INDIAN EDUCATION
A TEST FOR DEMOCRACY

THE HONORABLE PAUL J. FANNIN*

There are many conclusions that can be drawn, and in fact have been drawn, about Indian education. They range from the factual to the erroneous, from the sublime to the ridiculous, from the realistic to the idealistic. As one perceptive student of the subject once remarked, "there are more conclusions about what is right and wrong with Indian education than there are Indians." Perhaps he is right. But the mere fact that we concern ourselves with the problem, and that we are prepared to offer a considered hypothesis, is in itself encouraging — if for no other reason than it evidences a change in attitudes toward and concern for the American Indian and Indian education.

In the approximately 100 years since the federal government signed treaties with the separate tribes, our government's policies and attitudes toward Indians have run full circle. During the first part of this century our concern was simply one of containment. Then we entered a long phase of steady (if somewhat retarded) progress, the thrust of which was directed toward helping Indians adopt our ways and customs, at the considerable expense of their own.[1] Finally, to complete the cycle, a new and more enlightened era of concern has descended upon us. It is visible everywhere — in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), in the Congress, and in state legislatures. It is a concern for Indians not just as Indians, but as individuals with hopes, dreams, and aspirations, and as eager to contribute to our society as to learn from it.

When the change in attitude concerning Indian education began is as difficult to discern as it is to identify the catalyst. One thing that is clear, however, is that Indian tribal leaders played a big part in the renaissance, a major step being taken in 1965 when they started their successful drive to have Congress include Indian schools within the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).[2] Designed to encourage educational innovation, with the bulk of funds going to "poor" school districts, ESEA was expanded in 1967 to provide

---

* Senator from the State of Arizona, B.A. Stanford University, 1930. The author wishes to pay tribute to Felix S. Cohen, author of the HANDBOOK OF FEDERAL INDIAN LAW (1942), precursor to U.S. DEP'T OF THE INTERIOR, FEDERAL INDIAN LAW (1958). Mr. Cohen was perhaps the Indians' most forceful advocate for their rights of citizenship and enlightened self determination.

[1] See Kelly, *Indian Adjustment and the History of Indian Affairs*, p. 559 *supra* for a similar view.

[2] 20 U.S.C. § 241(a) (1964).

needed monies for those schools teaching one of America's most educationally disadvantaged minorities — the Indian.[3]

Also important were the efforts during the mid-sixties of Dr. Carl Marburger, then Assistant Commissioner for Education in the BIA, to establish the Bureau's educational system as an example of excellence for the Nation.

Dr. Marburger's efforts were hampered, however. He soon discovered he had no direct authority over the schools of the Bureau and that he was powerless to replace those in the system who he felt were inadequate or incompetent. Failing to achieve the necessary administrative changes, Dr. Marburger resigned after a year of effort that was, nevertheless, not without a positive effect on Indian education. For example, he was successful in selling tribal leaders and administrative personnel on the idea that Indian education should and indeed could become the pacesetter of educational programs for all disadvantaged youths. He also was successful in making *some* needed personnel changes, and in focusing the attention of the Bureau on itself. This introspection revealed, among other problems, such basic inadequacies as the lack of an adequate date base from which to project needs and to plan programs.

Congressional concern over Indian education resulted in a study of the feasibility of transferring the responsibility for the education of Indian children from the BIA to the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). This study,[4] conducted jointly by the BIA and HEW, showed that while the present Indian educational program is far from satisfactory, its transfer from the BIA to HEW would be administratively difficult and would deny the Bureau sufficient time to determine the effectiveness of its new educational program. While the study did not result in a change in authority over Indian education, it, together with the growing wave of complaints by tribal leaders and members over the quality of education provided their children, did result in an increased awareness in the Congress concerning inadequacies of past BIA educational policies.

In 1966, a Presidential Task Force was formed to study the status of Indian affairs and to make recommendations concerning education, economic development and other facets of the "Indian problem." Its findings were reported to the President in 1967, but the official report has never been released to the public. One member of the task force, Herb Striner of the Upjohn Research Institute, feeling that the informa-

[3] 20 U.S.C. § 241(c) (Supp. III, 1968).

[4] DEP'T OF THE INTERIOR, ORGANIZATIONAL LOCATION FOR QUALITY EDUCATION OF AMERICAN INDIANS (Interdepartmental Report 1967).

tion should be made available, published his own version,[5] which reportedly is, in essence, the results of the task force study. A major recommendation contained in Mr. Striner's summary is the transfer of the entire BIA operation to HEW, primarily because HEW is the agency concerned with related problems for the general public, and because HEW emphasizes human development while BIA's overseers, the Department of the Interior, deals mainly with land problems.

Because I felt that Indian education still lacked the prominent public forum necessary to provide the impetus needed for reform, I urged, in August 1967, the formation of a Special Subcommittee on Indian Education. Although the Senate has committees, subcommittees and special subcommittees to study almost every problem, none existed to study Indian education exclusively, one of the most specialized and least researched of all problems.[6]

The first hearings were held in Washington, D.C., December 14 and 15, 1967. They were designed to discuss in very broad terms the nature of Indian education and to identify problem areas to be considered in more detail during subsequent field hearings. While the special subcommittee has attempted to limit its study as much as possible to problems concerning classroom education, it has been necessary, in the interest of a thorough investigation, to consider federal-tribal relations, federal-state relations, and Indian health and economic conditions. Since we sought to give major emphasis to testimony from Indian witnesses, the field hearings became the heart of the special subcommittee's work, taking us to various Indian reservations and cities throughout the country.

The report of the special subcommittee, with accompanying recommendations, is expected to be published soon, but at the date of this writing it is incomplete. It can now be said, however, that many of the problems identified concerned difficulties with administration of programs, coordination between the federal departments, and with the general bureaucratic malaise which infects many federal agencies. These findings lead to the conclusion that considerable improvement could be accomplished in Indian education without new legislation if existing programs are closely examined and, where necessary, overhauled.

Two other major studies on Indian education are being conducted. One, headed by Dr. Robert Havighurst of the University of Chicago

[5] H. STRINER, TOWARD A FUNDAMENTAL PROGRAM FOR THE TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC EQUALITY OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN (1967).

[6] The subcommittee was chaired by the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy. Members included Senators Wayne Morse (Oregon), Ralph Yarborough (Texas), Harrison Williams (New Jersey), Peter Dominick (Colorado) and myself. Following the tragic death of Senator Kennedy, Senator Morse was appointed chairman and Senator Walter Mondale (Minnesota) was named to fill the vacancy.

and funded under a grant from the Office of Education, is concerned with gathering data, information and opinions about the status of Indian education nationally. The second study, headed by Dr. Clark Abt of Abt Associates in Boston and funded by the BIA, is concerned with a cost-effectiveness model for the Bureau and is looking into the organization and effectiveness of the BIA's educational program. As of this time no significant findings have been released by either study.

THE HISTORY OF FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT IN INDIAN EDUCATION

During colonial days, the Crown and the colonial governors sought only to regulate intercourse between their own subjects and the Indians. Little or no thought was given to the internal affairs of the tribes. And, except for a few missionary efforts such as a Jesuit school in Florida in the 1700's, there was little concern for Indian education.

Indian educational provisions were for the first time, included in a treaty negotiated with the Oneida, Tuscarora, and Stockridge Indians.[7] Thus began the practice, which persisted to the end of treaty making with Indians in 1871, of including educational provisions in treaties with various tribes.[8]

In 1802 Congress made the first general appropriation for Indian education; the amount, not to exceed $15,000 a year, was to promote "civilizing" the Indians.[9] Fifteen years later, President Monroe called for additional efforts to improve the Indians' lot,[10] prompting Congress to enact the provision which is still used for Indian educational appropriations.[11]

> The President may . . . employ capable persons of good moral character to instruct them [Indians] in the mode of agriculture suited to their situation; and for teaching their children in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and performing such other duties as may be enjoined according to such instructions and rules as the President may give and prescribe for the regulation of their conduct, in the discharge of their duties.[12]

President Monroe, anxious to implement this provision as effectively as possible, employed the help of missionary groups already involved in Indian education.[13]

But it was the Indians themselves who bore the brunt of the educational burden during the first half of the nineteenth century.

---

[7] Treaty of December 2, 1795, 7 Stat. 47, 48.
[8] *See* U.S. DEP'T OF THE INTERIOR, FEDERAL INDIAN LAW 270-71 (1958) [hereinafter cited as FEDERAL INDIAN LAW].
[9] Act of March 30, 1802, 2 Stat. 139, 143.
[10] FEDERAL INDIAN LAW, *supra* note 8, at 272.
[11] 25 U.S.C. § 271 (1964).
[12] *Id.*
[13] FEDERAL INDIAN LAW, *supra* note 8, at 273.

> A significant development in the history of Indian education was the establishment by a number of Indian tribes of their own schools. As early as 1805, the Choctaw chieftains maintained a school with annuity funds. In 1841 and 1842, before a number of states had provided for public schools, the Cherokee and Choctaw Nations had put into operation a common-school system.[14]

In the Southeast, the Cherokees established a successful educational system. It was destroyed when the tribe was forcibly relocated in Oklahoma (the infamous "Trail of Tears"), but it was rebuilt by the Cherokees and again prospered. As Knepler writes, in *The Chronicles of Oklahoma*:

> The history of the Cherokees from the time of first contact with the explorers and colonists from Europe until tribal dissolution in 1906 was featured by the unusual attitude of an Indian group involuntarily acculturating itself to occidental civilization. Although they resented the encroachments of the newcomers in America, the Cherokees realized, as did few other Indian tribes, that to fight them was futile. Instead, they began adopting the ways of the colonists in order to survive and prosper, regarding education essential in all walks of life.
>
> There were three important phases in formal Cherokee educational history. First, came the missionaries, at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. Encouraged by the Federal government and aided by the invention of a native alphabet by Sequoyah (a Cherokee), their emphasis was upon discouraging the perpetuation of the indigenous culture. Following the Cherokee exodus to the west in 1838-39, a unique self-maintained public school system was established, supplanting mission education in importance. This public school system continued the process of acculturation although not very successfully among the full-bloods. The United States began to assume control over educational affairs in 1898, preparatory to dissolving the government of the Cherokee Nation. Managing the schools jointly with the Cherokees, it effected a number of reforms in the public school which were finally absorbed into the public school system of Oklahoma.[15]

The Indians were not without help, however. George W. Manypenny, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, noted that total expenditures for education among the Indian tribes during the 10 year period ending January 1, 1855, was in excess of $2,150,000. Of this, over $400,000 had been paid by the Indians themselves, $830,000 furnished by private sources, $824,160 added from treaty funds and $102,107 paid directly by the United States.[16]

---

[14] *Id.*

[15] Knepler, *Education in the Cherokee Nation*, in XXI No. 4, THE CHRONICLES OF OKLAHOMA 378 (1943).

[16] FEDERAL INDIAN LAW, *supra* note 8, at 273.

After the Civil War the Federal Government assumed a more active role in Indian education. Off-reservation boarding schools increased to five by 1878, including the United States Training and Industrial School at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, which served Indians from all over the country. In 1882, Congress passed an act providing that abandoned military posts might be turned over to the Department of the Interior for use as schools, thereby adding further impetus to the boarding school movement.[17] Conditions at many of the early boarding schools were deplorable. Sanitation, diet and general living conditions were far below acceptable standards, even for that period. The program employed military procedure and was structured to accomplish the almost total assimilation of Indian children, many of whom were forcefully taken from their homes and sent to the schools.

Prompted by public opinion concerned with the plight of American Indians, the Merriam Report,[18] published in 1928, did much to change federal attitudes toward Indian affairs and had a beneficial effect on Indian educational policy. Together with the Report of the National Advisory Committee on Education in 1931,[19] the Merriam Report was responsible for the betterment of the boarding school system. It focused attention on the need for community day schools and vocational training, reduction of child labor at all schools, improvement in educational personnel through higher requirements and increased salaries. The report also emphasized the need for increased federal expenditures and pointed out the desirability for decentralizing control and placing it at the local and regional levels. Unfortunately, the recommendations contained in these reports have not been adequately acted upon by Congress.

Also important in the development of public school education on Indian reservations was the Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934.[20] Still in force today, the Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the states for the education of Indians in state schools. Then, as now, these funds, coupled with 20 *United States Code* sections 241(a),(c) (Supp. III, 1968) (Federally Impacted Area Aid) monies, provide the major financial support for education of reservation Indian children attending public schools.

CONTEMPORARY INDIAN EDUCATION

There is a dearth of reliable statistics on Indian education, but those that are available present a bleak picture. For example, 50 percent

[17] Act of July 31, 1882, 22 Stat. 181.
[18] BROOKINGS INST. FOR GOVERNMENT RESEARCH, THE PROBLEM OF INDIAN ADMINISTRATION (1928).
[19] SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, FEDERAL RELATIONS TO INDIANS (1931).
[20] 25 U.S.C. § 452 (1964).

of the 142,000 Indian children now in school will drop out before the 12th grade. Furthermore, in 1966 it was determined that at least 16,000 school age Indian children did not attend school at all.[21] Another study found that aggressive behavior, insecurity and personality problems are by-products of Indian boarding school educations.[22] Among the Navajos, America's largest tribe, an estimated 40,000 Indians are illiterate and cannot speak English.[23] The average educational level attained by all Indians under federal supervision is just 5 years.[24]

I do not offer these statistics to belittle the BIA or the many, many truly dedicated and able teachers and administrators within its ranks. The BIA cannot be blamed for all that is wrong with Indian education. The Bureau is limited by what the administration permits and the funds that Congress appropriates. From a historical perspective, it is evident that neither the various administrations nor the Congresses have been overly concerned with the problems of Indian education.

Let me cite one current example. The Phoenix Indian High School, one of the most highly regarded of its kind in the Nation, is limited to a per pupil expediture roughly equal to what it spent 10 years ago. Considering the increase in educational costs during the past decade, and how much less a dollar buys today than it did in 1958, it is reasonable to assume that no other school in the country is now spending at the same level it did 10 years ago. This deplorable condition exists not only with the Phoenix Indian School and not because the Indian school administrators do not recognize the need for substantially more funds, but rather because some of those who write and approve federal budgets put the interests of the Indian child at the bottom of the financial priorities list.

It can be seen that Indian education has not reached the level of excellence it should. Because one's education largely determines his success in every aspect of life, many Indians face hardships unknown to most other Americans. Consider these additional facts: nearly 40 percent of all Indians are unemployed; their housing is 90 percent substandard; their average lifespan is 42 years (compared with the national average of 62.3 years); their infant mortality rate is double the national average; one in five dies as a result of an infectious disease; and their incidence of tuberculosis is seven times the national average.[25] If these

[21] *Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare*, 90th Cong., 2nd Sess., pt. 1 at 9 (1967) (memo from Senator Fannin to the subcommittee) [hereinafter cited as *Hearings on Indian Education*].

[22] *Id.* at 19.

[23] Id. at 9.

[24] *Id.*

[25] *Hearings on Indian Education, supra* note 21, at 9. *See* BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, INDIAN RECORD, SPECIAL ISSUE — PRESIDENT JOHNSON PRESENTS INDIAN MESSAGE TO CONGRESS — THE FORGOTTEN AMERICAN 14 (1968).

statistics are not tragic enough, a somewhat overlooked fact is that the birth rate for American Indians is more than *double* the national average, indicating that the Indian's education, health, and economic problems are not going to improve without help. Even more frightening is that these statistics do not tell the complete story of the Indian's plight.[26]

The importance of these statistics is not that our President, the Congress or the BIA is at fault; what is important is that we recognize the statistics for what they demonstrate — as a nation we have not done nearly what we should for Indian education.

BASIC ISSUES

The hearings and field visits of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education have to date identified certain basic issues which must be resolved, including:

Termination Nothing causes greater concern among Indian leaders than the possibility of termination of federal jurisdiction over their reservations without their involvement and consent. This fear permeates all aspects of Indian affairs. At the outset even the formation of the special subcommittee was viewed, quite erroneously, by some Indian leaders as a step toward termination. The feeling was best articulated by Dr. Robert Roessel, noted authority on Indian education and director of the highly acclaimed Rough Rock Demonstration School on the Navajo Reservation. In testimony before the special subcommittee Roessel stated: "If you are looked upon as being a tool which leads toward termination, then your effectiveness, I feel, will be totally destroyed. It is important that this Committee recognize the pervasiveness of this fear on the part of Indians throughout the Nation and act to clarify the issue."[27] As I said, termination was not and is not the aim of the subcommittee.

Local Control In addition to a say in national policy, Indian people desire a voice in local decisions affecting the education of their children. This means Indian representation on local school boards having real control over personnel, curriculum and the activities of the schools. Dr. Roessel describes this principle in terms of "the right to be wrong":

> 'The right to be wrong and the right to be right' are essential American prerogatives-privileges of democracy. This freedom that comes with the right to be wrong or right gives our country its eminence. We have an opportunity to vote for the people

[26] For a more complete picture, see Taylor, *Indian Manpower Resources: The Experiences of Five Southwestern Reservations*, p. 579 *supra*.
[27] *Hearings on Indian Education*, *supra* note 21, at 20.

> we wish as leaders in government and you may disagree with our choice, but we have this chance and right, and this is the meaning of freedom.
> Yet I believe that this has not been a privilege that the Indians have enjoyed for very many years. The Indians have not been given the right to be wrong, but have been subjected to people of expertise who have made decisions for them.[28]

The point was most poignantly made by Sam Deloria of the Oglala Sioux tribe in testimony before the special subcommittee on April 16, 1968:

> "We are occasionally used as authenticators, never as originators."[29]

The right to be wrong is in fact a guiding principle of the experimental Rough Rock School on the Navajo Reservation. An all Indian school board sets educational policy, approves curriculum and seeks to involve the total community in the activities of the school. It also has authority over personnel and budgets. Several board members have little or no formal education, yet the board's record supports the notion that adult Indians can and should be entrusted with more of the responsibility for the education of their children. The design may well serve as a model for things to come.

These are some of the characteristics that distinguish the Rough Rock School:[30]

1. The Indian people are directly and actively involved in the operation of the school.

2. The school board meets with the chapter (local government unit) to discuss school affairs and holds regular school-community meetings to consider school matters and work out school-community projects and relations.

3. Parents from the community work in the dormitory on a rotating basis, living there for eight weeks and acting as foster parents and adult counselors to the boys and girls. Community elders visit the dormitories to tell stories and acquaint the youngsters with Navajo traditions, legends, and history.

4. Weekly school board meetings are held which are attended by large numbers of community residents.

5. The school maintains close contact with the home and community. Students are not only allowed but are encouraged to go home for weekend visits as often as possible. Transportation is provided in

[28] Address by Robert A. Roessel before the 8th Annual Indian Education Conference, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, March, 1967.
[29] *Hearings on Indian Education*, 91st Cong., 1st Sess., pt. 4, at 1231 (1968).
[30] Brochure, "Rough Rock Demonstration School," school staff (Jan. 1968).

those cases where children otherwise would not be able to go home. The basic policy of the school is that children belong to their parents and not the school.

6. A cultural identification program makes Navajo culture a significant and integral part of environment. At Rough Rock, students are exposed to important values and customs of both Navajo culture and the dominant society. Students are not forced to abandon one culture for another.

7. The school provides in-service training to staff members. Many Navajos who could not be employed at other schools, because of insufficient education or inability to speak English, have been hired in various capacities such as dormitory aides, janitors, dormitory parents, kitchen aides, maintenance helpers, arts and crafts trainees and instructors.

8. The school provides adult educational opportunities for community members.

Although the Rough Rock School is only in its third year of operation, the innovations it has brought to an otherwise inflexible system of education are capturing the attention of skeptics everywhere.

Self-Identity The system of administration and education inflicted upon Indian people for the past 100 years has been actively oriented toward their assimilation into the "mainstream" of American society as rapidly as possible. These policies, which usually disregarded Indian values and philosophy, have only increased the Indians' resistance to assimilation and destroyed his feeling of self-worth. It also has led to increased fears and suspicions by Indians of the many non-Indians working with and for them.

Indian boarding schools have been severely criticized in this regard. In fact, if there is one aspect of Indian education that has come under fire from all sides, it would have to be the boarding school program. These schools are accused of being impersonal, indifferent to the needs of Indian children and ineffective as centers of learning. That conclusion, it seems to me, is more sentimental than logical. I do not mean that boarding schools are fine or that they cannot be improved. Many are not fine and must be improved. A few are deplorable. They need more curriculum specialists, modern learning aids, updated vocational training programs, better facilities and greatly expanded guidance and psychological services. But, it should be emphasized that these are largely financial determinations rather than structural ones. The reason boarding schools generally are not well equipped is not because their administrators and teachers have not requested the requisite funds.

The other criticism misdirected at boarding schools is that they remove children from their mothers at too early an age.[31] I doubt that anyone would deny that the ideal situation, for both Indians and non-Indians, is to have neighborhood schools within walking distance of home. But the ideal at this point in time is impractical. In the unlikely event that Congress would appropriate many millions of dollars for Indian school construction, the problem still would not be solved. Without community centers and adequate road systems, many Indian youngsters still would be too far removed from schools to go there and return home each day. Consequently, the present choice for many reservation children is a boarding school education or none at all.

Many of the boarding school system's loudest critics send their own children off to prestigeous boarding schools to be educated, tending to confirm my opinion that the problem is not boarding schools, per se, but rather boarding schools that are not what they should be. The answer is to replace criticism of the BIA schools with genuine efforts to improve them, and one of the places to begin is with larger appropriations.

If it appears I am leading the defense of the boarding schools let me assure you I am not. I have criticized many of their practices in the past and will continue to do so until improvements are made. That they can be greatly improved is a well-known fact. One step I have suggested is that the BIA stop using boarding schools as dumping grounds for children it thinks should be removed from their home environments for reasons unrelated to education.[32] The schools simply cannot serve both as centers of learning and rehabilitation. The point is, that to really improve the situation, we must begin by being realistic about the purposes and limitations of boarding school programs.

THE FUTURE — SOME RECOMMENDATIONS

No attempt to improve the educational system will succeed unless it evolves from the realization that above all else, the American Indian wants to be an Indian and that he feels his identity is being threatened — both as an individual and collectively as a tribal group. The Indian is

[31] The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make and enforce regulations necessary to secure regular attendance of Indian children at Indian or public schools. 25 U.S.C. § 282 (1964). There exist no regulations requiring attendance at boarding schools, but 25 C.F.R. § 31.1 (1968) makes "available" Bureau operated boarding schools to children of one-fourth or more degree of Indian blood living within the reservations where no other appropriate schools are available or when they are from broken or unsuitable homes. Since 25 C.F.R. § 33.3 (1968) requires attendance in accordance with state school laws, attendance at boarding schools for school age children is mandatory if, as is usually the case, no other school is available.

[32] *See* 25 C.F.R. § 31.1 (1968) which makes "available" Bureau boarding schools for those children from broken or unsuitable homes, and 25 C.F.R. § 33.3 (1968) which makes state attendance laws applicable to Indian children.

emotionally attached to his land, and he constantly fears its loss through forced termination. To a very large extent, he sees outside forces as threatening his identity, his pride and his right of citizenship.

We must allow Indian citizens the same measure of control over the governmental functions on their reservations that other citizens enjoy in their local governments. Unfortunately, the relatively recent establishment of Indian school boards at most BIA schools is more symbolic than real — particularly since the boards do not really govern the schools. The present Civil Service System — which regulates personnel in Bureau schools — and the Federal budget process — which is far removed from the local school's influence — make it impossible for Indian school boards to exercise the necessary degree of control. This must be changed.

The recent though rare instance of turning Bureau schools over to the local community on a contract basis, as was done at Rough Rock, offers some hope to the tribes. This is one way in which the BIA *can* initiate improvement since, as of today, the decision to involve the community in the process is the BIA's, and all too often that agency has simply lacked the courage to permit the Indian people to run their own schools. When the BIA sees fit to employ the Rough Rock method on other reservations, as it ultimately must, the program, to be fully effective, must include the following:

1. The transfer must include the funds and staff required not only to teach the children, but also to provide training for the teachers and administrative personnel, the Indian school board members and the community itself.

2. The curriculum of schools serving Indian children must be relevant to them and their communities. It must honor, not degrade, their cultural heritage, while providing an understanding of contemporary Indian life in a dominant Anglo society.

3. Vocational training programs, perhaps the single weakest link in the BIA educational system, must be completely updated — both materially and philosophically. Every effort must be made to use only the latest techniques and equipment. It does more harm than good to train students on outdated machinery for jobs that existed two or more decades ago. They must be prepared for jobs that exist now and that will exist in the years ahead.

Another weakness of the vocational training programs which must be corrected is that they prepare students for jobs available only off the reservation. Vocational training at the junior high school and high school levels should be directed, at least partially, towards jobs on the reservation which are now filled by non-Indians — for example, barbers,

store managers, mechanics, secretaries, etc. Additionally, training programs could be geared more toward opportunities available in tribal government. One of the real problems with our entire Indian program is that Bureau policies and practices have actually encouraged Indian leaders to leave their communities instead of staying to work among their people.

4. The BIA's educational program must upgrade the role of school principal. He must become less a manager of buildings and budgets, and more a force for instructional leadership and educational innovation. Additional funds for outside consultant services will have to be provided, as will funds for more professionals on the various staffs. These experts should be placed at the middle-management level and should be available to assist the local communities in improving their educational programs. Studies have indicated that too many middle-management personnel in the present system are out of touch with such recent developments as educational programming and systems design. As a result, far too much of their time is spent defending the status quo.

5. A concerted effort must be made to attract bright, young Indian people to careers in teaching and school administration. The developing career-ladder approach of training teacher aids and other para-professionals can help to bring this about. This approach is predicated upon the availability of first-rate training for para-professionals, continued support and training on an in-service basis and the opportunity to work with enthusiastic, well trained teachers.

These changes would require a level of financial support well above that provided typical suburban school systems serving largely middle-class Anglo children. Yet, realizing that the cost of a quality program, in the long run, is far less than the cost of maintaining people on welfare or the roles of the unemployed, we must provide that support. Congress and the American people must be willing to accept this challenge; at the same time, administrators involved in Indian education must be willing and able to provide skillful planning and to eliminate waste and inefficiency in the system.

I am convinced that there exists in our Indian population as proportionate a number of dedicated teachers, potential professional educators, lawyers, doctors and others as we find in the general population. It is our responsibility and our obligation to develop that potential.

A basic principle of democracy is the involvement of people in government. To the degree we actively involve the American Indian in the determination of his own destiny, we will realize the full value of his participation in American society — participation as a productive, enlightened citizen. In this sense, Indian education is a test case for democracy.