

power yields a rich and suggestive analysis of the role of education in the lives of women.

Kate Rousmaniere  
Miami University (Ohio)

Donal F. Lindsey, *Indians at Hampton Institute, 1877–1923*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995 (Blacks in the New World series; August Meier and John H. Bracey, eds.). Pp. xvii, 305. US\$43.95, cloth.

Along with Carlisle Indian School, Hampton Institute is among the best-known residential schools for Native Americans. Both were founded and run in their early years by dominant personalities of military background: Captain Richard Henry Pratt at Carlisle, and General Samuel Chapman Armstrong at Hampton. Both attracted a great deal of attention, and both schools, not to mention their forceful leaders, influenced public debate and policy. Hampton, however, offered residential education to a small number of Native Americans and a larger number of African-American young. It is the implications and consequences of that uniqueness that Donal Lindsey probed in a doctoral dissertation for Kent State University and now in his monograph *Indians at Hampton Institute*.

In 1877 Hampton saw the arrival of a number of the Native prisoners under Captain Pratt's supervision. Over the next half-century approximately 1,300 (Lindsey's totals vary: 1,388 on p. 197; 1,230 on p. 213) young Native Americans were accommodated, with 158 of them seeing their education through to graduation. The primary recruiting ground was the western territories, although a significant number were drawn from eastern locations as time went on and western Indian opposition to Hampton increased because of distance and the familiar residential school syndrome of morbidity and mortality. The school's high-water period was the 1880s, when its reputation and influence swelled, and when it also attracted a remarkable cadre of instructors and supervisors, including Booker T. Washington in 1880–81. Hampton declined rapidly in the twentieth century, the victim of a combination of factors that included the availability of Native schools in the west and hardening racial attitudes throughout the United States. Hampton, which had always been suspect in the eyes of some southerners because of its mixing of races, became vulnerable to widening intolerance in an era of spreading Jim Crow laws and attitudes.

*Indians at Hampton Institute's* many strengths include a persuasive description and analyses of how Hampton worked, and of what makes the

Institute a special case for students of the history of Native education. Well-grounded in research in primary and secondary sources, *Indians at Hampton Institute* explains how Gen. Armstrong provided a distinctive pedagogical system that sought to use the perceived complementary strengths of black and Indian students to combat what Armstrong and his followers thought were their respective weaknesses. At Hampton, to a degree not understood until Lindsey's analysis became available, there was a systematic effort to combine—not integrate precisely, but intermix—the instruction and other activities of Native Americans and African Americans. The theory underlying this approach was that mixing would spark emulation and thus good results. Moreover, the Native American would learn the non-Native American ways from the black students, whose lengthy period of slavery had acculturated them to those manners, while African-American students would absorb something—not too much, naturally—of the pride and stoicism of the Native American. Although these pedagogical and racial assumptions produced some interesting experiments at Hampton, there is little evidence in Lindsey's account that they were any more successful in an instructional sense than were the methods of other custodial institutions for Native American and other minority students.

It is mildly disappointing that this analysis, fine-grained and persuasive as it is, keeps the reader's gaze fixed firmly on instructors and policy makers rather than on the instructed and their families and communities. The author intends his work to "consider the Indian program at Hampton Institute in full context, extensively comparing the two sides of the equation as a major means of analysis" (p. xii). Unfortunately, "full context" in this account means the framework of attitudes and policies concerning the education of both African- and Native Americans. This "full context" does not embrace another duality: the impact on and response of the students themselves. It is revealing that Chapter 6, on "Friction and Fraternity on a Biracial Campus," the one that attempts to deal most directly with the student experience, is the shortest of the work's substantive chapters. The author is much more interested in how policy is applied by Caucasian Americans than in those policies' impact on minorities. Thus, for example, the reader finds a substantial examination (pp. 36–38) of the question whether Pratt or Armstrong more deserves the "credit" for inventing the "outing system" of outdoor work, but no serious consideration of what that system meant for the young people who left the institution to work for non-Native employers. Similarly, Lindsey treats the reader to lengthy coverage (pp. 220–32) of the 1887 Childs investigation into charges of mistreatment of students at Hampton, in which the reader learns quite a bit about *allegations* of poor care and health conditions at Hampton though the work provides comparatively little analysis of the *reality* of these problems.

Other minor shortcomings are diction and inconsistency. Dr. Lindsey has difficulty distinguishing the use of "effect" and "affect" (pp. 161, 201, and 225) and uses "mitigated" when he means to say "militated" against (p. 162). The author is also occasionally inconsistent. The varying totals of enrolment of Native American youths have already been noted. Another example is the name of the dormitory for female Native students: it is "Winona Lodge" on pages 43, 131, and 198, but "Winona Hall" on page 166 and in the illustration. (The absence of "Winona Lodge/Hall," "Wigwam" [the males' dormitory], or even "dormitories" from the index makes it impossible to resolve the question of proper appellation.) The prose in the first half of the book, though correct and sound, is somewhat wooden. Although, happily, it loosens up in the second half, on a few occasions (e.g. "[Evelyn] Two Guns gave Andrus both barrels," p. 206) the result is less than happy.

All in all, Donal Lindsey's *Indians at Hampton Institute* is a solid and competent analysis of one aspect of Native American education within the policy theme. It might seem ungrateful to criticize it for not going beyond the consideration of policy assumptions and preoccupations of its predominantly white-skinned promoters and staff to provide us with an account of how the students on the ground experienced and reacted to those policies. However, given the methodological and historiographical advances of the past quarter-century, in the 1990s analysis "in full context" should mean more than an examination, however well executed it might be, of all the policy makers, their policies, and their times.

J. R. Miller  
University of Saskatchewan

Graham Boardman et al. *Sydney Teachers College: A History 1906-1981*. Sydney: Hale & Iremonger, 1995. Pp. 253.

One of the fallow areas in the history of Australian education is teacher education. We have a slight and clumsy general history of the subject, and an inward-looking history of a Melbourne college, but these add up to a lack of a solid engagement in this area of study. The states' general neglect of teacher education, compounded by the state education departments' direct control over elementary teacher education, may help to explain this absence of sustained historical work—but also suggests why that work is so needful.

Before 1970 the states were at once the suppliers, recruiters, "trainers," and employers of the majority of teachers. Historians have awaited impatiently a systematic history of Sydney Teachers College, "the brightest and best"