Historical Studies in Education / Revue d'histoire de l'éducation
ARTICLES / ARTICLES

Charles T. Loram's Decade in North America: From Black South Africans to Indigenous North Americans

Richard Glotzer
University of Akron

ABSTRACT
Early in the twentieth century, Charles Templeman Loram (1879–1940) fashioned a transnational career focussed on the education and control of colonized peoples. Starting with the education of Black South Africans, Loram took inspiration from the American model of "Negro industrial education," formulated by Booker T. Washington. Loram's authorship of *The Education of the South African Native* (1917) led to his appointment to the Native Affairs Commission in 1921. His liberal views (by South African standards) led to his eventual career derailment in 1929. Assisted by American philanthropic interests, an appointment at Yale University as the Sterling Professor of Education and chair of a new Department of Race Relations and Culture Contacts led to his emigration to the United States in 1931. There, Loram became involved with North American Indigenous peoples. Supported by philanthropic leaders and John Collier, head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Loram was able to expand this work, retaining his former interests and travelling extensively in the colonized world. Loram took students to reservations and lectured and organized seminars and conferences on the Indigenous peoples of North America. The landmark North American Indian Today conference, held in Toronto in 1939, was the culmination of his activities involving Indigenous peoples. This article explores how Loram's North America-based experiences influenced his view of Indigenous peoples. In an apparent contradiction, he rejected the view that there were innate racial differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples, yet he continued to support racial segregation in education. For Loram, the disintegration of Indigenous cultures was inevitable, and full assimilation into "civilized" society an eventuality. Interspersed through this article are descriptions of Loram's use of networking, illustrating his strategy for penetrating recently corporatized foundation structures and gaining access to sponsors, resources, and opportunities.

RÉSUMÉ
Au début du 20e siècle, Charles Templeman Loram (1879–1940) a façonné une carrière transnationale axée sur l'éducation et le contrôle des peuples colonisés. En commençant par l'éducation des noirs de l'Afrique du Sud, Loram s'est inspiré du modèle américain de « l'éducation industrielle noire », formulé par Booker T. Washington. Loram a rédigé *The Education of the*

https://doi.org/10.32316/hse-rhe.2024.5247

South African Native (1917), ce qui conduit à sa nomination à la Commission des affaires autochtones de l'Afrique du Sud en 1921. Ses opinions libérales (selon les normes sud-africaines) ont conduit à son déraillement de carrière en 1929. Aidé par des intérêts philanthropiques américains, une nomination à l'Université Yale en tant que « Sterling Professor of Education » et directeur d'un nouveau département de Relations raciales et des contacts culturels a conduit à son émigration aux États-Unis en 1931. Là, Loram s'est impliqué auprès des peuples autochtones nord-américains. Soutenu par des leaders philanthropiques et John Collier, chef du Bureau des affaires indiennes, Loram a été en mesure d'étendre ce travail, en conservant ses intérêts antérieurs et en voyageant beaucoup dans le monde colonisé. Loram a emmené les étudiants dans des réserves et a donné des conférences et organisé des séminaires et des conférences sur les Autochtones. La conférence historique North American Indian Today, qui s'est tenue à Toronto en 1939, a été l'aboutissement de ses activités auxquelles participaient les peuples autochtones. Cet article explore comment les expériences de Loram en Amérique du Nord ont influencé sa vision des peuples autochtones. Dans une contradiction apparente, il a rejeté l'opinion selon laquelle il existe des différences raciales innées entre les peuples autochtones et non autochtones, mais il a continué d'appuyer la ségrégation raciale dans l'éducation. Pour Loram, la désintégration des cultures autochtones était inévitable et l'assimilation complète dans une société « civilisée » une éventualité. Entrecoupées dans cet article sont des descriptions de l'utilisation du réseautage par Loram, illustrant sa stratégie pour pénétrer les structures de fondation récemment corporatisées et d'accéder aux commanditaires, aux ressources et aux opportunités.

Introduction

Charles Templeman Loram's career (1879–1940) reflects the ways in which the education of Indigenous peoples by colonial administrations developed from nineteenth-century missionary work into an international effort led by governments, philanthropic foundations, social scientists, and educators in the early and mid-twentieth century. His own transnational education encompassed the University of the Cape of Good Hope (BA, 1901); King's College, University of Cambridge (BA and LLB, 1905; MA, 1908); and Teachers College, Columbia University (PhD, 1917).

Loram is important for historians of education in South Africa and internationally for several reasons. Initially appointed an inspector of schools in Natal Province in 1906, Loram's career advancement drew on his development of a national model of South African "Native education," influenced by his exploration of "Negro industrial education" in the American South. His Teachers College doctoral dissertation, "The Education of the South African Native," which was premised on racial segregation, was published as a book in 1917 and quickly became part of the international canon of Indigenous educational theory. His involvement with American foundations nurtured a professional network that advanced his career in South Africa, the dominions of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and in the United States. An appointment to Yale University in 1931 and a substantial foundation grant enabled his explorations of indigeneity to encompass transnational colonialism.[1] My focus here is on a single project, Loram's work with Indigenous North Americans.

This essay is the first exploration of Loram's involvement with Indigenous peoples during the years from 1933 to 1940—an unlikely endeavour for a Zulu-speaking South African expert with no training or experience with Indigenous North Americans. Part of his success rested in the shared, if unarticulated, belief among

his compatriots that Indigenous peoples were all quite similar. Influential colleagues enabled this undefined interest, without structure or goals, to flourish. Flummoxed by the choices in habitation, cultural expression, and vocation offered to Indigenous peoples under the Roosevelt administration's "Indian New Deal," Loram retained an authoritarian perspective. Using the available records, I examine Loram's involvement with Indigenous peoples and identify how he applied his prior experiences to this new endeavour. Coinciding with the Roosevelt administration's departure from harsh assimilationist policies, Loram's many contacts allowed him to attach himself to the "Indian New Deal."

In this essay, I argue that Loram's North American career was energized by his ever-expanding professional network, accruing *bonae fidei quae sunt dubiae veritatis* based on travel, observations of Indigenous peoples, graduate fieldwork courses, and high profile conferences advancing transnational Indigenous education.[2] The distinction between *familiarity* and *expertise* rests in Loram's interpretive lens. Understanding indigeneity was ancillary to the process of recasting cultures through Western education, Western concepts of family and work, and reworking cultural institutions. Loram's perspective on "native education" relied on positivist social science, offering that observation, data collection, and analysis led to best practices and long-term strategies. For Loram, widely disparate Indigenous populations were roughly equivalent, although he recognized their unique circumstantial "deficiencies." The significance of Loram's educational perspective lay in its endorsement of racial segregation; recognition of "Native" intellectual capacities, aspirations, and cultural influences; crafting of curricula and the educational process for subservience; and advocating for the recruitment of collaborators in structuring the educational apparatus.

Considering African Education

By 1914, when Loram received a bursary to support study in North America, the recommendations of several exclusive bodies had become interwoven into national policies, informing the policies and practices he observed in the United States. The conferences on "The Negro Question" held at Lake Mohonk, New York, in 1890 and 1891, endorsed Booker T. Washington's vocational Industrial Education Model for Black people. This endorsement was soon grounded in the "separate but equal" doctrine that prevailed in the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896.[3] The Lake Mohonk conferences on Indigenous Americans, held from 1883 to 1916, advocated the dismantling of the tribal system and its reservations through a vigorous policy of assimilative education and socio-economic practices.

When Loram returned to South Africa from his American sabbatical in 1916, he was promoted to Natal's chief inspector of native schools, a position he held from 1917 to 1921. He shifted the focus of the curriculum from a rudimentary version of "white education" to what was termed "adaptive education."[4] Instead of academic subjects, practical subjects with vocational applications, modelled after the Black American industrial schools he had observed, would be taught. Advanced subjects were restricted and providing a thorough academic education was left to a few

well-established mission schools. Simultaneously Loram sought to professionalize teaching among Black Africans through small salary adjustments, summer teacher's workshops, and continuing Natal's *Native Teachers Journal*. By encouraging Black African teachers to "invest" in the system, Loram thought they would be drawn to the lower ranks of its structure.

In his doctoral dissertation, Loram sought to make a scientific, data-centred argument that supported a three-tiered system of South African education: primary, secondary, and tertiary.[5] In prefacing why Black South Africans needed an education — still an open question among many white South Africans — he argued that repression and equality were unpalatable alternatives for white society compared to constructive segregation.[6] In Loram's view, segregated education eliminated racial competition, kept an individual's aspirations within his or her own group, and enabled Black South Africans in their respective systems to build their own subordinate social structures.

Encouraging a comprehensive view of education, Loram argued that the education of Black South Africans, and South African education in general, was behind the times. Record-keeping was inadequate, and the introduction of modern tests and measurements lagged behind those used in other national systems. Educational systems needed quantitative data to help sort out effective fiscal, administrative, and pedagogical policies. Policy, administration, and finance for the education of Black students would best be done by the Union of South Africa's Department of Native Affairs, with the provinces offering direct supervision.

Emphasizing practical agriculture in the lower forms (standards I–IV), each year's syllabus assumed that this would be the last year of a student's formal education, reflecting the huge attrition rate. Basic literacy and numeracy in the lower forms, along with natural science-based causation, involved learning a simple spoken and written vocabulary of English or "Dutch" (Afrikaans) augmented by the provision of a simple dictionary. Agriculturalists would thus be equipped to run small farms (in reserves) as well as interact with both Afrikaans- and English-speaking white people as farm workers. "Education for life" was the core concept of primary education and a euphemism for manual labour.

Recommendations for secondary and tertiary education proved more controversial.[7] Secondary level qualifications led Black students to positions as clerks, schoolteachers, artisans, assistants of various types, and small business owners. The few seeking tertiary qualifications could do so through correspondence courses, overseas, or at a new institution, the South African Native College (SANC), founded in 1916. In the reserves established for Black South Africans by the Natives Land Act of 1913, compliant chiefs, headmen, and other tribal leaders were able to govern, albeit under the supervision of the Department of Native Affairs. Those few with "book education" would be integrated into those ranks. Pre-medical students could meet requirements at SANC but had to qualify for medical training in the United Kingdom or United States.[8]

Despite his insistence on segregation, Loram came down on the nurture side of the nature versus nurture debate. He believed that environment, culture, and level of

development, accounted for differences — and shaped the response to "difference." In 1918, Loram was elected president of Section E, Anthropology and Native Matters, of the South African Association for the Advancement of Science. In his 1921 presidential address, delivered shortly after his appointment to the Union government's Native Affairs Commission (NAC), he offered: "The machinery for dealing with the Native question has become obsolete and ineffectual, and for too many years the very real difficulties of the position have caused us to do little or nothing, as if leaving the problem alone would make it any easier."[9] Loram naively assumed that his appointment by Prime Minister Jan Smuts, the Liberal Party leader prominent in empire politics, signalled a call to action on behalf of Black South Africans. While a strongly internationalist supporter of settler democracy, Smuts shared the conservative views of other political parties on Black South African development and rights.

The NAC was housed in Cape Town, South Africa's legislative capital, and reported to the Department of Native Affairs, while co-operating with other agencies and Parliament. As chair of the NAC, Loram was drawn into inquiries requiring interpersonal skills and tact. Many NAC endeavours were field-based. Frequent travel, occasionally arduous, set the stage for fact-finding in many settings. Throughout the 1920s, the NAC reported on everything from insurrection, separatist churches, vaccinations, livestock care, and boundary disputes, to urban alcohol use and health care for Black South Africans. The NAC's many internal disputes were baked in by the clever selection of incompatible personnel.[10] Neither Smuts nor J. B. M. Hertzog, the National Party leader who followed him as prime minister, intended to advance the rights of Black South Africans. Both hoped the NAC's work would divert Black South Africans from pursuing their rights.

A second appointment followed Loram's move to the NAC. Smuts named him the Union government's representative to the American Phelps Stokes Fund's Survey of African Education in 1921.[11] A second survey followed in 1923. Britain, like other colonial powers, faced League of Nations pressure to provide education for the peoples it held "in trust," so that at some distant point, they might govern their own affairs.[12] Simple adaptive education was recommended as the mode to follow for most Black Africans; industrial education was introduced to Black Africans more familiar with European ways. Jeanes teachers — special teachers equipped with demonstration equipment, a concept borrowed from the American South — would later be added. The two reports on the surveys were written by the Phelps Stokes Fund's education director, Thomas Jessie Jones.[13] Having worked in many settings, including the Federal Census Bureau, Jones had amassed a wealth of professional connections which he shared with Loram.[14]

Involvement with the Phelps Stokes Fund and Jones certainly raised Loram's status. However, no association proved as important as his earlier ties to New York's Carnegie Corporation, founded in 1911. The Carnegie Corporation's Dominions and Colonies Fund symbolized Scottish Andrew Carnegie's affection for the British Empire. In the early interwar period, the Carnegie Corporation's president, Frederick Paul Keppel, the former dean of Columbia's undergraduate college, and James Earl Russell, Keppel's special assistant and the former dean of Teachers College, sought

out projects in the British Empire's dominions.[15] Identifying outstanding dominion post-graduate students, most of whom were well-connected mid-career educators and administrators, proved a successful point of entry for them into the dominion educational and governmental establishments.

In the late 1920s, Loram emerged as an official advisor to Keppel on South Africa. He would maintain this gate-keeping function even after his eventual emigration to the United States in 1931. His support for a study of poor whites in the South African Union, proposed by his countryman E. G. Malherbe (another Teachers College PhD) to Keppel in 1927, proved momentous for South Africa because of the impacts it had on economic policies aimed at bolstering the well-being of poor white South Africans at the expense of Black South Africans.[16] When Russell and Keppel visited South Africa in 1927, and the Phelps Stokes Fund trustee, Anson Phelps Stokes II, in 1932, Loram helped arrange their itineraries.[17]

Loram's activities outside of the NAC became increasingly out of step with South African government policies. Bookending his liberal activities across the 1920s were his participation with Jones and J. A. K. Aggrey in the Joint Council Movement in 1921 and his establishment of the South African Institute for Race Relations in 1929. The Joint Council Movement consisted of locally based interracial "joint councils" that were formed for the discussion of contentious issues. The South African Institute for Race Relations sought to offer ideologically neutral, data-based research. Neither had government input, and both were funded by American philanthropies, the Phelps Stokes Fund and the Carnegie Corporation respectively. While the South African Union government focussed on expanding white control and eliminating the direct franchise for Black peoples, Loram argued for the devolution of authority to Black Africans in local school and administrative councils.[18] The politics of the governing party under which he served did not deter Loram from addressing in the press what he considered policy errors and false parsimony. As a civil servant, he eventually raised the government's ire, outliving his usefulness.

When Natal Education Department's superintendent of education announced his retirement in 1929, Loram was named his successor, dashing his hopes for a third five-year leave of absence. Unsupported, he was manoeuvred off the NAC and he reluctantly returned to Natal. He regarded the move as near catastrophic, severely compromising his national stature in race relations.

Transition to North America

During the 1920s, Loram had taught summer school at Teachers College several times. On his 1929 visit, Loram's Cambridge classmate, Charles Seymour, now a Yale professor and the university provost, suggested sounding out Anson Phelps Stokes II, secretary of Yale from 1899 to 1921, and by 1929 a Yale trustee, about an appointment. An offer came from Yale's president, James Rowland Angell, and a grateful Loram accepted for the fall of 1931. He was named Sterling Professor of Education and chair of a new interdisciplinary Department of Race Relations and Culture Contacts housed in the Faculty of Education.

A Latinist, as was the entire Loram family, and an inveterate reader, Charles Loram fit in well at Yale and was soon voted into one of its faculty clubs.[19] At 6'2", Loram was imposing; he was also gregarious and moved comfortably among many types of people. He had what sociologist C. Wright Mills would later term a "marketable personality," ideal for the interpersonal method he used to pursue his professional interests.[20]

The Yale appointment coincided with a $15,000 Carnegie Corporation grant (approximately $304,391 in 2024 dollars) for a proposal "Research and Training in the Introduction of Western Civilization to Non-Western Peoples, 1931–1939." Over the decade, Loram used his grant to fund a series of conference-seminars, that is, on training more than research. He stretched this grant by securing sponsoring partners for these events. Being able to set his own agenda had a downside. By never fully engaging with his new colleagues at Yale, aside from teaching and administrative work, he no doubt missed out on possible research collaborations. Although Loram wrote many papers — mostly unpublished — he gravitated toward administrative and instructional activities.

Loram's first semester at Yale benefitted from team-teaching and guest lecturers, as he became acclimatized to his new setting. In a 1932 circular letter to friends, he offered that he had team taught comparative education, colonial administration, and a seminar in education for undergraduates. His co-teachers included Edward Sapir and G. P. Murdock.[21] His other course was in anthropology, "The Introduction of Western Civilization to Non-western Peoples."[22] That summer, Loram motored *com omni familia* to the University of Colorado at Boulder. Away from Yale, he taught social anthropology, several education courses, and gave the university's commencement address. Latin proved useful in Colorado. A friendship with Milo G. Derham, professor of classics and dean of summer sessions, led to summer teaching appointments in 1936 and 1937, with an honorary doctorate conferred in 1937.[23] In 1936 and 1937, he ran summer seminar-conferences on a new interest, Indigenous Americans.

Indigenous Peoples

Loram's interest in Indigenous peoples was most likely piqued by Jones, interpreted through Jones's experience as an instructor at the Hampton Institute, a Black institution founded by Union Civil War general Samuel Chapman Armstrong and missionaries in 1868. Organized as the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton had experimented with accepting Indigenous American students from 1878 to 1923 to determine whether the two groups might benefit from the same missionary-inspired industrial arts curricula and regimens. Ultimately, they did not.[24] Assimilative policies were not working well. The isolation of reservations, intractable white prejudice, draconian residential schooling, and other destructive assimilative measures, took their toll.[25]

Jones and other colleagues sought a comprehensive study of Indigenous Americans. The issues of funding and political support received a boost from a series of scandals involving oil leases and water rights on reservations.[26] Funding secured

from the Rockefeller Foundation led to the selection of a team of researchers headed by Lewis Meriam, a Brookings Institution efficiency expert. Jones advised on team selection, recommending several team members he knew well. *The Problem of Indian Administration* (1928), also known as the Meriam Report, was their product. Exhaustive in its scope — 847 pages — nine experts carried out seven months of fieldwork in ninety-five jurisdictions in eight areas of Indigenous life and welfare to produce the report. Jones also had a hand in editing the findings, as well as the strategic dissemination of the report as supporters angled for eventual legislation.[27] Recommended reforms percolated through the Hoover administration (1929–1933) and were enacted under the Roosevelt administration (1933–1945). This would prove to be good fortune for Loram.

Discussion of policy reforms, especially to economic policy relating to Indigenous peoples and the plight of colonized Indigenous peoples during the deepening Depression, were becoming more common in Loram's first years at Yale. Colonial powers curtailed their already insufficient efforts at Indigenous development and were mindful of growing resentment and tensions. This was a favourable environment for Loram to introduce his first project at Yale.

This was a summer seminar-conference titled Education and Culture Contacts held in 1934 that combined lectures, discussions, papers, and substantial fees for participants.[28] The late July meeting was co-sponsored by the British Colonial Office and Yale. An enthusiastic Loram wrote:

> Just picture about 100 Students from the British West Indies, the Southern States, the Department of Indian Affairs, with missionaries on furlough… and students of education among so-called backwards peoples spending eight to ten hours a day on their common problems.[29]

Signing the lecturing team, which included Jones and a Cape Town acquaintance, A. R. Radcliff-Brown, involved finding an authority on Indigenous American life. It is likely that Loram first contacted John Collier, President-elect Roosevelt's new head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), in this connection in 1933. By February 1934, they were sufficiently friendly for Collier to write a Monday acceptance for a Thursday dinner invitation from the Lorams; he would arrive in New Haven by train from Washington, DC, and return the same evening.[30] William Carson Ryan, a researcher on the Meriam Report and director of education for the Bureau of Indian Affairs from 1930 to 1935, joined the seminar-conference faculty.

Loram, Anthropology, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs

Anthropology had long interested Loram. In the 1920s, Loram attended the lectures of anthropologist A. R. Radcliff-Brown at the University of Cape Town. Like Radcliff-Brown, and his future Yale colleague, Bronislaw Malinowski, Loram followed the tenets of functionalism, especially as applied to Indigenous peoples. Functionalism as Loram interpreted it posited that broad and persistent contact with

advanced western cultures led to the erosion and disintegration of Indigenous societies over time. Economic and organizational challenges left traditional cultures unable to sustain their unifying structures, cultural meanings, and identity, leading to an inability of the culture to reproduce itself. For Loram and similarly minded specialists, the twilight between cultural disintegration and the assimilation into Western culture was dangerous, a set of circumstances detailed by Maurice S. Evans, an early influence on Loram's thinking.[31] The inability to exercise self-efficacy through unifying beliefs and collective agency, made "backward" peoples susceptible to negative influences, social movements, and contrarian explanations for their collective decline.

During his Cambridge years (1902–1906), the fieldwork of A. C. Haddon and his colleagues (1894–1898) was being sorted out, eventually published in six volumes as *Reports of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Straits*. The Cambridge team set international standards for non-invasive fieldwork among Indigenous peoples, which Loram would have been familiar with.[32] Their benign scientific methodology was also redemptive, attempting to ensure that debacles like the extermination of Indigenous Tasmanians fifty years earlier were not repeated.[33]

At Columbia, Franz Boas led in the development of cultural anthropology, and he and his colleagues influenced the Teachers College faculty and curriculum. Their concept of "cultural relativism" posited that cultures needed to be understood in terms of their own internal dynamics and logic. Loram surely understood this. Where he parted company with Boas was in respecting the immutability of such cultures. Loram aggressively sought to remake Indigenous cultures to render individuals suited for entering the lower rungs of the working class.

Loram's budding friendship with Collier, head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, led Loram to begin taking graduate students to the bureau's offices in Washington, DC, in tandem with graduate fieldwork tours of Black post-secondary institutions. When schedules permitted, Collier met with Loram's students. Loram's fieldwork course started at all-Black Howard University, where his racially mixed groups of students were housed.[34] The inclusion of Howard, a Black institution, with its high quality medical, law, and other professional schools, underscores Loram's recognition of Black intellectual capacity and the need for a well-educated segment in Black communities. Most of Loram's faculty and administrative contacts were within what are now termed "HBUCs"—Historically Black Universities and Colleges. Loram's southern tours continued on to Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee, also a Black liberal arts institution. There they were hosted by Loram's colleague, W. E. B. Du Bois, with whom Loram had a number of professional contacts. After Fisk, Loram and his students visited vocationally oriented institutions, coming north through Virginia, sometimes stopping at the Hampton Institute.[35] In southwestern fieldwork, students went from Washington, DC, to various Indigenous reservations.

Loram and The Changing Indian Conference

Participation in the Roosevelt administration's "Indian New Deal" brought Loram recognition through his association with Collier, the BIA, and teaching. This policy

initiative recommended respect for Indigenous cultures and languages and gave Indigenous peoples the right to choose where they wished to live: on a reservation, a rural area, or in (white) urban centres. Indigenous craftspeople were supported financially and through promotion of traditional products to increase income. Indigenous peoples were included in Roosevelt's Works Progress Administration and other employment creation programs. However, incorporating white democratic practices such as tribal councils with written constitutions voted in through secret ballot was problematic.

Aside from his administrative and interpersonal skills, one wonders about Loram's understanding of Indigenous Americans for dealing authoritatively with their issues. Despite the fact that he visited reservations and knew Indigenous individuals when few white academics did, he had no Indigenous language skills, prior fieldwork reservation residencies, or intensive study other than background reading.

His University of Colorado seminar-conference, The Changing Indian, held in Boulder in 1937, provided a rare look at an unscripted Loram in a professional setting.[36] The conference dealt with the cultural determinants that promoted, or deterred, the integration of Western perspectives, practices, and education into Indigenous reservation life.

The conference was well planned but lightly attended. Occurring during the middle of the university's summer quarter, Loram had sought to attract teachers working with Indigenous Americans that were on campus or summering in Boulder. Invitations had been extended to four local bishops. One declined and three never responded. Only Reverend Vine Deloria Sr. of the Lakota Sioux came, representing the Episcopal Church.[37] A recognized leader at age thirty-five, Deloria and his sisters Ella, an anthropologist and linguist, and Susan, an artist, were of mixed heritage, the family having Yankton Sioux, French, English, and German roots. The two loosely affiliated University of Colorado representatives at the conference besides Dean Milo Derham were Ralph "Doc" Hubbard and Leonard Leh.[38] Hubbard and Leh were well-regarded as knowledgeable amateurs of the study of Indigenous cultures; neither held an academic appointment at the university. Loram was unable to attract regular University of Colorado faculty to the conference. The Bureau of Indian Affairs sent anthropologist S. Scudder Mekeel, and Education Director Willard Beatty. John Collier's participation was eagerly anticipated but not realized. Thus, a small group of perhaps twenty-five individuals using a large conference room discussed Indigenous American policy.

Reverend Deloria advocated that Indigenous Americans adopt Christian values and beliefs, as converts were doing. His presentation "Christianity and the Indian" in part concerned Christianity as experienced by Indigenous Americans, including himself.[39] As Deloria noted dryly in his talk, after the "so-called battle of Wounded Knee" many victims were found wearing crucifixes around their necks.[40] This symbolic representation of an adopted belief in Christianity was fused with the traditional practice of wearing powerful objects as a means of bodily protection. If crucifixes were misinterpreted as amulets, wearers had also pondered why one of the basic tenets of Christianity, the sanctity of life, would allow Christians to murder other Christians.

Deloria argued that despite its blatant short comings, the ideals of Christianity were worthy, although difficult to achieve. Remnants of traditional Sioux culture and religious life had continued to exist since the 1880s. Deloria offered that even going back seventy-five years would not reinvigorate Sioux religious beliefs. Like studying Egyptians, this was a task for archaeologists.[41] An egalitarian religion with universalist implications was the best protection for Indigenous Americans in an otherwise hostile landscape. Reinstituting pre-Christian Indigenous ceremonies and rituals had uncertain implications, although it was rumoured that Deloria performed these in private.[42]

In a presentation at this conference by H. Scudder Mekeel, the Bureau of Indian Affairs anthropologist detailed his experience travelling with 300–400 Oglala Sioux (now the Oglala Lakota Nation) from the Pine Ridge Reservation to summer rodeos in South Dakota.[43] The Sioux understood that extended travel clashed with the agricultural cycle and had consequences for the winter months. Still, the Sioux, accustomed to following the buffalo in summer in the past, felt confined without some summer migratory experience. Loram asked Mekeel:

> You were speaking with appreciation … that … Indians … find in this rodeo attendance some substitute for an earlier form of amusement or occupation. What interests me is why you want to meet these cultural urges,… What is gained? What sociologically is gained in making it possible for the Indians to live through again these cultural patterns that they had in the earlier days[?][44]

Loram's response is telling since even as late as 1937 hunting was not a form of "amusement or occupation"; rather, it was essential for individual and collective survival and thus deeply engrained in the collective psyche of the Sioux. Loram might have considered whether western cultural imperatives would be any less important under the reduced circumstances of economic depression, natural disaster, epidemic, or war? By 1937, the nomadic hunt-driven practice *sans buffalo* was nearly seventy years old, originating under President Grant's Peace Policy (1868), a version of Southern Reconstruction for Indigenous Americans.[45] Settlement and agricultural cultivation were encouraged, with the Sioux being provided with various "annuities," including Texas cattle. As Pekka Hämäläinen writes, when cattle were substituted for the collapsed buffalo population, the Sioux wanted them live, so they could be scattered and hunted.[46] Mekeel was not necessarily signalling approval, but only providing an example. Cultural forms survive for complex psychological reasons even when their underpinnings are altered. Coming seventy years after the dispersal of the Lakota Sioux Nation and Chief Red Cloud's desperate diplomatic gambit in the late 1880s, Mekeel was onto something warranting further exploration.[47] His observations certainly flew in the face of functionalist theory.

In contrast, Loram argued that forced breaks with the past were necessary to dislodge the Black South Africans or Indigenous Americans "contented" in their huts, refusing to adopt the white man's ways.[48] The question remained: should former patterns of behaviour and belief be encouraged (or allowed) in new contexts? And by extension, in the assimilationist classroom? In South Africa, "tribal" cultures were

being recast to suit the nascent tourist industry, the integration of supervised sport into "urban native locations," and the melding of mining and "manhood" into the worker culture of the extraction industries. As Indigenous peoples in many settings knew, stewardship of traditional culture could subvert subjugating modernity.[49]

Mekeel offered that although Sioux culture had changed in response to external pressures, internal cultural continuities remained. The adoption of western clothing and log-cabin houses did not necessarily negate traditional processes—in, for example, the acculturation of children. Education, including life skills, moral and ethical training, religious education, and civil and cultural engagement were distinct endeavours and yet instruction for all remained relatively seamless. The deep structures of culture had staying power.

In a further exchange between Mekeel and Loram, Mekeel argued that efforts to entirely erase a culture through re-education and assimilationist practices was impossible. Enough identifiable beliefs, practices, and structure would survive, he contended. This would establish an unintended biculturalism. Loram disagreed, arguing that western culture was "better" as he put it, than other cultures:

> I refuse to be a sentimentalist…, our western culture is superior. Leave the Indian alone. Why spoil him? Leave the African alone. As if you could… Luckily for us we've got a … highly educated office of Indian affairs… Each of us works better when there is a policeman round the corner, and… the Office of Indian Affairs would profit if there were… groups of white people and Indians, joint councils we call them in Africa, who were tackling these problems, … I took the trouble to write to four Bishops, to preachers, and to persons…Well, I don't care very much whether Bishops come… they are never going to make a job of their Christianizing, until they… know the gentleman they are trying to Christianize.[50]

Loram's prior working environment had been in a dominion ruled by a minority that rejected assimilative pluralism in favour of racial segregation and problematic labour exigency. "Native" control intensified as a national project as labour dependency and urbanization grew. Between 1921 and 1936, the Black urban population of South Africa grew by 94.4 per cent, as rural depopulation accelerated in favor of urban prospects. [51] In North America, a right to choose reservation life or assimilation, in spite of policies subtly (and unsubtly) pressing for assimilation, was possible. Initiatives in public health, education, skill development, and other amenities did not disintegrate traditional culture, as Meekel argued.

The Navajo Study

The Navajo, the largest unified Indigenous nation in the United States, had voted against the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, which outlined the tribal democracy that the Bureau of Indian Affairs favoured. In addition, the Navajo were incensed by what seemed to them mindless culling of sheep ordered by the BIA, which resulted

in the loss of half their sheep by 1940. To have the largest Indigenous nation hostile to the government's "New Deal" programs alarmed the BIA. Responding to an urgent request from the BIA in 1938, in response to this crisis with the Navajo, Jones recruited Loram, Ella Deloria, and Harold Allen to undertake a study of the Navajo Nation on behalf of the Phelps Stokes Fund.[52] The fund's Navajo project was to prove as egregious as the BIA's previous missteps.

The 1930s drought—the scourge of the Canadian Prairies and the American Midwest—had reduced grazing lands as Navajo livestock herds (sheep) were expanding. Collapsed wool prices and reduced opportunities for supplemental income further threatened the weak Navajo economy. Across-the-board culling of herds impoverished some, with little consequence for others. Livestock destruction, a form of waste unfathomable to the Navajo, cast the BIA in a terrible light. The BIA stock reduction fiasco severely damaged any faith the Navajo would have in other initiatives, like education. Collier's overriding concern was potentially being blamed for soil erosion on the Navajo reservation interfering with the federal government's enormous Hoover Dam project (1931–1936).[53]

Haphazard herd reductions encouraged missionaries to call for new council elections they hoped would align the new councils with religious leaders. J. C. Morgan, a product of Hampton and now a Protestant missionary with Bureau of Indian Affairs teaching experience, spoke against the new secular (bilingual) day schools that Collier introduced.[54] In 1938, Morgan became the first Indigenous American elected Navajo tribal chairman, a position previously held by white Americans.

Against this calamitous background, the BIA approached the PSF to conduct a study, published as *The Navajo Indian Problem* (1939).[55] The team met on-site in January 1939, with Loram returning for a week in March with students, including his son Ian, a Yale undergraduate. Jones came for a two-week visit in June.

Allen met with interfacing agencies and commissions and drafted the initial report. Only Ella Deloria was in residence on the Navajo reserves for the full six months of the study. Luckily for the Phelps Stoke's Fund team, Jones knew Morgan when he was at Hampton. After a rather frosty reception, Jones was eventually able to secure the co-operation of missionary supporters.

The research was divided into eight sections: the problem, land, education, law and order, health and hogan (home), missionaries, and conclusions. Ella Deloria was given responsibility for women's issues, but there is no section specifically on women. Given the limited amount of on-site time spent by the team, there is no doubt that the team relied on existing documents and government reports. Curiously, Phelps Stokes Fund team members were not identified with specific areas of the inquiry.

"Navajo Education," section four, painted a stark picture of interrelated problems dating back to the late 1860s. The Phelps Stokes Fund estimated that 60 per cent of Navajo children did not attend school; a later assessment put it at 85 per cent.[56] Day schools, boarding schools, and several high schools served the reserve's ten school districts. New Deal planners had hastily constructed school buildings, giving little thought as to their useful placement or the durability of materials. Distances were vast and bus transportation proved difficult and expensive on the few viable reserve

roads. It took the Navajo education director, George Boyce, several months to complete a circuit allowing several hours at each school. By 1935, thirty-nine new day schools had been built, for a total of forty-seven schools.

School enrolments were usually higher in the fall. A government program providing free school clothing attracted pupils was still operating in 1935 but many pupils stopped attending school after they had received the clothing. Jenson offers that Congress neglected to provide money for 1936, rather than that there had been a "program change" as the Phelps Stokes Fund suggested, requiring parents to pay for clothing.[57] Despite this issue, the Phelps Stokes Fund claimed that new buildings increased enrolments. Jenson's less sanguine estimate for 1936 has enrolments decreased by 20 per cent.

Before 1935, teaching appointments were selective but with the rapid expansion of schools, many inexperienced and less well-regarded teachers were hired. New teachers were often white females with little experience. They could not speak the Navajo language, and in the lower grades, their students spoke little or no English. Teachers started at the beginning; more experienced and motivated teachers developed instructional techniques like small group lessons or the project method. The Phelps Stokes Fund investigators claimed that there were no standard syllabi, textbooks, or identified curriculum at any level. This was an exaggeration, but what was available was insufficient. There was consensus that teaching oral language skills, followed by written skills, was the best way forward. (This had also been Loram's preferred approach in the lower forms of Black South African education.) Language teaching and bilingualism became topics in themselves for those in the Navajo education community.[58] Language was power.

While *The Navajo Indian Problem* (1939) passed muster for Collier by supporting herd reductions and scientific conservation and agriculture, its sociological aspect was assimilationist. The Phelps Stokes Fund's assault on Navajo culture was as egregious as the Bureau of Indian Affairs programs had been and carried the strong scent of Jones and Loram's African work. The first chapter describes Loram as having "had a long experience both as a British Colonial Officer and as a friend and a teacher of tribal groups quite similar to the Navajo."[59] One might ask exactly how the Navajo were like Zulus, Xhosas, or Ndebele, in customs, culture, and aspiration? For Loram, they simply seemed a type: brown, non-western, non-English speaking, and living in what he considered controlled squalor. (He had seen much the same in Africa, Mexico, and the Caribbean.) It is doubtful that the Navajo, despite their dire circumstances, interpreted their present in the terms the Phelps Stokes Fund laid out: "the Navajo are in a period of cultural disintegration when the values of their old civilization have been destroyed and the new values of western civilization have not yet taken root."[60] This was pseudo-science, an anthropological trope of advanced cultures eradicating "backward" ones.[61] Loram turned his Navajo field research experience into a lecture. His critique of the BIA was harsh. The BIA had acted with undue haste. It did not consult and lacked a cultural understanding of the Navajo people. Loram additionally blamed Navajo resistance to change—and too much ready money for the hasty and ill-conceived schemes. Offering that the US government spent as much on

one "Indian" as the British government spent on a thousand Africans, Loram cited Collier's quip: "here is seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars provided you spend it by December 31st."[62] Ready money allowed the pursuit of hastily conceived projects such as school construction. In considering the entire "North American Indian Situation," Loram recommended to Collier a joint Canadian–United States seminar conference.[63]

The North American Indian Today Conference

Loram's bid for a transnational conference was supported by John Collier and Charles Seymour, now Yale's president. They were joined by the University of Toronto's president, Rev. Henry John Cody. Canada's Department of Indian Affairs agreed to cooperate, but cautioned that there would be no policy discussions.[64] The Carnegie Corporation and the University of Toronto, the co-sponsors, agreed on the dates September 2 to 16, 1939, for a conference to be held in Toronto. The attendee list of over seventy individuals was a who's who of "experts" and persons interested in Indigenous peoples from Canada and the United States.[65]

Prior to the conference, Rev. Cody brought Loram into contact with Canadian anthropologist T. F. McIlwraith, a former student of A. C. Haddon. Sharing a Cambridge connection, the two worked well together.[66] Following summer teaching at the University of California in Berkeley in 1939, Loram went north to Vancouver, and travelled across Canada to further familiarize himself with Canadian policies and practices before the conference began.[67]

Loram's introduction to the conference's published proceedings seem to be stuck in time. "The inevitability of its replacement [Indigenous civilization] by the dominant … civilization of the white man" was a central theme.[68] Pluralism, at best, was a temporary stopgap. Simultaneously, conference attendees were being told that Indigenous population numbers were rebounding. During the conference, on September 10, Canada declared war on Germany. Domestic policies quickly receded, and publication of the conference proceedings was delayed until 1943.[69]

The 1939 North American Indian Today seminar-conference sought to discuss commonalities and differences that might point to a constructive way forward. This was the first time Indigenous people had been invited to a Canadian academic conference.[70] The inclusion of twelve Indigenous speakers and commentators hinted at a more inclusive future. From the Indigenous perspective, there was also satisfaction in a de facto recognition that "national" boundaries ignored geographically interwoven histories. Away from the official program, Canadian officials informally discussed ways in which American initiatives could inform Canadian policy and legislation, especially the recasting of Canada's Indian Act.[71] The most important event of the conference occurred when the Indigenous representatives broke away from the main conference body and made their own resolution:

> We hereby go on record as hoping that the need for an All-Indian Conference on Indian Welfare will be felt by Indian tribes, the delegates

to such a conference to be limited to bona fide Indian leaders actually living among the Indian people of the Reserves, and further, that such conference remain free of political, anthropological, missionary, administrative, or other domination.[72] The Second World War brought an abrupt halt to domestic policy concerns, and a lack of newspaper coverage left the North American Indian Today seminar-conference a thread to be rediscovered, rather than the beginning of broad policy shifts.

The End of an Era

Nineteen-thirty-nine saw Loram elected a trustee of the Phelps Stokes Fund. Early 1940 found him arranging a Yale lecture series for Collier. In the end, dates for a March program could not be reconciled. Loram, returning from the southwest in late February, would have almost immediately hosted Collier. He planned to spend part of 1940–41 at Huachung University in Wuhan, China.[73] The planned China trip also clashed with Collier's offer to help him attend a major conference in Mexico.[74] In the end, he did neither. When Loram returned from the southwest, he wrote Collier "Lusa ukudingwa kusasa," the Zulu expression of thanks meaning "don't be tired tomorrow (I may come to see you)."[75]

On July 8, 1940, Charles Loram died of a massive heart attack in Ithaca, New York, as he prepared for Cornell University's summer school. Sandwiched between Yale's spring term and the upcoming Cornell summer school, Loram was doing war work at the British consulate in New York. His passing was widely noted.[76] Collier telegraphed Hilda Loram his condolences and one of the longest tributes came from the BIA's *Indians at Work.*[77]

Conclusion

As an influential Yale professor, Loram addressed Indigenous American issues in teaching and through his fieldwork courses. Sadly, student accounts of these widely varied expeditions, if preserved at all, are most likely in family collections. Ian Loram's participation in his father's 1939 field trip provides one of the few records of student activities, observations, and itinerary, although omitting their eventual destination: San Francisco's Golden Gate International Exposition, with its large exhibit about Indigenous Americans.[78] These interracial and international study groups were progressive for their time. And Loram was stalwart in travelling with them, navigating through several refusal of service incidents.[79] If, as Loram's BIA colleague Joseph McCaskill claimed, "Loram knew and counted many Indians among his best friends," the existing archival record offers no correspondence or other evidence of it. Gregarious, socially adept, and accustomed to "roughing it," Loram likely enjoyed good (albeit superficial) relations with some Indigenous Americans.

Students and colleagues seemed to mute whatever faults they found in Loram. It is doubtful that the Black South African students he brought to Yale, most of whom later joined the African National Congress (ANC), risked sharing their political views with him.[80] There is no record of Loram's intervention in or support for any specific Indigenous cause; nor did he bring any Indigenous students to Yale. Indeed, the closest he came to securing an Indigenous presence in New Haven was his attempt to secure the Indigenous exhibit from the San Francisco International Exposition for Yale.

Loram left no writing indicating that he was synthesizing his ongoing work. While many draft papers on ethnic and national groups survive, few offer original insights.[81] Such a volume, had one been published, would have provided some measure of how his North American experience had influenced his ideas from his earlier book, *The Education of the South African Native* (1917). Time may have been a consideration, but perhaps there was nothing new to add. Questions about the dimensions of culture and education and the influence of cultural contacts are left unanswered except for his public pronouncements. Loram left no self-reflective writing on the obligations of those who, like him, sought an Indigenous transition along western lines.[82] The closest we come are his conference remarks. In the policy arena, Loram's work in conference organizing with academics and policy-makers and his support for Collier and the Bureau of Indian Affairs signifies his commitment to "progressive" international colonialism.

Loram acquired the accoutrements of interracial and interpersonal sophistication handily. This may have led some to infer that his broader educational consideration of "Native Education" was more flexible than it was. His career, examined in this article, shows otherwise. For Loram, traditional cultures — Black South African or Indigenous American — were of transitional utility. They provided identity and useful myths while being supplanted by Western colonizing values and education.

Loram thought it best to recast Indigenous cultures in a Western mode, focussed on a collective subordinate position. Those purging themselves of their Indigenous roots stood, in Loram's estimation, as having the best prospects going forward. One might ask if a few persevering individuals were capable of major attainments, why couldn't many more be afforded the same opportunities, with expectations for similar outcomes? He pressed for incremental improvements in Indigenous education, but never for widespread accommodations.

Comparing dreary statistics on southern "Negro education" with South Africa, he wrote: "What a fair system of education would cost in Natal with its separate schools for whites, Coloureds, Indians, and Natives, would almost break the Province."[83] There was no mention of consolidation, let alone a single system — even theoretically. In Loram's world view, universal intellectual capacity and achievement potential coexisted with immutable racial and cultural "disadvantages," the mirror image of white exclusivity. He argued across his career that the complexity of western ideas was easily misinterpreted by "immature" cultures, and the rough-hewn results of such misinterpretation invariably led to "premature" demands for equality.

Notes

1 Cf. Julie McLeod and Fiona Paisley, "The Modernization of Colonialism and the Educatability of the 'Native': Transpacific Knowledge Networks and Education in the Interwar Years," *History of Education Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (2016): 473–502.

2 Loram's travels while living in North America included Canada, Great Britain, Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Mexico, Jamaica, the Philippines, the Dutch East Indies (now Indonesia), China, and Japan. He attended and helped organize major conferences in New Haven in 1933; South Africa in 1934; Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) in 1935; Manoa, Hawaii in 1936; Chapel Hill, North Carolina in 1938; and Toronto, Canada in 1939.

3 Plessy v. Ferguson, May 18, 1896, record group 267, Records of the Supreme Court of the United States; Plessy v. Ferguson, 163, #15248, National Archives, Washington, DC; Lake Mohonk Conferences, on-line catalogue, hathitrust.org.

4 Peter Kallaway, "Science and Policy: Anthropology and Education in British Colonial Africa in the Interwar Years," in *The Changing Face of Colonial Education in Africa,* ed. Peter Kallaway (Sun Media, 2021), 139–66.

5 Loram's thesis advisor, George D. Strayer, analyzed large metropolitan school systems. Cf. George D. Strayer, Ellwood P. Cubberley, and Frank P. Bachman, *Some Problems in City School Administration* (Nabu Press, 1913); George D. Strayer and Edward L. Thorndike, *Educational Administration; Quantitative Studies* (McMillan Company, 1913).

6 Charles T. Loram, "The Education of the South African Native" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1915),17–25, 28–45.

7 The collective trauma of the Indian Mutiny of 1857 remained influential in colonial educational circles across the British Empire, with some locating the revolt's origins in the Raj's liberal educational policies. Parimala Rao, "Modern Education, and the Revolt of 1857 in India," *Paedagogica Historica* 52, no. 1 (2016): 1–18.

8 Ann Digby, "Early Black Doctors in South Africa," *Journal of African History* 46, no. 3 (2005): 427–54.

9 Charles T. Loram, "The Claims of the Native Question Upon Scientists," *South African Journal of Science* 18, no. 12 (1921): 99–109. https://hdl.handle.net/10520/AJA00382353_2607.

10 Saul Dubow, *Racial Segregation and the Origins of Apartheid in South Africa, 1919–36* (McMillan Press, 1989), 77–127; Robert J. Gordon, *South Africa's Dreams: Ethnologists and Apartheid in Namibia* (Berghahn Books, 2021), 17–46.

11 The will of Caroline Phelps Stokes established the fund in 1911. Charged with improving New York's housing for the poor, providing education for Black Africans, Black Americans, and Indigenous North Americans, as well as deserving white students, the $300,000 endowment equates to approximately $9,000,000 in 2024 values. "Stokes Fortune to Charity; Part of $300,000 for Education of Negroes and Indians — Other Bequests," *New York Times*, October 27, 1909; CPI Inflation Calculator, officialdata.org.

12 Clive Whitehead, "Education Policy in British Tropical Africa: The 1925 White Paper in Retrospect," *History of Education* 10, no. 3 (1981): 195–203.

13 Jones's writings were generally unsympathetic to the fuller aspirations of Black educators and led toward a path of subordinate status. His social studies book was widely read and emulated. Like the earlier *Flexner Report on Medical Education* (1910), he harshly criticized Black higher education, and like Flexner, he identified and ridiculed weak institutions and urged their closure. Jones's African experience led him to derive four essentials integral to the education of "backward peoples": health (hygiene), home life training, industry, and (wholesome) recreation. Thomas Jesse Jones, *Social Studies in the Hampton Curricula* (Hampton Institute Press, 1906); Thomas Jesse Jones, "Negro

Education: A Study of Private and Higher Schools for Colored People in the United States," United States Bureau of Education in Cooperation with the Phelps Stokes Fund, issued as Bulletins No. 38 and No. 39, 1916. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1917. vol. 1, vol. 2; Thomas Jesse Jones, *Education in Africa: A Study of West, South, and Equatorial Africa* (Phelps Stokes Fund, 1922); Thomas Jesse Jones, *Education in East Africa: A Study of East, Central and South Africa* (Phelps Stokes Fund, 1925); Thomas Jesse Jones, *The Four Essentials of Education* (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926). See also Susan Hunt, "The Flexner Report and Black Academic Medicine: An Assignment of Place," *Journal of the National Medical Association* 85, no. 2 (1993): 151–55.

14 The extent of Jones's connections appears in a 1938 appreciation of his work. D. O. W. Holmes, Editorial Comment, "Twenty-Five Years of Thomas Jesse Jones and the Phelps-Stokes Fund," *Journal of Negro Education* 7, no. 4 (1939): 475–80.

15 Richard Glotzer, "A Long Shadow: Frederick P. Keppel, the Carnegia Corporation and the Dominions and Colonies Fund Area Experts 1923–1943," *History of Education* 38, no. 5 (2009): 621–48, doi:10.1080/00467600802054562.

16 Tiffany Willoughby-Herard, *Waste of White Skin: Carnegie Corporation, and the Racial Logic of White Vulnerability* (University of California Press, 2015).

17 Anson Phelps Stokes to Loram, July 12, 1932, box 34, folder 20, Phelps Stokes Papers, Schomburg Center for African Culture, New York Public Library, New York.

18 Charles T. Loram, "The Devolution of Responsibility and Authority on Native Leaders," unpublished article, series II, box 1, folder 23, Charles Templeman Loram Papers, Manuscripts and Archives, Sterling Library, Yale University, New Haven (hereafter Loram Papers).

19 For a view of Yale's faculty culture, see Regna Darnell, *Edward Sapir: Linguist, Anthropologist, Humanist* (University of California Press, 1990).

20 C. Wright Mills, *White Collar: The American Middle Classes* (Oxford University Press, 1951), 241.

21 Edward Sapir found his way to Franz Boas and anthropological linguistics at Columbia University. Boas introduced him to fieldwork in the Pacific Northwest and to Indigenous languages. Temporary positions led to his appointment in 1910 as chief ethnologist in the Division of Anthropology in the Geological Survey of Canada. Sapir's sixteen years in Canada were focussed on surveying Canadian Indigenous languages. His influential work led to an appointment in anthropology at the University of Chicago in 1925. Sapir moved to Yale in 1931 as head of anthropology, charged with mapping out a program of linguistic research in a new Department of Anthropology and Sociology. Sapir assumed an immense workload, also encountering resistance from social science colleagues and anti-Semitism — of which he had been warned by Chicago's president, John Maynard Hutchens, a former Yale dean. Stress brought a severe heart attack in 1937 followed by a second in 1938. Sapir died in 1939. Darnell, *Edward Sapir.* George Peter Murdock was a prominent anthropologist specializing in ethnographic studies, family structure, and social anthropology. His first major work appeared several years after Loram came to Yale. G. P. Murdock, *Our Primitive Contemporaries* (Macmillan, 1934).

22 *Loram News*, no. 3, November 15, 1932. Unaccessioned files, Loram-Malherbe correspondence, 1926–1940, E. G. Malherbe Collection, Killie Campbell Library, University of Kwa Zulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.

23 Charles T. Loram, Remarks, June-August 1937, Milo G. Derham Papers, 1841–1948, 1905–1937, call no. 297-3 (21–22), Carnegie Library for Local History, Denver Public Library.

24 Donal F. Lindsey, *Indians at Hampton Institute, 1877–1923* (University of Illinois Press, 1995).

25 Starting in 1887 the Dawes Act (General Allotment Act) authorized apportioning communal lands to individual (usually male) holders. By the late 1920s, dismantling communal life by privatizing agriculture brought poor agricultural results, fractured reservation relationships — women traditionally farmed and directed land use, and put Indigenous American land into settler hands. Khalil A. Johnson Jr., "Problem Solver or 'Evil Genius': Thomas Jesse Jones and *The Problem of Indian Administration,*" *Native American and Indigenous Studies* 5, no. 2 (2018): 37–69.
26 Lawrence C. Kelly, *The Assault on Assimilation: John Collier and the Origins of Indian Policy Reform* (University of New Mexico Press, 1983),103–254.
27 *The Problem of Indian Administration: Report of a Survey* (Johns Hopkins Press, 1928).
28 Loram to Helen R. Bryant (American Friends Service Committee, Institute on Race Relations), November 29, 1933. Franz Boas Papers, American Philosophical Library, digilib.amphilosoc.org.
29 *Loram News,* no. 5, Christmas 1934, unaccessioned file, Malherbe Collection Correspondence, 1926–1940, Killie Campbell African Library, University of Kwa Zulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.
30 Collier to Loram, February 12, 1934, John Collier Papers, Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University (hereafter Collier Papers).
31 Elizabeth A. Herbin-Triant, "Southern Segregation South Africa-Style: Maurice Evans, Clarence Poe, and the Ideology of Rural Segregation," *Agricultural History* 87, no. 2 (2013):170–93.
32 No sources link Loram to Haddon, although Haddon's files include material on Natal's Zulu population. Haddon also attended the British Association for the Advancement of Science's 75th Annual Meeting held in 1905 in South Africa. Roberta Wells, "Centenary of the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to Torres Strait," *Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 21, no. 1 (1999): 79–99; Notes on Zulu-Kafir Group, item 5412, and British Association for the Advancement of Science meeting ticket, item 5414, 1903–06, file 5065, "Newspaper clippings from South Africa, 1903–1906," Alfred Cort Haddon Papers, Cambridge University Library.
33 Patrick Brantlinger, *Dark Vanishings* (Cornell University Press, 2003),124–30.
34 Cf. "International Group Tours HU Campus," *The Hilltop* 12, no. 9: 4 (December 22, 1934). *The Hilltop*, 1930–40, 52, https://dh.howard.edu/hilltop_193040/52.
35 Frank E. Midkiff, "Negro Education and Race Relations in Southern United States," *Journal of Negro Education* 3, no. 4 (October 1934): 586–92.
36 Proceedings for 1934 could not be located. The Changing American Indian Today Conference, July 12–15, 1937, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1937, series II, box 6, folder 132, Loram Papers.
37 Philip Deloria, "Vine Deloria Sr." In *The New Warriors*, ed. R. David Edmunds (University of Nebraska Press, 2001): 79–96.
38 For a biography of Hubbard, see Native American Artifact Collection, Grand Opening, G. B. Olsen Special Library Collections, 9–17-1993, Minot State University, Minot, North Dakota, minotstateu.edu; Leonard L. Leh was a missionary and archeologist; see L. L. Leh, *Christianity Reborn* (McMillan, 1928).
39 Vine Deloria, "Christianity and the Indian," July 14, 1937, 1, series II, box 6, folder 134, Loram Papers, Yale.
40 Vine Deloria, "Christianity and the Indian," 5.
41 Vine Deloria, "Christianity and the Indian," 7–8.
42 Susan Gardner, "Subverting the Rhetoric of Assimilation: Ella Cara Deloria (Dakota) in the 1920s," *Hecate* 39, nos. 1–2 (2014): 8–32.
43 Mekeel's expertise was in the psychological and psychoanalytic impact of structural crises on identity. Gordon MacGregor, "H. Scudder Mekeel, 1902–1947," *American Anthropologis*t 50 (1948): 95–100.

44 Loram's response to the untitled Mekeel lecture, July 13, 1937, 3, series II, box 6, folder 138, Loram Papers.
45 Pekka Hämäläinen, *Lakota America* (Yale University Press, 2019), 294–97.
46 Hämäläinen, *Lakota*, 297.
47 Frank Goodyear, *Red Cloud* (University of Nebraska Press, 2003), 93–122.
48 The example comes from Charles T. Loram, *The Education of the South African Native* (Longmans, Green, and Company, 1917), 11.
49 Elliot Turiel, "Resistence and Subversion in Everyday Life," *Journal of Moral Education* 32, no. 2 (2003): 115–30. http://doi.org/10.1080/030572403200007206.
50 Changing Indian Conference, Loram statement after Mekeel lecture, July 13, 1937, 9, series II, box 6, extract folder 134, Loram Papers.
51 For an overview of this contentious issue, see Helen Suzman, ed., *A Digest of the Native Laws Commission*, known as *The Fagan Report,* (South African Institute of Race Relations, 1952): 1–10. Available online at sahistory.org.za.
52 Ella Cara Deloria earned a BA from Teachers College in 1915. Franz Boas, Margaret Mead, and Ruth Benedict employed her. She produced a Dakota grammar in 1941 and was fluent in Latin, among other languages. Her Dakota and Lakota translations and projects, including novels, became landmark works. Jones to Phelps Stokes, Memorandum, March 25, 1939, box 47, folder 8, Phelps Stokes Papers; Roseanne Hoefel, "'Different by Degree': Ella Cara Deloria, Zora Neale Hurston, and Franz Boas Contend with Race and Ethnicity," *American Indian Quarterly* 25, no. 1 (2001): 181–202; Gardner, "Subverting the Rhetoric of Assimilation," 8–32; Allen had been an on-site representative for the Near East Foundation after the Armenian genocide of 1912 and the Foundations' Director of Education during the First World War.
53 Over 45,000 Navajo were spread across Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. Forced removals in 1864 led to imprisonment in New Mexico from 1864 to 1868. An estimated 10 per cent of Navajos died of influenza in the 1918–1920 epidemic. David Daily, *Battle for the BIA: G. E. E. Lindquist and the Missionary Crusade against John Collier* (University of Arizona Press, 2004), 114–17; B. R. Brady and Howard M. Bahr, "The Influenza Epidemic of 1918–1920 among the Navajos," *American Indian Quarterly* 38, no. 4 (2014): 459–91; Marsha Weisiger, *Dreaming of Sheep in Navajo Country* (University of Washington Press, 2011), 153–237.
54 Jon Reyhner, "Progressive Education and the 'Indian New Deal,'" paper presented at the annual meeting, National Educational Association, Rapid City, SD, October 13, 1996; available through ERIC.
55 Thomas Jesse Jones, *The Navajo Indian Problem* (Phelps Stokes Fund, 1939).
56 Katherine Jensen, "Teachers and Progressives: The Navajo Day-School Experiment, 1935–1945," *Arizona and the Wes*t 25, no. 1 (1983): 49–62.
57 Jensen, "Teachers and Progressives."
58 Reyhner, "Progressive Education."
59 Jones, *The Navajo Indian Problem*, 5.
60 Jones, *The Navajo Indian Problem*, 40.
61 Aisa Beliso-De Jesus, Jemima Pierre, Judaid Rana, "White Supremacy and the Making of Anthropology," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 52 (2023): 417–35, doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-052721-040400.
62 Loram, "The Navajo Indian Problem," unpublished manuscript, 1–11, Loram Papers.
63 Loram to Collier, May 3, 1939, Collier Papers, Yale.
64 Loram to Collier, May 3, 1939, Collier Papers, Yale; John F. Leslie, "Assimilation, Integration, or Termination? The Development of Canadian Indian Policy, 1943–1963" (PhD dissertation, Carleton University, 1999), 70–73.
65 Donald B. Smith, "From 'Indians' to 'First Nations': Changing Anglo-Canadian Perceptions of the North American Indian in the Twentieth Century," *Constitutional Forum* 13, no. 3 and 14, no. 1 (2005): 80–87.

66 John Barker, "T. F. McIlwraith and Anthropology at the University of Toronto, 1925–63," *Review of Canadian Sociology and Anthropology* 24, no. 2 (1987): 253–68.
67 Loram to Collier, May 15, 1939, Collier Papers, Yale.
68 Loram, *The North American Indian Today,* 8–9.
69 H. Scudder Mekeel, review of *The North American Indian Today*, in *American Anthropologist* 48, no. 1 (1946): 99–100.
70 Smith, "From 'Indians' to 'First Nations.'"
71 John F. Leslie, "Assimilation, Integration, or Termination?", 76–77.
72 Loram, *The North American Indian Today,* 349.
73 Loram visted Huachung University in 1936. By early1940, rapidly unfolding events in China may have made a second visit perilous. Loram, Japan, (typescript), October, 1936, series 2, box 2, folder 76, Loram Papers. United Board for Christian Higher Education in Asia (UBCHEA) Archives, Hua Chung Administration, Board of Founders 1940–42; United Board for Christian Higher Education in China, Divinity Library, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.
74 Loram is not listed with the United States delegation and apparently did not attend the conference. Collier to Loram, February 19, 1940, Collier Papers, Yale; Congreso Indígenista Interamericano Pátzcuaro, Mexico. Final Act of the First Inter-American Conference on Indian Life: held At Pátzcuaro, State of Michoacán, Mexico, April 14–24, 1940. Washington, DC: US Office of Indian Affairs, 1941.
75 Loram to Collier, April 12, 1940, Collier Papers.
76 E. G. Malherbe, "Charles T. Loram, An Appreciation," *School and Society* 52, no. 2 (1940): 586; "The Late Dr. Charles T. Loram," draft for *The Forum*, September, 20, 1940, Malherbe Papers, Killie Campbell Africana Library, University of Kwa Zulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa; Obituaries, *New York Times*, July 10, 1940, 19; W. E. B. Du Bois, "Dillard and Loram," As the Crow Flies column, *Amsterdam News*, October 19, 1940, W.E. B. Du Bois Papers, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
77 Hilda Loram to Collier, July 29, 1940, Collier Papers; "Death of Professor Charles T. Loram Removes Vivid, Important Figure from Field of Indian Affairs," *Indians at Work* (1940): 15–16, 26.
78 This tour included Pine Ridge (Sioux), South Dakota, Sherman Institute, Riverside, California, Tuba City, and Window Rock, Arizona (Navajo), the Hopi Reservation near Tuba City, and the San Francisco Exhibition. Ian Loram, "Report of Yale Field Trip," undated 1939, box 8, folder 180, Loram Papers; Frank E. Midkiff, "Negro Education and Race Relations."
79 *Loram News,* no. 5 (1934): 2.
80 Cf. Mathews to Ngcobo, October 8, 1933; also see Mathews to "Don" (M'timkulu?), November 6, 1933; Mathews to Jabavu, December 26, 1933; "Z. K. Mathews at Yale," UNISA Digital Collections, http://digilibrary.unisa.ac.za.
81 Loram started a book called *The African and Western Civilization*, a reworking of lectures delivered in South Africa, but it was never completed. *Loram News*, no. 3 (1932): 4, Loram Papers.
82 Neither Loram nor Yale are mentioned in John Collier's autobiography. After leaving the BIA (1945), Collier taught at the City University of New York and worked for the United Nations. He bore witness to efforts to keep South Africa out of the United Nations and the transformation of South African segregation into Apartheid. He died in Taos, New Mexico, in May 1968, aged 84. John Collier, *From Every Zenith: A Memoir; and Some Essays on Life and Thought* (Sage, 1963).
83 Loram, *Loram News*, no. 5 (1934): 3, Loram Papers.