nor
had they questioned the ethics of placing military personnel in charge of
Native American educational endeavors (Hoxie 56). Political back-
scratching between these two departments carried over well into the
twentieth century.

15 There is contrary evidence as to what party originally claimed, or held to
the claim, that the Carlisle School students would be held hostage for their
parents compliance to government mandates. In his text, Pratt plainly
attributes this to Hyat and the "Indian Bureau administration" (227).
Meanwhile Reyhner, a leading historian in Native American educational
studies, attributes this to Pratt per the 1878 Annual Report of the
Commissioner of Indian Affairs (45). Fritz mediates these claims
by stating that Pratt did not hold the students as prisoners; but that he,
along with his fellow Presbyterians, had simply argued that the
presence of Indian children in the east would predicate the good
behavior of their elders at home (165-66).

16 Luther Standing Bear reported that these names were to be "pointed
out" with a large stick. He also noted that students were not told the
"meanings" of these names. Although the names were haphazardly distributed, students could change their name if they were so inclined.

Note the following letter as recorded in Pratt's text:

Dear Captain Pratt:

I am going to tell you something about my name. Captain Pratt, I would like to have a brand new name because some of the girls call me Cornbread and some call me Cornrat, so I do not like that name, so I want you to give me a new name. Now this is all I want to say.

Conrad.

Conrad's request was granted. Pratt included this letter to demonstrate that he "encouraged their utmost freedom in coming to me at any time with any of their personal matters" (Battlefield 293).

It is important to note that these educators, politicians and philanthropists assumed that nomadic cultures did not have structure or that these behaviors and habits were aimless and purposeless. It was also ironic that those controlling Indian policy determined that "white" culture was superior to Native American ways. Little, if any, surviving documentation suggests that nineteenth-century educational or political figures reflected on assumptions of euroamerican, cultural superiority.

Edward Bruner's "Ethnography as Narrative" explores the nature of ethnographic discourse as story telling, asserting that stories give meaning to the present as well as congealing a more elusive notion that the present is the product of "relationships involving the constituted past
and a future." The two dominant narratives (one viewing the past as
glorious, the new seeing the past as exploitation) provide meaning to the
present in an "ordered syntagmatic system." Bruner also notes that
anthropological stories are representations, not to be confused with
concrete existence. He concludes that stories are not ideologically neutral
and that Native Americans, as well as others, will continually be constructing
new theories reconsidering the past's dominant narrative (139-155).

19 In a video series entitled "The Native Americans" historians
attribute the founding of the unified thirteen colonies to Native American
influences. On July 4, 1744 the Indian Confederacy met with colonial
leaders and "admonished them to make a permanent peace" with one
another so that the tribes could deal with one government. Iroquois Chief
Gana-sedego was recorded as stating, "We are a powerful confederacy
and by your observing the same methods our wise forefathers have taken
you will acquire much strength and power." Historians recognized that it
may have been a coincidence that the founding fathers decided to form a
confederacy, but stressed the irony of that decision when the colonies
were "surrounded by a sea of confederacies from New England to Georgia."

20 Henry E. Fritz implied that Pratt did not have a formal strategy for
his educational efforts. Fritz wrote that instructional efforts and labor
programs incorporated at St. Augustine were only provided "in preference
to the dullness of simple confinement" (184). Another author, Evelyn
Adams, suggests that the founding of Carlisle was proposed by E. A. Hayt rather than Pratt. Adams further directs credit for the founding of off-reservation Indian schools to Armstrong's work at Hampton rather than to Pratt's lobbying efforts (52). But in a letter to Pratt, Hayt himself stated, "You are entitled to the credit of establishing the School" (Hoxie 266). While Pratt's involvement in the founding of Carlisle may be above question, the purposeful nature of his pedagogy continues to be mysteriously understated.

21 Pratt allowed his feelings regarding equality to color every aspect of his military commission. He recalled a situation where he deemed a black Private as the "cleanest drilled soldier" which resulted in him being selected as "orderly" to the commanding officer for the day. Pratt's commanding officer questioned his judgment in this selection and ordered him to select a familiar white Private in the future. Pratt questioned, "That is your order notwithstanding the rules?" He said, "It is." Pratt noted, "But I was not to execute that order for that night the white soldier deserted. He could not face the ridicule of his comrades at being beaten by a Negro" (28-29). This passage seems to be indicative of the extensive racism Pratt regularly confronted throughout his career.

22 Pratt seemed to record Mrs. Stowe's assistance with teaching effort as a routine visit. She apparently wintered in St. Augustine and enjoyed
spending time with Miss Mather (incidentally, he never recorded her first name), Pratt's chief instructor at St. Augustine and later Carlisle. Pratt reported an entertaining incident involving Stowe and Mather which involved a language lesson. While attempting to teach the Indian prisoners the "th" sound, Mather used the word "teeth." To exemplify this, she removed her dentures to show them a complete set. The Indians were horrified and began stating, "Miss Mather is no good"—meaning that she was defective. Apparently Mather and Stowe found this situation immensely humorous and shared a hearty laugh (Pratt *Battlefield* 154-155).

23 Pratt's memoirs note two rather negative encounters with John Wesley Powell. The first claimed that Powell took credit for archeological finds excavated by Pratt and his Indian prisoners at a Native American burial mound near St. Augustine (*Battlefield* 130-131). The second recounted Powell's interference with Pratt's display of traditional tribal habitations at the Columbian Exposition (305). Pratt never directly referenced Powell's theories in his text, nor did he offer any positive comments regarding Powell or his work.

24 In his essay, Knoblauch accentuates the importance of recognizing the social and political conditions that tend to drive notions of literacy. He continues, "Possessing that understanding, educators in particular . . . may advance their agendas for literacy with somewhat less likelihood of being blinded by the light of their own benevolence to the imperial designs that may lurk in the midst of their compassion" (75). Knoblauch's
observations add compelling insight into Pratt's notions of literacy education. Because Pratt did not question social or political roles of literacy agendas, he fell prey to an inappropriate vision of his own work, whereby he saw himself as a selfless servant of the Indian peoples.
## Appendix A
### Table of United States Government Officials, 1877-1920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Secretary of the Interior</th>
<th>Commissioner of Indian Affairs</th>
<th>Superintendent of Indian Schools</th>
<th>Government Legislation/Indian Educ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford B. Hayes</td>
<td>Appointed 1877 Carl Schurz</td>
<td>E. A. Hayt</td>
<td>-1880- E. M. Marble</td>
<td>1870- $100,000 budgeted for Native American (NA) Industrial Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-Position Created: Inspector of Indian Education)</td>
<td>1871- Treaty making period ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James A. Garfield</td>
<td>S. J. Kirkwood</td>
<td>Hiram Price</td>
<td>-1882- J. J. Haworth</td>
<td>1879- Carlisle Indian School founded by R. H. Pratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester A. Arthur</td>
<td>-1881- Henry M. Teller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1882- Unoccupied military facilities approved for NA boarding schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1887- Dawes Act (heralded as the &quot;Indian's Magna Carta&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grover Cleveland</td>
<td>L. Q. C. Lamar</td>
<td>J. D. C. Atkins</td>
<td>-1886- John B. Riley</td>
<td>1890- Federal tuition offered to public schools educating NAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Harrison</td>
<td>John W. Noble</td>
<td>Thomas J. Morgan</td>
<td>Daniel Dorchester</td>
<td>1892- Federal teachers placed in Civil Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grover Cleveland</td>
<td>Hoke Smith</td>
<td>D. M. Browning</td>
<td>-1894- W. N. Hailman</td>
<td>1894- Prohibited sending NA students out-of-state without parental consent (outlawed withholding rations to gain consent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1896- D. R. Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1895- NA students can't be moved from school to school without parental or student consent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William McKinley</td>
<td>C. N. Bliss</td>
<td>W. A. Jones</td>
<td>-1898- Estelle Reel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of United States Government Officials, 1877-1920 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Secretary of the Interior</th>
<th>Commissioner of Indian Affairs</th>
<th>Superintendent of Indian Schools</th>
<th>Government Legislation/ Indian Educ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William McKinley</td>
<td>E. A. Hitchcock</td>
<td>W. A. Jones</td>
<td>Estelle Reel</td>
<td>1901- Reel introduces vocationally oriented curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1901-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1904- Pratt retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Roosevelt</td>
<td>Hitchcock</td>
<td>Hitchcock</td>
<td>James R. Garfield</td>
<td>1909- White children approved to attend NA boarding schools if pay tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leupp's Motto: Individualize and Specialize brought &quot;assembly-line&quot; mentality to NA schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Francis E. Leupp</td>
<td>Estelle Reel</td>
<td>1916- Uniform course of study Introduced at all federal NA schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Roosevelt</td>
<td>Hitchcock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UnderSells, Carlisle specialized in mechanical trades and apprenticed students to the Ford Motor Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1907-</td>
<td>James R. Garfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>1917- Carlisle closed for use as a World War I hospital base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-</td>
<td>Richard A. Ballinger</td>
<td>Robert Valentine</td>
<td>Harvey Peairs</td>
<td>April 23, 1924- Pratt died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Taft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1924- Curtis Act granted citizenship to all NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-</td>
<td>Walter L. Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Until 1929 NA languages, dress and hair styles were forbidden in govn. schools (Macgregor117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson</td>
<td>Franklin K. Lane</td>
<td>Cato Sells</td>
<td>Harvey Peairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson</td>
<td>Franklin K. Lane</td>
<td>Cato Sells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nineteenth Century
Socio-Political Factors Influencing the Carlisle Indian School

Carlisle Indian School
1879-Carlisle founded by General Richard H. Pratt with 136 students from four tribes (64 Sioux from the Rosebud and Pine River Reservations) Ptolemaic Theme: All the Indian In Him A Save the Man
Outing System Instituted- immune NA in Anglo culture and hold them there until they are thoroughly saved (Pitts 335).
1880-Over 1,000 students attended Carlisle-"The progress of the pupils...is far greater than in day schools. The children being removed from the life and corrupting habits of savage homes are more easily led to adopt the customs of civilized life, work, or engaged in useful pursuits with a desire to learn"-Board of Indian Commissioners (Raynew 49).

By 1891- Educators at Carlisle "no longer worked to transform the children who arrived there" and began concentrating efforts on English literacy instruction and the training of factory workers and farmers (Hoxie 194, Fritz 164-168).
1894-Commissioner Hallinan developed a new curriculum to replace schoolroom pedantry with "realistic work" (Hoxie 190).
Pratt's Rejection due to disagreements with legislators regarding interdisciplinary education of students vs. the move to exclusively technical instruction
Carlisle specialized in mechanical trades and apprenticed students to the Ford Motor Company (Hoxie 204).
1918-Carlisle closed/use as an Army rehabilitation site for veterans of WW1

Governmental Legislation
1846-Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) transferred from War Dept. to the Dep't of Interior
1870-$100,000 budgeted for Native American (NA) Industrial Schools
1871-Treaty making final ends

Rhetorical Theory
Scottish Common Sense Realism: Attempted to take into account both aspects of nature (material-behavioral-sensory and rational, the ethical, and the aesthetic in addressing the "total person", yet the above stated faculties were mechanically combined: they function independently of each other (62)

Romantic Rhetoric: Democratic rhetoric persuasively presents truth (85) the writer offers the wisdom of the dialectical product of ideas and experience through concrete expression of metaphor (85) Emerson's details is everywhere dialectical (53)

Theorists
George Campbell
Hugh Blair
Ralph Waldo Emerson

Other Influences
Theory of "Social Evolution"-Anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan asserted: "Social development proceeds in a series of stages of savagery, barbarism, and civilization - and all people can be placed in one of these levels" This theory later created that societies not advancing would move toward barbarism, predicting the downfall of Native Americans (NA) as "Vanishing Americans."

Henry Teller, Secretary of Interior 1882-85, promoted belief in the equity of mankind yet, paradoxically, noted that NAs should be "compelled to enter our civilization whether we will or... we'll not it" (Hoxie 52).
J. D. C. Atkins, Commissioner of Indian Affairs 1885-88, asserted "the true purpose of educating them (Native Americans) was to enable them to read, write, and speak the English language."
Reform sympathizer William Strong advised that NAs should "not maintain their own language."

Educational Administrator Alfred L. Riggs notified Secretary Schurz, "First teaching the children to read and write in their own language enables them to master English with more ease."

Calvin Woodward: His theory of manual education advocated "symmetrical training" exposing students to "habits of work and concentration that could be transferred to academic areas" (Hoxie 68).

By 1901-Instruction of NA students in literature and the arts seen as "useless on stone ground" (Gepp 16).
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