UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
Willard Beatty and Progressive Indian Education

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0pp4t209

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 33(4)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Stefon, Frederick

Publication Date
2009-09-01

DOI
10.17953

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE AND RESEARCH JOURNAL 33:4 (2009) 91–112

Willard Beatty and Progressive Indian Education

FREDERICK J. STEFON

> Our real measure of success is what happens to the children. If the children are happy, if they are making spontaneous use of English and enjoy doing so; if they are learning to read and enjoy work with books; if they can count easily and are acquiring automatic recall of number combinations, the teacher is doing a good job whatever methods he is using, or by whatever phrases he describes his educational philosophy.
>
> —Willard W. Beatty, *Education for Action*, 1944

INTRODUCTION

Willard W. Beatty (1891–1961) lived most of his early life in San Francisco. As a teenager there, Beatty experienced the first philosophic influence on his life—a profound influence that he would later incorporate into much of his educational philosophy. As a high school student, Beatty attended the California School of Mechanical Arts, or the James Lick School—a secondary trade school for high school students "drawn from the whole state of California."[1] His son, Walcott H. Beatty, in a letter to this author noted, "I believe that it was his experience [at the James Lick School] which greatly influenced his thinking with regard to education."[2]

The James Lick School offered an educational program that was vocational in nature and whose hallmark was a successful apprenticeship program. The founder of the school, James Lick, was a self-made millionaire and a piano maker by profession. A self-educated man, Lick never forgot his origin as a skilled mechanic. He continually sought to enhance his own education not as a means of escape for the laboring man but as a "means to enriched living." Willard Beatty wrote in 1944 that "Lick thought of things of the spirit, not merely of material well-being. . . . In this he anticipated by a generation

Frederick J. Stefon, assistant professor of history at Pennsylvania State University Wilkes-Barre Campus, is working on a history of the Thomas Indian School.

the philosophy of the British Labor Party."[3] Upon his death, Lick not only endowed the California School of Mechanical Arts, but also left substantial monies to the California Academy of Science and an endowment for the Lick Observatory of the University of California.

According to Beatty, Lick desired to teach a generation that would not only be proud to work with its hands but also embrace the values of culture usually set aside for the "professional" classes. "There was something quite fundamental in Lick's objectives," wrote Beatty, "something which is often lost sight of by many of today's educators." The learning through doing philosophy that Lick espoused meant that each student in attendance at the California School of Mechanical Arts was required to serve an apprenticeship in his particular trade while completing his high school program. The student was provided with the skilled instruction and experience normally received in an on-the-job situation within the confines of the school. Half of the student's day was spent in fulfilling the apprenticeship requirements; the remainder of the day was devoted to essential high school academic subject matter. The school's faculty emphasized science and mathematics, which gave "increased meaning" to the skills learned under the apprenticeship program. Although the school's course of study did not emphasize the humanities, it provided the student with basic introductions to social studies and English literature. Young Beatty's years at the James Lick School so impressed him that he entered the University of California in 1909 and graduated in 1913 with a bachelor of science in architecture.[4]

In 1913, following commencement, Beatty took a job as a teacher of drawing at the Oakland California Technical High School. In 1915, Beatty launched his long career as an educator when he accepted the position of head of the Arithmetic Department at San Francisco State Teachers College, which was then under the leadership of progressive educator Frederic Burk.[5] Even though Beatty, throughout the next decade of his life, was exposed to the progressive educational philosophies of Francis Parker, Burk, William H. Kilpatrick, Charles H. Judd, and John Dewey, he never forgot his early experiences as a student at the James Lick School whose philosophical outlook left a lasting impression upon him. In 1944, midway through his tenure as director of Indian education, Beatty wrote an article in praise of Lick's philosophy as an introduction to the first chapter of *Education for Action*—a book of essays about Indian education. Beatty, like Lick before him, shunned the "fundamentally fallacious" assumption of many traditional educators that "education is the stepping stone from work with the hands to work with the brain." Both Beatty and Lick believed that a democratic system of government needed well-educated and "intelligent hand workers" because they comprise the majority of the voting public. After all, noted Beatty, it is the laboring classes in a democracy that finally choose "whether we have playgrounds or dump heaps, libraries or pool halls, art centers or saloons, etc." Hence, pedagogues who stressed education as liberation from labor "rather than as enrichment of the labor, are contributing to a breakdown in the social structure, for which they offer no compensating alternative."[6]

In the opening article in *Education for Action*, Beatty applied Lick's philosophy to the problem of Indian education. Instead of educating the

Native American to escape from his way of life, observed Beatty, the Indian Service must be concerned "with perfecting the native ways of life in the face of inevitable contacts with the outside world."[7] There should be but two basic purposes in Indian education: "First, to contribute, so far as possible, to better living under the conditions of the environment; and second, to that enrichment of understanding which has tended to make life more tolerable under all conditions." Although Beatty granted that the life of Eskimos in the Arctic was severe and the life of the Natives on the Papago desert or Hopi mesa "inevitably restricted," he insisted that "for people who are used to it, it has undoubted compensations, and may in fact be a better life than the same individuals might win elsewhere." Thus, for Beatty, the traditional stereotyped academic program found in most American high schools had no place in the Indian Service. Beatty insisted that Indian schools "must teach the boys and girls to make a living—in a majority of cases from the assets in their immediate environment."[8]

EARLY YEARS: SAN FRANCISCO TO BRONXVILLE

Between 1915 and 1920, Willard Beatty was a faculty member at San Francisco State Teachers College. During this five-year period Beatty advanced quickly through the ranks from his initial position as head of the Arithmetic Department to a dual position as head of the History and Civics Departments and director of the Teacher Training Department. He held both positions simultaneously from 1917 to 1920.[9] Throughout Beatty's five-year tenure at the Teachers College, Burk's untraditional education ideas, independent thought, and innovative experiments with "individual instruction" inspired Beatty, and offered him a viable alternative to the traditional educational milieu of which he had grown ever more suspicious since his "learning by doing" apprenticeship at the James Lick School and his first teaching position across the bay in Oakland. San Francisco State Teachers College became a seedbed for educational reform under Burk's aggressive leadership. Burk had studied under G. Stanley Hall at Clark University and became a leading figure in teacher training.[10] Under Burk's direction, Beatty was first exposed to the study of individual differences of children within a classroom setting. Carleton W. Washburne, a colleague of Beatty under Burk, and perhaps Burk's leading disciple, noted that Burk's Normal School "was widely known for its innovations in the education of teachers and the high quality of teachers it trained."[11]

Washburne and Beatty later owed their successful careers to the outstanding reputation of Burk's Normal School. In 1913 Burk initiated, with the cooperation of the faculty of his training school department, an experiment in individualized instruction.[12] One year earlier, Mary Ward, supervisor of arithmetic at San Francisco State, had experimented successfully with an idea originally formulated by Preston Search, superintendent of the Pueblo, Colorado, schools in the 1880s.[13] Search had disavowed the "lockstep" or graded class system of traditional education and launched a program of individualized instruction throughout his public school system.[14] The lockstep

system then entrenched in the traditional public school was best defined by Burk in the article "Individual Instruction vs. the Lock-Step System." Burk wrote that a "mental lock-step" existed in the public school system. "From nine until three," he noted, "every mental and physical act of every pupil, if the regulations of the class method of instruction could be carried out ideally, must be performed in unison, by external direction and dictation of the teacher."[15] Search's experiment to break this mental lockstep achieved some success. Although he did not utilize any "special plan," he simply allowed children in his schools to progress at their own rate through assigned reading in existing textbooks. Traditional teachers and textbooks proved insurmountable obstacles for Search. Political opposition to his work forced Search to end his experiment.[16] Search's experiments lay dormant for two decades until Ward resurrected them and Burk created a renaissance of learning around them. Burk molded Search's original idea into a theoretical framework, experimented for twelve years with this theory, and developed exact techniques for individual instruction. Burk believed the traditional uniform course of study and graded class system found in the American public schools to be "a crude and primitive machine which falsely measures and cruelly maims the victims of its own impossibilities."[17] Burk succinctly explained the rationale behind individual instruction in "The Desire to Know—Educational Dynamo." This new pedagogy will not concern itself "so much with *what* pupils shall learn and *how* they shall learn, but with shaping school conditions to give that freedom of mind and action by which pupils may leap to their destinies, not follow unwillingly duties arbitrarily dictated to them."[18]

In 1925, Ward and three other faculty members from the San Francisco State Teachers College, who had worked under Burk until his death in 1924 and experimented with his technique, outlined the original experiment in *The Twenty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education.* Seven hundred children were enrolled in the initial experiment. Each child was given a detailed course outline for each subject in his "program of studies." Under Burk's "Individual System," provisions were made for testing and promoting students "as soon as the work outlined for any subject was completed." The experiment eschewed daily subject assignments, and class recitations were forsaken.[19] Burk's staff wrote, organized, and printed their own "self-instruction bulletins."[20] Burk's innovative work at San Francisco State Teachers College gained him a worldwide reputation, and the teachers he trained in his methodology carried his philosophy into the American school system. Always a realist, Burk knew that his Individual System could not merely be the individual "teacher's undertaking" but was rather an administrative problem "requiring a revolution of administrative mechanisms." It required a "complete displacement" of the graded class system and its replacement with "new forms of books, new spirit, points of view and educational philosophy of life upon the part of teachers, superintendents and boards of education."[21] Burk believed that if his methodology was to develop into "new educational projects" it must be tested not in the somewhat ideal confines within the training school at a teachers college but under normal circumstances in a public school system. Two of Burk's former faculty members

were the first to inaugurate the necessary administrative reforms that enabled Burk's individual instruction method to become a reality in a public school system—one was Washburne, the other, Willard W. Beatty.[22] The unorthodox Beatty was enamored with Burk's Individual System simply because it was "not a system having a mechanism worked out in any adequate degree." As Burk admitted as late as 1924, "it is merely a series of principles changing from day to day in accordance with the changing development of modern science and civilization."[23] Beatty was indebted to Burk for exposing him to an educational technique that Beatty later modified and through which he gained national recognition first at Winnetka, Illinois, as assistant superintendent of schools, and then at the Bronxville, New York, public schools as superintendent. Moreover, it was at Winnetka that Beatty first met Harold Ickes, who was destined to become secretary of the interior during Franklin Delano Roosevelt's presidency. Ickes admired Beatty's progressive educational policies at Winnetka and his leadership of the Progressive Education Association (PEA) so much that in 1935 Ickes chose Beatty to fill the position of director of Indian education—a post vacated by W. Carson Ryan.[24] Ironically, Beatty, like Burk, regarded himself as an independent thinker and therefore never viewed himself as Burk's disciple. As Hildegard Thompson, Beatty's successor as director of Indian education, pointed out: "I will say that Beatty was never an orthodox follower of anyone. . . . He had his own views and held his own views."[25]

In 1920 Beatty left his position at San Francisco State Teachers College and went on to teach at the Presidio Open Air School in San Francisco. While teaching at the Presidio Open Air School, Beatty completed his master's degree in education at the University of California in 1921.[26] Later, as president of the PEA, he lauded the educational innovations made by George Kyte at the University of California High School.[27] In 1922 Beatty left his teaching position at the Presidio Open Air School and followed Washburne, his former colleague under Burk, to Winnetka, Illinois. There both men successfully initiated Burk's technique of individual instruction in the large middle-class suburban high school and junior high school. Washburne and Beatty modified Burk's Individual System into what later became known as the "Winnetka Technique." Washburne concisely explained the "Winnetka System" in a 1924 article in *Progressive Education* magazine as a "system of self-corrective practice materials and complete diagnostic tests [that] eliminates the necessity for recitations." Washburne assured his readers that in the Winnetka schools the students' time was not spent in recitations but in "self-expressive and socialized activities." The daily round of school activities centered on "individual work in the common essentials" and creative group activity.[28] Washburne, who had been superintendent of schools at Winnetka since 1919, called upon Beatty to head the newly organized Skokie Junior High School and to become his assistant superintendent of schools. According to Washburne, Beatty "gave the school its initial character." During his four-year tenure at Winnetka, Beatty organized and gave the "initial character" to many new elective courses and special courses at the junior high school adapted to each child's special interests and needs.[29] For example, Beatty organized an innovative

elementary biology course in the seventh grade at the Skokie school. The course unabashedly covered the "important functions of living things from amoeba to man."[30] Students spent a good deal of their time in "frank" discussions learning about human reproduction. All students were required to take this course and could only be excused through the personal objection of a parent.[31] "The faculty presentation of human reproduction is accompanied by a discussion of the social and ethical implications of the sex functions," Beatty emphasized. "There is evidence that this work is developing an attitude of understanding and intelligent self-restraint among the students."[32] Such innovations at Winnetka and later at Bronxville gained Beatty a nationwide following in progressive-education circles.[33]

While at Winnetka, Beatty wrote an article on individualized instruction in the Winnetka schools for *Schoolmen's Week*: "Practically every experimental school that is contributing anything to educational thought today is finding that its appeal must primarily be addressed to the individual." In his article Beatty outlined certain types of development that he and Washburne held fundamental to a successful program in individualized instruction. First, grade promotion must be replaced by promotion through subject and the individual's work in each subject. Second, Beatty noted that the goals and content of each course must be defined in great detail because "experimental evidence proves" that this procedure improved student morale. Third, individualized instruction required a standardized, objective testing procedure to provide accuracy and thoroughness in kinds of work "where it is essential that a uniform degree of accomplishment be demanded by all." Fourth, Beatty called for the development of an "entirely new race of textbooks" that were to be self-instructive and written in language a child could understand. "These things," Beatty concluded, "we believe are coming as inevitably as tomorrow's dawn."[34] During his years at Winnetka, Beatty enrolled in a doctoral program in education at the University of Chicago under progressive educators Charles H. Judd and William Scott Grey.[35] Beatty admired Judd's leadership of the Laboratory School Program at the University of Chicago. "It is probable that a larger amount of valid educational research has been carried on in these schools under the leadership of Dr. Charles H. Judd and his conferees," wrote Beatty, "than in any other single plant."[36]

In 1926, after spending four years at Winnetka with Washburne perfecting and modifying Burk's Individual System, Beatty accepted a position as the superintendent of schools in Bronxville. He also took several teachers from Winnetka with him to Bronxville.[37] Upon his arrival, Beatty found the school's classrooms overcrowded and lacking in the necessary school equipment due primarily to an incomplete building program halted by a taxpayers' revolt. Beatty, perhaps because of his national reputation, was successful in overcoming the qualms of the taxpayers by stressing the need for more classroom space and equipment in order to provide a modern educational milieu for the children of Bronxville. Beatty incorporated much of the Winnetka program into the Bronxville schools, and within a few years he had administratively transformed the Bronxville system into a center of progressive experimentation in individualized instruction. Within a decade, Bronxville was known as

one of the leading progressive public school systems in the nation. "Just as the school he is leaving typifies the practical application of the most advanced methods of American education," reads a column in *The Bronxville Press* upon his appointment as director of Indian education, "so does Mr. Beatty represent the strongest leadership under which progressive education methods are being installed in many schools throughout the land."[38] During the first three years of his tenure as superintendent of the Bronxville public schools, Beatty continued his degree work at the University of Chicago; however, he never completed his doctoral thesis. Within this same three-year period he studied educational administration at Teachers College, Columbia University. While completing his doctoral course work at the University of Chicago he taught courses in the principles of elementary education and in tests and measurements each summer from 1924 to 1929. Due to his expertise in individualized instruction and his growing reputation as a progressive educator, Syracuse University asked Beatty to teach courses in the philosophy of progressive education and in administration for superintendents during the summers of 1931 and 1933.[39]

Beatty's experiments with individualized instruction at Bronxville gained him such national prominence that in 1932 he not only became vice president of the PEA but also received an assignment from the prestigious General Education Board, a philanthropic institution created by John D. Rockefeller in 1902.[40] As the General Education Board's representative, Beatty undertook an intensive study of fifty-six public and private elementary and secondary experimental schools. The purpose of the study was to "evaluate the contribution" of these schools "to the program of American Education."[41] This study served to enhance his reputation as a leader in the progressive-education movement. A year later, as president of the PEA, Beatty emphasized the association's commitment to the practical "application of scientific technique" in seeking answers to the nation's perplexing education issues. The PEA, he warned, offered no cure-all solution for the "educational ills" of the American school system. Rather, Beatty envisioned, in words reminiscent of Burk's philosophic outlook, that the PEA's primary concern should be to fit the school, and therefore to build its environment to meet the "needs of the individual pupils." Beatty wrote hopefully in 1934 that "in so far as [PEA's] theories are sound, and in so far as the experiments which it fosters are successful, it can expect the mass of American schools gradually to accept and incorporate into their programs ideas which the association has sponsored."[42]

PEA president Beatty actively promoted a "program of educational experimentation." Beatty insisted that tradition be overturned in favor of a new innovation in pedagogy if it promised a better learning experience and a more abundant life for students in an era of depression and uncertainty. The worldwide depression had radicalized Beatty's thinking about the American economic system and about educational and social policy.[43] In 1933, in an editorial in *Progressive Education*, Beatty questioned and eschewed the economic ideology of rugged individualism and promoted the "integrated social planning" policies of the Roosevelt administration as the only hope for preserving "a social and economic structure even remotely resembling

the one familiar to the nations of western Europe and America."[44] In his editorial, Beatty expounded on the role he hoped educators, especially progressive educators, would play in bringing Roosevelt's "new and better social order" into being:

> We must recognize the fact that schools cannot offer their children instruction in political or economic doctrines which differ materially from those understood or accepted by the adult community. A double burden therefore rests upon the educator who would contribute materially to social planning. He must be prepared to undertake not only the instruction of children for their share in a new order, but also leadership and guidance of the adult community in its groping for individual and social security in this rapidly changing world.[45]

Beatty never avoided controversial issues during his tenure. For example, in 1935, Beatty, through a lengthy editorial in *Progressive Education*, defended the academic freedom of John Noble Washburne, an avowed socialist and teacher of educational psychology at Syracuse University, against charges made by the Hearst newspaper chain that Washburne was a communist. The Hearst newspapers at that time were waging a concerted media campaign to root out communism from American colleges. Beatty defended Washburne's right to carry on a free and impartial discussion about controversial issues and his full rights to citizenship even though he was a member of the Socialist Party of the United States. Beatty called on "all true friends of education" to support Washburne's academic freedom lest American education become "subservient to special interests." Beatty wrote, "We expect Syracuse University to support unequivocally Mr. Washburne's right to exercise the privileges of American citizenship in his capacity as instructor at that university."[46] Beatty never wavered in his support of the controversial Washburne or for that matter of any other cause he felt an affinity toward. He gave little regard to the sobering political reality that the philosophical disputes he stirred might threaten future funding possibilities for the association. For example, in his 1933 editorial in *Progressive Education* Beatty's defense of the Roosevelt administration's "substitution of social planning for 'rugged individualism,'" called upon the "leaders in progressive education" to participate in the "actual remaking of education, so that it may contribute directly to the building of a new and better social order."[47] He took this stand despite the fact that the PEA was just starting to acquire large amounts of financial support from the Carnegie Corporation and the General Education Board.[48]

Even after he was named director of Indian education in 1936, Beatty cared little about avoiding controversial issues. For instance, Beatty remained loyal to Secretary of the Bureau of Indian Affairs John Collier, even when Collier's political opponents in Congress moved to liquidate the bureau and certainly threatened Beatty's education program. Beatty was urged by some of his staff members to bypass Collier, who by 1944 proved a liability to his own program, and go directly to Congress for funds.[49] Senate Partial Report 310, 11 June 1943, had called for the abolishment of the Indian Arts and

Crafts Board, the elimination of all day schools, and an immediate reduction of $15 million dollars from the bureau's budget.[50] Beatty, however, persisted in his loyalty to Collier and his policies. George Boyce, director of Navajo education under Beatty and a man particularly hostile to Collier's Navajo school and livestock conservation programs, remarked that Beatty "was not a politician." Beatty, Boyce insisted, "didn't realize the importance of political backing, and political maneuvering to get money and things for which government has the responsibility, and you have to do this through Congress." Willard Beatty, noted Boyce, "was a very honest person to his superior; fortunately I could be loyal to Beatty, but I couldn't be loyal to Collier when the chips were down."[51]

Three important articles resulted from Beatty's study of experimental schools carried out under the auspices of the Rockefeller-supported General Education Board. "Progressive Education in the Public Schools," which appeared in the November 1932 issue of *Progressive Education*, was a concise summary of Beatty's overall findings; the remaining two articles were published in 1933, the year Beatty assumed the presidency of the PEA.[52] The findings Beatty reached from his study concerning the validity of progressive educational methodology left deep impressions upon him that ultimately influenced his own administrative philosophy as director of Indian education.

Most, if not all, of the fifty-six schools Beatty visited to collect data for his study had attempted to put into practice accepted progressive educational principles. The schools endeavored to remold learning in terms of "purposeful activity," provide a learning environment that allowed students creative expression, reconcile the school to the students' individual differences and changing social realities, and utilize "the scientific method" when evaluating school programming and educational practice methodology.[53] Like Ryan, his predecessor as director of Indian education, Beatty sought to incorporate these very same principles into Indian Service schools. Ryan and Beatty attempted to inculcate their respective Indian Service teaching staffs with progressive methodology not through dictate, but through in-service training and summer schools.[54] The principal finding reached by Beatty in his study for the General Education Board was that experiments with progressive methods, lavish physical school plants, and even excellent teaching staffs alone accomplished little without the "driving force" of a "creative and effective" leader. Further, leadership, to be effective, must be "based on a purposeful philosophy of education." Beatty noted that "excellent staffs, lacking the driving force of leadership are accomplishing less than average groups cooperating under leadership."[55] Beatty believed that creative leadership was the key to the continued productive contributions of the schools he visited and followed this prescription throughout his career. Beatty, however, never practiced administrative leadership by fiat; rather, he used the "conference method." Throughout his fifteen years of combined administrative experience at Winnetka and Bronxville, Beatty easily organized his teaching staff around a common philosophy of education, and because both his staffs were compact enough, he used the conference method to discuss staff objectives and "hammer out its differences."[56] In his 1933 editorial for *Education for*

Action Beatty stressed that the good administrator "shares his responsibilities with others of his staff and allows them to exercise their initiative in planning their work." Moreover, Beatty was convinced that good administration could only be produced through "foresight, information, cold-clear headed planning, and hard work."[57] Even though the conference approach proved successful for Beatty at Winnetka and Bronxville, when he assumed his office as director of Indian education he was immediately confronted with an "unwieldy" staff scattered in 360 schools throughout the continental United States and Alaska.[58] Beatty was therefore forced to develop new administrative techniques to meet this new challenge. In his memoir, Collier recalled the immense scope of Beatty's administrative problem.

THE INDIANS' JOHN DEWEY

As the head of Indian education, wrote Collier, Beatty faced "one of the most demanding jobs in the world." No other "school administrative units of its geographical size and of its variety of problems" existed in the United States. The logistics of this vast school system aside, Indian education had to deal with the complexities of "different and distinct" groups and environments and had to encompass many studies not ordinarily found in school curricula.[59] Thus, Beatty, who shunned administration by edict from the central office because he believed it was "wasteful of individual creative ingenuity" and a poor substitute for the "integrated intelligence of the many," had to develop new administrative techniques in order to create an understanding of the official policy goals of the Collier administration on the operating level.[60] Beatty insisted that the educational goals of the Indian Service were "more clearly defined than are those of the average American school." The primary goal was to train young Indians to use their existing reservation resources in order to make a decent living. If, however, the resources of the reservation failed to provide an adequate subsistence way of life for all Indians living on the reservation, then a certain percentage of the school-age population must be trained in alternative occupations and "inspired to make a living elsewhere." Although the goals were clear, Beatty's administrative problems remained enormous because he not only had to familiarize his teaching and supervisory staff with these basic goals, but also had to offer guidance and direction even though they were scattered across an immense geographic area. To accomplish this task, Beatty asked Collier and Secretary of the Interior Ickes for support in initiating a number of innovative "in-service training techniques" that Beatty hoped would help to cultivate a unity of purpose throughout the education branch.[61]

Beatty instituted a five-part program. First, in 1936 and with Collier's aid, Beatty organized a chain of summer schools to offer not only a common philosophy to the Indian Service teachers but also to show them the philosophy in action through demonstration classes, practice teaching, and discussion. Instruction was given in progressive educational techniques, and the teachers were supplied with necessary materials to work out the methods in their own classrooms. In order to acquaint new staff members "with the Indians and their problems," one to four summer schools were offered each year at Indian

Service boarding schools located on reservations.[62] Robert Young, a linguist who worked under Beatty on Navajo bilingual texts, noted that at these Indian Services Summer Schools "new teachers, often coming from backgrounds far removed from Indian reservations, were introduced very effectively—and very warmly and pleasantly—to Indian education."[63] Second, Beatty supplemented the in-service summer sessions with brief "curriculum planning conferences" located at various reservations and attended by the staff members from a specific area. Beatty and his Washington staff planned these conferences to give local staffs the chance to discuss the application of general principles offered at the summer schools to their own situations.[64] Third, Beatty sought to encourage the teaching staffs at various Indian Service schools to undertake cooperative studies of local needs and to plan their curriculum to meet those needs. Fourth, following Collier's plan for a decentralized Indian Bureau, Beatty decentralized much of the supervision. Regional staffs were established with substantial autonomy over local conditions; the Washington office staff existed only to provide specialized assistance to the regional staffs. Finally, Beatty created the fortnightly pamphlet *Indian Education*, which was sent to every education department employee, in order to provide his teaching staff with "clear-cut statements of philosophy, policy and preferred procedure."[65]

"For the Social Education of Children," Beatty's second article based on the General Education Board's study, was published in *Progressive Education* in February 1933. His investigation of social studies teaching in the fifty-six experimental schools, whose basic philosophy supposedly related "all learning to experience," proved discouraging to Beatty. He discovered but a few schools with excellent teaching and the social studies programs consciously integrated into the other academic and vocational course offerings. Beatty found far too many uninspired teachers, outdated and often incomplete text materials, and teachers who were "inadequately equipped to follow the developments of current history" in the majority of the schools he visited.[66] He lauded the new approaches to social studies which de-emphasized factual learnings and stressed the "development of attitudes and understanding" in the child. Far better, Beatty held, for a child to learn the source of the city water supply and how the city is supplied with daily material necessities than to memorize and recite long lists of historical dates.[67] Beatty, a true progressive, believed the schools were "centers of life" in which children "learn to do by actually doing." Thus, despite the fact that the written or the spoken word "is a valuable aid in learning," it was never a valid substitute for experience.[68]

Yet, like John Dewey, Beatty qualified his emphasis on experience. He agreed essentially with the following statement by Dewey: "The belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative."[69] Hence for Beatty, as for Dewey, "no series of consecutive learnings is fortuitous [but rather] is the result of carefully organized planning."[70] Later, as director of Indian education, Beatty was faced with a diverse rural school system whose principal goal was to prepare young Indians to use their own resources productively. "A school program," Beatty observed, "is only valid when it satisfies the needs of the people being educated."[71] Given his progressive philosophy of social

education, he naturally avoided a uniform approach to curriculum and emphasized instead the need for his teaching staff to adapt their educational programs to the diverse necessities of the school's local environment. Although the Washington office did not prescribe a uniform course of study for all Indian schools, Beatty stressed the need for teachers to plan their work carefully along goals they scrupulously established and based, as they must be, on the specific needs of their locality. "It is important," Beatty stated, in line with Deweyan philosophy, "to define quite objectively step by step the knowledge or skills which each child should master in the course of his educational experience."[72] At an April staff conference on the Indian Service secondary schools held in Denver, Colorado, in 1938, Willard Beatty reiterated his belief in the need for diversity in curriculum planning:

> We expect that the program for each reservation and non-reservation school will differ, because you are each facing specific needs. . . . The material to be included will depend upon many different factors, such as economic conditions, soil conservation, and erosion control, which have practical and immediate application to the specific area. Differences of this sort are not only desirable, but necessary, since the degree to which your school is successful is determined by the applicability of its program to the particular area where the child will live, and the extent to which it prepares him for a more effective use of his own environment.[73]

In "Training Teachers for the New School" Beatty was disillusioned by and therefore highly critical of existing teacher-training institutions throughout the United States for failing to train teachers properly in modern progressive methods. "The Philosophy of the newer school," wrote Beatty, "demands that children learn to do by doing, and yet, in a majority of instances, those institutions which are offering even the slightest training for the new type of school are devoting most of their time talking about it."[74] What the experimental schools needed, and was found wanting in a great many instances, were highly qualified teachers who were open-minded to new ideas. Beatty also found the training schools offering in-service programs of little practical value, because there was "no close correlation between the plans of school departments for improvement in instruction and the professional instruction which the training institutions offer."[75] In light of this study, Beatty not only sought highly qualified teachers trained in progressive methods to fill Indian Service positions but also instituted practical yet innovative in-service training programs. For instance, Young, an Indian Service linguist on the Navajo Reservation, wrote this author that Beatty ingeniously varied the reservation locations of the in-service summer school programs every year so that teachers from one section of Indian country could study and learn about Indian social, cultural, and economic life on other reservations. Young observed that it was a veritable "natural laboratory where the principle of essential difference and the necessity for adaptive programming could be proven and reinforced."[76] Hence, Beatty fashioned his administrative policy as director of Indian education through the findings he gathered in his

intensive research project for the General Education Board in 1932, coupled with his extensive administrative background at Winnetka and Bronxville, his devotion to progressive educational principles, and later his total commitment to the conclusions reached by Ryan in *The Meriam Report* and the overall policies of the Collier regime.[77]

Perhaps nothing better epitomized the Collier administration's New Deal educational policy than the two educational experiments carried out under Beatty's direction at the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota, first, the innovative educational program at the Oglala Community High School and, second, the unique yearlong evaluation project initiated by Pedro T. Orata at the Little Wound Day School in the Kyle District of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation. Both of these experimental programs in community education point to the Collier administration's determination to diversify the federal Indian school curricula to meet the changing needs of the local Indian communities in the throes of the Depression. The ultimate objective of the Kyle community project was to teach the Indian people at Kyle, both young and old, to support themselves and to manage their own affairs.[78] In 1939, Beatty, acting on placement information he received from the just-completed *Pine Ridge Vocational Survey*, started a "reservation centered vocational training program to prepare students at the Oglala Community High School," a predominant boarding institution, to "make a living on the reservation, where the vast majority clearly intended to make their permanent home."[79] Under Beatty's direction the Oglala Community High School enrolled few elementary students. Out of an enrollment of six hundred, four hundred students boarded there while another two hundred attended by bus on a daily basis. Pine Ridge was a Sioux Reservation of approximately a million and a half acres of predominantly grazing land. For Beatty, the major purpose of such a central reservation high school under his replanned curriculum project would be to teach the Indian students proper land use so that they might use the land intelligently upon graduation. Thus, it is no surprise that high school students at Oglala learned the cattle business firsthand by caring for one thousand head of cattle on a thirty-five thousand–acre school reserve. Another two thousand acres of school land were devoted to small garden plots and the growing of cattle feed. Irrigation methods and cooperative market practices were also taught. The science courses offered at the school were developed with the needs of the particular Pine Ridge community in mind and were concerned with the conservation of plant and animal resources. At Oglala other courses stressed health, the Indian community, responsibilities under the Indian Reorganization Act, rural sanitation, and the social and economic aspects of rural community life.[80]

"Both the Pine Ridge and Rosebud Reservation," wrote Beatty to Rena Carr in 1939, "contain excellent grazing land for beef cattle and many students after graduation will be in the cattle business, supplementing their income from this source by a limited amount of agriculture and subsistence gardening. . . . Their training in the high school prepares them to succeed in this type of work."[81] Ironically, by 1950, when George Dale completed his survey of Pine Ridge, it was found that not only did the new vocational training in ranching and subsistence farming initiated by Beatty in 1939

help the 53.5 percent who remained on the reservation after graduation, but the program also enabled an increasing number of young people to find permanent employment off the reservation. Dale concluded, "There is evidence that the training which has been supplied has been successful, e.g., the people with more training have better standards of living."[82] The Little Wound School was an elementary and junior high day school in the Kyle District of the Pine Ridge Reservation. Perhaps Beatty chose the Kyle District because it contained a number of rural full-blood Teton-Dakota Indian communities. Although the original experiment at Kyle under Orata lasted only through the 1936 to 1937 school year (Orata left the project to become a special consultant in the US Office of Education in 1937), the groundwork laid by Orata was steadfastly continued after his departure by his school staff, which remained virtually unchanged. Hazel F. Wilson, the first-grade teacher at Little Wound Day School, once remarked that many educational experiments like the one at Kyle fell short of success because they were not carried beyond the initial stage. "Enthusiasm dies," she observed, "with the departure of the leader, and the only comment made about the experiment is that it was interesting—while it lasted."[83] Wilson, perhaps the most philosophically committed of Orata's staff, saw to it that the staff's enthusiasm for the Kyle community project did not die. A 1940 follow-up study showed that in spite of the hardships encountered and the general "lack of enthusiasm and interest in the program" on the part of some Indian adults, the year, for the most part, "proved worthwhile and enjoyable to pupils, parents, and teachers alike."[84] As a devoted philosopher of Orata's progressive ideal, Hazel Wilson concluded: "All that we believe is that if a similar method were continued long enough, the Indian people in generations to come would learn to rely less on the government and more on their own resources in dealing with their problems and would become increasingly better able to manage their own affairs and to support themselves."[85] A few years after the 1940 follow-up study was made, Collier and Beatty commissioned yet another investigation of the Pine Ridge Sioux as part of their ongoing Indian education research project.[86]

This time Collier and Beatty appointed Gordon Macgregor to undertake a study of the society and personality development of the Pine Ridge Sioux. The major part of Macgregor's inquiry was devoted to the full-blood Teton-Dakota rural community of Kyle situated in the heart of the reservation. It is interesting to note that Macgregor found many of the community innovations implemented under Orata's astute management still alive at the Little Wound School. "Little Wound School is the most important institution of the district," commented Macgregor, "for it brings together all the children and many adults of the neighboring communities of Kyle."[87] The independence spawned by the New Deal community educational experiment at Kyle lives on in the democratic spirit that is alive today among many of the descendants of the Native Americans who experienced that program. Orata observed in his evaluation of the l937 Kyle community experiment that the Indian community was not likely "to be bossed around as easily as before . . . [and] was more likely to object to any plan for community development in which they had no part."[88] Fifty years later Orata's observation still held true. In August 1987 Kyle was a site of a protest staged by

members of the Oglala Sioux tribe to fight plans of the Honeywell Corporation to place a munitions and missile-testing facility on lands the tribe considered sacred in the Hell Canyon area in the southern tip of the Black Hills. South Dakota Governor George Michelson, local businessmen, and state politicians supported the Honeywell facility in the name of progress and development. The Pine Ridge Lakota teamed up with local ranchers to extend their protest and planned to use the courts to delay the construction of the Honeywell plant. Pine Ridge tribal attorney Peter Gonzales, in language reminiscent of Orata's 1937 observation of the Kyle Indians, noted, "there's a common perception among corporate people and the government that the Indians are a conquered people, that we're used to being pushed around. . . . That may be true of other Indians," Gonzales warned, "but it doesn't apply to us."[89] For as Collier said at the opening of his career as commissioner of Indian Affairs, "the Indian schools should primarily be designed to discover Indian life, and to discover to that Indian life, its own unrealized needs and opportunities."[90]

Throughout his tenure as director of Indian education, Beatty emphasized and continued the close cooperation between the Indian Service and the PEA first initiated by Ryan in 1930. The continued cooperation between the PEA and the Indian Service was made possible by the fact that Ryan (1930–35), Beatty's predecessor as director of Indian education, succeeded him as president of the PEA in 1937. Ryan held that position until 1940 when Washburne, Beatty's old colleague from San Francisco State and Winnetka, succeeded Ryan.[91] Washburne remained president of the PEA until 1942, the year the PEA started its decline due to the drastic loss of major sources of funding.[92] As director of Indian education, each year Beatty sent a request to Collier for monies that would allow a select number of superintendents and principals of Indian schools to attend the annual meeting of the PEA.[93] Beatty also contacted Frederic Redefer, the executive secretary of the PEA, annually and, as Ryan had done before him, requested that Redefer add a session on progressive methods in Indian education to the annual program.[94] The correspondence files of the Indian Office for 1939 show the activity between Redefer and Beatty and one of his superintendents, C. R. Whitlock—a man whom Beatty felt showed great promise as a progressive administrator. Beatty had requested that Whitlock prepare a talk for the PEA's conference in Detroit. In a letter to Beatty, Whitlock feared that his presentation would be inadequate: "If you think, in the limited time allotted to this presentation I am trying to cover too much ground I shall be pleased to have you indicate those phases [of the day school program] which you think should be emphasized."[95] Beatty assured Whitlock in a letter of his confidence:

> I like the outline which you have prepared for your Detroit discussion. . . . Such a concrete connection between community education program of the type which you are outlining and the final community economic status is something which people are dreaming about but never accomplishing, and the more skeptical appear justifiably to doubt that schools can really accomplish what your day schools on Rosebud have been doing. . . . I think you have done a real job on Rosebud in

> coordinating many of the divisional services to the end that there has been a real change in the status of many of your Indians.[96]

Another example of the close cooperation existing between the PEA and the Indian educational division of the Indian Service under Beatty is the following excerpt from Beatty's letter to Leo M. Favrot, general field agent of the General Education Board:

> At the recent meeting of the Executive Board of the Progressive Education Association held February 29, 1936, in Chicago, the appointment of a Commission of the Association on Indian Affairs, to cooperate with the Commissioners and Director of Education of the Federal Office of Indian Affairs, was approved. A request to the General Education Board for grants to be administered by this Commission on behalf of the Office of Indian Affairs [*sic*] was also approved.[97]

In his letter to Favrot, Beatty requested grant monies totaling $25,000. The first grant request was for $6,000 to cover the expenses of two in-service summer schools for the "improvement of teaching in the Indian Service." The second consisted of a request for $19,000 to be spent over a two-year period to pay for the employment and expenses of "two qualified specialists in textbook construction" in order to prepare texts oriented toward the Indians' way of life and distinctive Indian problems such as preparing Indians to understand the new tribal governments established under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934.[98]

As mentioned earlier, the close relationship between the Indian Service and the PEA originated during Ryan's tenure.[99] From the evidence he had gathered in preparing the education section of *The Meriam Report*, Ryan hypothesized that among the Indian communal organizations, especially among the Pueblo, he had found a utopian setting "for a new type of school of the progressive sort with which the whole community would be involved. . . . If there really is a new way in education," he continued, "certain Indian groups offer the best possible place to apply it."[100] Collier also promoted the use of progressive methods in Indian education; he attended and spoke at many of the PEA's annual conferences with regard to Indian education.[101] Perhaps Collier's affinity for progressive education was best expressed in his 1935 editorial in *Indians at Work* about the death of Ann Shumaker Lubin, former editor of *Progressive Education*:

> Mrs. Lubin was an interpreter and a pioneering thinker in progressive education. Progressive education is the deepest-reaching effort being prosecuted in the United States today toward the freeing of those mighty and redemptive powers, the birthrights of childhood and of adolescence, through which alone may a better human world be attained. And progressive education wars against the Philistine and strives to bring the realities of nature and of society into the school.[102]

Thus, when Willard Beatty assumed his office as director of Indian education and actively promoted close cooperation between the PEA and the Indian

Service he was following a tradition originally established by Ryan and given impetus by Collier.

CONCLUSION

Beatty viewed the early 1940s as a watershed to prove both the successes of his Indian education programs and the "correctness" of progressive-education theory. Unfortunately the war, with its drastic budget cuts, personnel losses due to war work, and the removal of the Indian Office headquarters from Washington to Chicago, hampered his educational program. Apart from the disorientation to Beatty's programs caused by the war effort, a concerted congressional attack on Collier's Indian New Deal began in 1943, further stigmatized all Indian Service operations, and ultimately forced Collier's resignation in 1945.[103] It is ironic that during the same period, the General Education Board, which had so generously financed Beatty's 1932 study and other progressive educational experimentation throughout the 1930s, frustrated, if not doomed, the efforts of the leadership of the PEA to save the progressive-education movement from waning into obscurity in the 1940s. In 1940 Beatty's faith in the tenets of progressive educational methodology was stronger than ever before.[104] Despite his busy schedule as director of Indian education, he still found time to commit himself to the cause of progressive education and served actively as treasurer of the PEA and chairman of its Commission on Indian Education in the early 1940s.[105]

Beatty had recognized early that the PEA was not "a panacea for all educational ills." Nonetheless, he saw it as a necessary association of educators devoted to a program of educational pioneering and predisposed to "break with tradition on behalf of new ideas which give promise of richer life and learning for children and youth."[106] Beatty believed that "theory and experimentation had reached a point by 1940 where they could be able to demonstrate the effectiveness and correctness of [progressive] ideas."[107] In 1941 Beatty and other leading members of the PEA took their cause to the General Education Board, the PEA's leading contributor until that time, but their action proved fruitless.[108] According to Beatty's son, Walcott, his father believed that "a politically motivated decision by the General Education Board, to fund other educational projects, robbed [the PEA] of this opportunity."[109] In *Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe*, Patricia A. Graham substantiates Beatty's contention. "The end in 1941," she notes, "of the large grants from such foundations as the Carnegie Corporation and the General Education Board forced the Association to curtail the activities of its commissions, at that time its most vital activity."[110] Although Beatty was at first disillusioned by what he considered to be the loss of the PEA's effectiveness to promote its ideas in American educational circles—the PEA was officially dissolved in 1955—he never surrendered his faith in progressive theory and experimentaion.[111] Throughout the remainder of his tenure as director of Indian education and, later, as deputy director of UNESCO's Fundamental Education Program from 1952 to 1953, he actively continued to experiment with the tenet of progressive educational theory.[112]

NOTES

1. Willard W. Beatty, *Education for Action* (Washington, DC: US Indian Service, 1944), 11. The present study is based principally on the writings of Willard W. Beatty; letters from Beatty's children; the oral and written reminiscences of Beatty's contemporaries; and materials from the National Archives (hereinafter cited as NA) and the John Collier Papers housed at Yale University. The personal papers of Willard Beatty were apparently destroyed after his death. This fact was confirmed to this author in a letter from Willard Beatty's daughter, Mrs. Duncan D. Dwight, dated 6 August 1979. It should be noted that Margaret Szasz offers a concise view of John Collier's and Willard W. Beatty's educational philosophy in ch. 4 of her fine book, *Education and the American Indians: The Road to Self-Determination since 1928* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1977). Donald Parman's important work, *The Navajo and the New Deal* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1976), contains an interesting chapter about the Collier-Beatty New Deal Indian educational administration on the Navajo Reservation. Finally, four of Willard Beatty's contemporaries, Hildegard Thompson, George Boyce, Madison Coombs, and Pedro T. Orata, provide significant insights into the everyday workings of Beatty's educational policy toward Native Americans in their respective works: Hildegard Thompson, *The Navajos' Long Walk for Education* (Tsaile, AZ: Navajo Community College Press, 1975); George Boyce, *When Navajos Had Too Many Sheep: 1940s* (San Francisco: The Indian Historian Press, 1974); Madison Coombs, *Doorway Toward the Light* (Washington, DC: US Department of the Interior, 1962); and Pedro T. Orata, *Fundamental Education in an Amerindian Community* (Lawrence, KS: Haskell Institute, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1953).

2. Letter from Walcott H. Beatty to author, 28 June 1979, 1.

3. Beatty, *Education for Action*, 11.

4. Ibid.

5. Colorado State Teachers College, Information Form, Record Group 75, 45839–808, Gen. Ser., pt. 2, NA (hereinafter cited as Colorado State, Information Form, RG 75, NA) and *Who's Who in American Education*, vol. 20 (Chicago: Marquis-Who's Who, 1961–62).

6. Beatty, *Education for Action*, 11–12

7. Ibid., 13.

8. Ibid., 12, 14.

9. *Who's Who in American Education*, 103; *Who Was Who in America, A Component Volume of Who's Who in American History*, vol. IV (Chicago: Marquis-Who's Who, 1961–68), 69.

10. Patricia A. Graham, *Progressive Education from Arcady to Academe* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967), 11. See also, Guy Montrose Whipple, ed., *The Twenty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, pt. 2 (Bloomington: Public School Publishing Company, 1925), 58–94.

11. Carleton W. Washburne and Sidney P. Marland Jr., *Winnetka: The History and Significance of an Educational Experiment* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall), 6, 19.

12. Whipple, *The Twenty-Fourth Yearbook*, 60.

13. Washburne and Marland, *Winnetka*, 7.

14. Frederic Burk, "Individual Instruction in the San Francisco State Teachers College," *Progressive Education* I (April 1924): 8.

15. Frederic Burk, "Individual Instruction vs. the Lock-Step System," *The American City* XVIII, no. 4 (April 1918): 327.

16. Burk, "Individual Instruction in the San Francisco State Teachers College," 8; Carleton Washburne, "The Inception of the Winnetka Technique," *Journal of the American Association of University Women* 20 (1930): 12.

17. Frederic Burk, *Lock-Step Schooling and a Remedy*, Monograph Series A (Sacramento, CA: State Printing Office, 1913), 12.

18. Frederic Burk, "The Desire to Know—Educational Dynamo," *Normal Instruction and Primary Plans* 34 (December 1924): 95.

19. Whipple, *The Twenty-Fourth Yearbook*, 60.

20. Ibid., 59.

21. Burk, "Individual Instruction in the San Francisco State Teachers College," 9.

22. Washburne and Marland, *Winnetka*, 153.

23. Burk, "Individual Instruction in the San Francisco State Teachers College," 9.

24. Boyce, *When Navajos Had Too Many Sheep*, 16.

25. Hildegard Thompson to author, "An Oral Reminiscence of Willard W. Beatty, Director of Indian Education: 1936–1952" (transcription completed on 25 April 1979).

26. Colorado State, Information Form, RG 75, NA.

27. Willard W. Beatty, "Training the Teacher for the New School," *Progressive Education* X, no. 5 (May 1933): 249.

28. Carleton Washburne, "The Winnetka System," *Progressive Education* I (April 1924): 12.

29. Washburne, "The Inception of the Winnetka Technique," 133.

30. Willard W. Beatty, "For the Social Education of Children," *Progressive Education* (February 1933): 79.

31. Carleton Washburne, "Winnetka," *School and Society* XXIX, no. 733 (January 1929): 45.

32. Beatty, "For the Social Education of Children," 79.

33. See Willard Beatty, "Sex Education in the Public Schools," *Public Health Nursing* 28 (June 1936): 276.

34. Willard W. Beatty, "Individual Instruction in the Winnetka Public Schools," *Schoolmen's Week*, University of Pennsylvania Bulletin 24, no. 38 (7 June 1924): 199–200.

35. Colorado State, Information Form, RG 75, NA.

36. Beatty, "Training the Teacher for the New School," 249.

37. Washburn and Marland, *Winnetka*, 153.

38. "Mr. Willard W. Beatty appointed Director of Indian Education" (reprinted from *The Bronxville Press*), *Indians at Work* III, no. 14 (1 March 1936): 7–8.

39. Colorado State, Information Form, RG 75, NA.

40. Willard W. Beatty, "Progressive Education in the Public Schools," *Progressive Education* IX, no. 7 (November 1932): 467; Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School* (New York: Vintage Books, 1961), 81.

41. Beatty, "Progressive Education in the Public Schools," 467.

42. Willard W. Beatty, "Statement," *Progressive Education* XI, no. 6 (October 1934): 326.

43. Willard W. Beatty, "Editorial," *Progressive Education* X, no. 6 (October 1933): 304.

44. Beatty, "Editorial" (October 1933). Beatty's philosophy was not, however, as

radical as that of George Counts, an avid proponent of social reconstruction through an "organized educational profession." Counts, an important voice in the Progressive Education Association, and other like-minded "social reconstructionists" founded *The Social Frontier* magazine in October 1934. Counts wrote the following of *The Social Frontier*'s philosophy in the first issue (George Counts, "Editorial," *The Social Frontier* I, no. 1 [October 1934]: 4–8):

> Already a few voices have been raised within the ranks of educational workers in acceptance of the challenge of social reconstruction. . . . To contribute to the achievement of this object, *The Social Frontier* is being launched. . . . *The Social Frontier* acknowledges allegiance to no narrow conception of education. Although recognizing the school as society's central educational agency, it refuses to limit itself to a consideration of the work of this institution. On the contrary, it includes within its field of interest all of those formative influences and agencies which serve to induct the individual, whether old or young, into the life and culture of the group. It regards education as an aspect of a culture in process of evolution. It therefore has no desire to promote a restricted and technical professionalism. Rather does it address itself to the task of considering the broad role of education in advancing the welfare and interests of the great masses of the people who do the work of society—those who labor on farms and ships and in the mines, shops, and factories of the world.

45. Beatty, "Editorial" (October 1933).

46. Willard W. Beatty, "Editorial," *Progressive Education* XII (February 1935): 71–73.

47. Beatty, "Editorial" (October 1933).

48. Graham, *Progressive Education*, 70.

49. Margaret Szasz, "Transcript of Interview between Szasz and Boyce" (26 May 1972), *American Indian Historical Research Project*, University of New Mexico, 23.

50. US Congress. Senate. *Survey of Conditions among the Indians of the United States, Partial*, 78th Cong., 2d Sess., 11 June 1943, S. Rep. 310, 22.

51. Szasz, *American Historical Research Project*, 279.

52. Beatty, "Progressive Education in the Public Schools," 467–72.

53. Ibid., 467.

54. Beatty, *Education for Action*, 8; Beatty, *Education for Cultural Change* (Chilocco, OK: Chilocco Indian Agricultural School, 1953), 18.

55. Beatty, "Progressive Education in the Public Schools," 468.

56. Beatty, *Education for Action*, 7–8.

57. Ibid., 330–31.

58. Ibid., 7.

59. John Collier, *From Every Zenith: A Memoir and Some Essays on Life and Thought* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Books, 1963), 196.

60. Thompson to author, "An Oral Reminiscence of Willard W. Beatty."

61. Beatty, *Education for Action*, 7–9

62. Ibid., 8.

63. Letter from Robert W. Young to author (4 June 1980), 2.

64. Beatty, *Education for Action*, 8. See also, *The Indian Service Secondary School*, report of conference held at Denver, CO (25–29 April 1938), 1–46, RG 75, 22810-1838-808, Gen. Ser., NA.

65. Beatty, *Education for Action*, 8.

66. Beatty, "For the Social Education of Children," 77.

67. Ibid., 76.

68. Beatty, *Education for Action*, 140.

69. John Dewey, *Experience and Education* (New York: Collier Books, 1973), 25.

70. Beatty, *Education for Action*, 140.

71. Willard W. Beatty, "Training Indians for the Best Use of Their Own Resources," in *The Changing Indian*, ed. Oliver La Farge (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1952), 128.

72. Beatty, *Education for Action*, 140.

73. *The Indian Service Secondary School*, 22.

74. Beatty, "Training the Teacher for the New School," 282.

75. Ibid., 248.

76. Young to author, 2.

77. On 21 February 1928, W. F. Willoughby, director of the Institute for Government Research, formally transmitted the report entitled *The Problem of Indian Administration*, called *The Meriam Report* after its director, Lewis Meriam, to Secretary of the Interior Hubert Work. The voluminous report covered some 847 pages of documentation about the findings and recommendations that ten specialists had compiled during an intense fifteen-month study. Seven months of fieldwork went into the study in tandem with eight months of skillful preparation. The meticulously detailed survey delved into the perplexing problems of general Indian policy, health, education, family and community life, economic conditions, the legal aspects of the Indian problem, the plight of migrated Indians, and even missionary activities. Its findings represent the most comprehensive survey ever undertaken in the administration of federal Indian policy. Throughout his administration Beatty sought to uphold the following two conclusions reached by Ryan in the education section of *The Meriam Report*: "(1) It is true in all education, but especially in the education of people situated as are the American Indians, that methods must be adopted to individual abilities, interests and needs, and (2) the Indian problem is essentially one of education and social welfare, rather than land, property, or business and principles that have been found to be successful in educational administration on a large scale should be applied to it." Lewis Meriam et al., *The Problem of Indian Administration* (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1971), 346, 424.

78. Orata, *Fundamental Education*, 17, 95. See also, Pedro T. Orata, *Democracy and Indian Education: Four Volumes*, vol. II (Kyle, SD: US Department of the Interior, 1938), ch. 1 (unpublished manuscript).

79. George Dale, *Education for Better Living* (Washington, DC: US Department of the Interior, 1955), 5.

80. Willard W. Beatty, "Indian Education in the United States," *Indians at Work* VIII, no. 8 (April 1940): 42–43. See also Willard W. Beatty, "Twenty Years of Indian Education," in *The Indian in Modern America*, ed. David A. Baerris (Madison: The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1956), 28–29; Lloyd E. Blauch, *Educational Services for Indians* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1939), 60–61; and Willard W. Beatty to Rena T. Carr (4 January 1939) RG 75, 1959-1939-806, Gen. Ser. Control Files, 1907–1939, NA, 1–2.

81. Beatty to Carr, 1–2.

82. Dale, *Education for Better Living*, 16–17.

83. Orata, *Democracy and Indian Education*, vol. IV, 7.

84. Ibid., 7–8.

85. Ibid., 621.

86. The Committee on Human Development of the University of Chicago and the US Office of Indian Affairs jointly sponsored this project.

87. Gordon Macgregor, *Warriors without Weapons: A Study of the Society and Personality Development of the Pine Ridge Sioux* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), 77.

88. Orata, *Democracy and Indian Education*, vol. I, 475–76.

89. Quoted in Ann Davis, "Lakotas Battle Honeywell over Munitions Testing Site," *Akwesasne Notes* 19, no. 5 (1981): 17.

90. John Collier, "New Policies in Indian Education," *The New Mexico Quarterly* 3 (November 1933): 204.

91. Graham, *Progressive Education* (App. A), 166–97.

92. Ibid., 141–43.

93. John Collier, memorandum to M. Burlew (18 February 1938), RG 75, 7146-1936-800, Gen. Ser., pt. 1, NA, 1–2.

94. Willard W. Beatty to Frederick Redefer (9 January 1939), RG 75, 7146-1936-800, Gen. Ser., pt. 2, NA.

95. C. R. Whitlock to Willard W. Beatty (18 January 1939), RG 75, 7146-1936-800, Gen. Ser., pt. 2, NA.

96. Willard W. Beatty to C. R. Whitlock (2 February 1939), RG 75, 7146-1936-800, Gen. Ser., pt. 2, NA.

97. Willard W. Beatty to Leo M. Favrot (16 March 1936), RG 75, 15839-1936-868, Gen. Ser., pt. 1, NA, 1.

98. Ibid., 1–2.

99. W. Carson Ryan Jr., "The Indian Education at the Annual Conference of the Progressive Education Association," *Indians at Work* (1 April 1935): 25.

100. W. Carson Ryan Jr. and Rose K. Brandt, "Indian Education Today," *Progressive Education* IX, no. 2 (February 1932): 83.

101. Ryan, "Indian Education at the Annual Conference of the Progressive Education Association," 25.

102. John Collier, "Editorial," *Indians at Work* (December 1935): 1.

103. Frederick J. Stefon, "The Irony of Termination: 1943–1958," *The Indian Historian* 11, no. 3 (Summer 1978): 4–5. See also Willard W. Beatty, "History of Navajo Education," *American Indigena* XXI, no. 1 (January 1961): 21–22.

104. Walcott H. Beatty to author, 2.

105. *Who Was Who in America*, vol. IV (1961–68), 69.

106. Beatty, "Statement," *Progressive Education* XI, no. 6 (October 1934): 326.

107. Walcott H. Beatty to author, 2.

108. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, 257.

109. Walcott H. Beatty to author, 2.

110. Graham, *Progressive Education*, 141.

111. Walcott H. Beatty to author, 2.

112. Willard W. Beatty to John Collier (10 August 1954), *The John Collier Papers*, 2–3.