

8-2012

A Way Out: The History of the Outing Program from the Haskell Institute to the Phoenix Indian School

Alexandria L. Gough
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Native American Studies Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gough, Alexandria L., "A Way Out: The History of the Outing Program from the Haskell Institute to the Phoenix Indian School" (2012). *Theses and Dissertations*. 545.
<http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/545>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu.

A WAY OUT: THE HISTORY OF THE OUTING PROGRAM
FROM THE HASKELL INSTITUTE TO THE PHOENIX INDIAN SCHOOL

A WAY OUT: THE HISTORY OF THE OUTING PROGRAM
FROM THE HASKELL INSTITUTE TO THE PHOENIX INDIAN SCHOOL

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in History

By

Alexandria L. Gough

University of Arkansas

Bachelor of Arts in History, 2010

August 2012

University of Arkansas

ABSTRACT

From the earliest years of the United States, its leaders wrestled with the perceived need to assimilate Indian peoples into American society. Many believed that Indians in their “natural” condition were cultural primitives incapable of taking part in national life. However, with proper guidance they could be elevated to a level of civilization that would allow them to join the national family. After the conclusion of the Indian Wars in the 1880’s, the United States government began to address the continued “Indian” problem by establishing Indian boarding schools. Indian children attended school to learn to behave as white, Christian and productive members of society.

Students attending the off-reservation boarding schools, like the Haskell Institute in Lawrence, Kansas and the Phoenix Indian School in Phoenix, Arizona were taught the fundamentals of education and a trade so they could eventually provide for themselves and their families without government support. In order to further reinforce these principles, students participated in the outing program, where they could work for local white families. This program allowed students to develop working relationships with whites, earn spending money, and practice what they learned at school in a practical setting. While this program was initially designed to quickly assimilate native children into white, middle class society, the program ensnared Native Americans in a constant state of wage labor. Students who graduated from the boarding schools often could not find jobs within their trade and many who returned home were ostracized for not knowing their traditional language and customs. These students, being caught between two worlds, were essentially assimilated as unskilled and inexpensive laborers willing to work for white employers. The outing program partially achieved the goal

of assimilation, but Indians did not achieve equal standing with whites. Instead, the outing program assimilated Indians by becoming common laborers for whites.

This thesis is approved for recommendation
to the Graduate Council.

Thesis Director:

Dr. Elliott West

Thesis Committee:

Dr. James Gigantino

Dr. Patrick Williams

©2012 by Alexandria L. Gough

All Rights Reserved

THESIS DUPLICATION RELEASE

I hereby authorize the University of Arkansas Libraries to duplicate this thesis when needed for research and/or scholarship.

Agreed_____

Alexandria Gough

Refused_____

Alexandria Gough

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is my pleasure to thank everyone who has helped shape this thesis into what it is today. This thesis originated as an undergraduate honors thesis under the direction of Dr. Elliott West, who helped me formulate my theories about the effectiveness of the outing program. After a successful honors thesis defense, I decided to continue my research on Indian boarding schools by looking at both the Haskell Institute and the Phoenix Indian School. Through the expansion of my original research I met many new people who had an immense impact on my research. First and foremost, the staff at the National Archives offices in Washington, D. C., Kansas City, Missouri, and Riverside, California aided my research with their knowledge of the collections and with the unenviable task of photocopying. I am also so thankful to them for allowing me to photograph literally thousands of documents. Without their kindness and their knowledge of their collections, this thesis could not have been written.

My advisor, Dr. West, has continued to be instrumental in the writing of this thesis and my education. His enduring patience of my hypothetical questions is remarkable. He has always been generous with his time and has been a thoughtful editor all the while encouraging me to think about the subject in new and inventive ways. Without his support, I know I could not be where I am today.

A special word of thanks goes to Dr. James Gigantino. Dr. Gigantino and I have gone round for some time now. As my first professor as a graduate student, he pushed, stretched, and demanded that I continue to grow in my thinking and writing. After taking more classes with him than any other professor in the department, I can honestly say I have grown. Never one to shy away from my frantic mid-night or vacation intruding emails, I've received some of the most valuable pieces of advice that I will not easily forget. Thank you for everything.

Last but certainly not least, in any respect, I thank my family. Only they know how hard this last year has been for me, but they have never stopped encouraging me and praying for me. They are now, and have been, and always will be my cheerleaders. I love you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Vocational Training in the West.....	18
III. The Outing Program.....	43
IV. Student Experiences.....	67
V. Community Reactions to Outing.....	90
VI. Conclusion.....	109
Bibliography.....	126

Introduction

From the earliest years of the republic, its leaders wrestled with the perceived need to assimilate Indian peoples into American society. Many believed that Indians in their “natural” condition were cultural primitives incapable of taking part in national life. However, with proper guidance they could be elevated to a level of civilization that would allow them to join the national family. But, to successfully assimilate, Native Americans, they had to adopt Christianity, practice European farming techniques, embrace certain moral fundamentals, including monogamy, and learn the many social customs of the American mainstream. Ultimately, whites required Indians to surrender their own cultures.

Initially, the responsibility for accomplishing this great change fell to missionaries and agents living among independent Indian peoples, but the Bureau of Indian Affairs expected this to take many generations. During the 19th century, and especially after the Mexican Cession and Oregon Treaty that secured American hegemony over the continent, government officials and the American people alike realized that the transformation of Indians into white needed to be accomplished far sooner. With the defeat of the last resistant Indians after the Civil War, government officials turned to ever more rigorous methods to meet the old goals of turning indigenous peoples into potential citizens. Education of Indian youth always had been a prime part of assimilation programs since the efforts of the first missionaries, and now the government re-examined Indian education with an eye to using it to accelerate the cultural evolution of native peoples. Though education would help deliver all Indians from their plight, government officials realized that they would be most successful by focusing on children rather than adults. The Bureau of Indian Affairs saw adult Indians as resistant to change, but they believed young children would be more receptive to education and white society.

Many believed that Indian children, if educated in a school setting similar to white children, could enjoy the same opportunities as any upper-class white child.¹ In 1900, officials at the Department of the Interior argued that since “the disposition and hereditary instinct of the old and conservative Indian cannot be changed, governmental support should be provided “to train the next generation of these people so that they may become stronger mentally, morally, and physical[ly].”² The Interior Department believed this education essential, as it would not only pacify Indians but save the government money. In the years after the Civil War the federal government spent one million dollars for each Indian killed in battle while educating one Indian child for eight years, and thereby assimilating him, only cost \$1,200. In addition, after the Indians became educated and especially if they could be taught a trade, they could support themselves rather than relying upon government aid, which would thereby lead to the integration of Indian peoples into white society.³

Indian education soon developed into three different types of schools: reservation day schools, reservation boarding schools, and off-reservation boarding schools. The 1860’s gave rise to the first type, the reservation day school. Indian children attended school for four to five hours a day and then returned home to their parents, just like traditional, white elementary schools. These schools focused on basic, primary education by teaching the students to read and write along with other basic principles. This type of school, while convenient and perhaps the most comfortable for the children, did not effectively assimilate them since they learned about white culture and society during the day, but returned to their traditional homes and

¹ David Wallace Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928* (Lawrence: UP of Kansas, 1995), 18-19.

² *Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1900*, Interior Affairs Report to the Commissioner and Appendixes (Washington: GPO, 1900), 33.

³ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 20.

culture during the evenings. To Indian reformers, this system advanced too slowly since it took several generations before Indian students could assimilate into white society.⁴

The reservation boarding school developed in the 1870's as a response to the criticism surrounding the reservation day schools. These new schools, although located near the reservations, did not have any specific ties with local reservations. Children lived at the school and returned home during the winter and summer breaks. Soon it became evident that this too was problematic, since the students still spent extended periods of time with their families and retained much of their traditional lifestyle – the exact opposite of what the government and the schools intended.⁵ Reformers concluded that students should be placed in boarding schools removed from the reservations in order to be fully incorporated into white society.

Since three distinct Indian school systems existed, problems arose as each school operated independently without a standard government approved curriculum. Indian Commissioner Thomas J. Morgan developed a system to determine which children attended what type of school while ensuring that no one type of school became overcrowded. By the 1890's, many of the nation's day reservation schools had closed, due to their ineffectiveness at assimilation, and the responsibilities had been assumed by the reservation boarding schools. At this point, the reservation boarding schools taught local students the basics of education and served primarily as an elementary school focusing on the education of the lower grades. Off-reservation schools taught students from the upper elementary grades through middle school. Students who wished to continue their studies by attending high school and learning vocational

⁴ Ibid., 28-29.

⁵ Ibid., 31.

or commercial trades could only do so at select off-reservation schools, such as the Carlisle Indian School, the Haskell Institute, and the Santa Fe Indian School.⁶

To facilitate movement between the reservation and off-reservation schools, Morgan required the reservation schools to send their brightest students to receive further instruction at off-reservation boarding schools. This method allowed promising students to attend larger, better funded schools that could offer them the most opportunities. Because the reservation schools often kept their best students in an attempt to make their own schools appear more successful, many off-reservation schools had to recruit their students directly from the reservations in order to obtain enough students.⁷

Once admitted to the non-reservation boarding school, Indian children had to adjust to an entirely foreign world. Boarding schools adopted military principles, in order to teach Indian students to be obedient and reinforce white superiority. Many government and school officials believed that the practice of dividing students into groups to preform military drills would help the children learn to work as a group and be obedient, self-restrained, and disciplined. Schools punished disobedient students in order to reinforce the right course of action for the offender and all other witnesses. All boarding schools used corporal punishment, but some schools, especially prior to 1900, practiced more extreme forms of punishment. Some schools, including the esteemed Carlisle Indian School and the Haskell Institute, used a school jail often called a guard house. Imprisoned in a stone room with no windows, students remained there for hours and sometimes days, which encouraged the students to remove their cultural identities and often resulted in breaking their will to rebel against the school. The

⁶ Ibid., 62.

⁷ Ibid.

government discouraged this practice, but it was not discontinued until the turn of the 20th century.⁸

By the turn of the century, concerned citizens, government officials, and teachers initiated a campaign to improve the nation's boarding schools. After the government realized that harsh treatments did not result in Indians being assimilated rapidly, along with rampant cases of disease and overcrowding within the schools, government officials created the position of "school inspector," later called the Superintendent of Indian Schools. The Superintendent of Indian Schools toured the nation's boarding schools to determine how each might be improved. The Superintendent's recommendations went directly to the Secretary of Interior, who could take prompt action to remedy potentially dangerous situations as a result of the poor conditions at many of the Indian schools.⁹ In addition to establishing school hospitals, limiting overcrowding, and ensuring schools had the necessary supplies, the campaign for improving Indian schools focused on increasing the schools' emphasis on vocational training. By teaching the students the fundamentals of education along with a trade, it was hoped that Indians could then be able to break from the aid of the government and support themselves.¹⁰ In addition, Indians could provide whites with both skilled and unskilled labor as a means of assimilation as menial laborers. This campaign led to the establishment of vocational programs and the use of the "outing program," a student exchange program that allowed Indian students to live with white families in order to learn trades and become productive members of white middle class society.

⁸ Ibid., 118-119; Ibid., 121; Ibid., 123.

⁹ Ibid., 68-69.

¹⁰ Ibid., 133; Ibid., 315.

The idea of white families allowing Indians to live with them so that they could learn the ways of proper society had existed since 1618. Virginian authorities stated everyone should endeavor “to bring the native children to the true religion, morality, virtue, and civility.” While this statement referred to every Christian’s duty to bring people to Christ, it does show that the idea of a direct relationship with Indians existed from the earliest settlers until the establishment of boarding schools. The first Virginian legislative assembly stated that every plantation should take Indian children into their homes in order to teach them the ways of white society, although it is unclear whether any families acted upon this suggestion.¹¹

The Cushmans, a prominent Puritan family, made a more direct statement concerning white and Indian relationships in 1621. In reference to “those poor heathens,” their biographical genealogy states “...we find in many of them, especially of the younger sort, such a tractable disposition, both to religion and humanity, as that if we had means to apparel them, and wholly to retain them with us (as their desire is) they would doubtless in time prove serviceable to God and man, and if ever God send us means, we will bring up hundreds of their children, both to labor and learning.”¹² Puritans predictably emphasized the conversion of Indians to Christianity, but what is intriguing about this statement is the fact that, as in Virginia, the settlers were eager to keep the children with them to teach them to be a functional part of white society. This is the first instance of an entire community showing an eagerness to transform the Indians in more than a spiritual sense.

Once the government began looking at educating Native American children, the idea of the outing program or an apprenticeship soon came to the forefront. From the seventeenth

¹¹ *Annual Report 1900*, 32.

¹² Henry Wyles Cushman, *A Historical and Biographical Genealogy of the Cushmans: the Descendants of Robert Cushman, the Puritan, 1617-1855* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1855), 44.

century to the formation of government run boarding schools, fledgling forms of the outing program flickered into existence through the efforts of supportive individuals. The *Native American*, the Phoenix Indian School's paper, reported that the first Indian apprentice who successfully learned printing did so in the seventeenth century in Cambridge, Massachusetts under the direction of John Eliot. Eliot reported that this Indian worker was the only employee "who was able to compose the sheets and correct the press with understanding."¹³ Initially, the idea of allowing a 'savage' into one's home did not spark a lot of interest, but the idea spread and by the eighteenth century, several ministers from the eastern states took Indian children into their homes to teach them.¹⁴

Richard Henry Pratt established the first fully functional outing program in the country. Pratt, retired from service at the end of the Civil War, but he re-joined the military in 1867 as a second lieutenant in the 10th Calvary to subdue Indian resistance in the West.¹⁵ Once in the West, Pratt concluded that Indians could become civilized, but he believed that would never happen as long as they lived on reservations and continued to live in a traditional manner.¹⁶ If Indians could be removed from their environment, they could do as much as any white man. He even stated that Indians possessed "exceptional pluck and endurance" and a strong character that had carried them through the Indian wars. Pratt claimed that he could take any Indian "straight from the camps" and transform him into a respectable member of society within three years.¹⁷

¹³ *Native American*, April 21, 1900.

¹⁴ Robert A. Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930," *Pacific Historical Review* 52, no. 3 (1983): 269.

¹⁵ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 38.

¹⁶ *Annual Report 1900*, 31-32.

¹⁷ Elaine Goodale Eastman, *Pratt: The Red Man's Moses* (Norman: UP of Oklahoman, 1935), 57; *Ibid.*, 223.

In 1875, Pratt became a warden at an Indian prison established in the abandoned military post of Fort Marion, in St. Augustine, Florida which formed the basis of what would soon become the modern outing system. As soon as Pratt assumed his new position he decided to conduct a rudimentary type of school for the young Indian boys under his supervision. Pratt essentially wanted to experiment with his idea of Indian education without the government assuming responsibility or the risk associated with its possible failure. In time, Pratt allowed the Indians to polish sea shells to sell to tourists. Unlike other work programs of the time, the Indian boys kept the money they earned to spend as they pleased.¹⁸ The prisoners worked, earned money, and most importantly learned to interact with whites within the confines of white society.

Soon after the work program began, Pratt allowed the Indian boys to work outside of the complex. Many worked at local orange groves, packing houses, sawmills, and some even worked as baggage men at the railroad station.¹⁹ This fledgling outing program began with only eighteen boys, but participation grew rapidly. “The Indian student rapidly mastered the English language,” Pratt wrote, and “internalized the habits of industriousness, and generally speaking, acquired the everyday habits of civilized living.” With such a marked improvement of the Indian prisoners, the Fort Marion outing system soon expanded from a summer experience to include the whole year.²⁰ Eventually, the success of the program and the apparent change of the prisoners convinced the government to release the Indian prisoners in 1878. Many boys immediately returned home, but twenty-two boys wanted to continue their education.

¹⁸ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 39; Eastman, *Pratt*, 57.

¹⁹ Eastman, *Pratt*, 57-58.

²⁰ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 54.

Although those students who had been at Fort Marion had some basic education, Pratt also realized that he needed to find an acceptable location for Indians who came straight from the reservations. Since off-reservation Indian schools had not yet been established, Pratt faced the difficult task of finding an existing school that would accept Indian children. The Hampton Norman and Industrial Institute, originally developed to teach trades to freed slaves, seemed to fit the needs of Pratt and his students, but Ezra A. Hayt, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, rejected the idea. He feared mixing Native Americans and African American students would promote immorality which would make the government's job of assimilation of both blacks and Indians more difficult. Hayt finally allowed the admission of 50 Indians, however. Only seventeen students accepted the offer at first, but by the end of 1878, the first year Indians attended, sixty-two Indians had enrolled.²¹ The Hampton Institute experienced a rapid enrollment of Indian students and the school soon asked Pratt to lead the Indian program rather than remain a teacher. Pratt brought his experience with the outing program to the Hampton Institute. Here too, it proved very successful.²²

Soon after joining the staff of the Hampton Institute, Pratt decided to start his own school devoted to the education of Indians. The government allowed Pratt to use an abandoned military base at Carlisle, Pennsylvania as the first non-reservation boarding school for Indians. The Carlisle Indian School opened on November 1, 1879 with the capacity to house 125 students.²³

Although Pratt had great success with his students at Fort Marion working for local patrons, he encountered initial distrust and reluctance among many of the farmers surrounding

²¹ Robert A. Trennert, "Educating Indian Girls at Non-reservation Boarding Schools, 1878-1920," *The Western Historical Quarterly* 13, no. 3 (1982): 274-275.

²² Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 44; *Ibid.*, 47; Eastman, *Pratt*, 222.

²³ Eastman, *Pratt*, 77; Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 48.

the school at Carlisle. Pratt had hoped that Pennsylvanians would readily accept Indian students into their homes and teach them with Christian love; however, many potential patrons were afraid to allow Indians into their homes.²⁴ Eventually, Emily Bowen, a resident of Connecticut, volunteered to take eight Indian girls under her tutelage to “educate them to return and be a blessing to their people.”²⁵ Once individuals realized that the students would not harm them or their families, the outing program developed into a noteworthy system that served as a model for many other non-reservation boarding schools. The first summer outing, in 1880, had a total of twenty-four participants, but this number grew steadily throughout the years. By 1903, 305 students participated in the full year outing program, which allowed students to attend local white public schools. After twenty-four successful years of the program, Carlisle set a record of sending 948 students to local homes within one year.²⁶

Before any students could be placed, Pratt required both employers and students to sign a contract to ensure that both parties knew the program’s ultimate goal: to emphasize and reinforce the student’s education.²⁷ This document informed employers that the program was not a work program and that no abuse of the system would be tolerated. Because participation in the program was not required, students who wished to participate had to submit a formal request. There was only one requirement: they had to have at least a working knowledge of English. Pratt chose families carefully and investigated the homes before any students were placed with a family. The school monitored every student and their patron to guarantee that the host families did not take advantage of their student workers. In addition, each family

²⁴ Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 272.

²⁵ Trennert, “Educating Indian Girls,” 277.

²⁶ Eastman, *Pratt*, 223; Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 275.

²⁷ Eastman, *Pratt*, 224.

submitted a monthly report advising the school of the student's behavior.²⁸ Students also submitted a report stating their view of the program and their host family. This system allowed both the patrons and the students to hold each other accountable for their actions while the school ensured the best interest for all parties involved.

Eventually so many students participated in the program, that Pratt found it necessary to establish an office at Carlisle that acted as a liaison between the students and host families to ensure the safety of the children and the effectiveness of the program. Representatives of the office, referred to as outing agents, made scheduled and unannounced visits to check on the living circumstances of the students.²⁹ By having a separate office and outing agents in charge of the outing program, Pratt created a type of quality control that hopefully identified and removed students from dangerous or simply unproductive circumstances.

As the program expanded, outing began to take on three distinct forms. The first and the most basic of the three consisted of only allowing outing through the summer months. The second sent children on outing year-round for one to two years, which allowed students to attend local public schools. Pratt initially refused to send students to cities or industrial settings since he believed students in those situations, being far removed from the supervision of the school, could easily become wage laborers by working in menial positions, undermining the educational aspect of the program. Instead, Pratt stated, "we make it a rule that they [the students] go only to those homes where the people will take them into the family, and be personally interested in them."³⁰ With the large amount of student interest in the outing program, however, Carlisle soon exhausted all potential outing placements surrounding the

²⁸ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 158-159.

²⁹ Eastman, *Pratt*, 224.

³⁰ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 274-275.

school and it became necessary to seek out suitable positions within cities. This became the third type of outing at Carlisle. Pratt believed that students who spent extended amounts of time with their host families were the most successful, but those who worked in cities or industrial areas encountered many more corrupt and abusive situations.³¹ Although Pratt deemed year-long outing to be the most successful option, the majority of schools adopted only the summer outing simply because it was an easier program to establish and manage. After the success of the outing program at Carlisle became well known, non-reservation boarding schools and government officials alike became interested in expanding the program across the nation, but many, Pratt included, feared that other regions of the country would not be as sympathetic to the plight of Indians as the Quakers in Pennsylvania who had been the primary patrons of outing students. Pratt was especially concerned that opportunistic farmers would be interested in solely obtaining cheap labor rather than teaching the Indians a trade or treating them as a member of their family.³² The Superintendent of Indian Schools, Daniel Dorchester agreed. Pratt even wrote a letter to General O. O. Howard, a military friend and fellow educator, in 1895 stating, “You know and I know that frontier ‘outing’ is and must be a flat failure.”³³

Despite Pratt’s misgivings, the overwhelming enthusiasm concerning outing pushed the program into the West. At its height at Carlisle, the assistant Superintendent A. J. Standing stated that the program was the best “civilizing agency.” A report to the Department of the Interior predicted that it “will prove elsewhere as well as at Carlisle that the best system of civilizing Indians is ‘mixing’ them with the families of white citizens in their homes, in their

³¹ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 157.

³² Eastman, *Pratt*, 223.

³³ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 162.

shops, and in their fields.”³⁴ By 1881, the U. S. Senate approved an amendment to the Indian appropriations bill fully endorsing the outing program and encouraging its growth. The *Outlook*, a popular magazine around the turn of the century, featured an article by George Bird Grinnell, stating that the instillation of the outing program in the West, “...is well worth trying, though at a smaller scale....If the experiment should prove as successful there as in the East, the whole question of Indian education and Indian progress will be simplified and hastened.”³⁵

Such praise and the hope placed in the outing program apparently somewhat relieved Pratt’s fears of the success of the program. “The great need of the Indian is the language, intelligence, industry and skill of the white man,” he wrote in 1888:

Some say he can best acquire these by keeping away from the white man, but the proof and common sense are all the other way. Those who claim to be friends to the Indians and yet seek to limit their range of opportunities for association with the whites ... are not less real enemies than those who destroy them with powder and sword. An Indian can do no better thing for himself than to spend years among the best whites, gaining their language, industry and skill in the fullest and quickest way, and if he begets a desire to continue that association for life ... why forbid or limit his possibility, his rights as a man, or his liberty, under any pretense whatever?”³⁶

In 1891, Pratt wrote in his annual report of Carlisle that “Through contact only will prejudice of the whites against the Indians, be broken up ... I have always advocated that schools for Indian youth be so located and conducted as to be the means of getting young Indians into our American life.”³⁷

After Congress agreed to appropriate funding toward building additional non-reservation schools, locations for the new schools were considered across the nation. Pratt and many other believed that Lawrence, Kansas would provide an ideal location for an Indian

³⁴ *Annual Report 1900*, 430; *Ibid.*, 32.

³⁵ Eastman, *Pratt*, 288; George Bird Grinnell, “The Indians and the Outing System,” *The Outlook*, September 19, 1903, 173.

³⁶ Eastman, *Pratt*, 221-222.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 230.

school due to its proximity to Topeka, Kansas City, and the University of Kansas. The surrounding areas could easily provide host families for the outing program and it was thought that a better educated population would be more sympathetic to the Indian condition and how it might be improved. Representative Dudley Chase Haskell, who had lobbied extensively for the establishment of an Indian boarding school in his home town, was immensely pleased to learn the government had indeed chosen to locate an Indian school in Lawrence. The government had provided no funding for its construction, however. The town therefore started a campaign to raise money for the purchase of land and construction of buildings. They raised \$10,000 for the land, but construction halted due to insufficient funding. Eventually, the school had three buildings completed by July of 1884.³⁸

The school opened on September 17, 1884 with an enrollment of twenty-two students. The school's biggest advocate, Congressman Haskell, had died on December 17th, 1883 and to commemorate his role in the school's founding, the Indian school became known as the Haskell Institute. Financial shortcomings continued to plague the school during its first year, resulting in the suspension of construction of the boiler room. Frigid conditions may have contributed to the deaths of ten students before the completion of the project in late November. Nonetheless, the school began to grow and finished its first year with an astounding 280 students enrolled.³⁹

Like many off-reservation schools, Haskell found it difficult to recruit students due to the risk of interfering with the recruitment of reservation day schools. The Haskell Institute relied on word-of-mouth recommendations, door-to-door recruitment, and former students

³⁸ Myriam, Vučković, *Voices from Haskell: Indians Students between Two Worlds, 1884-1928* (Lawrence: UP of Kansas, 2008), 18-19.

³⁹ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 19-21.

touting its advantages. Although Haskell had to recruit students by non-traditional means, their attendance continued to grow. In 1889, the school had 425 students enrolled and by 1894 that number had increased to 660 students representing over thirty-five tribes. The school's skyrocketing attendance made the Haskell Institute the second largest Indian school, after Carlisle. When Carlisle closed in 1918, Haskell became the largest Indian school in the nation, with an enrollment of 1,130 students.⁴⁰

While the Haskell Institute was founded with the first wave of boarding schools, the Phoenix Indian School did not form until 1891, during a second and significantly larger wave of schools that pushed further west. The Phoenix Indian School, originally located at Ft. McDowell, immediately faced problems of dilapidated facilities and issues of transporting construction materials and foodstuffs to the site. As a result, the school relocated to three miles north of the city of Phoenix. There, the superintendents of the school could easily buy, sell and trade in Phoenix, and the teachers could also find jobs for their outing students within homes in the city. This new location also placed the school next to many orchards where school officials hoped many students could go on outing.⁴¹ By the turn of the century Phoenix had a population of 8,000, but relatively few Indians lived within the city limits. The location of the Phoenix Indian School provided a sense of separation between the reservations and the city and could even be seen as a stepping stone to help Indians enter white civilized society.⁴²

⁴⁰ Ibid., 38; Ibid., 28-29; Ibid., 33; Ibid., 43.

⁴¹ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 278; Robert A. Trennert, *The Phoenix Indian School: Forced Assimilation in Arizona, 1891-1935* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988), 18.

⁴² Dorothy R. Parker, *Phoenix Indian School: The Second Half-Century* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996), 3; Robert A. Trennert, "Victorian Morality and the Supervision of Indian Women Working in Phoenix, 1906-1930," *Journal of Social History* 22, no. 1 (1988): 115.

Although Indian boarding schools encouraged female students to attend, the Phoenix Indian School initially had no female students enrolled simply because the girl's dormitory had not yet been completed. Once completed, Superintendent Wellington Rich enrolled twenty girls to attend classes and work within the domestic science departments of the school. Although Pratt had not viewed Indian girls' education as an important facet of Indian boarding schools, the Phoenix Indian School enrolled far more Indian girls than boys.⁴³ To the early superintendents, girls were easier to recruit to school, more obedient than boys, and they could easily be placed within the outing system.⁴⁴ The school quickly grew to be one of the largest schools in the Southwest with an average enrollment of about 700 students. By 1921, the Phoenix Indian School could no longer accept any new students because their facilities had been filled to capacity. At this point, the school became known as the "Carlisle of the West."⁴⁵

The national expansion of Indian boarding schools led to a steady decline of formal education and the rise of vocational education. Western boarding schools strove to teach students a trade and to instill a work ethic through labor at the school. This allowed students to practice their trade while also allowing the school to remain operational. By working at the school, students gained valuable experience that hopefully would aid them in finding outing positions and eventually full time employment once they returned to the reservation. Pratt soon

⁴³ Trennert, "Educating Indian Girls," 279. Pratt thought that female education was of minor importance since they were only educated as a way to support the boys in the program whose training held far more importance. Hence, girls could only learn domestic science trades in preparation for being a wife rather than finding working outside of the home. Ibid., 277.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 280.

⁴⁵ C. W. Goodman, "Report of School at Phoenix, Ariz., August 18, 1903," *Annual Reports of the Department of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1903* (Washington D.C.: GPO, 1904), 411; *Native American*, October 27, 1900; *Native American*, September 10, 1921; Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 280.

began to realize that the majority of boarding schools did not develop an outing program that reflected the goals of Carlisle nor did their students reap the same benefits.

By the turn of the century, the Bureau of Indian Affairs replaced many of the humanitarian reformers, who had advocated for Indian schools and formal education, with bureaucrats who believed that Indians could not be fully assimilated.⁴⁶ Rather than be fully educated they should be trained to be wage laborers. Even with the development of the Phoenix Indian School, the first superintendent, Wellington Rich, believed that the majority of male students should be trained as fruit growers and pickers since they would support the school and work for nearby orchards.⁴⁷ The outing program, as a way to assimilate Native Americans into white middle class society, allowed students to work with local families and businesses for minimal wages; however, student labor from the Haskell Institute and the Phoenix Indian School soon ceased to teach vocational skills and became a way for Indians to assimilate into white society as modern wage laborers.

⁴⁶ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 288; *Ibid.*, 283.

⁴⁷ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 279.

Vocational Training in the West

Upon their arrival at the boarding schools, students went through a process of physical and social transformation meant to strip them of any cultural identity. Teachers immediately cut the students hair into standard and acceptable short hairstyles, which allowed for cleanliness and also conformity, especially since the Indian's long hair indicated their "barbarism and uncleanness" and ultimately would not be acceptable in white society. Clothing was often replaced by other garments inferior in construction and quality, but conforming to white standards of the day.¹ School uniforms discouraged nearby whites from associating students with the "savages" from the West. Receiving new names would also supposedly assimilate Indian students into white culture more quickly. Although renaming students allowed teachers to avoid the often difficult pronunciations and odd meanings of the names, Native American students saw this as a great affront to their culture.²

Students entered a world profoundly foreign to them and their ancestors. The buildings were constructed with straight lines, squares, corners and right angles.³ These reflected white values of privacy through private spaces divided by walls, in contrast to Indian dwellings composed of circles, reflecting the belief that all things inter-connect with one another. Students also learned the importance of clocks, schedules, and the consequences of being late. Indians based all records of events and seasons by observing the sun and taking note of natural occurrences, while "clock time" was among the most important features of the modern Euro-

¹ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 64; *Ibid.*, 100-101; *Ibid.*, 103.

² *Ibid.*, 108.

³ *Ibid.*, 133.

American world. Without a firm knowledge of working by a schedule or hours, Native Americans could not properly function or even keep a job within white society.⁴

Aside from the many cultural changes students encountered immediately upon admission to boarding schools, each school posed specific challenges for students. These differing experiences become particularly clear when the Haskell Institute and the Phoenix Indian School are compared with one another.

Many Indian schools were very disciplined and even militaristic by nature; the Haskell Institute was no exception. The second superintendent, Colonel Arthur Grabowskii, strove to make the school resemble a military compound by dividing students into five “companies” that performed military style drills daily. Grabowskii believed this broke all tribal lines and forced the children to speak English since each company contained a mixture of all tribes represented at the school.⁵ In addition, Grabowskii established a demerit system enforced by the students. Any demerits received could be worked off by doing extra chores, but if a student received too many, harsher punishments, including confinement in the school’s guardhouse, were imposed.⁶ H. B. Peairs, the disciplinarian at the time and who would later become the longest serving superintendent, became known for his harsh punishments. In fact, John Yellow Bear accused him of breaking his leg as a result of punishment. Peairs remained the disciplinarian, since the school nurses said Yellow Bear’s leg was just “sprained,” but his punishments significantly lessened in severity.⁷

⁴ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 119-120; *Ibid.*, 164.

⁵ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 23; Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 118-119.

⁶ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 62; *Ibid.*, 219.

⁷ Eric Anderson, *An Imperfect Education Assimilation and American Indians at Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, 188-1894* (Master’s Thesis, University of Kansas, 1990), 88.

Superintendent Charles Robinson, who immediately followed Grabowskii, worked to ease some of the demands placed upon the students. He established the school's band and library, and even allowed students to gather for social activities two nights a week. Although more relaxed than his predecessor, Robinson enforced many rules to maintain order. Boys and girls could seldom be together, even in their free time. Boys spent their time outdoors while the girls stayed inside and partook of womanly activities such as letter writing, sewing, and reading. Even school dances were initially prohibited since they allowed too much familiarity and physical closeness between the sexes. In addition, school administrators tried to prevent boys from sneaking into the girls' dormitories during the night by nailing all the windows shut and locking all fire escapes, but this was discontinued after a safety report cited this as an extreme danger in case of fire.⁸

Students also faced significant changes in their diets. For most boarding schools, meals were simply determined by a white middle class diet and reinforced by budgetary constraints and the availability of goods. As a result, the most common meal featured beef, potatoes, bread and gravy. Due to this, Haskell became known as the "Gravy College." The Meriam report of 1928, commissioned by the Office of Indian Affairs and led by Lewis Meriam, reported these conditions and suggested ways to improve the nation's boarding schools. The report's alarming findings demonstrated that students rarely ate vegetables and were constantly malnourished. In addition, dormitories continued to be overcrowded and unsanitary and

⁸ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 25; *Ibid.*, 187; *Ibid.*, 146; Brenda Child, *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families 1900-1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 38.

toiletries remained in short supply. Many students had to share towels and toothbrushes, while soap and toilet paper were perpetually absent.⁹

Student discontent consequently ran high at the Haskell Institute and for the first few years of the school's existence, Haskell had a chronic problem of runaway students. In 1885, its second school year, forty-five "desertions" occurred, and in 1910, 109 students ran away within the first three months of school. Whenever desertion occurred, the school contacted the local police and together with the school staff they searched for the missing students. Once caught, teachers or law officers promptly returned the students to the school. Students deserted for a host of reasons, but the most common centered on homesickness and the strict rules of the institution.¹⁰ Students who attended Haskell quickly realized they would be spending the majority of their childhood within the confines of the school, especially since students could not return home to their families during summer or winter breaks.

Phoenix students also had to adjust to the world of boarding schools, but unlike Haskell, teachers helped the new students acclimate to their environment by pairing the new students with older students from the same tribe. These pairs often became inseparable. The older student could communicate the school rules, likely including hints and tips concerning teachers, in a familiar language, while the new students formed a friendship with an older student that resembled a sibling relationship. Younger students could look up to and ask for advice from the older student, while the older students served as a good example through manner, deed, or language. After shadowing another student for a couple of weeks, dorm assignments and

⁹ Lucille Winnie, *Sah-gan-de-oh: The Chief's Daughter* (New York: Vantage Press, 1969), 49; Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 187; 83; Superintendent Meserve, "Report of Haskell Institute, Lawrence Kansas," *Report to the Secretary of Interior* (Washington: GPO, 1891), 563.

¹⁰ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 234-235; 237.

classes were shuffled so no one with the same tribal affiliations would be placed directly next to one another.¹¹ Thereafter, English became the dominant language and curriculum became more important than friendships. After completing a tour of the facilities at the Phoenix Indian School, a local Phoenician, who evidently was highly impressed by the school's facilities, stated, "Too bad we can't all be Indians."¹² Students from the Phoenix Indian School seemed to enjoy their time there and desertions rarely occurred. Of course many of the difficult rules remained intact, but teachers at Phoenix seemed to recognize the importance of a school community. Therefore, students had plenty of opportunities to meet and socialize on the school grounds, especially near the large lagoon on the campus where the boys fished and the girls had picnics under the shade trees. The school newspaper, the *Native American*, presented articles and school news in a jovial manner that further supported the camaraderie between the students.¹³ It is unclear why the Haskell Institute and the Phoenix Indian School maintained such a different approach to Indian education, especially since the curriculum had been standardized by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the emphasis on vocational training remained virtually the same. Still, it is clear that the morale at Phoenix remained markedly higher, leading to fewer desertions and greater successes with their students.

The Phoenix Indian School also operated a sanatorium and school on its campus, called the East Farm Sanatorium. Many Indian children had contracted tuberculosis either on reservations or in the crowded and unsanitary conditions at boarding schools. Once established, the East Farm Sanatorium allowed the students in their care to attend school for a few hours a day; however, it only admitted school age children who had a strong chance of

¹¹ Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 4; *Ibid.*, 8.

¹² *Native American*, April 3, 1920.

¹³ *Native American*, January 23, 1900; *Ibid.*, May 12, 1900.

recovery and who had not been declared bed-ridden. By 1915, the sanatorium contained sixty-five patients/students and had acquired space for an additional thirty-five beds.¹⁴

Although considerable differences existed between the Haskell Institute and the Phoenix Indian School, the curriculum and the goals of the school remained identical due to the standardization of Indian schools through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Teachers taught basic education which included English, math, sciences, and geography along with the many vocational courses offered at the schools. As the Superintendent of Phoenix stated, “The classroom work is forceful and aggressive and is cutting a wide swath in Indian ignorance and primitive superstition.”¹⁵ Teachers also taught their pupils etiquette and how to behave among whites. Students were to present the school as well as themselves in a positive light. While teachers performed the majority of this teaching, students helped reinforce good behavior by helping fellow students or sometimes humiliating them in order to further emphasize what one should and should not do.¹⁶

Indian boarding schools began as a way to offer all Indian youth basic education, but as time went on, it became clear to the Bureau of Indian Affairs administrators that boarding schools needed to raise their educational standards while also focusing more on vocational programs. When boarding schools began, they often included all ages, from infants to teenagers; however, with some restructuring the off-reservation boarding schools began to focus only on students between sixth and twelfth grade. The Phoenix Indian School did not

¹⁴ Ibid., May 8, 1915.

¹⁵ Goodman, “Report of School at Phoenix,” 411.

¹⁶ An example of this type of behavior occurred at the Phoenix Indian School after a young classmate unsuccessfully attempted to eat a soft boiled egg. After spilling the egg on his napkin, the incident was written up in the school newspaper. The article emphasized learning quickly and correctly from their teachers or else the unfortunate student would be given a nickname indicating his failure to learn. In this instance, students began calling this student “Egg-face man.” *Native American*, April 7, 1900.

become a high school until the 1960's, but school officials began making strides towards this goal early on. In 1928, as more reservation schools were established, the Phoenix Indian School began eliminating the lower grades which drastically reduced their enrollment numbers from 950 students in 1928 to only 500 in 1935.¹⁷

The Haskell Institute, on the other hand, went through a much more gradual process of eliminating younger students, but actually became an accredited high school in 1921, with the first graduates in 1923.¹⁸ Before the 1920's, Haskell's curriculum ended with the eighth grade. The students could then either return home or remain at the school to receive specialized training within the industrial, business, commercial or nursing departments.¹⁹ Haskell became a "continuing school" just after 1900, which restricted the age of students admitted to fourteen and above. This classification also ensured that all students in attendance had prior school experience before entering Haskell, allowing Haskell to focus on industrial training for students, with the goal of teaching students to be self-sufficient and provide for their families after graduation. Haskell also strove to format their curriculum to resemble that of the Kansas public school system, in order for students to attend local schools while on year long outing.²⁰

While students attended classes and learned valuable skills and developed trades, they also learned to be diligent Christians. Many people, including those in the government, believed Christianizing the Indians could go a long way towards assimilating them into white society. At the turn of the century, also at the height of Victorian morality, Indian women were thought to be "prone to filth, 'animal gratification,' lewd, licentious, and promiscuous behavior

¹⁷ Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 4.

¹⁸ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 37.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 92.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 40; *Ibid.*, 56; *Ibid.*, 96.

in general, and drinking and laziness in particular.”²¹ In order to counteract these tendencies many schools, like Haskell, established weekly religious services and Bible classes. Both the Haskell and Phoenix school newspapers published religious articles containing religious principles, sermons, or lectures from theologians.²² Teaching Indian students the basics of Christianity and morality also helped facilitate the outing program, since patrons could be insured that their student workers were not heathens, but had in fact been converted to Christianity.

Vocational education soon began to supersede the importance of traditional education, especially since the majority of Americans agreed with the Superintendent of Indian Schools when he stated Indians were “too dull to excel in academics.”²³ Industrial or vocational training adhered to Victorian customs by training women to work in the home and raise children while men provided security and means for his family. These gender-specific tasks often defied tribal customs. Among many native cultures, for example, women did all the work of tilling, planting, weeding, and harvesting crops while the men hunted game. Instead, in Indian schools, boys worked in the fields while the girls remained in the home and learned to be proper housewives.

The Haskell Institute and the Phoenix Indian School essentially blended traditional and vocational education together to complete their curriculum. This cooperative vocational training, as it became known, required students to spend half of the school day in the classroom studying traditional subjects and the other half being trained in specific areas related to their

²¹ Trennert, “Victorian Morality,” 113.

²² Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 130; *Native American*, March 12, 1900.

²³ Margaret L. Archuleta, Brenda J. Child, and K, Tsianina Lomawaima, eds., *Away From Home: American Indian Boarding School Experiences 1879-2000* (Phoenix, Heard Museum, 2000), 32.

interests.²⁴ Although the goal of vocational training was to assimilate Indians into the work force through respectable vocations, many believed that Indians could never integrate fully into white society unless their vocational training prepared them for a life of manual labor. Boarding schools, however, attempted to produce graduates with valuable skill sets that could be applied to skilled labor. H. B. Peairs, Haskell's longest serving Superintendent, believed students should and could indeed be successfully trained for a true vocation which would lead to Indian assimilation. Even the Meriam Report stated that vocational education remained the most valuable education for Indians, since employers often took advantage of simple wage laborers.²⁵

By 1900, both Haskell and Phoenix developed individual departments or workshops where the students learned their desired trade.²⁶ The majority of the trades reflected the standard curriculum of the federal government, but some regional differences emerged. The Phoenix Indian School, for example, had a lapidary department, a shop where the boys finished raw onyx, since the school was relatively close to an onyx mine. On the other hand, the Haskell Institute offered additional certification programs. After finishing their basic education, Haskell students could enroll in the commercial and nursing programs. The commercial department began in 1897 and quickly became one of the most popular programs since it trained students to be stenographers, typists, and clerks. Despite its popularity, the Office of Indian Affairs shut the program down in 1903, but Indian Commissioner Frances Leupp reopened it in 1906. He believed the program to be highly important for Haskell since

²⁴ Lewis Meriam, et. al., *The Problem of Indian Administration* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1928), 388.

²⁵ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 93-94; Meriam, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 390.

²⁶ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 280.

the students could easily find jobs as clerical workers in the nearby cities of Lawrence and Kansas City.²⁷

Male and female students each had different options concerning vocational education; however, boys had the greatest choice due to societal constraints placed upon women working outside the home. Boys at Haskell worked in the following shops: agriculture, paint, carpentry, electrical, auto mechanics, drafting, mason, leathercraft, plumbing, forging gas and welding, the power plant, the baking department, and the printing department.²⁸ Boys at Phoenix could learn blacksmithing, dairying, mechanical drawing, engineering, farming, sloyd making, tailoring, and wagon making, in addition to carpentry, harnessmaking, printing, and painting.²⁹ The Phoenix Indian School's lapidary shop was revolutionary for boarding school education since this type of training had never been attempted prior to its use at Phoenix. Students in the program learned a great deal about machinery and chemicals and the demand from the public encouraged the program to continue. Many local shops and hotels ordered large pieces of the finished stone to display.³⁰

As the students' skills progressed, the school allowed them to attempt larger projects. In 1939, the Superintendent at Haskell instructed Charles Leech, the supervising construction engineer, to begin planning two new cottages "to be built as student projects," with an

²⁷ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 94; *Indian Leader*, May 22, 1925, 1-2.

²⁸ *The Indian Leader*, June 8, 1934, 30-32. The various departments were called shops since they operated like independent shops even though they were designed for teaching.

²⁹ Sloyd making was derived from the Swedish educational system, where students in vocational training programs learned through completing tasks consisting of increasingly complicated techniques. The Phoenix Indian School utilized this education method to teach their students woodworking. *Native American*, February 17, 1900.

³⁰ *Native American*, January 13, 1900.

appropriated five thousand dollars for the purpose.³¹ Whenever the schools needed additional buildings, students gained experience by participating in all stages of the project. These types of projects served as critical and valuable learning experiences since students tested everything they had learned from their teachers in a real life application.

Teachers at Haskell tried to provide a diverse industrial program with many options, but the most popular trade was farming. Teachers initially saw farming as the most beneficial skill for Indians, since many still considered working the land to be the easiest and fastest way to become independent and industrious. Indians who returned to the reservations, more often than not, experienced economic troubles due to few job opportunities available for them. By learning agriculture, school officials hoped students could free themselves from any dependence on whites and become industrious members of society. It is equally possible however, that the Haskell Institute advocated agriculture so that the students and the staff could be fed entirely off of the land that Haskell owned. In this way, the school could be self-sufficient which reiterated the necessity of independence.³²

Indian boarding schools, still notoriously under funded, typically could not teach their students how to perform their trades via modern technology; however, the Phoenix Indian School managed to incorporate some modern machinery and methods in their vocational program. At Haskell, some trades could not be offered immediately, like auto mechanics, and many of the trades the school offered lacked modern machinery making it difficult for the Indian boys to keep up with the market demands and their employers. In addition, the Haskell

³¹ Spaulding to Mr. Leech, September 5, 1939, Haskell Junior College Manuscript Collection (hereafter HMC), Record Group (hereafter RG) 75, National Archives Central Plains Region (hereafter NARA, Central Plains Region).

³² Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 120.

Institute continued teaching harness making and blacksmithing long after cars became the dominant form of transportation.³³

The schools tried to employ teachers both skilled at their trade and compassionate toward the condition of the Indians, but finding both of these traits in one person proved difficult. Teachers might have been skilled in their trades, but they often had little desire to teach Indian children.³⁴ The Phoenix Indian School did, however, hire a skilled man from Mexico to start the lapidary at the school. After establishing the program, the original instructor left while Mr. Brito continued teaching the Indian boys.³⁵ More often than not, the teachers hired by the school did not effectively teach their students. This could be due to miscommunication, lack of interest on the part of the teacher, or even the inability of the student; however, it seems as though students did not truly understand what they had been taught. A young Phoenix student learning harness making stated that he had been working in the shop for five years, “but I can’t say I have learned a great deal, for there are so many things to do and many ways of doing them that I do not quite understand.”³⁶ Many students left the school with a minimal understanding of their trade instead of the detailed knowledge and practice that had been hoped.

The Annual Report to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1900 recommended that each industrial teacher familiarize him or herself with the reservations of the tribes represented at each school. By studying the various regions and the problems the students would encounter when they returned home, the teachers could customize their lesson plans to enable each

³³ Ibid., 118.

³⁴ Ibid., 114.

³⁵ *Native American*, January 13, 1900; Ibid., April 21, 1900.

³⁶ Ibid., March 10, 1900.

student to become independent and self sufficient.³⁷ However, this recommendation never was carried out. In fact, teachers taught the students how to grow crops most suitable for the area around the school. Hence, a Navajo student who returned to his arid reservation would not be able to put his trade of growing wheat and potatoes into practice.

While the boys' industrial programs were rather diversified, the girls' industrial program was extremely limited. Haskell Indian girls had the rare opportunity to study in the nursing or commercial departments in addition to studying Home Economics; however, girls at other boarding schools only studied home economics or the domestic sciences. Girls learned to cook, care for and raise children, wash, clean, garden, decorate their homes, host parties, and sew, in addition to "the pros and cons of wallpaper versus whitewash, wood-frame [housing construction] versus logs, and curtains versus shades."³⁸ For many white women it seemed impossible that Indian girls had to be taught these basic skills to keeping house, but for many it became clear they were "dealing with girls thoroughly normal except for handicaps caused by their home environment."³⁹ To make up for these "handicaps," teachers worked very hard to instill what they regarded as womanly and virtuous values within their female students.

Home economic departments taught a variety of subjects with the most emphasis placed upon sewing, cooking, and child care. Sewing classes focused on clothing construction and particularly clothing required for boarding school use. At Haskell, only female students learned to sew and made every garment worn by the students living at the school. Phoenix, however, taught both boys and girls to sew. Girls in the sewing shop learned to sew all the garments required for females, while the tailor shop taught the boys to make uniforms for the

³⁷ *Annual Report 1900*, 432.

³⁸ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 117; Margaret L. Archuleta, *Away From Home*, 116.

³⁹ *Indian Leader*, May 27, 1932, 3.

band members and the boys' military style uniforms.⁴⁰ In both schools, the clothes made by the students' were distributed to the rest of the school population since government issued clothing remained in short supply.

Cooking classes emphasized not only preparation of meals, but also nutrition, ordering groceries, serving guests, hosting parties, and food storage. The girls often made their own meals and regularly hosted parties for school teachers, government officials, and sometimes their own friends.⁴¹ In addition, the girls took turns practicing different roles, including planning meals, grocery shopping, cooking, and serving. The most difficult thing students had to overcome was their nervousness. Waitresses often had a difficult time keeping their hands steady while pouring drinks and serving food, and many students did not feel comfortable eating while under the scrutiny of their teachers and sometimes even visitors from Phoenix.⁴²

Childcare was one of the most common requirements of patrons seeking to hire an Indian girl in the outing program. Unfortunately, many of the girls lacked the necessary skills for this task. This portion of the program taught girls "the characteristics of healthy children and malnourished, cleanliness, and sanitation." Many of the girls, however, had no practical ideas of how to manage or raise a child. By this point, the youngest children had been removed from the Indian boarding schools. Even those with younger siblings were not able to return home, therefore their time around babies or young children was severely limited. In fact, Haskell began to recognize this shortcoming and sometimes children of the staff would be brought in to the class to serve as a sort of teaching aid for the girls.⁴³

⁴⁰ *Native American*, April 3, 1915.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, February 2, 1901.

⁴² *Ibid.*, April 24, 1925; *Ibid.*, December 8, 1900.

⁴³ *Indian Leader*, May 24, 1935, 34-35.

Despite only learning the rudiments of their trade and still being quite unsure of themselves, the students took great pride in their work as evidenced by several contests held on the Phoenix Indian School grounds. These contests served as a means to test the student's knowledge and to challenge their ability under the tutelage of their teachers turned coaches. The first contest recorded in 1900 was a roofing competition between two teams of twelve boys who worked four hours a day to construct a 3,000 square foot roof. Much to the chagrin of the students the teams tied and the roof was completed in two days. Even female students partook in the activities as demonstrated by a napkin ironing contest which awarded students points for the "neatest folding, straightest hems, and the best polish." Subsequent contests peppered the schedules of the various work shops and featured plowing, cooking, and sewing competitions.⁴⁴

Most students entering the program had not received much education or training in their chosen trade. Initially, teaching students English and other fundamentals left students and teachers with little time to pursue other courses of study. It was not until students had attended school for some time that they began learning a trade in earnest. Students who had received more training than others were identified as vocational students, while the younger and less experienced were considered to be pre-vocational. At Phoenix, this division began at the 7th or 8th grade when students chose what trade they would specialize in. From then on, the students would be under the direction of their shop teacher until they mastered their skill upon graduation.⁴⁵

Haskell clearly defined the differences between vocational and pre-vocational students as a way to make outing patrons aware of the amount of training the students had received. Pre-vocational girls consisted of freshman and sophomores who "have not had any special

⁴⁴ *Native American*, February 10, 1900; *Ibid.*, March 20, 1900; *Ibid.*, January 12, 1901.

⁴⁵ Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 15.

training in home economics but they are capable of doing good work under supervision.”

Vocational girls included juniors and seniors who “had training in domestic art and science.”⁴⁶

Once these distinctions were made clear to the public, the majority of patrons understandably requested vocational girls. Pre-vocational students continued to be placed, but their placement rate remained lower and patrons often returned them to the school.

All entering female students at Haskell were placed within the Domestic Science department, classified as pre-vocational, and given basic training in sewing and cooking. First-year students, assumed to have no knowledge of sewing, learned the basic skills as applied to the construction of undergarments. Second year students learned to make aprons, pajamas, and children’s clothing.⁴⁷ Cooking classes for the first year students proved to be more difficult. Students like Miss Spencer had to cook breakfast for a family, but she was so overwhelmed she felt like she would not be able to manage when it came to the rest of the meals. Sophomore girls learned to prepare all meals required for a family of six, to plan menus, and to cook nutritional food at a small cost.⁴⁸

Haskell’s vocational girls learned more advanced sewing and cooking techniques in addition to child care. Junior girls learned to sew play sets for children in addition to making four other projects, while seniors sewed dresses using commercial patterns and practiced altering ready made clothing. In regards to cooking lessons, the junior girls learned how to preserve food. Each senior girl presented a final dinner party as their final project, which included the planning, invitations, hosting, cooking, serving, and cleaning with the help of one

⁴⁶ Superintendent Peairs to F. H. Smithmeyer, April 29, 1920, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁴⁷ *Indian Leader*, May 24, 1935, 35.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, April 20, 1928, 4; *Ibid.*, May 24, 1935, 34; *Ibid.*, October 26, 1928, 6; *Ibid.*, May 24, 1935, 34.

waitress. Child care courses, only offered to seniors, included caring for infants and toddlers, cooking nutritious meals and basic childhood development skills. The girls could then apply those skills at the Haskell Institute's nursery school, which cared for the instructors' children.⁴⁹

Industrial training provided students with much needed knowledge, but the boarding schools benefited as much as the students. Farming students cultivated school land that provided student meals, and when a girl learned to cook, she helped prepare meals for the rest of the students. Extra goods produced, such as saddles, harnesses, wagons, and foodstuffs, could be sold, those at Haskell on the open market and those at Phoenix at a campus store for the public. Student work was not paid unless they worked at the school during the summer, which was then considered a form of outing.⁵⁰ It is clear that some individuals at Haskell and in the government expressed concern that student labor could easily be abused. In fact, the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, William Hailmann, stated that the "industrial work of the school should cease to be mere drudgery" since students became "mere toilers or choremen and chorewomen."⁵¹

The same system designed to help advance Indian children and integrate them into white society could also degrade the students. Work programs at Indian boarding schools became so prominent because government funding remained scant. The government funded Indian schools through the sale of Indian lands and existing treaties, but when distributed to each school, the amount received for one child was \$167 for one year.⁵² This amount simply did not cover the expenses of clothing, food, supplies, and medical attention required for each

⁴⁹ Ibid., May 24, 1935, 34-35.

⁵⁰ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 112-113; *Native American*, October 27, 1900; Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 113.

⁵¹ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 151.

⁵² *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs* (Washington: GPO, 1886), 144.

student. To make up the difference, boarding schools used the labor performed by the students. In the matter of clothing, for example, Phoenix Indian girls in the sewing department were responsible for the construction and mending of the clothing of all 300 girls in the school. To make matters worse, the government required that each girl have “two work dresses, one uniform dress in gingham and one in wool, in addition to the necessary underclothing.”⁵³ The Phoenix Indian girls typically constructed and cared for an average of 2,400 articles of clothing. When the Haskell Superintendent contacted the Office of Indian Affairs requesting additional money for clothing, he was told that students who worked in their respective departments received great benefits from their jobs; as a result, students in the domestic science department should work harder to make more clothing. They would be better for the experience.⁵⁴

Through the teaching of domestic science and various other trades, the Indian Affairs office thought that the students could complete their courses and be comparable in every way to white children. Yet while students learned the same subjects, the manner in which they learned was quite different and decidedly racially based. Indian males, initially seen to be lazy, worked long hours at the most tedious tasks to transform them into diligent workers. For example, Frank L Chuawhia, a Phoenix student, performed the duties of a night watchman and was responsible for waking the students for their chores each morning, an unenviable position for any student.⁵⁵ Indian girls, considered strong and able to do the work that weaker females could not, performed menial, labor intensive chores like washing windows and scrubbing floors. Moore, a Pima Indian working at the Phoenix Indian School, washed the dining hall floors every Saturday morning with the help of several girls. “My little helpers and I hadn’t

⁵³ *Native American*, September 1, 1900.

⁵⁴ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 69.

⁵⁵ *Native American*, March 24, 1900.

even reached our teen-aged year yet, and this work seemed so hard!” If the students did not complete their task by eight in the morning “...the dining room matron would go around strapping us while we were still on our hands and knees ... We just dreaded the sore bottoms.”⁵⁶

At the Haskell Institute several students died due to overwork or dangerous working conditions. Charles Quain died of sunstroke in 1902 while working in the school fields to provide the school with a steady supply of food. Also in 1902, Lomo Congwhio died of a ruptured heart while carrying lumber to provide the school with fuel throughout the winter. In 1903, Sophie Webster lost all her fingers when her hand caught in a mangle while working in the school’s laundry facilities. Pahhe Yazza’s hand was crushed while working in the carpentry shop in 1910, which resulted in an amputation. Tom Little Wolf was electrocuted by a live wire in 1908.⁵⁷

Some teachers realized that working in an industrial type setting, where girls cooked meals and sewed clothing for hundreds, did not give the students a sense of what it would be like to manage their own household. Josephine Mayo, the girls matron at the Genoa Indian School stated in 1886 that, “making a dozen beds and cleaning a dormitory does not teach them [Indian girls] to make a room attractive and homelike.”⁵⁸ Mayo also realized that students needed to learn to “supply a family with a pleasant and healthy variety of food, nicely cooked” rather than the “wholesale” style of training they receive. To teach Indian girls to be good housewives, she suggested that “[t]hree or four little cottages, plainly furnished, would be sufficient here to give each girl a fair, practical idea of what is expected of her in her own

⁵⁶ Trennert, “Educating Indian Girls,” 285.

⁵⁷ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 208.

⁵⁸ The Genoa Indian School was another off-reservation boarding school located in Nebraska.

home.” She referred to what appeared in many western boarding schools by 1900 – the domestic science cottage.⁵⁹

Alice Fletcher, an anthropologist, first developed the domestic science cottage in order to teach Indians at the Hampton Institute. In order to encourage young Indian newlyweds to live like modern white families, the Institute invited many to attend the school, where the men could develop a trade, while the women learned to manage a small cottage provided to them.⁶⁰ The program began in 1883 and since their cottages were in a central location, these families reminded the other students what “Christian civilization” looked like. They fulfilled the role of the “model family” that every Indian should strive to become after graduation. The model families remained at the school for three years while the parents attended classes half a day. If the Indian newlyweds had children, they could keep them in the sewing room where they were “kindly treated and waited upon by the girls who [vied] with each other in caring for them.” After classes, the family returned to their cottage to cook meals, maintain their home and their garden. The program seemed to be a success and by 1885, six cottages had been built on the campus. Even though the model family program was retired soon after, Indian girls resided in the cottages to practice housekeeping under the direction of their teachers.⁶¹

Seeing the success of the practice cottages at Hampton, the Bureau of Indian Affairs allowed the expansion of the program, but even at the program’s height, only fifty cottages were in use among all Indian boarding schools. Despite this, the practice cottage served as a laboratory to apply lessons from the classroom to a real life situation while still under the supervision of teachers. Its goal was to give Indian girls an understanding of how “civilized”

⁵⁹ *Annual Report 1886*, 14; Trennert “Educating Indian Girls,” 283.

⁶⁰ Archuleta, *Away From Home*, 118.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 128; *Ibid.*, 122-123; *Ibid.*, 126; Trennert, “Educating Indian Girls,” 283.

white middle class lived and what they should strive to achieve once they graduated and started their own family.⁶² Students learned to manage “family-size kitchens and dining rooms” instead of the massive dining halls in the school, which also enabled the students to operate kitchen tools more effectively. Students also learned to plan, prepare, order food, and serve meals to their families as well as how to be good hostesses by learning to organize and host parties. The cottage experience was thought to encourage students to feel at ease with their surroundings and be able to eat and entertain within a group of mixed company. Students also learned how to manage a house efficiently and to complete tasks in a timely manner. In addition, teachers hoped that learning to manage a home would enable the Indian girls to think critically and even devise new and better ways of completing their tasks.⁶³ In summary, the most important thing a girl could learn from her time in the practice cottage was self-sufficiency and the necessity of preparation.

The first practice cottage at Haskell was built in 1915. In step with the cutting edge of technology, the small house had electricity, running water, and central heat. The *Indian Leader* described a “modern three story house containing three bedrooms and bathroom for the girls; [it] also [includes a] housemother’s room, hall vestibule, living room, dining room, pantry, kitchen, one screened-in back porch and an open porch on the south side.”⁶⁴ The cottage housed eight girls at a time with a female teacher serving as chaperone and teacher. Those who lived in the house spent a total of ten weeks in order to rotate responsibilities and learn all parts of household management. To demonstrate how a proper family worked as a unit, the girls worked in groups of four so they could assume the role of a family member. One girl would be

⁶² *Indian Leader*, May 27, 1932, 1; Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 118.

⁶³ U. S. Information Services, *Guide for Cooks, Bakers, Housekeepers, and Matrons* (Lawrence: Haskell Press, 1947), 9-10.

⁶⁴ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 119; *Indian Leader*, November 29, 1918, 1.

the “mother” and plan the meals; one would be the “father” and build the fire and help cook. The other two girls acted as “brother” and “sister” and helped serve meals, wash dishes and clean the kitchen. Since the girls rotated their positions, this arrangement gave the girls practical experience meant to apply to the outing program and their own future lives.⁶⁵

By 1929, Haskell, utilizing the skills of the boys in their shops, completed the construction of a new practice cottage, a frame building with electricity, heat provided by gas and coal stoves, running water, plumbing and sewer. This new cottage became a prominent place on campus and became known as Kolati.⁶⁶ With the construction of a new cottage, the rules and programs were altered slightly to ensure the girls continued to get a well-rounded education.⁶⁷ The new practice cottage supported six girls who had shown exceptional skills in their home economic classes and seemed to genuinely enjoy the work. The girls rotated out of the cottage every six weeks. Each week, the girls worked one of six jobs that also rotated after one week. The jobs included hostess, cook, assistant cook, waitress, maid, and outdoor girl. The hostess maintained the living room, guest room, and the front porch neat and tidy and she greeted guests at any social functions. The cook planned menus and prepared meals while the assistant cook washed dishes and dish towels, and cleaned the back porch. The waitress not only did all of the serving, but also cleaned and prepared the dining room. The maid’s duties were centralized upstairs, where she swept floors, made beds, and dusted. Lastly, the outdoor girl tended to the chickens, piling wood, and running any errands. Together these girls maintained a fully prepared and efficient household.⁶⁸

⁶⁵ *Indian Leader*, May 24, 1935, 34.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, October 4, 1929, 4; Building File, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; *Indian Leader*, April 13, 1934.

⁶⁷ *Indian Leader*, October 4, 1929, 4.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, November 8, 1929, 4.

Before the girls could rotate out of the cottage, they were tested on the skills obtained throughout the prior six weeks. Each student, with only the help of one waitress, had to plan, prepare, and serve their teachers a meal.⁶⁹ As intimidating as this might have been at the beginning of the girls' first week, it was likely less so after the many parties held at the cottage. To help reinforce what the girls had learned, the cottage held parties at least once a week and sometimes more often when special occasions arose. Each Thursday evening was a social night for the girls to entertain Haskell employees at the cottage. Girls left the cottage with the ability to act "properly" in the company of their fellow students, both boys and girls, and adults.⁷⁰

To ensure that the practice cottage operated smoothly and the girls completed their tasks and did not act improperly, one of the home economics teachers lived in the cottage as chaperone. These positions usually lasted for the entire school year. The girls who lived in the practice cottage also continued their cooperative vocational training, going to class for half a day. Because of the necessity of daily chores, the students awoke at 5:30 every morning to begin their work before classes. By the afternoon, the girls returned to the cottage to prepare that night's dinner.⁷¹

The Phoenix Indian School also established a practice cottage on their campus in 1902 to provide their female students with a simulated outing experience, since their outing program had been halted for a time. After the outing program began again, the practice cottage was closed, but was reopened in the 1930's by Eleanor Palimo, who was involved in the Rural

⁶⁹ Ibid., April 6, 1928, 43.

⁷⁰ Ibid., January 13, 1928, 5; Ibid., May 27, 1932, 1; Ibid., November 8, 1929, 4.

⁷¹ R. M. Kelley, Acting Superintendent, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, September 3, 1935, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; *Indian Leader*, October 3, 1930, 5.

Home Training Program.⁷² Like Haskell, the male students at Phoenix, built the practice cottages.⁷³

An average of nine girls lived in the cottage for “several weeks or months at a time” with a teacher serving as matron. Their chores were remarkably similar to those in other practice cottages, although they did keep chickens and a milk cow in addition to maintaining the house and the garden. The superintendent of Phoenix, C. W. Goodman, lauded the program for allowing the girls to “escape from the monotonous features of institutional life,” even if it was only for a short time. Goodman also stated the girls’ “individuality will be encouraged, and their desire for the good, the beautiful, and the true, it is hoped, will be more readily fed and strengthened” through their time at the cottage.⁷⁴ Despite having similar curricula, every school shaped the minute details of the program to fit the needs of the region. The Phoenix Indian School maintained their practice cottage program as a way to encourage Christian and moral development of their girls, but Haskell maintained their program as a way to train their students in cleanliness and the modern methods of homemaking. By that, it was hoped to counteract the common impression that all Indians were by inclination dirty and ignorant of basic rules of good hygiene.

Unlike the Haskell Institute, the Phoenix Indian School operated a practice cottage program for their male students, called the Subsistence Homestead Enterprises. In this program, the boys lived in small cottages while they learned how to plan and cook meals, wash clothes, and keep house as well as home maintenance and subsistence farming. Since the boys learned many different subjects and trades, the agriculture and home economics staff directed

⁷² Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 286; Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 16.

⁷³ *Native American*, March 13, 1915.

⁷⁴ Goodman, “Report of School at Phoenix,” 411; *Native American*, February 27, 1904.

the program. To participate in the program, the boys either had to have recently graduated from the school or have studied extensively within the agriculture department.⁷⁵ The Phoenix Indian School utilized the practice cottage to teach students skills that often crossed acceptable white gender lines, but the argument was that these skills helped Indian boys and girls understand the necessity of being independent and no longer relying upon government aid for their livelihood.

Although designed to prepare girls and boys for future roles as housewives and farmers, domestic cottages often reinforced those skills that would lead to work at either menial labor or in service positions. Female students learned to operate a home with the aid of modern equipment and tools, such as vacuum cleaners and kitchen appliances commonly available for white families but rarely known to Indians on reservations. The cottage at Haskell also purchased a new Atwater-Kent radio and a new Chevrolet, items hopelessly out of reach for most Indians.⁷⁶ The skills taught to the boys who participated in the program re-emphasized the importance of hard work and wage labor to provide for one's family. Thus the cottages essentially trained young Indian girls to work as domestic servants for white families and boys to be farm hands. The outing program reinforced this training and essentially solidified Indian girls and boys working standards.

⁷⁵ Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 16.

⁷⁶ *Indian Leader*, December 18, 1931, 6; *Ibid.*, March 15, 1935, 3.

The Outing Program

The Bureau of Indian Affairs had heartily approved of the outing program since it had been proven successful at Carlisle, but the Bureau realized that not every school's location would be suitable. The Bureau only allowed outing programs in areas with "a civilized white community in the immediate vicinity in sympathy with the plan [to educate Indian youth]."¹ Captain Pratt remained concerned that the expansion of the outing program would reduce its effectiveness, but for the most part the western boarding schools claimed a high level of success. At Haskell, an annual report by Superintendent Blair stated that their students returned from outing "with more self-confidence, gained through handling a difficult job successfully" and the students learned their trades "in a much more intensive way than we can possibly do in the classroom or in the school details." Blair added that the students who had participated in the program remained farther advanced when compared to students who had not. The *Native American* at Phoenix stated that the object of the program "is not so much to put [students] in positions to earn money, as to give them practical ideas of modern civilization and customs."²

School officials and the government believed the outing program remained the most efficient means of not only establishing proper relationships with whites but also exposing students to "the highest standards of American life." By the turn of the century, the government hoped to use the boarding schools to instill a healthy work ethic so the Indians could provide for themselves and their families. Ultimately, Indians would become comfortable with whites and this would form "a happy medium of imparting the lesson of

¹ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 283.

² C. M. Blair, Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1927, 5-6, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; *Native American*, December 8, 1900.

Americanism.”³ Outing patrons, it was argued, provided Christian homes and the lessons learned in school were reinforced while on outing. All students on outing, especially the girls who worked directly with white families, could model their own households after what they witnessed in the homes of their patrons.

The outing program quickly became idealized. Estelle Reed, who wrote *The Course of Study for the Indian Schools of the United States*, believed the outing system placed each Indian boy “where he must compete with wideawake boys and girls of the white race...”⁴ The outing program provided girls with “the surest and perhaps only way in which Indian women can be lifted out of that position of servility and degradation ... on to a place where their husband and men generally will treat them with gallantry and respect which is accorded to their more favored white sisters.” Despite the abundant praise and the benefits of the program, teachers realized that “unless it [outing patron’s home] can be a home its mission is useless, and the nearer it comes to the best home life, the greater and grander its influence and results.”⁵

Although outing students developed useful skills and learned how white middle class families lived and maintained their homes, the program ultimately provided cheap labor for local households and businesses. Rather than teaching students how to attain middle class standing, Indian boarding schools taught Indians how to work for white families. Indians were technically still assimilated into white society, but only as wage laborers. The outing system, initially designed for educational purposes, ultimately became an employment service designed to provide cheap labor to white citizens.

³ *Annual Report 1900*, 488; *Annual Report of the Department of the Interior* (Washington: GPO, 1901), 19.

⁴ Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 284.

⁵ Trennert, “Victorian Morality,” 114; *Native American*, December 8, 1900.

The Haskell outing program did not begin until 1888, four years after the opening of the Haskell Institute. The success of the program at Carlisle impressed not only the Office of Indian Affairs but also Haskell's Superintendent Charles Robinson. Robinson decided to attempt the program, which rapidly expanded and soon became a crucial part of the students' education. During the first few years of its existence, the outing program allowed students to work outside of the school during the summer months. Many of the boys spent the summer working on the campus while some of the girls worked in the homes of their teachers. The fully developed form of the program, with students working for families or employers not associated with the school, began in 1911. At this time, the outing program became key to the complete education of all the students at Haskell.⁶

The first attempts at the outing program at the Phoenix Indian School began in 1893, just two years after the school opened. Superintendent Wellington Rich carefully selected the first students sent on outing so he could ensure he sent students sure to succeed within the program. Knowing how influential the outing program could be for the students, Rich stated "we could not afford to have any failure at the beginning of this 'outing business.'" The first group of students to go on outing in the Phoenix area included eleven girls who worked as domestics and several boys who worked at a local vineyard and at the school constructing buildings.⁷ The first year of outing went well and by 1900 the school had forty students in the program. That number increased to 200 students by 1910.⁸

The curriculum at Phoenix emphasized outing from the school's first year since the Phoenix Indian School was located near a large urban and agricultural setting. In fact

⁶ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 26; *Ibid.*, 113; *Ibid.*, 122.

⁷ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 279.

⁸ *Native American*, September 1, 1900; *Ibid.*, January 13, 1900; Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 282.

Superintendent Hall believed that “an education can be given hand in hand with practical work which enables a living to be made from the start. The School can thus serve as an employment agency, whereby the deserving Indian pupil can secure employment as soon as qualified.” To see this goal to fruition, Hall asked for government permission to expand the outing program to southern California in 1896. He felt that some students needed to be located farther from the school in order to further separate the students from their parents, since several parents had come to their children in order to beg for money.⁹ Governmental approval was given and the Phoenix Indian School placed students as far away as Los Angeles, thereby giving further credence to Hall’s employment agency idea, especially since the children sent to Los Angeles worked as cheap laborers with no school or government supervision.

Once the outing program took root in a location, the system had to expand in order to provide enough students to satisfy the demands of the local citizens. Therefore, the outing program began to take on many forms that varied from school to school, but the most common features included working at the school, summer and year-long outing. The Haskell Institute’s program represented the most common uses of outing, while the Phoenix community necessitated several alterations to the outing program that were not typical for the rest of Indian boarding schools.

Working for the school during the summer remained the simplest form of outing and was quite popular at Haskell. Students who chose to spend their summer working on the school grounds received payment comparable to those who worked for employers not associated with the school. Payment averaged twenty-five cents an hour, which brought a student’s net income to ten to twelve dollars per week. From this salary, room and board were

⁹ Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 277; *Ibid.*, 280-281.

deducted, which equaled ten dollars a month. The school claimed to do this both to maintain the operation of the school throughout the summer and to help the students understand the value of hard work and money. Working at the school throughout the summer became a necessary and important part of outing since the students performed necessary repairs to school property, tended to crops and livestock, and continued to produce items to sell to the public for revenue.¹⁰ Without student labor during the summer, the school would not be ready for the upcoming school year and the school would not be able to stay in operation.

Even though student labor at the school ensured its future success, summer outing away from the campus remained the most popular outing choice. Haskell's outing program began solely as a summer practice so it would not interfere with regular course work. As the program became more popular and better known, Haskell received letters requesting students far in advance of the end of the school year so local families could ensure they would have summer help. However, students did not go on outing until they had finished the school year.¹¹ The duration of a students' stay with a host family often varied depending on the needs of the host family, inappropriate situations, host families' vacation plans, illness, and the needs of the school for student workers. For instance, in 1924, girls spent the whole summer while the boys spent half the summer on outing and the other half working at the school. To oversee the program, the school placed students in areas fairly close to the school. Girls stayed closer to

¹⁰ Sharon R. Mote, Assistant Superintendent of Haskell, to Superintendent of Industries, August 2, 1924, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

¹¹ R. M. Kelley to Mrs. A. B. Fenton, May 10, 1938, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; *Indian Leader*, May 31- June 7, 1929, 18.

the school and typically worked in Topeka, Kansas City, Wichita, and in Lawrence, while boys worked for families in the surrounding farming communities.¹²

As the outing program continued to grow in popularity, the Haskell Institute allowed students to continue the program through the entire year. Students who worked year round attended the local public schools for at least eighty days out of the year. This ensured that the children continued their education while in the outing program and that the patrons upheld the rules of the program. Students on year-long outing worked for their patron in the mornings before school and after school and also on Saturdays. Superintendent H. B. Peairs stated that “some of them [the students] seem to be having a hard time and claim that they do not have enough time to prepare their lessons. I suppose that in some instances, this may be true but ordinarily the patrons try to give them time as required.”¹³ Nevertheless, this type of outing was not as widely supported both because of the inadequate time for studies and the low wages received.

School finances also discouraged year-round outing. The first few years Haskell allowed their students to go on year-long outing, the local public schools accommodated the Indian students. By 1918, however, public schools began requesting Haskell to provide tuition for the outing students. Haskell students did not have enough money to pay the fee, nor did the students earn enough on outing to pay their own way. As a result, the responsibility fell upon the host families. Superintendent Peairs stated, “I should greatly regret having to recall the girls as they are anxious to attend high school.”¹⁴ By the 1930’s, Haskell began to pay tuition

¹² C. M. Blair, Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1927, 5-6, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

¹³ John Lofty, Principal of Wichita High School, to Superintendent Peairs, November 29, 1918, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

¹⁴ Ibid.

for their students to go to public schools, but in 1934, the federal government required public schools to file an application with the government in order to receive reimbursement for each Indian student attending.¹⁵

Year-long outing was beneficial because the students lived in a stable environment and developed significant relationships with white families, but year-long outing presented several challenges for students and Haskell staff. Students found this type of outing to be especially challenging since they worked and went to the school at the same time. The staff at Haskell also found it difficult since they were responsible for ensuring the students' well being while still teaching large classes on the Haskell campus. Nonetheless year-long outing continued and actually gained support once Haskell hired an outing agent to oversee the program.

Unlike Haskell students, those at the Phoenix Indian School were not required to participate in the outing program and many students chose to return home for the summers. Students' families often needed help with the harvest during the summer and the students themselves wanted to enjoy their summers away from the school. Rather than force them to participate in the program, which often resulted in unsatisfactory placements, Phoenix encouraged the children to spend up to half of the summer with their families. The only time teachers refused to send students home for the summer was in 1900 when a big drought had severely affected the reservations.¹⁶

¹⁵ Superintendent R. D. Baldwin to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, September 20, 1932, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; United States Department of Interior, Office of Indian Affairs, Regulations Concerning Public School Tuition 1934, circular letter, May 1, 1933, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

¹⁶ Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 17; Amanda Chingren, Outing Matron Report, May 31, 29, Phoenix Indian School Manuscript Collection File no. 824 (hereafter, PHIS), Record Group (hereafter, RG) 75, National Archives, Washington, D. C. (hereafter, NARA, Washington D.C.); *Native American*, June 23, 1900.

Like Haskell, the Phoenix outing program consisted of various types of outing with the most common being working at the school and summer outings. Essentially, Phoenix students working at the school and those on summer outing were nearly identical to the Haskell outing students. Those working at the school performed a variety of tasks which included construction, agriculture, and working in the shops to produce marketable goods, much like the students at Haskell.¹⁷ By 1934, John Collier, the Superintendent of Phoenix, created an alliance with the Indian Crafts Association so the students could produce native style crafts and goods to be sold to the public. This alliance actually turned into a type of outing work since the students kept half of the proceeds while the other half paid the associations dues and bought more art supplies.¹⁸ This program marked the reintroduction of native traditions to the Indian students.

In order to participate in the true form of summer outing, both boys and girls had to maintain decent grades and have no disciplinarian marks so they could act as representatives for the school. Phoenix students wanting to participate in the outing program could reside at the school while working in the city, with their patrons, or at the YMCA or the YWCA offices in Phoenix. Female outing students most often lived with their host family, but the majority of boys lived at the school, paying room and board, and commuted to their outing work daily.¹⁹ By allowing the Phoenix students to commute to their outing positions, the Phoenix school essentially limited their students' exposure to the influence of Christian families. While this

¹⁷ *Native American*, August 25, 1900; *Ibid.*, Mid-Summer Issue, n.d.; Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 8-9.

¹⁸ Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 20-21.

¹⁹ *Native American*, June 12, 1920; Superintendent of Industries to Superintendent John Brown, July 15, 1929, Phoenix Indian School Manuscript Collection, Central Classified Files (hereafter, PHIS), Record Group (hereafter, RG) 75, National Archives, Pacific Region (hereafter, NARA, Pacific Region); Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 17.

system was not as effective as the methods used at Haskell, the Phoenix Indian School followed Commissioner Charles Rhoads instructions to not allow any young person “to aimlessly drift” lest they fall into trouble. Despite the differences of living conditions for outing students, the summer outing program at Phoenix was nearly identical to the summer outing at the Haskell Institute.²⁰

As the Phoenix Indian School’s outing program continued to develop, many Phoenix residents expressed concern that Indian students could potentially flood the job market leaving no work for the city’s white citizens. Therefore, in 1920, the Phoenix Indian School limited outing to the summer, but during the school year, boys could participate in Saturday outing. Saturday outing boys worked as day laborers, giving them additional work experience, while also quelling the fears of the locals. Patrons who needed Indian labor called the school on Friday morning with the type of work to be done and how many students were needed for the job. Also on Friday, teachers from the various shops made lists of exemplary students who could be spared for the day. After being paired with a student, patrons transported them to and from the job and paid the students for their work upon their return to the school. This program became a huge success with an average of 150 male students working on Saturdays. This form of outing continued to be popular long into the 1950’s.²¹

The primary reason that the Phoenix Indian School resisted an outing program for the full year was due to the establishment of a Phoenix employment agency for Indians in 1929. The employment agency, although it eventually undertook the responsibility of the outing program, initially began by placing reservation Indians in respectable working environments.

²⁰ Commissioner C. J. Rhoads, circular letter no. 2665, March 10, 1930, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

²¹ *Native American*, June 12, 1920; *Ibid.*, January 10, 1920; Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 46.

To ensure the success of the employment agency, the Phoenix Indian School decided to limit their outing students and because many reservation Indians wanted to return home for the summer the outing students helped fill the void for labor in Phoenix and in the surrounding areas.²²

All students who participated in the outing program received payment for the work they performed, and the wage depended upon the students' gender, type of work performed, and how much training the student had received while at the school. Despite this fluctuation, all outing student wages compared to those received by white manual laborers in the area.²³ During the early years of the outing program, payment for their work was a secondary concern for the government officials. In fact, just after the turn of the century, the students had to negotiate their own wages without the aid of their teachers. Superintendent Peairs stated that this was necessary because "there should come a time when our young people were left to their own initiative."²⁴ As the program matured, this caused many problems until Indian boarding schools set a minimum wage acceptable for outing students in order to keep students from being taken advantage of by their patrons. At the beginning of the program, students typically received only fifty cents per week, but by 1900 students averaged between \$1 and \$5 per week.²⁵

Patron families were required to send at least two thirds of the student's wages directly to the school to be placed in a savings account in the student's name. Students received the remainder to use as spending money. For many Indians, wealth was measured in how much

²² Brief Index Notes, 1930's, n.d., PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

²³ Haskell Junior Collage Manuscript Collection, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

²⁴ Superintendent Peairs to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, October 1, 1913, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

²⁵ Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 123; *Native American*, December 8, 1900.

one gave away, unlike whites, who believed that wealth equaled how much one could accumulate for oneself. Schools utilized bank accounts to teach students how to manage, spend, and save their money wisely. “Experience has taught us that most Indian boys will spend money as fast as they earn it and even faster,” Peairs wrote, but the school behaved like a “guiding mother,” ensuring that students not only saved their wages, but also understood the value of money. However, according to one teacher, this often proved to be a difficult task since Indians are “very susceptible to criticism in this matter.”²⁶

Student bank accounts could be kept either on the schools premises, like Haskell, or they could be stored in a bank, as demonstrated by Phoenix. Since Phoenix used the federal banking system, the students’ money earned four percent interest and the students learned to keep track of their money through checkbooks.²⁷ For the beginning years of the outing program, Haskell kept the money students earned in the Superintendent’s safe, so all transactions were approved directly by Haskell staff members, if not solely by the Superintendent. However, as the commercial program expanded, the commercial students began to manage the outing money in the same manner as a bank. At that point, students learned to use deposit and withdrawal slips and each student had a checkbook to keep track of their own expenses.²⁸

Technically, the money earned while on outing belonged solely to the student. The goal of the school was simply to curb and guide student spending. The Phoenix Indian School took

²⁶ *Annual Report 1900*, 32; Superintendent Peairs to Mr. Good, March 5, 1908, HMC, RG 75, NARA Central Plains Region; *Native American*, December 8, 1900; Elinor D. Gregg Report, April 16-17, 1925, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

²⁷ *Native American*, March 17, 1900; *Ibid.*, December 8, 1900.

²⁸ Superintendent Peairs to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, November 15, 1908, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; “The Haskell Institute Student Bank,” March 23 1955, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

this to heart and allowed the students to do as they pleased with the money they received, since the majority of student wages was sent to their families on the reservations. Upon graduation or leaving the school, a student received what was in their account to start a household.²⁹

The Haskell Institute did not look at the student wages as individual property, though once students began to earn their own money, Haskell began to charge students for some of the necessary school supplies to alleviate some of the school's financial straits. Haskell officials also encouraged students to purchase their own clothing. The Haskell Institute often stated that they ensured the students did not spend their money foolishly, but the practical effect was that students had to request permission to withdraw their own money for individual purchases. They also could not withdraw all their money at once, since they could not be trusted to make sound decisions. Many Indian children who came to school had to sign a form stating they agreed to attend school for a predetermined amount of time, but this term often expired before the students graduated from high school. Unlike at the Phoenix school, a student leaving for any reason other than graduation forfeited all money made through the outing system. Thus the banking system provided an incentive for the students to remain in school until they graduated.³⁰ As with many other Indian programs, the results often weighed in favor of the white administrators.

All outing students signed contracts stating they understood the rules of the program and would follow them while on outing. Haskell students also promised to attend church and live according to Christian principles and write home at least once a month. In addition, students had to "bathe at least once a week," and be neat in appearance, a provision meant to dispel the idea that Indians were unclean. Many whites worried that Indian students could

²⁹ *Native American*, December 8, 1900.

³⁰ Haskell Junior College Manuscript Collection, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

easily introduce disease into their homes, so students had to demonstrate their cleanliness to reassure their patrons. All students were to obey their host families or patrons and alert them if they would be absent from their duties. They could not leave their employer without due notice. In addition, the children were to be “kind, courteous, helpful, and agreeable to those about them, in order to obtain the greatest benefit of their outing.”³¹ In essence, outing students represented their schools to the public and, thus, had to maintain a respectable image.

Although the majority of the rules issued by the boarding schools concerned all students, those governing male and female students varied widely. Outing boys could not gamble, smoke or drink alcohol, but they could go about town on their own and meet with friends without supervision. Female students had to obey much stricter rules. Girls had to live in the homes of their employers and while they could have other females over, they could not have any male callers. In addition, outing girls could spend time with their friends on Saturday and Sunday afternoons, but they had to return to their employers by nightfall. At all other times, girls had to be accompanied by their employer while outside the home. Any disobedience was promptly reported to the school.³² Ultimately, Indian boarding schools feared that inappropriate behavior would give the impression that the school supported, or at least allowed, debauchery amongst the Indian youth. The schools hoped that the more people saw reformed Indians, the more acclaim the Indian education program would gain, thus more government funding would be allotted.

Outing patrons were also governed by contracts that required them to be responsible for the students’ health and well being. To reinforce the principle goal of the program, the number

³¹ Outing Rules Governing Pupils, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

³² Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit C,” Regulations Governing Indians, June 8, 1922, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

one rule stated, “The primary purpose in placing Indian pupils with selected families is to secure the benefits of good home training. All are sent out primarily to be taught.” In addition, patrons had to ensure that the students did not leave the house unaccompanied and that they regularly attended church services, dressed respectably, displayed good manners, and did not write to or socialize with members of the opposite sex, Indian or otherwise. Any “serious misconduct or violation of these rules” were reported to the school where the disciplinarian would see to just punishment.³³

Since the boarding schools could not oversee all the activities of their students on outing, they designed the outing agents to hold both students and patrons accountable for their actions. Although these rules display the objectives of the school, students found them difficult to follow since they were not under the influence of their strict teachers, and while some patrons were extremely strict, others did not concern themselves with the students’ behavior, as long as the students completed their work. For example, when Georgine Black and Anna Mandan went on summer outing in Kansas City, away from the strict confines of Haskell, Black persuaded Mandan to visit a “cheap Night Club.” When Anna’s hosts discovered this, she was immediately fired and sent back to the school. However, Georgine’s hosts cared only that she did the work assigned – which she did very well.³⁴

The majority of the host families fell in between these two reactions and many forgave their students first offense. Mrs. Cosner requested a girl to help clean house and was assigned Florence Wanna. At one point during her outing, Florence stayed away from home for one night and could not be found; she had spent the night at the Martha W. Hotel in Kansas City.

³³ Outing Rules Governing Patrons, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

³⁴ Vera Woods to Superintendent R. M. Kelley, June 19, 1936, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

Rather than immediately return Florence to Haskell, Mrs. Cosner gave the girl another chance. However, both Haskell and Phoenix remained adamant that if students continued to break the rules of the program, they could no longer participate.³⁵

The large number of students and patrons in the programs necessitated continual efforts to at least attempt to ensure that the objectives of the program were being achieved, students obeyed the rules of the program, and patrons did not abuse the children or take advantage of them as a cheap labor force. As the program continued to grow, teachers had to spend an increasing amount of time pairing students with potential patrons, recruiting patrons to sign up for the program, and performing home visits to ensure the safety of the students and ultimately the success of the program. Eventually it became necessary to hire outing agents, whose sole responsibility was to oversee the outing program.

Superintendent Peairs requested permission from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to hire an outing agent: “it is also difficult to keep track of the place where a boy is working unless we have someone to make the rounds constantly and assure himself that the boy is actually employed at the place where he has been sent. The boys frequently become dissatisfied with one employer and will go elsewhere.”³⁶ The Commissioner allowed Haskell to hire outing agents on a temporary basis beginning in 1911. Peairs hired one agent for the girls, earning eight hundred dollars a year, and another agent for the boys, who earned one thousand dollars a year. Both agents worked solely with outing students to ensure their safety by contacting them at least once a month. With these new hires, Peairs stated that “it is my purpose to push this outing program vigorously and with determination, and make it a

³⁵ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Cosner, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

³⁶ Superintendent Peairs to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, July 13, 1910, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

success.”³⁷ This help, however, was only temporary. By the 1920’s Haskell again required staff members to assume the duties of outing supervisors. But by 1929, Paul Cannady, the supervising teacher for the outing boys, realized that without an outing agent, the school’s 172 boys on summer outing were being placed in a position of extreme danger. The necessity of an outing agent had become urgent.³⁸ Since the program had expanded to such a degree, Superintendent Blair contacted the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to again plead the case for a permanent outing agent. Haskell provided for the students’ immediate needs by teaching them trades and facilitating working relationships with whites, but the school offered little to no vocational guidance for graduating seniors. Seniors were “very undecided as to just what activity they should devote themselves.” Blair argued that with the hiring of both a male and female outing agent, they could work with students in the outing program and provide the vocational guidance that had previously been missing. These two new positions would be called “vocational guidance director, outing agent, or some similar designation, and the pay should be about \$1800 per year.”³⁹

The Phoenix Indian School, having started their outing program much earlier than Haskell, had teachers designated to the oversight of the outing program prior to 1900. These teachers, like the rest of the Phoenix employees, lived on the campus in a dorm-like building

³⁷ Superintendent Peairs to Miss Anne S. Ely, April 29, 1911, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

³⁸ J. F. Stubeck to John Brown, Superintendent of Phoenix Indian School, August 25, 1924, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; C. M. Blair, Annual Report of the Haskell Institute, 1927, 5-6, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Paul Cannady, Haskell Boys’ Advisor, to Superintendent C. M. Blair, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

³⁹ C. M. Blair to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

and received \$100 per month.⁴⁰ The early stages of boarding school education, however, saw rapid teacher turnover rates due to the poor pay and often miserable living conditions at the schools. By the late 1890's, the Bureau of Indian Affairs realized that the boarding school system could not work unless the government retained intelligent and talented teachers. Therefore, Indian teachers became part of the civil service department, which guaranteed wages and standards of living, ultimately making the position more desirable. Just after this alteration to the status of Indian teachers, the Phoenix Indian School hired their first outing agent, Miss Amanda Chingren, who served until 1930.⁴¹ Although Phoenix consistently maintained the position of female outing agent, the school did not have a permanent outing agent for males until 1930, with the introduction of the Phoenix Indian employment service. Until that office opened, male teachers supervised the outing boys and Miss Chingren supervised the outing girls along with reservation Indian girls who needed to find employment in the area.⁴²

Female outing students received far more attention from the newly appointed outing agents than their male counterparts since they were thought to be more susceptible to abuse while on outing. The records essentially ignore the boys outing experiences, while they abound with information concerning the girls. Agents were responsible not only for finding the homes for the female students; they also ensured their safety throughout their stay.⁴³ Whenever a family expressed interest in obtaining a student worker, the outing agent performed a home visit. While there, the agent toured the home, viewed the future living quarters of the outing

⁴⁰ *Native American*, July 14, 1900; Amanda Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit C," Chingren, Official Statement, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

⁴¹ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 87; Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 46; Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 292.

⁴² Superintendent John Brown, "Regulations Governing the Conduct and Service of Non-citizen Indians in Phoenix and Vicinity," June 8, 1922, Amanda Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit C," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

⁴³ *Indian Leader*, December 20, 1929, 5.

student and discussed the particular needs of the household and the family's religion. The outing agent also attempted to explain the purpose of the program and determine whether or not the family was sympathetic to the Indians.⁴⁴

Since the outing system continued to grow, boarding schools needed to keep diligent records with all pertinent information concerning patron families and outing students. While each school had its own particular filing system, the organization used at the Haskell Institute is indicative of the structure most often used. The outing agents at Haskell kept all student and patron information on 4x6 index cards in order to find cases quickly. Student cards featured their name, class ranking, how much training they had received in sewing, cooking, and childcare, and the type of work desired. Patron cards included their names, addresses, phone numbers, types of work needed, expected working hours of the students, number of family members including children and if childcare was needed, sleeping arrangements, and the expected wages. Whenever outing agents visited patron homes, investigated complaints, or placed a new student, those changes were noted on the reverse of the card as a quick reference for the agents. This system kept the outing agents apprised of the various situations and it allowed them to take swift action if they found any students in immediate danger.⁴⁵

Particular job requirements for agents and the kinds of persons to be hired were not specified until the 1920's. A female outing agent, often called an outing matron, needed to be an "ideal woman" who was hard working, God fearing and possessed an unusually developed sense of moral character.⁴⁶ In addition to placing outing students, ensuring their safety,

⁴⁴ C. M. Blair, Annual Report of the Haskell Institute, 1927, 5-6, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Miss Stanley, "Report of Outing Trip," n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁴⁵ Outing Employer Cards, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁴⁶ Trennert, "Victorian Morality," 116.

investigating complaints, and negotiating wages, outing agents provided guidance for students wanting to continue their education, instructed teachers about what type of students to recommend for the program, recruited additional students and patrons through school and community events, and ultimately maintained the reputation of the school while enhancing public opinion of Native Americans.⁴⁷

The most important charge of the outing agents was ensuring the safety of students, but the agents also made it clear that no students would be allowed to enter a situation where they could possibly be exploited. That being said, the careful observation of the program did not guarantee students or their labor would not be abused by their outing patrons. The Hotel Radisson in Minnesota contacted the Haskell Institute requesting performers who could sing, play instruments, and perform “fancy ballets.”⁴⁸ Despite the handsome pay of forty dollars per week, Superintendent Peairs stated that by keeping the students in the local area the “influence and results are much better.” Both Phoenix and Haskell wanted their students to experience different types of employment situations, but the outing agents were still wary of placing students in factories. Factory managers were politely told that the outing program was not an employment agency, rather it strove to be an educational experience that strove to educate the students.⁴⁹

To ensure that both student and patron abided by the established rules, outing agents made regular home visits. If students or host families did not follow the guidelines of the program, the outing agent was notified immediately so troublesome students could be replaced

⁴⁷ H. W. Grattan, Superintendent of Industries, “The Placement Agent’s Job Report,” n.d., circa 1930, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

⁴⁸ C. R. Beaulieu, Hotel Radisson, Minnesota to Superintendent Peairs, June 9, 1920, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁴⁹ Superintendent of the Warehouse for Indian Supplies to Superintendent Peairs, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

and inappropriate outing positions could be rectified.⁵⁰ One of the most common problems was that students did not alert their hosts of their desire to leave their employment. Often, students would return to the school if they did not like their position, but the proper course of action was to give their host family two weeks notice so the outing agents could locate another student to take their place. For example, Blanche Shoemake, did not like her outing position since she worked “from early morning until late at night.” She planned to leave without notice, but her employer, Mrs. Leon Block, discovered her plans and notified the school. The outing agents instructed Blanche to remain in her position until another student could take her place. Although the outing agent sympathized with the student, she stated “...her manner of leaving left her as well as the office open to just criticism.”⁵¹

The first students to go on outing were ignorant of the situations they would encounter, which led to many abusive situations. To impress on future students what problems they might encounter, Haskell agents began offering pre-placement classes in 1934. These classes, based on case studies of former students, discussed the rules of the program, employment conditions, job requirements, and various other aspects of the program. Nonetheless agents still dealt with many problems between students and patrons. No other schools adopted such classes.⁵²

Prior to admission to the program Haskell girls were reviewed by the head of the Home Economic Department, which in the 1930’s was Leila Black. Students who had not received sufficient training were eliminated, while the others were given a physical exam to ensure they would be able to handle the work required of them by their host families. Once the girls passed

⁵⁰ Superintendent John Brown, “Regulations Governing Indians,” June 8, 1922, Amanda Chingren Investigation “Exhibit C,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington D. C.

⁵¹ “Outing Report,” December 31, 1904, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Leon Block, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁵² C. M. Blair, Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1927, 5-6, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

the examination period, they filled out a card to specify the type of work they would like to do while on outing.⁵³ After being selected, Haskell girls had to receive the express permission of their families prior to being placed with a host family. This kept the parents informed while also alerting them that their child could not return for the summer break.⁵⁴

While Haskell records provide detailed information about the selection for outing girls, very little is known about the screening process for the Phoenix Indian School. Conversely, the Phoenix Indian School's records relate how they selected their outing boys, while Haskell does not. The Phoenix boys were simply divided between skilled and unskilled labor based on the amount of training they had previously received. Those with unskilled labor worked at the school during the summer while the skilled laborers went on outing with local families or businesses. Students, at both Phoenix and Haskell had to receive recommendations from the school's staff members that addressed their "character, personal appearance, disposition, reliability, and steadfastness."⁵⁵

Outing agents also screened potential patrons to try to mitigate abuse of the system. They made home visits to make certain the students would live in respectable, Christian homes. After placing a student, the outing agent would visit again to see that the student's living conditions and treatment were appropriate. Often the specifics concerning employers deemed ineligible for outing students were not recorded. In fact, the records for the Phoenix Indian School did not include negative initial visits, most likely because the outing agents threw away the application after rejecting the potential patron. The Haskell Institute, however, kept the

⁵³ Margaret Speelman, Haskell Girl's Advisor, to Miss Irene Coonan, Guidance and Placement Officer, March 14, 1933, HMC, RG 75; NARA, Central Plains Region

⁵⁴ *Indian Leader*, May 24, 1935, 21.

⁵⁵ Unsigned note, April 2, 1934, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; *Indian Leader*, December 20, 1929, 5.

names of people with unsuitable living arrangements on a “black list,” which held a list of twenty-eight names by the 1930’s. The Haskell outing agents were instructed “Do not send girls to these homes under any circumstances.” Mrs. Stanley, the current outing agent, visited the home of Mrs. Shields, a blacklisted home. Because Mrs. Shields was ill and her husband was in the navy, she requested an Indian girl to help take care of her and her invalid son. After visiting the home and meeting the live-in hired boy, Stanley decided the household “looks to me like a dangerous proposition. He is 18 years old and weakling, looks like a worm type.” Another list featured the names of families that were safe, but not particularly desirable for the outing students.⁵⁶

Once they placed student within homes, the outing agents were responsible for making sure the placement was satisfactory for both the girls and the patrons. Sometimes the agents physically stopped by the home, but as the program expanded, it became more practical for the agents to contact the home by telephone. If during the phone call either the patron or the student sounded dissatisfied, the outing agent then made a home visit. The agent also double-checked the students’ work requirements to make certain they received fair wages for the type and the amount of work required. The wage for girls and boys from Haskell to Phoenix averaged around five dollars per week throughout history of the program. Since this rate did not account for the family size or the tasks required, a graduated pay scale had been suggested to provide fair wages, but it is not clear whether or not this was instated at either school.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Outing Employer Cards, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Miss Stanley, Outing Agent, to Superintendent Peairs, May 10, 1920, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁵⁷ Irene Coonan, Indian Affairs Field Office, to the Haskell Institute, January 6, 1934, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; C. M. Blair, Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1927, 5-6, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Miss Stanley to Superintendent Peairs, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

Whenever students complained, the outing agents were required to investigate. If no compromise could be made between the student and the patron, the agent removed the student and another girl would take her place. One such incident concerned the Anderson household. Alma Murphy complained that she disliked the work at the Anderson home, but when her replacement, Lillian Adams, worked there, she stated “the whole family is lovely, any unfavorable reports of unkind treatment given by Alma must be groundless.”⁵⁸ On other occasions the outing agents deemed the household unsuitable for the girls. On one such occasion, an unnamed girl worked for a local businessman, but upon a home visit from the outing matron, she discovered that the family made the girl live in a shed in the backyard that was infested with lice. When the outing agent confronted the woman of the house, she was not at all concerned since the girl was not permitted to enter the house. The agent quickly removed the student and sent her home for a full recovery prior to being placed with another family, while that family never received another outing student.⁵⁹

For the Haskell students on year-long outing, agents also had to visit the local schools to inquire as the Indian girls’ progress. In one report, Mrs. Stanley reported that the girls who attended Wichita High School did very well and fit in with the other students, but they “would finish [the work] they had on hand and sit idle unless the teacher watched closely.” There is no clear explanation for this, but it could be due to several factors. Boarding schools taught students to be obedient, so whenever they tried to separate themselves from the rest of the students, by action or even dress, they were told to join the other students. Another explanation could be the fact that the students were exhausted from the demands placed on them by their

⁵⁸ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Evard Anderson, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁵⁹ Trennert, “Victorian Morality,” 118-119.

employers, especially since patrons considered outing students as cheap laborers. Finally, students who worked slowly or sometimes not at all found these actions to be an effective form of passive resistance. They could not be punished for doing anything wrong, but they made the work at the school or on outing move slower than both the schools and patrons would have liked to see.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ Miss Stanley to Superintendent Peairs, n.d. HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Adams, 231.

Student Experiences

To make their time at the restrictive and often oppressive boarding schools more bearable, students often turned to coping mechanisms, most commonly by speaking their own languages with friends and continuing to practice traditional customs. Some simply ran away. Students also saw the outing program as a way to escape the boarding schools, if only for the summer. Outing, although still a work program, gave students considerably more freedom by allowing them to interact with other whites and their friends while living off campus and earning their own spending money. Although entering the outing program meant the possibility of being placed in an abusive position, students were willing to take this chance in exchange for more freedoms not allowed to them while at the boarding schools.

Recorded reactions of Haskell boys in the outing program are few and far between since outing for boys operated like business transactions. Patrons received boys and the boys received their wages. For instance, one Lawrence resident hired two Indian boys to work at his printing press. He wrote that while the boys worked slower than his other employees, they learned quickly and became better all the while.¹ Problems, however, were inherent in the system. Superintendent Peairs often had trouble with host families wanting to keep their students rather than return them to the school in the fall. When the students did return after a summer on outing, the school often faced radically changed students. Since the students were away from the strict guiding influence of their teachers and their carefully regulated schedules, many adopted bad habits, such as using tobacco. Many boys developed the habit of smoking

¹ *Annual Report 1903*, 15.

while on outing, but once they returned to school the teachers worked all year to stop the practice. If they succeeded, it usually was only until the next outing term began.²

As the outing program grew, many schools began to look for opportunities that would allow them to place many students with one employer. It happened that at just this point several sugar beet companies began soliciting schools for large numbers of outing students to help plant, weed, and harvest beets. The Genoa School, located in Nebraska, was the first school allowed to send their students to the beet fields and considered it a legitimate outing position. Although Thomas J. Morgan, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in 1889, allowed the students to work in beet fields, he admitted that it was not a true form of outing since the students did not learn a skill, but provided cheap labor for the farmers.³ Despite this admonition, many boarding schools began to send their students to work in the beet fields, including the Haskell Institute. The Annual Report to the Department of the Interior for 1903 even stated that the outing program was only dangerous for boys since they were often sent to locations that were far removed from the oversight of the school. Nonetheless, the report claimed, “there have been only a few mistakes made.”⁴

In an effort to send all of Haskell’s male students on outing no matter the level of training they had received, boarding schools tried to find jobs that would allow even the youngest boys to participate in the program. Labor in the beet fields of Colorado and Western Kansas offered one such opportunity. The companies described the work as neither demanding nor exacting in attention or training, so anyone would be able to perform the task. Beet companies sent circulars advertising numerous positions available. They described the job as

² *Annual Report 1901*, 537.

³ Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 277.

⁴ *Annual Report 1903*, 15.

“light work, though tedious ... [beet thinning] is all done in stooping over or on the hands and knees. Small boys are very well adapted to this work and it can be done very nicely by the boy of ... 13 to 14 years of age.” Boys received two dollars a day which averaged between ten to twelve dollars a week. Room and board were then deducted, however, leaving boys earning between nine and eighty cents per day, or forty-five cents to four dollars per week.⁵ No escorts or chaperones accompanied the boys to ensure their safe arrival or their living conditions. The boys also paid a transportation fee of twenty dollars for using government trucks. While traveling to the beet fields “precautions are taken to have good equipment and drivers so that if an accident occurs it will be simply a matter of regret and not of remorse.” Once the boys arrived at the fields, they found that their living quarters were “far from good” and the students could not afford to spend more than thirty-five cents a day for food. The companies also required the boys to choose two of their number to serve as a foreman and a cook, but the others had to pay for their services out of their own minimal salaries. Most companies also charged the outing students one dollar per season for the use of the company’s hoes and another dollar per month for hospital privileges.⁶ Through the Haskell records, it is clear that the beet companies only hired Indian boys as a source of cheap, menial labor, not for the purpose of educating the Indian youth.

The records are not clear how often Haskell sent boys to the beet fields or how many students came from other schools, but the records do express the interest in the outing program by beet farmers. Ralph Collins, a beet farmer from Rocky Ford, Colorado had apparently become accustomed to having outing students work on his farm. He wrote to Superintendent Peairs that he would like to have fifty boys work on his farm for the summer outing season.

⁵ Meriam, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 390; *Ibid.*, 524.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 390-391; *Ibid.*, 525; *Ibid.*, 391.

Peairs sent a response that he could not send fifty of his students since the absence of that many students would “cripple the work here.”⁷ Another letter from the Holly Sugar Company requested students to help on their farms. They had grown “22,500 acres of beets and need a great deal of labor to take care of this territory,” but by this point the Assistant Superintendent had been given specific instructions by H. B. Peairs to end the practice. This decision seems to have occurred around 1907, twenty-two years before the Meriam report revealed the detrimental effects of allowing students to work in menial labor positions.⁸

The Phoenix Indian School maintained fairly detailed records on their outing boys as well as the outing girls. The *Native American* often reprinted letters received from outing patrons praising the boys’ work and the school’s training departments. These letters served to encourage the students and to keep them up to date with their friends. Many patrons praised the character that the school had instilled in their students. Vernon Vaughn, a local grocer, stated that the boys he had hired had all been trustworthy and he had no “cause for suspicion or doubt.” Mrs. W. A. Work just loved her outing student, Robert Sekistewa. “He is an exceptional boy, does his work willingly and well, is a perfect gentleman, and I most heartily recommend him.” And Mr. Aller stated that with all the outing students he had “no other class of men equal[ed] them in general intelligence, honesty or industry.”⁹ Other patrons wrote to the school to praise the successful vocational training departments and the students that came to them well trained. T. C. McReynolds, an outing patron, stated that while the boys often took longer to complete their tasks, “but when they get through with a job, it is done right.”

⁷ Ralph Collins to Superintendent Peairs, April 13, 1907, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁸ Holly Sugar Company to Superintendent Peairs, April 13, 1907, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁹ *Native American*, September 10, 1921; *Ibid.*, October 9, 1920; *Ibid.*, January 22, 1921.

McReynolds even stated that John Thomas, an outing student in charge of equipment maintenance, performed “the work in a much more competent manner than the white man whom he succeeded.”¹⁰

At least in the published letters, local patrons did not express discontent with their outing students. Many stated that they had few or no problems with the students and some, like T. E. Irvine, who had employed outing students for over twenty years, even became good friends with the boys. Mr. H. L. Aller did state that they “occasionally have a boy working for us who gets the ‘Spring Fever’ in his blood and is attracted by the shady side of a tree, but this is no more than can be expected of the majority of boys of the white race and the Indian boys take their medicine in such instances with better grace than the white boy is apt to.” From the abundant praise received, the *Native American* deemed the outing program as a great benefit for all students.¹¹

Many boys worked with families or at businesses located in Phoenix, but many students worked for larger companies or farms in the surrounding areas. Unfortunately, as the students accepted jobs further away from the school and school’s authority and oversight, students found themselves in troubling and sometimes abusive situations. When the outing program began at Phoenix, school officials hoped that the majority of the male students could find jobs at local orchards and cotton farms. Many students did work as cotton pickers since it was seen as “the only opportunity open to the common laborer.” By 1933, the cotton industry as a whole openly accepted the employment of Native Americans, but they paid Indians less than their white employees, unlike other outing positions where the pay was comparable to the wages of

¹⁰ Ibid., September 11, 1920.

¹¹ *Indian Leader*, January 22, 1921; Ibid., January 10, 1920.

white labor.¹² Soon after, the Phoenix Indian School stopped sending boys to the cotton fields for outing since cotton prices had dropped significantly and it became clear many farmers hired Indians specifically because Indians had become a cheap and steady supply of labor. For instance, the Arizona Cotton Growers Association wanted outing students to pick ten acres of cotton, but the boys had to provide their own tools and find their own transportation only to be paid fifty cents a day. Another farmer wanted some students to pick his ten acres of land for eighty-five cents per day, but his fields had already been picked twice before.¹³

Outing students also worked as cheap labor in mining and construction positions. The Phoenix Indian School did not have many opportunities to send their outing students to the local mines because several labor strikes and the depressed economy halted work during the 1920's and 1930's, but the school sent many boys to work at construction sites. Because of the Works Projects Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Phoenix Indian School was uniquely positioned between several building projects, including the Salt River Bridge and the Coolidge Dam construction sites. Many Indian boys and men worked at these sites, some as skilled laborers, but many more just as common laborers.¹⁴ Although many Phoenix students worked as unskilled labor, the outing agents attempted to find positions where the boys could practice their trade or learn new skills. In 1934, the Phoenix Indian School sent

¹² T. E. Shipley, outing agent, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, July 1, 1930, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; T. E. Shipley to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, September 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

¹³ T. E. Shipley to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, September 1932, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; T. E. Shipley to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, November 28, 1932, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

¹⁴ T. E. Shipley to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, November 10, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; T. E. Shipley to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, February 8, 1934, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; T. E. Shipley to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, November 10, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; T. E. Shipley to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, July 9, 1934, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

sixty outing boys to the construction site of the future Salt River Day School. They rented rooms at the school and paid for their transportation to and from the job site, but they still earned five dollars a week for their work. Even after the summer ended, Superintendent Skinner allowed the boys to work for two weeks and then go to school for two weeks so they could continue their education. The outing work at the Salt River Day School required skilled labor and the opportunity allowed the community to see how successful the Phoenix Indian School's students had become through the school's training departments.¹⁵

Male outing students worked at a variety of locations and different jobs, but outing agents tried to place the boys in "jobs that will, as nearly as possible, give them practice in the trade they are studying in the school." For both the Phoenix Indian School and the Haskell Institute, the majority of boys worked on farms or on construction sites. At Haskell, boys worked with local farmers since Lawrence was a farming community and farming was seen as a practical vocation because those who returned to the reservations could easily support themselves with the principles they had learned. In fact, seven out of ten graduated Indian students worked as farmers, herders, or foresters. During the summer outing of 1927, Haskell sent sixty-three boys to work on farms, which resulted in a net income of \$3,000 during that summer alone.¹⁶ While construction work was not as popular as farming at Haskell, the Phoenix outing agents predominantly placed their outing boys in those positions. The Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps desperately needed construction workers and building materials, and students easily found positions available at construction

¹⁵ T. E. Shipley to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, May 1, 1934, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; T. E. Shipley to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, September 6, 1934, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 17.

¹⁶ *Native American*, January 8, 1916; C. M. Blair, Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1927, 5-6, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; *Annual Report 1900*, 488.

sites, mines, and lumber mills during the summer months. Some boys worked at factories and as salesmen, but these numbers remained small.¹⁷

One of the more popular trades at Haskell was auto mechanics, and it soon became a very desirable program for the students, and many car companies requested outing boys from this program. The Reo Auto Company located in Lansing, Michigan requested an average of one dozen boys each year to help work in their factory. In addition, the boys who worked for them also attended the company's training course, which furthered their education. The company also tried to place students with an aptitude for the trade in permanent positions. A representative of Reo stated that "Reo has been pleased to have had this contact with these young men. Their conduct, attitude, and ability has been desirable in every way."¹⁸ This company willingly taught the boys what the school could not and they helped support the boys after they left school. To the administrators at Haskell, this company understood and demonstrated just how the outing system was designed to work.

As more people learned about the outing system, more opportunities for work began to emerge for the Indian boys. One unique program, offered to Haskell students, was a class in Range Livestock Production in Miles City, Colorado. This class taught boys how to care for livestock, which included more advanced techniques of breeding animals, raising their young, and even breaking horses. There was also demand for boys to work as counselors at summer and Boy Scout camps. This began in 1930, but the demand steadily increased and despite the Phoenix Indian School's initial refusal to send their students, both Phoenix and Haskell sent

¹⁷ T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, July 1, 1930, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

¹⁸ Superintendent R. D. Baldwin to Mr. Hunter Clarkson, December 3, 1931, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; *Indian Leader*, May 31-June 7, 1929, 18; A. F. Avis, Reo Motor Car Company employee, to Superintendent Peairs, August 1, 1930, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

outing boys to summer camps, even though some were thousands of miles away from the schools.¹⁹ In fact, the demand for camp counselors became so strong the Haskell boy's advisor, Paul Cannady, stated to Superintendent Peairs: "It would be wise to begin teaching the students at Haskell leather work, bead work, making war bonnets, bow and arrow making, archery, Indian legends and customs, Indian dances, Indian sign language, nature study, horsemanship, rifle marksmanship, Boy Scout work, [and] some idea of military organization and leadership." Peairs did begin to incorporate more Indian practices in Haskell's curriculum, which allowed students to experience some of the same things done on reservations.²⁰ The Phoenix Indian School also reintroduced native customs to their curriculum. Due to their proximity to California, the superintendents often received requests from movie studios to film their students. Some requested to film native customs, such as the Apache Devil Dancers, in order to preserve native heritage, but others simply wanted to use Indians as props, such as the Cudiacolor Picture Company requesting 300 Indians and 50 horses to supplement a western.²¹ Whites removed Indians identity while through boarding school education, but at this point, whites began superimposing a new image for Native Americans: the noble savage. Despite this new identity, most Indians continued to work as unskilled and menial laborers. Utilizing Indian students as cheap labor was not only easier for the school and the communities as a whole, but

¹⁹ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 287; Superintendent Skinner to Mr. W. E. Thomas, State Boy's Work Secretary at Omaha, Nebraska YMCA, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Superintendent Skinner to Mr. Louis Haviland, St. Louis, MO, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

²⁰ Paul Cannady, Boys' Advisory, to Superintendent C. M. Blair, May 8, 1930, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Paul Cannady, Boys' Advisory, to Superintendent Peairs, November 15, 1930, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains, Region.

²¹ T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, July 5, 1932, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, December 23, 1939, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

it also was what the public expected from Indians. Most people were only comfortable with Indians working for them as long as they remained subordinate to whites.

The wages male students earned varied from year to year and depended on the work. Haskell students earned on average between twelve to fifteen dollars a week, but the students at Phoenix earned between ten to twenty-two dollars per week. The Phoenix's boys also held the record for the highest paid Indian skilled labor from the school at thirty-five dollars per week for a "skilled boiler maker." At Haskell, the average money earned in 1926 was \$18.38 a week while the average for 1927 was \$14.18 a week.²² Usually the school employees negotiated the wages for the students, but there were occasions when the students tried to take matters into their own hands. One such incident featured a group of boys who worked for a local farmer, Claus Hein. When they asked what they were paid per day, Hein stated the negotiated rate of one dollar per day. This upset the boys and they stated they "wouldn't work for less than \$1.50 per day." When the farmer refused to comply, the boys returned to Haskell on their own accord.²³ While there are not many cases like this in the records, it does show that renegotiations could occur within the outing program, especially if the work was too demanding or differed in any way from the original contract.

Outing agents paid special attention to female outing students because, it was argued, they would be responsible for raising future generations of assimilated Indians. Indian girls needed to receive a quality education so they could teach their children what they had learned throughout their boarding school experiences. Host families requested Haskell girls, often called Haskellites, to serve as domestic servants when their regular hired help left for the

²² Arthur Stark to Superintendent C. M. Blair, August 6, 1927, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, July 1, 1930, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

²³ Claus Hein to Mr. Milligan, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

summer. Both staff members and fellow students encouraged girls to apply for the outing program. In fact, the *Indian Leader*, the school's student newspaper, stated that "working under Haskell makes each one feel that she can never do her work too well ... the Indian girls who goes out from Haskell to work during the summer is helping herself socially, economically, and spiritually to a place of independence and security."²⁴

Reactions to the program varied, but based on correspondence, the most common complaint of the girls was homesickness. Cordelia Garvie wrote to Peairs that "I am now getting used to my work and like it very much ... The country and the people all seem rather strange to me, therefore I get very lonesome for Haskell and friends. But I hope to get used to it all and do my very best, and live up to your expectation if possible." Peairs answered that homesickness was typical and encouraged her by saying that it always subsided.²⁵ Nonetheless girls sometimes had to either return to the school or were even sent home due to their loneliness. One such student, Bernice Dupris, cried the entire time she lived with her host family, which only amounted to one full day. She reported that the family was very nice, but the children reminded her of her own family. The current outing agent, Irene Coonan, called these girls "Cry-Cases" which applied to "girls placed for the first time who weep and wail either until they 'snap out of it' and settle down to their job or don't, and return to Haskell."²⁶

²⁴ *Annual Report 1900*, 433; Meriam, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 628; *Indian Leader*, December 20, 1929, 6.

²⁵ Cordelia Garvie to Superintendent Peairs, October 15, 1907, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Superintendent Peairs to Cordelia Garvie, October 19, 1907, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

²⁶ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Kessler, n. d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Irene (Coonan) Traffert, Guidance and Placement Officer, to Miss Mary Stewart, Assistant Director of Education, Indian Office, August 7, 1934, HMC, RG 75, NARA Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. H. J. Bayless, n.d. HMC, RG 75, NARA Central Plains Region.

The outing agents tried to pair students and patrons so that they could spend the entire outing duration with one family; however, this was not always possible. Some benign reasons why girls returned to the school included the return of former domestic servants, vacations or a fundamental change in the household such as marriages, births, deaths, and illnesses of either the patron or the student. Students were also returned due to a lack of experience, laziness, clash of personalities, and any type of disobedience by the student.

Despite instances of outing girls not being fully trained, patrons who employed domestic servants often loved them and many offered the girls full time employment upon their graduation from Haskell. Charlotte Butler enjoyed working with Mrs. Bellamy so much she did not want to return to Haskell. The outing agents managed to see her off to school again, but it became clear that she would rather have stayed with her outing family. Mable Brown also expressed her desire to remain with her outing family and after the family took a short vacation, she returned to her position for the remainder of the summer.²⁷ Mrs. Brand stated her student worker did not act on her own initiative, but nevertheless, she hated to see her go when she had to have an operation. Pearl Edmo enjoyed working for Mrs. Einhorn so much that when she contracted an ear infection she told no one for days because she did not want to be sent away. Some students and host families enjoyed each other enough to request the same arrangement for the following outing season.²⁸

²⁷ Miss Stanley, outing agent, to Superintendent Peairs, n.d. HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Meriam, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 628; Outing Student Cards – Charlotte Butler, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Anna Dosey, Senior Matron, Outing Report, July 14, 1941, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

²⁸ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Brand, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Einhorn, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

For all the families who truly cared for their students, many patrons only expressed interest in the program to secure cheap domestic labor. The most frequent complaint heard from the outing girls was either the work was too hard or there was simply too much work to be done by just one girl. Ernestine Chosa cooked, cleaned, and did all the household ironing for Mrs. Sam Goodman, but she soon left because she thought the work was too demanding. Lorena Pahmahmie's patron, Mrs. Deutch, wanted a girl who could clean, cook, and care for a two and a half year old child, but the family ate different times of the day and they all wanted Lorena to cook special orders. Lorena eventually left, unable to attend to her other chores since she was always in the kitchen.²⁹ Dorothy Chosa's patrons required her to prepare some meals, clean and do laundry for two children, but she reported that the work was "very hard [and she] never gets any rest during the day." She too requested another outing position. LaHoma Moore worked for Mrs. Fleet who required her to cook, care for children, clean "quite particular[ly]," and wash the family's clothing. LaHoma could handle the large amount of work, but she reported that "Mrs. F[leet] is not at home enough to do anything [and she] brings unexpected guests." When LaHoma discovered the family's intentions to move to a larger house, she requested a transfer since she knew the work could be far too difficult for just one person.³⁰

In two cases, students claimed the work was too difficult due to a lack of modern appliances. Fannie Ned stated that Mrs. Jacobs had no modern equipment, which meant that all work had to be done by hand. Helen Bruguier reported that Mrs. Haynes also had no vacuum

²⁹ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Sam Goodman, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Deutch, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

³⁰ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Allan Browne, n.d. HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Fleet, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

cleaner, but she wanted all the chores completed every day. As a result, outing agents transferred Helen and Fannie to different host families. Behind this problem was another one involving the girls' futures.³¹ Trained in the domestic science department to manage a household with modern appliances, graduates prepared to work as domestics for wealthier white families but not for the work waiting for them if they returned to their families still on the reservations.

There are many examples of how outing arrangements did not work as expected or how both students and patrons experienced difficulties throughout the process. Some outing patrons and students did not like one another; some students were just disobedient and some students, like Wilma Burd, did not like the quarters they were allotted. Other situations were entirely unique. Vivian Lagoo worked in the Dobbins household where she received instructions from both the father and the grandmother of the house. When she followed one set of instructions over the other, each would become angry that she had not done what she had been told. Fortunately, this situation was resolved with the aid of outing agents.³² Cleora Collins worked for Mrs. Rebecca Stern, but she soon left because of dietary constraints. She was expected to "eat dry bread, she cannot eat the kosher food and is losing weight all the time. [She] wishes to leave because she doesn't get enough to eat." No matter how carefully the outing agents placed their students, some girls and patrons inevitably did not get along with one another.³³

³¹ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Jacobs, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Haynes, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

³² Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Watson, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mr. Preston Dobbins, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

³³ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Rebecca Stern, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

Although some patrons took advantage of the program, some problems occurred because of the behavior of individual students. The students who went on outing experienced new freedoms that had never been afforded to them before. Several patrons reported that the students had become very disrespectful and even immoral. Some students began to display a mild disobedience, such as staying out too late at night or talking on the phone for long periods of time. Viola Masquat was one such student. She began the outing program in the company of Mrs. H. D. Robinson with a reportedly nice disposition, but in time she began to stay out late at night and sometimes did not return until seven in the morning. Mrs. Robinson stated that she does good work, but “she smokes all over the house when she has asked her not to. She is not personally clean and has gotten very flippant.” Elizabeth Chossa began stealing from her outing family. “A silk dress, a roll of beautiful pennants, a leather bound scrap book, a tennis racket case, some beautiful embroidery and several little trinkets” were found among Elizabeth’s belongings. After she “cried hysterically for a long time,” she promised she would “do right from now on.”³⁴

When problems presented themselves, host families were often forgiving and willing to give the girls a second chance, but if the students continued to take advantage of their patrons and the outing system, they were returned to the school. Julia Whitebeaver was one such student. Her record noted that she had fallen into bad company while on outing in Lawrence and had managed to lead several other students astray as well. Julia’s rebellion escalated until local police arrested her and several other Haskell outing students for public intoxication. Soon

³⁴ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Dreyer, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. H. D. Robinson, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Miss Stanley to Superintendent Peairs, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

after, Julia Whitebeaver, Esther Skenandore, Ruth Boy, Alice Brown, and Emma Davis were removed from the Haskell Institute and promptly sent home.³⁵

The majority of the complaints to Haskell concerned lack of training in cooking. The majority of the outing girls were pre-vocational students who had not received extensive amounts of cooking lessons. The Haskell Institute hoped the outing system would help the girls develop these skills quicker than if they remained solely at the school. Instead of teaching the students, however, many housewives quickly returned the students because they lacked time or the desire to train the students how to accomplish the required tasks. Mrs. Eden returned Carmen Eagleman because she did “not have the time to train anyone now,” even though Carmen was obliging and had the potential to be a very good help. Mrs. Foley stated that Cleora Collins was very slow and “only a fair cook.” Mrs. Hutchins said Ruth Chisholm was “not willing or interested in learning to cook and cannot cook at all.” Mrs. Curry reported that Zohy Galligo “did not even know the rudiments of cooking and could not learn.”³⁶

One of the principal reasons the girls left their employers was due to the responsibility of taking care of small children. Haskell girls did not have much experience with children, but the majority of patrons requested girls who could help care for their children. Haskell had child-rearing classes, but the average girl did not score better than middling grades. The staff recognized this difficulty the girls faced, but rather than provide more training for the students, the *Indian Leader* stated that taking care of small children was a “character building exercise

³⁵ Mrs. Frances D. Adams, Placement Officer, to Irene Coonan, Phoenix Outing Agent, September 29, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

³⁶ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Eden, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Foley, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Hutchins, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Curry, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Epstein, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

for the girls to learn patience and temper control.”³⁷ Louise Schrimpscher experienced this when she began working with Mrs. Jones’ family. She was responsible for caring for the children in the house, but when she arrived she was ill. This caused the children to think she was weak and they proceeded to take advantage of her. Betty Breuninger, an outing patron, accused her of being “unable to assume responsibility for children. [She] let [the] boy take a knife into [the] yard and lose [it].” Myrtle Anderson “simply cannot get along with the baby,” and so she too returned to Haskell.³⁸ Lillian Saul, placed in the Bren household, was responsible to clean and care for a one-year-old child. Lillian reported that she “could not go to her room at night because [the] baby was sleeping in it.” Mrs. Bren reported “that Lillian was impudent [and she] slapped [the] baby’s hands, when corrected [she] said to Mrs. B[ren] ‘Why don’t you teach your baby better, or stay home once in a while?’” Lillian was promptly removed from the household. No other girls worked there, reportedly because the mother would place all responsibilities for childcare on them.³⁹

The Phoenix Indian School’s outing girls remained in high demand and every year all their students who wanted to participate in the program easily found positions. Just like at Haskell, many patron families and businesses spoke highly of their students and either requested the same girls each year or recommended family friends as potential outing placements.⁴⁰ Mrs. Helen Willis praised Vivian Poogalinka as “... a joy; she is a dear – all that

³⁷ Outing Student Cards – Beatrice O’Jibway, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; *Indian Leader*, December 20, 1929, 5.

³⁸ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Jones, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Porch, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Bernstein, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

³⁹ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Bren, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁴⁰ Brief Index Notes – Elena Mamahu, 1930’s, n.d., PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Brief Index Notes – Katherine Huga, 1930’s, n.d., PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

you claimed for her.” While Lillie Eldridge’s family stated “I have never had a more satisfactory person than Lily. She is very capable and has the nicest manners and a perfect disposition.” While Mrs. Chas. Griggs claimed her “world couldn’t have been better,” with Minnie Shorty. Even Mr. Adams, the owner at the Phoenix Hotel, stated that he “would like to have more of your Indian girls. Those who are employed at the hotel [Alice Hall and Annie Fisher] are the best and the neatest workers I have had. I’d be glad to employ more of the same kind.” It is clear that many Phoenix employers, like those in Lawrence, formed “deep attachments” with their outing students.⁴¹

Phoenix outing patrons also expressed concern over the students’ futures and seemed relatively willing to teach them the tasks they required. Mrs. John Flinn stated that her student, Irene “will be very good after she learns the work, it is all so new to her.” Several families seemed truly concerned with the outing girls’ education. Mrs. J. J. Perley wanted to keep her student in Los Angeles so she could attend a larger public school for the fall semester. Others, like Mrs. W. R. Wyland, did not “want to spoil any chances for her [outing student] as she is so ambitious, so we’ll do whatever is best.” Mable H. Sarbane praised Mildred Tolanwintewa’s work, but also encouraged her to continue “to develop character in her remaining two years at school.” Outing patrons like these often maintained relationships with their former outing students by continuing to request the same student to work for them year after year.⁴²

⁴¹ Helen H. Willis to Amanda Chingren, August 15, 1932, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington D. C.; Mrs. Lewis to Amanda Chingren, n.d., Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit B,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington D. C.; Brief Index Notes – Minnie Shorty, 1930’s, n.d., PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; *Native American*, June 23, 1900.; Lucile M. Parsons to Amanda Chingren, September 9, 1923, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit B,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

⁴² Mrs. John Flinn to Irene Coonan, September 25, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Mrs. J. J. Perley to Superintendent John Brown, August 24, 1927, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Mrs. W. R. Wyland to Irene Coonan, September 22, 1933, PHIS, RG

One key difference between the outing programs at Haskell and Phoenix was the amount of individual choice available to their students. Haskell school officials placed all students in the outing program and with various employers regardless of what the student preferred. The Phoenix Indian School, however, gave their students a considerable amount of choice with the outing program. Students could choose whether to go on outing, where they would work and the type of work, and even which employers they did or did not want to work with.⁴³ The Phoenix program also often placed their female students far away from the school, and while this often resulted in homesickness, the distance also encouraged the students to become involved in their community and meet other Indian girls in the area. For example, several outing girls working in Prescott, Arizona, formed a literary club as a way to socialize with one another on a weekly basis. Many girls were thankful for the experience since they saw more of the world than they ever had before.⁴⁴

As in Haskell's outing program, the Phoenix Indian School encountered many circumstances where patron families either did not care for their students or had no interest in teaching the Indian girls. Several patrons expressed discontent with their students for either a lack of training or interest in the work. Mrs. Robert Armstrong claimed that although Stella

75, NARA, Pacific Region; Mable H. Sarband to Irene Coonan, September 6, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

⁴³ Blanch Innis to Irene Coonan, September 2, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Brief Index Notes – Elizabeth Harvey, 1930's, n.d., PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Josephine Roberts to Irene Coonan, September 25, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Irene Coonan to Miss Mary Stewart, Assistant Director of Education, Office of Indian Affairs, July 11, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

⁴⁴ Irene Coonan to Amy Numkena, September 1, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Cora to Amanda Chingren, July 13, 1923, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit C," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Anna Easchief to Amanda Chingren, September 25, 1923, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit C," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 17; Minnie Autone to Amanda Chingren (copied by Chingren in her own hand), July 20, 1923, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit C," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

Beading cleaned very well, “that is all I can say for her – She is most indifferent to my child.” Mrs. H. Gold’s outing student was a “Good worker but could not recommend because of nervous[ness]” which left her hysterical by nightfall. Mrs. Emery C. Kolb expressed disappointment with the lapse of time between finding a replacement outing student after her previous student left. Over time, with lapses in the system and the frustration of untrained students, several patrons had “sworn off Indians.” But even with all of the frustrations inherent in the outing program, demand for outing students remained high at the Phoenix Indian School.⁴⁵

Probably because the Phoenix Indian School placed students farther from the school grounds, there were greater instances of abuse on the part of both students and patrons. Several outing students, Emma Razor, Frances Capone, and Jennie, were accused of stealing articles from their outing employers. In most instances, the items were returned to the patrons, but the fact that the thefts took place indicates a lack of oversight from school officials.⁴⁶ Abuses by patrons were far more common than those of students. Patrons saved all the dirty work for their outing students, which kept them “toiling from early to late.” Students were “never given a word of encouragement, never permitted to enter the living rooms of the home, [and] compelled to always eat [their] meals from a plate in the kitchen alone.” Clara Lewis, working for Mrs. Gunst in Tucson, reported that “I just cannot stay here for another month. I am so

⁴⁵ Mrs. Robert Armstrong to Irene Coonan, September 6, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Brief Index Notes – Mrs. H. Gold, 1930’s, n.d., PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Mrs. Emery C. Kolb to Irene Coonan, October 14, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Irene Coonan to Miss Mary Stewart, July 11, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

⁴⁶ Frances D. Adams to Irene Coonan, September 29, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Belva Coats, December 8, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Clara B. Nells to Amanda Chingren, August 21, 1923, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit B,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

lonesome and besides I am so sick with my back. I am not going to be slave to any body I tell you that. I never worked as hard as this in my life.” Stella B. worked from Mr. and Mrs. Armstrong in Iron Springs, Arizona where she washed the family’s clothes but because there was so much work, she could not even wash her own clothes. When she did go wash her own clothes, Mrs. Armstrong scolded her for not ironing the family’s clothes. She left that job because of the heavy work load for only three dollars a week.⁴⁷

Indian outing agents from all boarding schools, more often than not, placed girls in white homes as domestic servants. In fact, the 1927 annual report of Haskell, Superintendent Blair stated that “our girls are placed exclusively in homes as domestic help.” It was fairly easy to find domestic servant jobs for the girls since a social stigma still remained on that type of work. Haskell Outing agent, Ruth Bronson, reported that they would be able to place ninety-five girls in the Kansas City area, but the only jobs available were servant positions.⁴⁸ This was especially true in Phoenix since very few of those groups who typically filled to servant positions, African Americans and European immigrants, settled in Phoenix.⁴⁹

Haskell agents, on the other hand, tried to expand the program to include a wider variety of jobs. After being assigned to the Haskell placement office, Irene Coonan contacted department stores, factories, telephone companies, and various businesses to determine whether or not Indian help was either wanted or needed, but this survey was conducted in 1934 when

⁴⁷ Trennert, “Victorian Morality,” 115; Clara Lewis to Irene Coonan, September 11, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Stella B. to Irene Coonan, September 13, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

⁴⁸ C. M. Blair, Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1927, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Meriam, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 628; Ruth Bronson, Outing Report, 1929, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁴⁹ Irene Coonan to Miss Minnie Chapeo, September 14, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Irene Coonan to Mrs. Beula D. Robinson, Little Brown Tea Room, October 18, 1934, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

economic conditions had affected everyone. Although businesses expressed interest, they had no positions available. A few students found positions outside white homes: Margaret Johnson worked in a garment factory and Lillian Marlow in a beauty parlor. Another student worked at a summer camp in Estes Park, Colorado teaching Indian crafts and legends and Bessie Manatowa was between outing positions when Leila Black, the girls' advisor at Haskell, allowed her to serve as her typist.⁵⁰ One successful placement of outing students in positions other than domestic servants was at the Sylvan Lake Hotel in the Black Hills of South Dakota. In 1928, Haskell allowed eight of their girls to work there. The following year twenty-one students were hand-picked by Haskell staff and sent to serve as waitresses, piano player, office assistant, maids, bell boys, life saver, boat boy and scouts. The experiment was a success. The hotel staff and the guests were impressed with the Indian students.⁵¹ This type of placement encouraged whites to view Native Americans and Indian boarding schools in a more favorable light.

Indian girls on outing received considerably less pay than the Indian boys. Just after the turn of the century, female students were paid an average of \$3.50 a week, but as time progressed, they began to earn an average of five dollars a week.⁵² During the boom of the

⁵⁰ Irene Coonan, Indian Affairs Field Service to Haskell Institute, January 6, 1934, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; "Report for Week Ending November 18, 1933," HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; "Report for Week Ending December 16, 1933," HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Ruth Bronson, Outing Report, 1929, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Leila Black, Report of Girls in Kansas City, December 2, 1932, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁵¹ Ruth Bronson, Outing Report, 1929, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Sylvan Lake Hotel to C. M. Blair, October 25, 1928, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁵² Theodore Griesa to Superintendent Peairs, June 18, 1907, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Superintendent Peairs to F. W. Dusenbury, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Superintendent Peairs to Mrs. Leroy Root, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

1920's, outing girls could make between five and ten dollars a week, with some occasionally placed for ten to twelve dollars per week. These high wages rapidly decreased with the start of the Great Depression until the average wage again was five dollars a week, but at Phoenix the girls could still make up to eight dollars per week if they had been highly recommended and fully trained.⁵³

⁵³ C. M. Blair, Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1927, 5, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Ruth Muskrat Bronson, Report of Outing, 1929, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; "Report on Kansas City Outing Girls for Summer 1936," HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Amanda Chingren, Weekly Outing Report, June 30, 1923, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit C," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Brief Index Note – Florence Little, 1930's, n.d., PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Irene Coonan, "Form Letter to Potential Outing Girls," September 16, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

Community Reactions to Outing

When the outing program began in western off-reservation boarding schools, school officials were unsure how the public would react to the hiring of Indians into their homes. But, the public readily accepted the outing program and Indian labor. The program continued to grow rapidly and the demand for students began to exceed the amount of students participating in the outing program. During the summer of 1900, Haskell could not supply all the requests for outing students and the following year the superintendent stated that “hundreds of girls could be placed in homes [around Lawrence].” Male outing students were in equally high demand, especially during the months of July and August due to the harvest season.¹ Potential host families quickly became aware of the demand and submitted requests for students as early as March. Letters sent in early June and even late May received replies from the school stating that all the outing students had been placed. The citizens of Lawrence seemed excited about the possibility of having Indian labor, most likely because a school would bring jobs for construction and supplies, and the outing program would provide the area with “cheap labor.” The *Lawrence Daily Journal* added that the school would demonstrate a new “method of dealing with the red man who has for so long been wronged by our people and our government.”² Whatever the true motives of the citizens of Lawrence, they supported the Haskell Institute wholeheartedly.

The citizens of Phoenix were simply ecstatic that the Phoenix Indian School would be providing the area with a steady supply of cheap labor. Phoenix lacked a large immigrant and African American community, leaving whites to work in service positions typically reserved

¹ *Annual Report 1900*, 487; *Annual Report 1901*, 537.

² Vučković, *Voices from Haskell*, 18; Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 58; *Lawrence Daily Journal*, September 21, 1884.

for the low class or ethnic communities. Since whites chose not to work those types of jobs due to the social stigma attached, the whole area lacked servile workers. The Phoenix Indian School immediately stepped in to fill this void by training the males to work in the local orchards and fields and the girls to work as domestic servants. As soon as the students received sufficient training, local farmers eagerly hired them, and many housewives began “to recognize our Indian women as an industrial factor of real importance and many express the conviction that they are coming to be our best domestic help.” Soon after the establishment of the outing program, the Phoenix Indian School became the largest supplier of domestic labor for the city and the surrounding areas and often refused potential outing patrons due to a shortage of outing students during the summer months.³

Word about the availability of student workers spread quickly once the outing program began. People first learned of the program through word of mouth. One of the leading advocates for the Haskell program was United States Senator Chester Long. Just after the turn of the century, Long hired a girl from Haskell and had been so impressed by the program he told many of his friends. Several people who requested students during the spring of 1907 mentioned that Senator Long informed them of the program. J. L. Bristow wrote to request two students since Senator Long had told him that a single student was apt to get lonely with no other Indian students in the area. Haskell outing agents also sent circulars to area households alerting them to the fact that Indian girls could be hired for the summer and winter breaks.⁴

³ Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 2; Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 278; Trennert, “Victorian Morality,” 120; Trennert, “Victorian Morality,” 115; Commissioner of Indian Affairs to Superintendent John B. Brown, January 3, 1930, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; *Native American*, May 19, 1900.

⁴ W. J. Bailey to Superintendent Peairs, April 24, 1907, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; J. L. Bristow to Superintendent Peairs, May 4, 1907, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

Phoenix outing agents regularly posted advertisements in the local newspapers and even distributed cards and meeting potential outing patrons at the fair.⁵ In a way, the outing program advertised itself. Students placed in cities and in large businesses acted as representatives for the Indian schools and the outing program. Boarding schools often highlighted the differences between the reservation Indians and the educated students as yet another way to promote Indian education and to demonstrate the advantages of the outing program.

Outing agents strove to place their students in Christian homes that would serve as a lifelong example as to how Indian students should strive to conduct their own households. The majority of families who became patrons were upper middle class and wealthy white families who typically maintained a prominent presence in their local society. But as time went on, the outing program suffered a loss of many outing patrons due to the hard economic circumstances during the Great Depression.⁶ There is no indication that either the Haskell Institute or the Phoenix Indian School placed their outing students with patrons who were not white Americans. In Lawrence, some Jewish families applied to participate as host families for Haskell outing students, but the school denied nearly every Jewish applicant. For example, Haskell outing agents found the Goldberg family residing in “not a very good place [in the] Industrial Section [and a] rather uncultured Jewish family.” Even the students placed in Jewish families often complained about the living circumstances, food, or familial customs. As a

⁵ Irene Coonan to Mary Stewart, May 8, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Amanda Chingren, Outing Matron Report, November 1930, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

⁶ Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 282; Irene Coonan to Mary Stewart, August 9, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, October 5, 1932, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Belva Coats to Irene Coonan, April 16, 1934, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

result, the Haskell outing agents eliminated the majority of Jewish families as potential hosts during the initial interview process.⁷

Host families generally liked their workers, and many continued to participate in the program for many years. If the family discovered they enjoyed the company of a particular student, they often requested the student by name for the next outing term, and some even hired the students as permanent workers after they graduated from school. Some commonly reported that the outing students were “just lovely, very good in every way” and the students performed their “work beautifully,” Mrs. Kendall liked Ethel Crane so well that when the family moved, she returned Ethel to Haskell with specific instructions to return to their service after she graduated from school.⁸

Many host families tended to pass judgment too quickly concerning the Indian girls, only to later find their work satisfactory. Mrs. Schwartz wanted to send Irene Colbert home within the first week of outing, but after Irene learned how to properly do the work and “lost her shyness,” she proved to be a valuable asset to the household. It was also fairly common for the outing girls to state they did not like their placement but later to say they liked their outing patrons and the work.⁹

⁷ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. I. Goldberg, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁸ W. A. Spencer to Superintendent Peairs, March 17, 1920, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; C. M. Blair, Annual Report of Haskell Institute, 1927, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Glanville, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Gilmour, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Henry, n.d., HMC RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Kendall, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁹ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Schwartz, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

Some households welcomed the Indian girls with open arms and tried to treat them as a regular member of the family. Even if the patrons had to discipline their outing students, it was frequently done out of kindness and as a way to demonstrate what was right and wrong rather than harsh punishment. Mrs. Fennemore reprimanded Nora Fulton for staying out late, but Mrs. Fennemore remained “very fond of her.” A poignant example of how some of the outing patrons cared for their student workers can be found in the case of a young girl who ran away from her outing family. Since neither she nor the host family were associated with Haskell, their names are not known. When the girl ran away, the family approached the Haskell outing agents, since no Indian employment agency was located in the area. The family found a note left by the student stating she was six months pregnant and had decided to take the “easiest way out.” Concerned the girl would try to take her own life, the family and the outing agents searched all over Kansas City for the girl. Fortunately, she was found trying to earn enough money to return to her own family. Once the family located the young girl, they extended their support to both her and her child.¹⁰

No matter how extensively the outing agents interviewed potential patrons, nor how often families treated students well and grew fond of them, cases of abuse still became apparent, primarily through patron use of outing students as wage laborers. Despite the emphasis on education and the mandatory outing contracts, patrons still considered outing students as a steady form of cheap labor. In fact, Superintendent Harwood Hall of Phoenix stated, “the hiring of an Indian youth is not looked upon by the people of this valley from a philanthropic standpoint. It is simply a matter of business.” In fact, the Phoenix Indian School

¹⁰ Irene Coonan to Nora Fulton, September 2, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Weekly Report of the Haskell Employment Service, October 19, 1935, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

outing contract signed by both patron and student stated that if an outing agent discovered that the students were not being taught, they would promptly return the student to the school. But the *Arizona Republican* joked about the matter stating, “What a howl would go up from residents of this valley if the superintendent would exercise this authority.” Many patrons considered their responsibility to their student workers ceased with payment. In addition, if the students worked and followed instructions well, then many minor forms of disobedience were ignored. This was especially true in Phoenix since outing students provided the majority of unskilled labor for the area.¹¹ Although the Indian schools did as much as they could to prepare the students for outing through their course work, students still faced difficulties. For example, an outing boy in the Phoenix area had been hired to refinish some wood floors, but he did not know how to operate the equipment; therefore, the outing agent along with the carpentry instructor went to the boy’s work place to demonstrate how to work the equipment.¹²

Phoenicians hired students not only because they were cheaper but also because many found that Indians could “be controlled to better advantage.” Many potential outing patrons requested students from specific tribes who had a reputation as willing workers, compliant, and not cause too much trouble for their employers. The most commonly requested students originated from the Pima and Papago reservations. However, the fact remains that the majority of employers simply wanted Indian workers regardless of what tribe, thinking that “the Hopi is a Pueblo and the Apache is about the same as a Navajo.”¹³

¹¹ Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 280; *Arizona Republican*, March 11, 1901; Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 287; Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 282; T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, January 11, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

¹² T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, September 14, 1934, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

¹³ T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, December 16, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Reuben Perry, Superintendent of U. S. Indian School, Albuquerque, New Mexico to

Outing patrons in both Lawrence and Phoenix often pressed their student workers to do more work than what they had originally reported to the outing agents. Dora Parsons, placed with Mrs. Baraban, stated she would assist in the kitchen, clean, and wash laundry, but Mrs. Baraban actually held Dora responsible for all the household chores. Mrs. Glazer returned Anna Mike since she was “not willing to give up her time off...” Mrs. Daleo requested a girl to wash all the household laundry, cook, and clean. The student assigned, Irene McAfee, reported that she worked from four in the morning until nine at night in order to finish the tasks required of her.¹⁴ The Lieberman household became infamous for the difficulty of the work they required from outing students. Because Mrs. Lieberman would not raise any of the girls’ wages, she went through five outing students in one year. One student, Jessie Thompson, hitchhiked back to Haskell. Mary Roach reported that “Every day I had been working so hard ever since I came here, cleaning house and lots of ironing... I’m very tired, my feet get so tired of standing all morning.” Perhaps the most dramatic case of outing patrons viewing students as nothing more than common laborers is illustrated by the case of Mrs. Dern. She originally requested a student who could help cook and take care of two children under the age of five. Minerva Mason was placed in the position, but she soon reported that Mrs. Dern owned a boarding house. Minerva cooked all the meals, cleaned all the rooms, and tended to the

Superintendent John B. Brown, Phoenix Indian School, March 27, 1928, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

¹⁴ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Sol Baraban, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Glazer, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Daleo, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

children. Although the work was very difficult, Mrs. Dern refused to raise her wages, which led Minerva to return to Haskell.¹⁵

Outing patrons often complained that the students were being paid far too much for the work they did. The majority of students had not received their complete training within the boarding schools and therefore had not been adequately prepared as domestic servants. For some host families, this fact caused them to believe that the students could easily be overworked without repercussions and the problem did not become known unless the students disputed their wages. Mrs. Annette Greenberg requested an outing girl to assist with the cooking, cleaning, and washing. Margaret Wapato and Mrs. Greenberg originally worked well with one another, but soon, Mrs. Greenberg reported that Margaret had “been getting altogether too many phone calls – stays out too late at night...She does not do the work as she should.” Lenora Spitto replaced Margaret, but her successor too was reported for staying out too late, asking for extra time off, and “picking up” men. After an investigation, the Haskell outing agents determined that the Greenbergs did not want to raise either of the girls’ wages, thus the “story was fabricated.”¹⁶

School officials were especially concerned that impressionable students would fall prey to immorality while working in the cities. The Haskell Institute outing agents addressed several cases of suspected immorality, and the Phoenix Indian School’s agents feared their students would be overcome by sin while on outing. This fear began in 1897 with the appointment of S. M. McCowan as the new superintendent. McCowan found that many girls

¹⁵ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Lieberman, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Mary Roach to Amanda Chingren, July 7, 1916 (Copied by Chingren in her own hand), Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit C,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Dern, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

¹⁶ Outing Employer Cards – Mrs. Annette Greenberg, n.d., HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

had become susceptible to immorality since the program had not been properly overseen up to that point. “Sending unformed, undisciplined girls out to service in families that care nothing for them except the work they can get from them, without careful supervision,” McCowan stated, “is often more of a curse to the girls than a blessing.” Through his term as superintendent, outing agents became a regular feature at the Phoenix Indian School to help oversee the morality of the young girls in the program.¹⁷

Despite the hiring of permanent outing agents, by 1902 several members of the Phoenix community expressed concern about the morality and oversight of the girls in the outing program. As Phoenix continued to grow, many Indians from the nearby reservations began to work within the city limits. Since these Indians were not overseen by anyone, they openly engaged in gambling, drinking, swearing, and “encouraging them [female outing students] to carouse at night.” Many residents of Phoenix mistook the Indians from the reservations for those from their nearby Indian school. This type of behavior reflected poorly upon the Phoenix Indian School and on all Indians working within the city limits. The current outing matron abruptly resigned, claiming that “the people for whom the girls work teach them nothing, but simply pile up the hard and dirty work...and then complain if the work is not perfectly done.” She also stated that she could not “permit myself to be made instrumental in the moral downfall of the girls whom I am here to guide and uplift.” After this resignation, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, W. A. Jones, ordered the Phoenix Indian School to close the outing program for all girls until further notice, but they could continue to place their male students on outing during the summer months and on Saturdays during the school year. In addition, all western

¹⁷ Trennert, “From Carlisle to Phoenix,” 281.

boarding schools had to submit weekly outing reports to determine the amount of supervision each school provided for their outing students.¹⁸

Female students could once again participate in outing in 1906 with the appointment of Amanda Chingren as the Phoenix outing agent. Because of the previous trouble, Chingren and several Phoenix teachers hand-picked the first female outing students to represent the school in a favorable light, but the outing program did not fully recover from the incidents in 1902 until the start of World War I.¹⁹ When the outing program resumed, the amount of reservation Indians working in the city had dramatically increased. In order to keep the students from misbehaving, Chingren had to be very strict. Many Phoenix residents, Amanda Chingren included, viewed reservations as infested with poverty, sex, and degeneration. To keep the Phoenix Indian School's girls away from this, Chingren believed that all of the girls should work as domestics so they could be surrounded by moral, upright Christians and all the trappings of a middle or upper class home. It was hoped that this would help a young girl see that reservation life was an immoral place where she would simply "throw herself away on someone."²⁰

Despite the efforts by the Phoenix Indian School and Amanda Chingren, some students on outing easily fell to temptation, which included excessive drinking, but more commonly manifested in the form of sexual relationships, often resulting in pregnancies. These circumstances resulted in more work for the outing agent since Chingren often had to locate both offending parties, but typically the father of the illegitimate child moved away from the city to avoid punishment for the unplanned pregnancies. Chingren arranged a marriage and

¹⁸ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 285; Trennert, "Victorian Morality," 116; Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 285-286.

¹⁹ Trennert, "Victorian Morality," 116-117; Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 287.

²⁰ Trennert, "Victorian Morality," 121; Ibid, 116-117.

helped the newlyweds find jobs so they would be industrious and provide for themselves. Under the circumstances, the Phoenix Indian School's outing program began to be negatively associated with the immoral behavior of the reservation Indians.²¹ To correct this image, the school's female outing students only worked during the summer months to determine if the main offenders were students or reservation Indians. By 1922, it became clear that the reservation Indians had no supervision or guidance. To salvage the reputation of the outing program, the Phoenix Indian School assumed the responsibility for these young adults. In this way, the school could oversee all Indian labor in Phoenix while ensuring that those considered slipping into moral decline would be punished appropriately before they could influence other students.²²

Amanda Chingren had been educated as a teacher, but it is likely that she had no significant training with Native Americans prior to being employed through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Although she never passed the civil service exam to qualify to work within the Indian service, her first assignment was in 1902 as a domestic science teacher at the Pima Indian Boarding school in Sacaton, Arizona. She was promoted as the field matron for the Phoenix Indian School in 1906, where her sharp tongue and short temper soon sparked controversy that led to a federal investigation of her and the Phoenix outing program.²³

Superintendent August Duclos from the Pima Agency lodged the first official complaint about Amanda Chingren to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. He stated that he felt her overly harsh methods of supervision and correction encouraged outing girls "to wrong doing

²¹ T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, 1930, n.d., PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Belva Coats to Irene Coonan, April 16, 1934, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Trennert, "Victorian Morality," 119.

²² Trennert, "Victorian Morality," 121; Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 288-289.

²³ Statement of Mrs. G. G. Mason, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit B," n.d., PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Trennert, "Victorian Morality," 116.

through lack of sympathy and kindness.” Duclos decided to report Chingren after she called the police to arrest Louisa Nolan, whom she claimed to be a prostitute. Duclos investigated this claim, but he found no evidence to support the charge, and instead of punishing Nolan, he talked to her about the issue and then placed her with a new family where she proved to be a diligent worker. Duclos believed “our Indian girls are in a transition period. Their standard is different from ours and the endeavor should be to educate them rather than inflict punishment.” Chingren commonly placed girls in reform school, but this forced Indians to attend classes with white and Indian juvenile delinquents which reinforced their immoral behavior. Duclos believed that Indian students simply needed to be educated since their “standard is unmoral and not immoral.”²⁴ Duclos ultimately summarized the situation as thus: “Miss Chingren is entirely out of sympathy with her charges; she has a nagging disposition, which attitude has incurred the ill will of the girls. While an earnest worker, she is absolutely without tact and diplomacy. As a result, she has considerable friction with the employers of the girls.” Superintendent Brown, Chingren’s supervisor agreed: “the outing matron, in my judgment, talks too much, too long and too vigorously even when wholly right in her position...”²⁵

In response, Charles H. Burke, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, sent Adelina Otero-Warren to investigate the situation in November of 1923. Her report consisted of three exhibits: Exhibit A, focuses on the initial complaint; Exhibit B, features statements from the outing patrons and students taken by the investigator; Exhibit C, consists of Amanda

²⁴ Superintendent John Brown, Phoenix Indian School, to Charles Burke, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, August 27, 1923, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit A,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; August Duclos, Superintendent of Pima Agency, to Charles Burke, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, June 29, 1923.

²⁵ August Duclos to Commissioner of Indian Affairs Burke, June 29, 1923, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit A,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Superintendent Brown to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, August 27, 1923, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit A,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

Chingren's defense. Through the course of the investigation, Adelina Otero-Warren found that the majority of patrons and students hated working with Chingren, while very few individuals defended her actions.²⁶ Only two outing patrons spoke favorably of Chingren. Mrs. Loyd Christy stated that Chingren always "look[ed] to the best interests of the girls" while being helpful to the employers and Mrs. Robertson believed that if Chingren was indeed too severe "on the whole it is a good thing for the girls."²⁷ However, in Duclos' initial complaint he said Chingren dealt harshly with the outing employers which resulted in many complaints from employers and in one case, Mrs. McIntire cried because of the treatment she received from the outing agent. The situation only continued to get worse and many outing employers and even reservation superintendents refused to work with her. Mr. W. C. Hornberger's statement revealed that "women are afraid to ask Miss Chingren for Indian girls – she behaves so badly and is so abrupt that it frequently falls to the men's lot to make such efforts to get girls [for domestic service]." In addition, many reported that Chingren often played favorites by sending outing students to her friends first and was particularly judgmental during individual home visits. In one instance, Mrs. G. G. Mason reported that Chingren searched through all her closets, something no other outing agent did during the home visits.²⁸

²⁶ Adelina Otero-Warren, Inspector, to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, November 8, 1923, Chingren Investigation, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

²⁷ Mrs. Loyd Christy Statement, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit B," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Robertson Statement, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit B," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

²⁸ Superintendent Brown to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, August 27, 1923, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit A," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Superintendent Duclos Statement, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit B," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Mr. W. C. Hornberger Statement, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit B," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Wilkinson Statement, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit B," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. G. G. Mason Statement, Chingren Investigation, "Exhibit B," PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

Outing patrons agreed that Chingren was “dictatorial” towards the girls and spoke to them “in such a manner they are all afraid of her.” She believed that the outing patrons should not punish the girls for their disobedience. Instead, Chingren handled all punishments which often resulted in the girls choosing between working on Sunday, their day off, for three months, or returning to the school even for a minor offense. It soon became clear that Miss Chingren had no sympathy towards the native plight or respect for the students under her direction. Chingren commonly berated the outing students and accused them of “having every buck on the reservation.” Dr. D. D. Northcup, a medical doctor and a patron, tried to explain Chingren’s behavior by tentatively diagnosing her with hysteria since she was “... highly nervous due to her age and that she has fits of temper, which she is not responsible for.”²⁹

Female outing students agreed with their outing employers. They too reported that Chingren was unsympathetic and inflicted overly harsh punishment. Several students interviewed by Adelina Otero-Warren stated that they would much rather find employment on their own in order to avoid working with Miss Chingren. Understandably, girls who admitted to breaking rules told their patrons instead of Chingren, hoping for milder punishments.³⁰ Although four Indian girls spoke in favor of Amanda Chingren, these sources are highly suspect since they all are dated within six months of the investigation, include seemingly exaggerated praise of the agent, and every letter had been “copied by her [Chingren’s] own

²⁹ Mr. W. C. Hornberger Statement, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit B,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Dr. D. D. Northcup Statement, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit B,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Mr. W. C. Hornberger Statement, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit B,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Asa M. Royce Statement, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit B,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. G. G. Mason Statement, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit B,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Dr. D. D. Northcup Statement, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit B,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

³⁰ May Meyers, Pima, Student Statement, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit B,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

hand.” While there most likely were Indian girls who did think of Chingren favorably, it seems as though these letters were fabricated by Chingren to support her case.³¹

Chingren’s defense contained her detailed statement in which she responded to all the allegations and included letters from outing students attesting to her kindness. In response to the initial complaint filed by Superintendent Duclos, Chingren stated that she had asked the police to help locate girls who had left their outing positions, but she did not have any outing girls arrested. In the same sworn statement, however, she did claim that “Louise Nolan is thoroughly bad,” and had been arrested by the police. She also stated that she had “never been a party to sending girls to the reform school, but have taken care of them when paroled.” In a weekly report submitted earlier in the year, however, she stated that “the need of an institution for our delinquents becomes more deeply felt as they make contacts with the world away from their own people, and are more numerous in a community ready to take advantage of their weakness.”³² In regards to the complaints filed by outing patrons, Chingren emphatically denied that she searched through Mrs. Mason’s closets and playing favorites. She also stated that she had been kind and more than willing to aid the outing girls as long as they demonstrated their desire to work. In fact, when a local bank declared bankruptcy, she bought all the stock that the Indian girls had in it so that “no charge under me would have to lose a

³¹ Isabel Wilson to Amanda Chingren, January 29, 1923, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit C,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Minnie Autone to Amanda Chingren (Copied by Chingren in her own hand), July 20, 1923, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit C,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Emma Grant to Amanda Chingren (Copied by Chingren in her own hand), October, 17, 1923, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit C,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Milda Brown to Amanda Chingren (Copied by Chingren in her own hand), n.d., Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit C,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

³² Amanda Chingren Statement, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit C,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Amanda Chingren, Weekly Outing Report, June 30, 1923, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit C,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

cent.” In closing, Chingren apologized for being “over-zealous of their [the students] welfare to a degree that has not met with approval” and she also stated:

If I have been too positive in statements made to employers when I felt that grave injustice had been done to Indian girls; if I have been overly severe with some of the girls when their moral conduct required correction; if I have lacked tact and diplomacy on such occasions, I can truthfully say, Mr. Commissioner, that in no instance was I actuated by any other motive than to protect and defend them under my care or induce them to lead honorable and upright lives...³³

After collecting statements from outing patrons, students, and local school and reservation authorities, Adelina Otero Warren determined that Chingren did indeed lack sympathy and a “human understanding” towards her students and their employers. She tended to rule them by fear and severe punishments “perhaps thinking that by so doing she is keeping the girls straight.” Warren also found that Chingren, after being the outing agent at Phoenix for fifteen years, was remarkably efficient and attempted to find decent places for the outing students. Warren concluded that Chingren be reprimanded and encouraged to acquire the “full confidence of the girls by extending to them a helping hand in a sympathetic way.”³⁴ Charles Burke, Indian Commissioner, expressed these findings to Chingren in a letter, and no disciplinary action was taken against Chingren. In fact, she remained the sole outing agent for the Phoenix Indian School until 1930. By 1929, Charles Rhoads assumed the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs and began to implement many new policies recommended by the Meriam report, completed in 1928. Since many of the older teachers did not readily accept these changes, Commissioner Rhoads issued an early retirement program which allowed him to replace older teachers with younger, more enthusiastic educators. Amanda Chingren fell under

³³ Amanda Chingren Statement, Chingren Investigation Materials, “Exhibit C,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Amanda Chingren to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, October 5, 1923, Chingren Investigation, “Exhibit A,” PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

³⁴ Adelina Otero Warren to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, November 8, 1923, Chingren Investigation Materials, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

the rubric of the early retirement program, but she and Superintendent Brown protested the decision. Nonetheless, this was denied and Chingren stepped down from her position as outing agent on July 31, 1930 after twenty-four years of service at the Phoenix Indian School.³⁵

The Phoenix outing program came under new scrutiny during the Great Depression. By 1932, the depression's full impact had reached Phoenix, which led many local employers and those seeking work to question whether the outing program was still appropriate. Mr. B. M. Atwood, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors in Phoenix, published a statement in the local paper stating that many white men and women could not find jobs. While the outing program had been appropriate when plenty of jobs had been available, now the program hinders whites from finding jobs, he argued, especially since Indians "being wards of the Government are well cared for..." Atwood appealed to the Phoenix Indian School superintendent, Dr. Carl H. Skinner, to recall all outing boys and girls who held year round positions in the city limits. In this way, no Indian laborers would "interfere with any citizen earning his or her livelihood." After much debate between Mr. Atwood and Superintendent Skinner, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and Arizona Senator Carl Hayden weighed in on the issue. They decided that if the school should get a call for an Indian worker, school officials must contact Atwood to see if he had a white individual he could place in that position. If he did, the outing student would remain at the school, but if no whites were available to take the position, an Indian student would be assigned to the job. Commissioner Rhoads believed this to be a fair compromise since he did not want the outing students to "take work from residents of the community with dependents but, on the other hand, we are convinced that a wholesale calling in of these boys

³⁵ Commissioner of Indian Affairs to Amanda Chingren, December 5, 1923, Chingren Investigation Materials, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Trennert, "Victorian Morality," 125.

would not result in the work being done by deserving citizens.” Atwood and Skinner decided to utilize the Salvation Army’s location in downtown Phoenix as an employment agency, but by July no further arrangements had been made, and the school continued to place outing students as if no controversy had occurred.³⁶

The principle concern for Phoenix employers during the depression was to hire as many whites as they could, rather than continuing to hire Native Americans or other minorities. In 1933, the Dixon Construction Company fired all of their Indian employees in order to hire white friends and neighbors from Phoenix. When the students and reservation Indians returned to Phoenix, the male outing agent T. E. Shipley began to investigate the situation since the Indians had been wrongfully fired. The order to fire the Indian employees came from the District State Engineer, but when Shipley contacted the Chief State Engineer and the State Attorney General, they were in favor of Indian labor and authorized the re-hiring of the wronged Indians. Although Native Americans had a right to work the same positions as white men and women, the Director of Indian Employment, E. R. Burton, cautioned Shipley to not press the issue, but “work them in wherever you can in sections where the supply of white labor is not too great.”³⁷ Even though Native Americans worked as menial laborers, during the depression paid positions were scarce so white laborers worked whatever positions they could attain. The people of Phoenix viewed Indian labor as a luxury when jobs were plentiful, but as

³⁶ Mr. B. M. Atwood, Chairman, Board of Supervisors, to Superintendent Skinner, Phoenix Indian School, January 14, 1932, PHIS, RG 75, NARA Pacific Region; Superintendent Skinner, to Mr. B. M. Atwood, January 29, 1932, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Commissioner of Indian Affairs C. J. Rhoads to Senator Carl Hayden, March 5, 1932, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Superintendent Skinner to Commissioner of Indian Affairs, July 18, 1932, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

³⁷ T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, August 27, 1932, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; T. E. Shipley to E. R. Burton, Director of Indian Employment, April 10, 1933; PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; E. R. Burton to T. E. Shipley, April 18, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

the number of jobs dipped, Phoenicians felt threatened by the Indians presence. In order to distinguish themselves from the Indians, whites needed to remove the competition of Indian labor. Although this ultimately did not succeed, these actions demonstrate white sentiments towards Indian laborers. Indians could only assimilate into white society as menial laborers, but if their position threatened the social status of whites, they could easily be removed from even this low position.

Conclusion

As the outing program continued to grow nationwide, many reservation schools began to participate in the program by sending their students to larger cities, but with no supervision. If these students encountered any trouble while on outing, they were sent to the nearest off-reservation boarding school. Therefore, Indian workers in Kansas City went to the Haskell Institute and those in Phoenix went to the Phoenix Indian School. Soon there were so many Indians working in the larger cities that the outing agents at Haskell and at Phoenix had become overrun with additional students, which took time away from their own outing students. The Phoenix Indian School first encountered this problem soon after the school opened when the second superintendent, Harwood Hall, began to find employment for students from the Pima and Papago agency schools. For example, by 1917, only 40 out of 142 Indian girls working in Phoenix were from the Phoenix Indian School.¹ Both the Phoenix Indian School and the Haskell Institute began to operate an independent employment office within their respective city limits to oversee the placement and ensure the safety of all Indian workers.

By the 1920's, reservation Indians working in Kansas City had overwhelmed Mrs. Ruth Bronson, the outing agent at Haskell, to the point that she requested that an outing office be established in the Kansas City area so all students could be advised in the field. Establishing an employment office would also reduce stress from the teachers at the school by enabling them to concentrate on teaching the students remaining at the school. It was argued as well that the

¹ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 280; Trennert, "Victorian Morality," 121.

placement of an officer there “ought to be considered as an emergency measure and carried into effect in time to care for summer placement.”²

Ruth Bronson assumed the position as the outing agent for the Indian employment office in Kansas City because her qualifications made her “admirably fitted by personality, training and experience to set up and conduct an efficient outing center for girls.” Haskell envisioned the outing center overseeing the direction of two to three hundred Indian girls. The facility included an office, reception room, dining room, kitchen, and sleeping accommodations for twelve to fifteen girls at a time, which allowed the girls to stay in a safe and comfortable place while the outing agents arranged positions for them. The office would also be a place where the girls could receive “special instruction about the ways of the city, the use of modern conveniences, or the particular conditions in the home to which they are to be assigned.” The annual salary of the outing agent began at \$2,400 with an additional \$250 allowance to meet the personal needs of the outing girls.³

Ruth Muskrat Bronson was promoted to the position of Placement and Guidance Officer at the new outing center, known as the Haskell Institute Employment Office, on August 1st, 1930. This was a large responsibility for anyone to undertake, but Bronson excelled in the position. Both peers and students thought highly of her and all the work she did to assist the students. In fact, the *Indian Leader* often reported acts of Bronson’s kindness to the outing students. She was especially sympathetic to the students who became ill away from their home and strove to return the students to their families until they completed their recovery. Since

² Ruth Muskrat Bronson to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, May 6, 1930, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; John Hobst to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, March 7, 1930, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

³ John Hobst to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, March 7, 1930, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

Haskell students could not return home to visit their families, Bronson's actions were widely respected by the students.⁴

The Haskell Institute Employment Service allowed the outing program to expand exponentially. Prior to 1928, the number of students allowed to go on any form of outing remained small and directly correlated to the ability of the staff. Year-long outing had been limited since "there is no one in the city to advise the girls, to safeguard the conditions under which they work, to adjust differences between them and their employers, or to promote the best type of education for each individual." Not having a chaperone or supervising teacher in Kansas City was seen as an especially dangerous situation for the girls.⁵ Once the Haskell field office was established, the program operated all year. Ruth Bronson's position as Guidance and Placement Officer essentially provided a liaison between the school and the employers of the outing students. This arrangement kept the school abreast of pertinent information, but the majority of the responsibilities fell to the field office. This allowed the outing program to expand and in 1933, the field office oversaw the outing of sixty girls for the duration of one year.⁶

To make the program seem more comfortable, outing agents provided encouragement for the outing students. Many of the girls often felt isolated from their friends while on outing, which often caused the girls to return to the school before their outing term had expired or to take up behaviors considered immoral.⁷ In response, the outing agents tried to make the girls'

⁴ *Indian Leader*, December 26, 1930, 3; *Indian Leader*, March 1, 1929, 2.

⁵ John Hobst to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, March 7, 1930, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

⁶ *Indian Leader*, January 17, 1936, 1; *Indian Leader*, December 26, 1930, 3; *Indian Leader*, October 13, 1933, 2.

⁷ Since many of the students placed by the employment agency came directly from reservations, they often had a more difficult time adjusting to life in a big city than those who

experiences more enjoyable by giving them Thursday afternoons off from their responsibilities, so the students could meet with their friends. In addition to this, outing agents encouraged the girls to join the Indian club, which met once a month. The outing office in Kansas City also orchestrated parties and weekly Thursday afternoon teas.⁸ The girls often visited the outing office, and the staff there tried “to create a home atmosphere.” It also provided the girls with wholesome entertainment so they would have no reason to search “after pleasures which would be detrimental and prevent the girl adjusting satisfactorily, social as well as economical.” The afternoon teas were also beneficial for the students who remained at the school since those students provided all the refreshments for the outing offices. On special occasions, the outing agents would either allow the students to return to Haskell to participate in school dances or they would bring invited Haskell guests to dances hosted by the outing office. The outing agents admittedly realized that the program was difficult for the girls, but they tried their best to keep the girls entertained and content while away from the school.⁹

Despite the initial support for the Haskell employment service, the Office of Indian Affairs soon attempted to close the field office. A letter from John Collier, then Commissioner of Indian Affairs stated, “For some time we have doubted the wisdom of continuing the placement office as at present set up in Kansas City: First, because it serves only a limited number of girls in a limited field of work ... second, because the office is expensive in

came from Haskell. This often caused them to take up with the wrong type or fall into despair which is evident by the amount of unexpected pregnancies, forced adoptions, and in at least one instance a suicide attempt. Belva Coats to Irene Coonan, March 30, 1934, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Mrs. Frances D. Adams, Placement Officer, to Irene Coonan, September 29, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

⁸ Irene Coonan, Indian Affairs Field Service, to Haskell Institute, January 6, 1934, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; *Indian Leader*, October 13, 1933, 2.

⁹ Irene Coonan, Indian Affairs Field Service, to Haskell Institute, January 6, 1934, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; *Indian Leader*, October 13, 1933, 2; *Indian Leader*, April 13, 1933, 2.

proportion to the number served.” Haskell officials, however, saw a vast improvement over the previous situation. In order to keep a semblance of the outing office alive, a compromise was made. The Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA) and the Haskell Institute Employment Service developed a cooperative agreement in 1934, which allowed the field office to operate from the YWCA facilities, thereby reducing costs. Girls placed outside the Kansas City area were referred to the nearest YWCA office so the required reports could be done through those branches.¹⁰

The cooperative agreement was maintained from 1934 to 1936, but at that point, with the economy still weak, the Bureau of Indian Affairs decided to make a clean break with all their outing field offices. Rather than closing the offices with no alternative means of finding suitable placements for outing students, the YWCA enveloped the Haskell field offices. A contract was drawn for the transfer of all duties in 1934, but this did not take place until 1936. The contract required the YWCA to be responsible for the girls, perform pre-placement home visits, follow up visits, and organize social events for the girls. The government provided one full time worker and a part time clerical worker to help facilitate the operation.¹¹ When the Haskell field office finally closed, on July 1st, 1936, the YWCA office became known as the Haskell Employment Service and fell under the direction of Vera Woods. Almost immediately the outing program scaled back until the majority of students participated only during the summer months. The girls who wished to go on outing for a year or more were classified as

¹⁰ John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to Dr. Henry Roe Cloud, Superintendent of Haskell, December 4, 1933, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Indian Affairs Field Office to Dr. Henry Roe Cloud, Superintendent of Haskell, February 19, 1934, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

¹¹ R. M. Kelley, Acting Superintendent of Haskell, to Miss Margaret Wilson, Secretary of the YWCA, March 27, 1936, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; *Indian Leader*, January 17, 1936, 1; “Contract Between the Haskell Institute Employment Office and the YWCA,” June 4, 1934, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

permanent workers and could no longer find positions within the Kansas City area. Instead, the outing agents placed these students in positions near their own homes since it was thought they would be more likely to continue their employment after graduating Haskell. Students who only wanted to spend a summer in the program worked as temporary employees where they could still work in Kansas City.¹²

The transfer to the YWCA caused much confusion in Lawrence and Kansas City. The spring of 1937 featured the all-too-familiar wave of mail from prospective patrons requesting the assistance of Haskell's students, but these inquiries were met with letters stating the following: "The Haskell Institute is not recommending girls for outing work in private homes in Kansas City," and "I must tell you that the Haskell Institute no longer places girls for permanent jobs in homes."¹³ The records do not indicate any sort of formal announcement of the bureaucratic shift, nor do they indicate a rapid decline of outing patrons for 1937. Nevertheless, the confusion this caused must have decreased the amount of patrons available to accept student workers.

The Phoenix Indian School had essentially operated an employment service since Superintendent Harwood Hall agreed to find employment for Indians from local tribes. Therefore, relocating the outing office at the Phoenix Indian School to downtown Phoenix went rather smoothly. By 1925, the newly established employment office actively maintained records for 400 Indian workers in town, including those from the school. Once the

¹² R. M. Kelley, Acting Superintendent of Haskell, to Mrs. J. S. Brown, April 15, 1937, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; E. J. Skidmore, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to John Woolersy, Senior Employment Agent, April 7, 1939, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

¹³ Superintendent R. M. Kelley to Mr. William Kirby, District Manager – Missouri State Employment Service, December 13, 1937, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region; Superintendent R. M. Kelley to Mrs. J. S. Brown, April 15, 1937, HMC, RG 75, NARA, Central Plains Region.

employment office opened, students at the school could only go on outing during the summer break and on Saturdays. Reservation and adult Indians worked during the school year so the Indian students could remain in school. The work of the outing matron essentially remained the same, but her duties included the responsibility for adult Indians which often included alumni of the Phoenix Indian School.¹⁴

By 1933, Irene Coonan, having prior experience with the outing program, became the female outing agent at the Phoenix Indian School Employment Service. The male outing agent at the time, T. E. Shipley, helped many Phoenix Indian School boys find permanent employment upon their graduation. The employment service's facilities were maintained in much the same way as the field office in Kansas City, with plenty of room to house several students and large meeting spaces for social events. While the Phoenix employment service attempted to facilitate a working relationship with the local chapter of the YWCA and YMCA, little more happened than the organization of a few social events. Contrary to the cooperative arrangement developed between the Haskell Institute Employment Service and the Kansas City YWCA, the Phoenix Employment Service continued to operate without assistance until the 1950's.¹⁵

The Phoenix Employment Service primarily dealt with the placement of adult Indians from nearby reservations. The outing agents did place the outing students from the Phoenix Indian School, but since the outing program was not mandatory, the number of adult Indians

¹⁴ Trennert, "From Carlisle to Phoenix," 288; Elinor D. Gregg, Superintendent of Field Nurses and Field Matrons, "Report on Outing Matrons' Activities in Phoenix, Arizona, April 16-17, 1925, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.

¹⁵ Elinor D. Gregg, Superintendent of Field Nurses and Field Matrons, "Report on Outing Matrons' Activities in Phoenix, Arizona, April 16-17, 1925, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Washington, D. C.; Irene Coonan to Miss Stewart, February 13, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Irene Coonan to Miss Stewart, June 17, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

disproportionately outnumbered Indians still in school. As a result, Phoenix outing agents often had to spend significant amounts of time recruiting Indian laborers from local reservations, settling Indian labor disputes, and finding suitable placements for families, often with children in tow. Since no Phoenix Indian students worked on permanent outing during the school year, the outing agents had to recruit enough adult, reservation Indians to make the employment service worthwhile. Soon after establishment, however, the outing agents had to recruit additional employers to keep up with the demand of Indian labor.¹⁶ One of the most difficult tasks for the Phoenix outing agents consisted of finding permanent positions for married couples. Many employers did not want or need to hire both a husband and wife. Almost all employers refused to hire young mothers who needed to bring their babies with them as they worked as domestic servants. Belle King contacted the employment office to find a position where she could bring her baby, assuring Coonan that he would be a good baby and not get in the way. Coonan did locate a place for Belle and her son Richard, but the job required a lot of work for a discounted wage due to the baby.¹⁷ Despite the Phoenix Employment Service's emphasis on locating permanent jobs for alumni and adult Indians, the Phoenix area still viewed Indians as a cheap source of labor. Even after being taught a trade, many former students found themselves working in the lowest positions for companies or as unskilled laborers for individuals. Graduated Indians had indeed been assimilated into white

¹⁶ Irene Coonan to Miss Stewart, September 16, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, November 20, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

¹⁷ Irene Coonan to Mr. Miller, Superintendent of Keams Canyon Agency, September 15, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Belle King to Irene Coonan, September 10, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Irene Coonan to Mrs. Jerome King, September 15, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

society, not as middle class citizens but rather as wage laborers with little chance of upward mobility.

The majority of Indians trained at off-reservation boarding schools returned to their families remaining on the reservations, despite having successfully mastered a trade. Indian boarding schools taught their students specific skills that would allow them to work in a modern white world, but reservation Indians remained poor and still lived by a subsistence economy. Returning students soon learned that the trades they worked to perfect often served no purpose on the reservations. Nora Naranjo-Morse, reflecting on her boarding school experience later in life, described her return to her tribal reservation in a poem titled “Gia’s Song.”

The government school taught sewing, I learned on an electric machine, By the time I returned to the village I could sew, but few of the people had heard of sewing machines, or even electricity. The machine I learned to operate as my trade could not be carried here and there, but this song you are learning, will always be carried in your heart, here and there.¹⁸

Former students faced the challenges of applying what they learned to traditional Indian life. Male students learned to provide for their families, but the majority of the trades taught at boarding schools were not needed on the reservations. Female students learned to keep well-ordered houses using modern techniques and machines, but they often did not know how to maintain a home without the aid of modern technology. When Esther Burnett, a former Haskell student, returned to her home in Green River, Wyoming, she had a difficult time adjusting. She cared for her young siblings while her sister and mother worked at a local restaurant. One day she “cleaned the house thoroughly and wanted to keep it that way. I insisted that the children play outside, except for meals and to go to bed. I didn’t want them

¹⁸ Margaret L. Archuleta, *Away From Home*, 22.

messing up my clean house. My mother had to talk to me about how important it was for our house to be a home. She said to me, ‘Essie, it’s their house! They need to live in it!’”

Elizabeth White, a former Phoenix Indian School student, also learned this lesson when she baked her family her award-winning cakes and pies. They not only refused to eat the treats, but they also called her “as foolish as a white woman.”¹⁹ Esther and Elizabeth realized that even though they had been well trained while enrolled in boarding school, they had learned to live an idealized life that had little in common with that of reservations.

In the eyes of the off-reservation boarding schools and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the students who returned to the reservations were considered failures because they often re-adopted traditional tribal customs. In order to preempt the students’ regression, several measures were enacted to try to help the students establish themselves. Reformers tried to give former boarding school students plots of land so they could begin farming and start a family, but these efforts never materialized as a nation-wide program. The Bureau of Indian Affairs also recommended graduating students be given a special status that allowed them to apply for civil service jobs “without further examination” and not in competition with white applicants. These measures endeavored to aid Indians in establishing a respectable and socially acceptable way of life.²⁰

After students graduated from an off-reservation boarding school, teachers encouraged them to pursue further education in specialized training or vocational schools that could expand their experience with the most modern techniques and equipment. School officials hoped that former students would find permanent employment in the trade of their choice. While all

¹⁹ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 280-281; Esther Burnett Horne and Sally McBeth, *Essie’s Story: The Life and Legacy of a Shoshone Teacher* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 50; Trennert, “Educating Indian Girls,” 286.

²⁰ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 292-293.

boarding schools took measures to ensure the success of their students, each school approached this from different directions. The Haskell Institute focused on finding jobs outside of domestic employment for their female students through the education and certification gained from Haskell's Commercial Department or the Nursing School. The Phoenix Indian School tried to help male and female students become teachers or civil service employees through the civil service examination process. Both schools considered all recent graduates a responsibility until they had been placed in a full time position.²¹

Indian boarding schools tried to provide their current students and recent graduates with a variety of additional specialized training. At the Phoenix Indian School, in 1933, current male students could participate in a short course provided by the Arizona Equipment and Tractor Company where students observed automotive mechanics. By 1939, Phoenix had developed a Telephone and Radio School to teach students to use short-wave radios to aid in forest fire control. This course also helped students meet the Federal Communications Commission requirements to obtain a short-wave radio operator's license. The Haskell Institute initiated the Commercial and Nursing Department so graduates could be certified as secretaries, typists, clerks, and nurses. In addition to offering specialized courses at each school, the school officials of Haskell and Phoenix continually contacted local colleges, such as the State Teachers College in Arizona, for admittance of their recent graduates. To aid these students, the Bureau of Indian Affairs offered financial support for exemplary students willing

²¹ Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 15; *Indian Leader*, May 18, 1934, 1-2; Commissioner of Indian Affairs, C. J. Rhoads, Circular Letter no. 2665, March 10, 1930, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

to pursue college degrees, certifications, or licenses that would help them gain permanent employment.²²

Despite these efforts, graduated students most often found employment as unskilled laborers, typically as construction workers, farm hands and domestic servants. As a result, they received low wages which kept them at a lower social standing than the middle class status the Office of Indian Affairs hoped to see Indians attain. In addition, many employers still discriminated against Native Americans in favor of white workers, so a significant number of graduates returned to their reservations and their families. The Bureau of Indian Affairs saw these “returned” Indians as a failure as well since they did not successfully assimilate into white society. While government officials were disappointed in Indian education and the outing program, several graduates from the Phoenix Indian School expressed frustration with the inability to find employment in their trades. Willie Haskie was trained as a saddle maker, but since he could not find work in his trade he had to accept a position as a day laborer performing chores for several Phoenix households. Clarence Wesley stated, “Recently I have been thinking over and over the education I had received, after all the government has done for me to complete my education, I think I owed them a great deal, and then come back to the reservation with no job and living the way they [uneducated Indians] lived...I think it’s a disgrace... Right now I am here in the mountains doing the forest work as though I wasn’t educated.”²³

²² Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 19-20; T. E. Shipley, Weekly Outing Report, August 31, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Ruth Bronson to Irene Coonan, September 22, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

²³ Marjorie La Franbois to Irene Coonan, September 28, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Willie Haskie, phone call, July 11, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region; Clarence Wesley to T. E. Shipley, October 17, 1933, PHIS, RG 75, NARA, Pacific Region.

While education and the outing program did not create true assimilation for Native Americans, it did help dispel some of the common racial ideas held by white Americans, who often had feared all Indians as disease-ridden savages. In this way, at least, the program had been somewhat successful, by allowing a first step towards full assimilation that would be completed through subsequent generations.

At the turn of the century, government officials began to level severe criticisms at Indian boarding schools. Indian Commissioner Francis Leupp stated that “the trouble with our efforts in the Indian’s behalf has always been that we have expected too much of him right away.” When little change was seen in the first generation of Indian children, some saw this as proof that Indians were incapable of change. Many also believed that rapid change could not be accomplished in the boarding schools, since the policies were often cruel, teachers taught dependence on government aid and the lack of traditional Native American customs was detrimental to their lives once they returned to the reservation. In that atmosphere, many saw outing programs as the new hope for Indian children.²⁴ For the next few decades those programs spread across the nation.

In time, however, the outing system brought another wave of criticism from the public. The training received at the school was considered contrived, archaic, and the activities not related to educational purposes other than to keep the school running on limited funding. The cultural anthropologist, Dr. Margaret Mead, believed the original form of the outing program, which began in the 1600’s, was a genuine form of aid for the Indians. The system that began in boarding schools, by contrast, was far from optimal. Indians were “herded together in large

²⁴ Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 308-309.

numbers and compelled to spend several hours a day in exacting labor, using machines which they would never encounter again.”²⁵

School officials believed that the skills learned at the boarding schools could be applied when the students returned to the reservations, but the opposite was true. Returned students remained caught between two worlds. They had been taught to strive for the conveniences available to middle class whites, yet they had been discriminated against when considered for jobs. This left many students with no choice but to return to the reservations, but upon their arrival they found they could no longer speak their tribal language. They were regarded as outsiders. In addition, those who did learn a trade found that they could not earn enough money to truly compete with whites and attain the goal of a middle class lifestyle.²⁶

Critics also argued that the program failed to encourage proper relationships between Indians and their white employers since the students were in positions of subservience. Boarding schools taught the outing students to be obedient to their outing patrons which enforced the idea that Indians were and always would be under the direction of whites. William Ketcham, a member of the board of the Indian Commissioners, wrote perhaps the most biting criticism of the outing program:

I protest against this system, because it does not afford proper contact with whites for Indian children and it has serious disadvantages, especially for girls. I do not understand how the outing system can be justified, and I wonder how those who hire out the children of Indian parents would feel if the United States Government would hire out their children to do menial or other work among any people, particularly the people of another race. The outing system is un-American and repellant, notwithstanding all the arguments, utilitarian and otherwise, urged in its favor.²⁷

²⁵ Meriam, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 388; Eastman, *Pratt*, 86.

²⁶ Meriam, *The Problem of Indian Administration*, 640; *Ibid.*, 628; *Ibid.*, 529

²⁷ *Department of the Interior, Annual Report 1919* (Washington: GPO, 1919), 331-332.

Although the outing program incited much debate, it was not clear how detrimental the outing system was to the Indian children who participated in it until the Meriam Report was issued in 1928.

The Meriam Report of 1928 leveled the harshest criticism at the outing system. The report, commissioned by Hubert Work, the Secretary of the Interior, sought to determine the status of current Indian policy. Lewis Meriam, the lead investigator, submitted an eight hundred page report that analyzed all portions of Indian life, including Indian education. Meriam reported that “whatever it may have been in the past, at present the outing system is mainly a plan for hiring out boys for odd jobs and girls for domestic service, seldom a plan for providing real vocational training.” The report suggested that the children should be placed in positions that reflected their interests and skills. That way, the student would feel more comfortable and would be inspired to do their best work. The report concluded that it was “extremely doubtful whether the outing plan as at present in operation is helpful to the economic advance of the Indian.” The implication was that all praise that the program had received to that point had never been based in actual evidence. After the details of the program came to light, people began to see that the outing program was not the miracle that it was originally thought to be. Despite previous opinions of the government and school officials that the program had succeeded, the program as seen in the Meriam report shocked many. In fact, after the Meriam report the most praise of the system stressed that the students learned better hygiene, could speak, read and write in English, and they had learned some skills to possibly earn a living.²⁸

²⁸ Meriam, *The Problem with Indian Administration*, vii; *Ibid.*, 389; *Ibid.*, 39; *Ibid.*, 528; *Ibid.*, 189; *Ibid.*, 627.

After the Meriam report, off-reservation boarding schools altered their curriculum to include more tribal customs to aid those students who returned to their reservations. Teachers also tried to train their students in trades the students liked and had an aptitude for, which helped ensure the success of those students. The outing program, however, remained much the same and both the Haskell Institute and the Phoenix Indian School actually continued the program well into the 1950's. The Haskell Institute maintained the true sense of outing during the summer months, while the Phoenix program only allowed their students to work on Saturdays. Soon after discontinuing the outing program, the Phoenix Indian School became the Phoenix Indian High School featuring a modern curriculum. However, due to lack of government funding, the school closed in 1990. In 1970, the Haskell Institute, however, became the Haskell Indian Junior College and in 1992, the Haskell Indian Nations University, a four-year institution. Their curriculum has increasingly focused on Indian culture and the cultivation of pride in cultural roots. The goal of the outing system, the preparation of students for assimilation into American culture, remains, but now it is wedded to the preservation of Indian life and tradition.²⁹

On balance, the record of the outing program was decidedly mixed. The program's goal from the beginning was to assimilate Indians into white society. It did to a degree, but not necessarily in the ways many public officials would have preferred. Initially, the Bureau of Indian Affairs wanted to help Native American children learn a trade and grow into productive members of society rather than remaining on reservations and dependent on the government. Few historians have delved into the history of the outing program, but Robert Trewnert, whose work focuses upon the Phoenix Indian School, believed the outing program did nothing for the

²⁹ Parker, *Phoenix Indian School*, 46; *Ibid.*, ix.

Indian children and in fact was a “dead-end from the beginning.”³⁰ If the program is judged by the measure of integrating Indians into white middle-class society, then it did indeed fail. For those students who returned to their reservations, where the skills learned in the program had little application and in fact could alienate them from the societies there, the program was also a failure. Outing did, however, serve to integrate young Indians, perhaps numbering in the thousands, into white society. They did so as wage laborers willing to work on the lower economic rungs of white society. It is worth noting that the Bureau of Indian Affairs never stated that Indians once assimilated, would attain equal status with whites. By this measure, the outing program provided a path for some Indians to develop working relationships with whites so they could continue to obtain employment for themselves after they finished their time at the boarding schools. Ultimately, the outing program did succeed in making some Indians independent from the United States government, and by doing so it also provided a pool of menial laborers for whites.

³⁰ Trennert, “Victorian Morality,” 126.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archival Collections

National Archives, Central Plains Region, Kansas City, Missouri. Haskell Junior College Manuscript Collection. Bureau of Indian Affairs Records, Record Group 75.

National Archives, Pacific Region, Riverside, CA. Phoenix Indian School Central Classified Files. Bureau of Indian Affairs Records, Record Group 75.

National Archives, Washington, D. C. Phoenix Indian School File no. 824. Chingren Investigation. Bureau of Indian Affairs Records, Record Group 75.

Government Documents

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of Interior for the Year 1886. Washington, D. C.: GPO, 1886.

Annual Reports of the Department of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1900, Interior Affairs Report to the Commissioner and Appendixes. Washington, D C: GPO, 1900.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1901. Washington, DC: GPO, 1902.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1919. Washington, DC: GPO, 1919.

Goodman, C. W. "Report of School at Phoenix, Ariz., August 18, 1903." *Annual Reports of the Department of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1903.* Washington D. C.: GPO, 1904.

Meriam, Lewis, et. al., *The Problem of Indian Administration*, Institute for Government Research: Studies in Administration. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1928.

Meserve, Charles. "Report of Haskell Institute, Lawrence Kansas," *Report to the Secretary of Interior.* Washington, DC: GPO, 1891.

U.S. Information Services. *Guide for Cooks, Bakers, Housekeepers, and Matrons.* Lawrence, KS: Haskell Student Press, 1947.

Newspapers and Periodicals

Arizona Republican, Phoenix, Arizona.
Indian Leader, Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas.

Lawrence Daily Journal, Lawrence, Kansas.

Native American, Phoenix Indian School, Phoenix, Arizona.

Grinnell, George Bird. "The Indians and the Outing System,." *The Outlook*. September 1903.

Published Primary Sources

Cushman, Henry Wyles. *A Historical and Biographical Genealogy of the Cushmans: the Descendants of Robert Cushman, the Puritan, 1617-1855*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1855.

Horne, Esther Burnett and Sally McBeth. *Essie's Story: The Life and Legacy of a Shoshone Teacher*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.

Secondary Sources

Adams, David Wallace. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1995.

Anderson, Eric. "An Imperfect Education Assimilation and American Indians at Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kansas, 1884-1894." Master's Thesis, University of Kansas, 1990.

Archuleta, Margaret L., Brenda J. Child, K. Tsianina Lomawaima, eds. *Away From Home: American Indian Boarding School Experiences, 1879-2000*. Phoenix: Heard Museum, 2000.

Child, Brenda. *Boarding School Seasons: American Indian Families, 1900-1940*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.

Eastman, Elaine Goodale. *Pratt: The Red Man's Moses*. Norman: Univ. Press of Oklahoma, 1935.

Parker, Dorothy R. *Phoenix Indian School: The Second Half-Century*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1996

Trennert, Robert A. "From Carlisle to Phoenix: The Rise and Fall of the Indian Outing System, 1878-1930." *Pacific Historical Review* 52.3 (1983): 267-291.

- _____. "Educating Indian Girls at Non-reservation Boarding Schools, 1878-1920." *The Western Historical Quarterly* 13.3 (1982): 271-290.
- _____. *The Phoenix Indian School: Forced Assimilation in Arizona, 1891-1935*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988.
- _____. "Victorian Morality and the Supervision of Indian Women Working in Phoenix, 1906-1930." *Journal of Social History* 22.1 (1988): 113-128.
- Vučković, Myriam. *Voices from Haskell: Indian Students between Two Worlds, 1884-1928*. Lawrence: Univ. Press of Kansas, 2008.
- Winnie, Lucille. *Sah-gan-de-oh: The Chief's Daughter*. New York: Vantage Press, 1969.

