“Kill the Indian, Save the Man”: Manhood at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, 1879-1918

Matthew Steven Bentley

PhD American Studies

University of East Anglia

Department of American Studies

Submitted: October 2012

Abstract

Name: Matthew Steven Bentley
Year of Submission: 2012
Title: "Kill the Indian, Save the Man": Manhood at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, 1879-1918

This dissertation examines the role of manhood in the programme to "civilise" the Indian at the Carlisle Indian Industrial School. Using gender and race theory as a frame for archival research, it argues that the model of manhood in operation at Carlisle was contested and changed throughout the school's history. The hegemonic model at Carlisle's beginning reflected the school's focus on civilised manliness, which included the ideals of self-sufficiency, individualism, and Christian morality. This model was progressively displaced by an athletic version, which promoted masculinity in the form of physical power and victory. The dissertation will show how the contest between these two models of manhood came to a head in the 1914 Congressional Investigation of Carlisle. During this investigation, the extent to which sex and alcohol had become inseparable from the athletic model of manhood as well as their prevalence among Carlisle students was revealed. As a result, school officials worked to return Carlisle to the original ideal of civilised manliness, but by this time the school was out of step with the wider demands of government Indian policy; in 1918 it was closed

This work extends previous academic examinations of gender at non-reservation boarding schools through its focus on masculinity. Specifically, it identifies, defines and explores how Carlisle's models of manhood changed according to the demands of the school, government officials and the wider public. It also examines how the school used these different models of manhood to promote the success of the institution. After Carlisle's commitment to rapid Indian assimilation was called into question by government policy, the school increasingly utilised the athletic model of manhood to demonstrate the school's success.

Manhood was a central component of the school's programme to eliminate Indian savagery. As such, the analysis of manhood at Carlisle provides critical insight into government Indian policy and white definitions of gender, as well as illuminating the centrality of manhood to the concept of civilisation.

Word Count: 80,279.

A previous version of Chapter Two was published under the title “Playing White Men: American Football and Manhood at the Carlisle Indian School, 1893-1904.” *Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Spring 2010): 187-209.

An altered version of Chapter Three was published under the title “The Rise of Athletic Masculinity at the Carlisle Indian School, 1904-1913,” *International Journal of the History of Sport*, Vol. 29, No. 10 (July 2012): 1466-1489.

Contents

List of Photographs and Illustrations

Acknowledgements

I would primarily like to thank everyone in the School of American Studies at the University of East Anglia for allowing me to undertake such an endeavour with their unyielding support. For Jacqueline Fear-Segal, for being my supervisor over the years and always having a kind word, a good idea, and supporting my work. Thank you to Nick Selby, who has kindly commented on my work; it would not have reached this point without either of you. I am also indebted to Catherine Barter and Nick Cleaver for proofreading. My thanks also go to everyone at the Cumberland County Historical Society, who made my research trip in 2008 so enjoyable. My especial gratitude is to Barbara Landis, who knows more about the Carlisle school than anyone. She has always been willing to help with any question I could think of as well as being an extremely kind and welcoming person. I would also like to thank Dickinson College for providing me with accommodation during my research trip. I also extend my thanks to everyone at the British Newspaper Library, who kindly secured photocopies of various magazines for me.

I could not have got this far without the emotional support of those closest to me. Thank you to Ann and Phil Bentley for always supporting me in my endeavour. I could not have arrived at such a point without their unwavering belief and love. Steve and Christine Halls have always brought me back down to earth after I get ideas above my station. Rafael Turkleton and Molly O'Neill have always had a kind ear to listen to my problems. However, my greatest thanks go to Anneliese Lenzen for supporting me, allowing me to continue on this project, and providing love and warmth, which made the process so much easier.

Introduction

In an 1892 speech at the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Correction, Captain Richard Henry Pratt, founder and superintendent of the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, stated that the school aimed to "kill the Indian in him, and save the man."[1] Such words defined a generation of white educational reform towards the Native population. Carlisle, the first non-reservation boarding school and exemplar of Pratt's statement, was a central pillar of the nineteenth-century Indian reform movement, which also included allotment of reservation land and American citizenship.[2] Pratt founded the Carlisle school in 1879 with the goal of "civilising" the Indian, ideally achieved through immersion in white society and rejecting anything Indian.[3] Agents took children from reservations, transported them across the country to Carlisle, and "killed the Indian." Historical discussion of such words has largely focused on the cultural death demanded by Carlisle. Rather than examining Carlisle's attempt at racial elimination, however, this study will focus instead on the saved "man." Consequently, my thesis will scrutinise the models of manhood as constructed by Carlisle officials. I argue that Pratt aimed to teach students a civilised model of manhood, which stressed the virtues of self-sufficiency, self-control, and individualism. In contrast, Pratt's successors preferred to focus on athletic masculinity,

---

[1] Richard H. Pratt, "The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites," in *Americanizing the American Indian: Writings by the "Friends of the Indian,"* ed. Francis Paul Prucha (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973): 261.

[2] Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Policy in Crisis: Christian Reformers and the Indian, 1865-1900* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976); Frederick Hoxie, *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2001).

[3] For examinations of Carlisle, see Genevieve Bell, "Telling Stories out of School: Remembering the Carlisle Indian Industrial School, 1879-1918" (PhD diss., Stanford University, 1998). For the education movement, see David Wallace Adams, *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1995); Jacqueline Fear-Segal, *White Man's Club: Schools, Race, and the Struggle of Indian Acculturation* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2007); K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *They Called it Prairie Light: The Story of the Chilocco Indian School* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1994); Hoxie, *A Final Promise*, 189-210; Prucha, *American Indian Policy in Crisis*, 265-291.

represented in terms of power and gamesmanship, or the idea of winning at any cost. This eventually led to the rise of hedonism at Carlisle, best exemplified in acts of sex and drinking. Such hedonism was consequently averted by the 1914 Congressional Investigation, which examined student masculinity and reintroduced a Protestant model of civilised manliness. In all, attention to "the man" will lead to a greater understanding of not only Carlisle, but also the entire Indian reform movement and the place of manhood within it. Pratt's words are unexamined in gendered terms, yet the connection he draws between race and manhood was pertinent to his mission.

According to Pratt, it was impossible to connect Indianness and manhood. The violent rhetoric of Pratt's speech – "Kill the Indian" – mirrored white-Indian warfare. Undoubtedly, Pratt's army service during the Civil War influenced his choice of language.[4] The violence of his rhetoric also suggested the simple nature of such a process with a single bullet of civilisation eliminating Indianness. Yet this violence, which continued in a different way at Carlisle, was necessary to turn the Indian into a "man."[5] Pratt's statement called for the destruction of all forms of Indianness, with Carlisle releasing the "man" hidden within. For Pratt, this was the goal of a Carlisle education: the destruction of the Indian to enable the creation of a civilised "man."

The Carlisle School aimed to retrieve Indian manhood by replacing "savagery" with "civilisation." With the allotment of reservation land, granting of U.S. citizenship and a civilised education, reformers hoped to include the Indian population in American society.[6] An extension of Ulysses S. Grant's "Peace Policy," which had aimed to end white-Indian warfare in the United

---

[4] Richard Henry Pratt, *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2003), 9-103.

[5] In this respect, it mirrored popular conceptions of the American frontier. See Richard Slotkin, *The Fatal Environment: The Myth of the Frontier in the Age of Industrialization, 1800-1890* (New York: HarperCollins, 1994), 53.

[6] Prucha, *American Indian Policy in Crisis*, 227-264; Hoxie, *A Final Promise*, 75-81.

States, this new policy aimed to include the Native population as equal partners in civilisation.[7] Its success was apparent as after Carlisle's founding, non-reservation boarding schools quickly spread across the United States with Haskell and Chilocco both opening in 1884.[8] By 1902, there were twenty-five non-reservation boarding schools for Natives. All with similar aims, such schools often referred to civilisation as a combination of Jeffersonian and Republican ideals of the yeoman farmer, property rights, male labour, and democracy.[9] With white Americans believing in the superiority of such ideals, they expected civilisation to easily overwhelm savagery. In all, civilisation was a self-defined ideal which positioned whites as the epitome of achievement and condemned anything different as inherently savage.[10]

Pratt's use of the word "Indian" as something for elimination revealed the opposition between savagery and civilisation. The word "Indian" masks the reality and complexities of Native society and culture by reducing it to a single, all encompassing depiction.[11] Using such a simplification to encompass a variety of differences, whites defined the Indian in terms of what they lacked in comparison to civilised society. These differences were largely based upon two prevailing stereotypes: the "bad" Indian and the "noble savage." The former was connected to white fears of the "bad" or "ignoble" Indian, a stereotype which encompassed Indian warfare, sexual freedom, and, at worst, cannibalism.[12] This type of Indian was stifling American

---

[7] Prucha, *American Indian Policy in Crisis*, 30-71.
[8] For a study of Chilocco, see Lomawaima, *They Called it Prairie Light*.
[9] Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 13-14; Slotkin, *The Fatal Environment*, 51-80; Cynthia Eagle Russett, *Sexual Science: The Victorian Construction of Womanhood* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1989), 140-144.
[10] Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 12; Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization*, xix.
[11] The terms "Native" and "Indian" refer to different concepts. The term "Indian" is a white construction which is based on their interpretation of that society and culture. "Native," although rarely used by American Indians themselves, is the term I have used refer to the actual Native people represented in this thesis. For more examination of this concept, see Joel Pfister, *Individuality Incorporated: Indians and the Multicultural Modern* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2004), 21.
[12] Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, 28.

expansion into the West and used as a justification for white decimation of Native tribes. Yet there was another side to this coin in the ideal of the "good" Indian, or the "noble savage." Conversely, this individual was dignified, brave, simple, and open to white demands.[13] Regardless of whether they were "noble" or not, however, all Indians were savage by virtue of their cultural and social background. Yet, the term "noble savage" suggested a potential for civilisation. With such a possibility, the removal of Indian children from their society before savagery took hold could conceivably result in civilisation. As such, students, regardless of their tribal background, were all labelled "savage." Thus, Pratt and his fellow reformers already had set ideas about Indian savagery and their need for civilisation.

To further understanding of Carlisle's attempts to move students from Indian savagery to civilisation, my study will focus on the importance of Carlisle educators' definitions and understandings of manhood. While Roy Harvey Pearce's and David Wallace Adams' analyses of the civilising program examined race, other scholars, such as Cynthia Russett and Gail Bederman, have expanded this discussion to include women and explore how race and civilisation were connected to definitive gender roles.[14] Bederman has interpreted civilised ideals of gender as espousing the rhetoric of separate spheres; women remained in the home while men earned an income in the workplace.[15] Such roles supposedly produced a gendered "set of truths" which instructed men and women how to behave.[16] This separation of spheres connected white men to the progression of civilisation, with the assumption that male dominance in society was due to civilisation and vice-versa.[17] Savage society, by comparison, did not match this desired

---

[13] Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian*, 28.
[14] Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995), 25. Russett, *Sexual Science*, 140-144.
[15] Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 25.
[16] Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 7.
[17] Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 26.

gendered hierarchy. White men, for example, believed Indian society oppressed women by forcing them to labour in the fields while the civilised alternative promoted the ideals of domesticity and homeliness.[18] By learning and becoming civilised, Carlisle expected students to move between these two opposite gender roles. Thus, the Carlisle students were to be assimilated into white gender expectations: men worked in the public sphere and furthered civilisation while women were restricted to domestic affairs.

Gender has been the focus of several academic studies of non-reservation boarding schools. Scholars such as K. Tsianina Lomawaima, Robert Trennert, and Katrina Paxton, have all argued that femininity was central to the teaching of civilisation in Indian schools.[19] Instruction in domestic skills and child rearing was pivotal to teach both civilisation and female subordination into the Native students.[20] My thesis builds upon this foundation and argument: with male power linked to civilisation, the teaching of manhood was also a necessary part of a civilising education. White assumptions of different gender roles in Indian society meant that a vital task for Carlisle was to teach male students about civilisation's expectations of them. Such an examination of the manhood constructed and taught by Carlisle officials can determine whether the school did indeed promote the male roles of Anglo-Saxon civilisation for Indians and thus offer equal entry into white society, or, if they received instruction in different, race-inflected male roles which reaffirmed white dominance. For example, if Carlisle taught students to rely on governmental aid rather than self-sufficiency, this would differ from white conceptions

---

[18] David Smits, "The "Squaw Drudge": A Prime Index of Savagism," *Ethnohistory*, vol. 29, no. 4 (Autumn 1982): 281; Russett, *Sexual Science*, 143.

[19] Lomawaima, *They Called it Prairie Light*; Robert Trennert, "Educating Indian Girls at Nonreservation Boarding Schools, 1878-1920," *Western Historical Quarterly* 13 (July 1982): 271-290; Katrina A. Paxton, "Learning Gender: Female Students at the Sherman Institute," in *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences*, ed. Clifford E. Trafzer, Jean A. Keller, and Lorene Sisquoc (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), 174-186; Carol Devins, ""If We Get the Girls, We Get the Race": Missionary Education of Native American Girls," *Journal of World History*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (1992): 219-237.

[20] Paxton, "Learning Gender," 176.

of manhood. The idea of Indian reliance would brand such a trait in racial terms and therefore signify a lack of civilised manhood, further marking the students as unequal partners in civilisation. The study of manhood at Carlisle thus forms another parameter for the measurement of the school's commitment to Indian civilisation and equality. Exploration of the models of manhood taught by Carlisle expose the extent to which Pratt, school officials, and the wider reform movement failed to achieve complete and equal assimilation despite their openly stated goal.

Carlisle's teaching of manhood entwined with changing government policy. Throughout Carlisle's existence from 1879 to 1918, the prevailing ideas about Indian education changed. Others, such as Estell Reel, had less confidence in Indian capabilities than Pratt, arguing that students be introduced into civilisation over several generations under a policy of "gradualism."[21] Reel, the supervisor of Indian schools between 1898 and 1910, reasoned that Indian education should focus more on vocational training, with the Indian entering at the lower ends of society instead of obtaining equal civilisation.[22] She subsequently dismissed all academic subjects deemed unnecessary for entry into lower-class vocations.[23] Pratt, stubbornly insisting his method was best, refused to listen to Reel's ideas.[24] After Pratt's dismissal in 1904 however, Carlisle implemented Reel's ideas on educating the Indian. As such, in the post-Pratt era, the majority of students were not expected to become equal to whites.

Pratt's dismissal from Carlisle in 1904 allowed the government to appoint someone who would introduce Reel's new policies.[25] The subsequent administrations of Captain William

---

[21] Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 307-321.
[22] Estell Reel, *Course of Study for the Indian Schools of the United States, Industrial and Literary* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1901); Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 315.
[23] Adams, *Education for Extinction*, 315.
[24] Bell, "Telling Stories out of School," 74-75.
[25] Bell, "Telling Stories out of School," 73-75.

Mercer and Moses Friedman closely adhered to Reel's ideal of vocational education.[26] Reel, Friedman, and Mercer believed that equal civilised manhood could only be achieved over several generations. What this means, in terms of my thesis, is two-fold. Firstly, that after 1904 both Carlisle's curriculum and manhood was based upon government policy. Secondly, that the models of manhood taught by Carlisle after Pratt's dismissal were representative of the government's ideal Indian man at this time. Thus, an examination of manhood at Carlisle is also a case study for the wider debate on governmental policy towards the Indian.

This thesis will examine the hegemonic model of manhood as constructed by white officials so as to develop a greater understanding of government policy, race, and civilisation at Carlisle. R.W. Connell argues for the idea of a "hegemonic" manhood within a culture or society. Using Antonio Gramsci's theory as "the cultural dynamic by which a group claims and sustains a leading position in social life," Connell's argument for a "hegemonic" model refers to the idealised version of manhood. The characteristics of such a model of manhood are culturally lauded so as to sustain male dominance over marginalised and subordinated men of supposedly inferior classes, races, and sexual orientations, and all women.[27] Such hegemony exists when the cultural ideal of manhood is combined with institutional power.[28] In the case of Carlisle, the hegemonic model of manhood found in the school's cultural and social make-up is connected to the power of white officials. To avoid the complexity of multiple Native cultures, I am referring here to the school's culture as defined by white officials. The school officials gave rewards and power to the male students who attempted to adhere to the hegemonic model of manhood. Such

[26] Bell, "Telling Stories out of School," 78-92.
[27] R.W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), 77; For Gramsci's concept of hegemony, see Antonio Gramsci, "Ethico-Political History and Hegemony," in *The Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings, 1916-1935*, ed. David Forgacs,194-195 (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1999). For an analysis of Gramsci and hegemony, see Chantal Mouffe, "Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci," in *Gramsci and Marxist Theory*, 168-206 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979).
[28] Connell, *Masculinities*, 77.

manhood at Carlisle did not exist separately from wider society, however. They were in constant discussion to ensure that the school's version was based upon dominant white ideals. Wider discourse affected the makeup of the hegemonic manhood, enabling it to change over time in response to challenges from subordinate models and femininity. Such hegemony is maintained by appropriating the characteristics of the opposing models, thus ensuring its continuing power.[29] It is important to note, however, that the hegemonic model was not the only one available to students. Other models were available, although marginalised or subordinated to the hegemonic version.[30] Thus, using Connell's theory, the identification of the school's hegemonic manhood is possible.

My thesis will use the theory of hegemony to identify changes in manhood related to both school and government policy. Using Connell's concept, I have identified two models of manhood which become hegemonic at differing times so as to maintain Carlisle's leading place in Indian reform. The first, an athletic manhood, was initially based upon the civilised characteristics taught by sport, such as self-control and sportsmanship. After Pratt's dismissal, however, the athletes' model of manhood became increasingly masculine through its focus on gamesmanship. The second model focused on civilised manliness and was represented by ideals such as self-sufficiency and individualism. For the majority of the Pratt-era, civilised manliness was the hegemonic model of manhood. Yet, towards the end of Pratt's tenure, the athletic manhood slowly displaced civilised manliness as the hegemonic model. A result of this change was the rise of hedonism among the students, embodied in acts of sex and drinking, with the

---

[29] Demetrakis Z. Demetriou, "Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique," *Theory and Society*, vol. 30, no. 3 (June 2001):348. Demetriou argues for a "masculine bloc" which sustains patriarchy. However, as I am looking at a single narrative of Carlisle, I will incorporate his idea of appropriation into Connell's "hegemony."

[30] Connell, *Masculinities*, 78-80. Connell also argues that some men are complicit with the hegemonic model of manhood. However, considering that I am examining the construction of manhood by Carlisle officials rather than the actual manhood of students, the idea of complicity does not apply.

model of civilised manliness becoming primarily reflected in the teachings of the school's Young Men's Christian Association (Y.M.C.A.). The hegemony of the athletes' manhood was brought to a head during the 1914 Congressional Investigation of Carlisle. The Hearings led directly to the displacement of the athletes' manhood from the hegemonic position. In response, Carlisle portrayed civilised manliness as the more beneficial model of manhood, resulting in the athletics being downgraded on campus. With such a narrative, this thesis is an examination of two contrasting models of manhood which were lauded by school officials at different times as the hegemonic version.

My thesis is primarily an examination of two contrasting models of manhood represented by Carlisle's "public transcript."[31] James C. Scott argues that the "public transcript" is the behaviour of the dominant and subordinate towards each other. The "public transcript" of the dominant aims to reinforce their power while the subordinate tries to carry favour with the dominant.[32] Conversely, the "hidden transcript" of the subordinate is what happens "off-stage," away from the eyes of the dominant. This represents their true feelings and can be seen in acts of resistance towards the dominant. I have implemented Scott's idea of a "public" transcript in defining it as the image of the school that Pratt, and later other superintendents, wanted the public to see. The school's public transcript was primarily portrayed through the school newspapers, which were edited by a white official at Carlisle.[33] By concentrating on the public transcript, my thesis bypasses the sheer differences in Native cultures and models of manhood.

---

[31] James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1990), 45-69.
[32] Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*, 3-4.
[33] For studies of the Carlisle newspapers, see Beth A. Haller, "Cultural Voices or Pure Propaganda?: Publications of the Carlisle Indian School, 1879-1918," *American Journalism*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Spring 2002): 65-86; Jacqueline Fear-Segal, "The Man on the Band Stand at Carlisle Indian Industrial School: What he Reveals about the Children's Experiences," in *Boarding School Blues: Revisiting American Indian Educational Experiences*, ed. Clifford E. Trafzer, Jean A. Keller, and Lorene Sisquoc (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2006): 99-122.

This is not to say, however, that the students' construction of manhood does not feature. The students' interpretation of manhood, for example, becomes central to my thesis when discussing the Congressional Investigation. Yet, such an area would present overreaching complexities with the hidden transcript presenting both a public and hidden model of manhood in the same individual. By concentrating on the school's public transcript instead, my study avoids such a problem. Focusing on the public transcript also overcomes various problems with Connell's theory of hegemony, primarily that the multiple cultures represented at Carlisle could feature several versions of hegemonic manhood. Thus, by focusing on the hegemonic manhood within Carlisle's public transcript, my thesis examines only one area of such an education, namely the construction of manhood by school officials.

Hegemonic manhood was often culturally constructed in terms of its relationship with femininity. In nineteenth-century thought, idealised white middle-class femininity and manhood were considered opposites.[34] While this is not our current understanding, it was a common idea among the middle-class in nineteenth-century America. This supposedly natural opposition was created by the rhetoric of "The Cult of True Womanhood" and the gendered separation of spheres.[35] Women were advised to remain within the home while adhering to the four feminine qualities of piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity.[36] While both the rhetoric of separate spheres and "True Womanhood" were often broken in the reality of daily life, nineteenth-century writers provided a guide of expected behaviour for both white, middle-class men and women.[37]

---

[34] Connell, *Masculinities*, 68; Ruth H. Bloch, "Untangling the Roots of Modern Sex Roles: A Survey of Four Centuries of Change," *Signs*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (Winter 1978): 237-252.
[35] Linda K. Kerber, "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History," *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 75, No. 1 (June 1988): 9-39; Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 2, Part 1 (Summer 1966): 151-174.
[36] Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood," 152.
[37] For women entering the public sphere, see Estelle Freedman, "Separatism as Strategy: Female Institution Building and American Feminism, 1870-1930," *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Fall 1979): 512-529. Freedman theorises a

In terms of this thesis, this makes the subject of femininity at Carlisle central to the construction of manhood by school officials. While female students were considered the most important part of the civilising mission, such women provided a relational opposite for the male students.[38] The hegemonic model of manhood at Carlisle, as in wider nineteenth-century American society, can be defined by its relationship with femininity.

Both manliness and masculinity are particularly pertinent to the exploration of two competing models of manhood at Carlisle. Gail Bederman, along with other scholars such as Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, argue that manliness focused on power over the self.[39] Evangelical Protestant organisations, such as the Y.M.C.A. for example, promoted manliness as the control of vice and sexuality.[40] Such control over the self allowed the man to focus on other areas, such as improving Christian society and workplace production.[41] Other men demonstrated manliness by improving their health, with J.A. Mangan defining this manifestation as 'physical manliness.'[42] White society believed the concept of manliness was primarily concentrated among the W.A.S.P. middle-class, which brought with it automatic power over other "inferior" men,

---

bridge between the two categories of separate spheres: the "public female sphere." In this, women built public separate institutions which arose from middle-class women's culture: colleges, trade unions, etc. For my thesis, while acknowledging that women entered the public sphere, Indian education mostly focused on keeping women in the private sphere. See Lomawaima, *They Called it Prairie Light*, 80-99.

[38] Devins, "If We Get the Girls, We Get the Race."

[39] Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 12; Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle-Class, 1780-1850* (London: Routledge, 2002), 108-113.

[40] For examinations of the Y.M.C.A. and the Muscular Christian movement, see Clifford Putney, *Muscular Christianity: Manhood and Sports in Protestant America, 1880-1920* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2001); David I. Macleod, *Building Character in the American Boy: The Boy Scouts, YMCA, and Their Forerunners, 1870-1920* (Madison and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983); William J. Baker, "To Pray or to Play? The YMCA Question in the United Kingdom and the United States, 1850-1900," in *A Sport-Loving Society: Victorian and Edwardian Middle-Class England at Play*, ed. J. A. Mangan (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006): 198-216.

[41] E. Anthony Rotundo, "Learning about Manhood: Gender Ideals and the Middle-Class Family in Nineteenth-Century America," in *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*, ed. J.A. Mangan and James Walvin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987), 38-40.

[42] J. A. Mangan and James Walvin, "Introduction," in *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*, ed. J.A. Mangan and James Walvin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987), 1.

such as working-class immigrants, who were unable to control their behaviour.[43]As such, the middle-class men who based their manhood on ideals of manliness were primarily concerned with self-control.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, some white men began to prefer masculinity over manliness. The rise of women's rights and big business had eroded male self-confidence in white manhood. Women were increasingly entering the workplace, an area largely male dominated while a significant number of white middle-class men were also being employed in offices, which offered little opportunity to demonstrate masculinity. The increasing number of European immigrants also threatened the dominance of Anglo-Saxon men in the workplace.[44] A rediscovered belief in masculinity was portrayed by some as the solution to this 'crisis.' Lynne Segal argues that masculinity "exists in the various forms of power men ideally possess: the power to assert control over women, over other men, over their own bodies, over machines and technology."[45] This demonstration of male dominance through the outward show of power was the central concept of this newfound masculinity. Instead of the inner strength espoused by manliness, masculinity was partly portrayed through the physical ability to overpower other men.[46] Masculinity, however, was not excessively demonstrated with excessive physical violence or overt sexuality being labelled "brutish."[47] Such a fear did not result in men

---

[43] This is not to say that manliness was not adopted elsewhere. For example, the African-American middle-class during the nineteenth century based their manhood on the concept of manliness. Martin Summers, *Manliness and its Discontents: The Black Middle-Class and the Transformation of Masculinity, 1900-1930* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 8.

[44] Michael Kimmel, second edition, *Manhood in America: a Cultural History* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 67; Joe Dubbert, *A Man's Place: Masculinity in Transition* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979), 81-114.

[45] Lynne Segal, third edition, *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 103-104.

[46] Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 82.

[47] The position of hyper-masculinity in White thought can be seen in the fear of the black rapist during the nineteenth and early twentieth century's. Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 64. Also see Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin,*

dismissing masculinity as by the time Carlisle closed in 1918 it became a viable method of demonstrating manhood in wider society.[48]

The contest between manliness and masculinity was also played out at the Carlisle Indian School. At Carlisle, both concepts were incorporated into various models of manhood at differing times so as to demonstrate the success of students and the school. When sport was introduced, for example, the athletes' manhood was mostly based upon manliness to prove the students' civilisation. However, when Carlisle's position as the foremost Indian boarding school became threatened, the athletes' manhood became more masculine so as to prove the students' success. Parallels between the Carlisle models to those at work in wider white society provide evidence of the determination to civilise the students, this study thus offering a microcosm for the wider debates concerning manliness and masculinity.

Both manliness and masculinity, however, were inseparable from discussions focusing on race in the dominant society. Manliness was fervently connected to the rise and success of white civilisation. As Bederman argues, "just as manliness was the highest form of manhood, so civilization was the highest form of humanity. Manliness was the achievement of a perfect man, just as civilization was the achievement of a perfect race."[49] Other supposedly "inferior" races did not possess the necessary character to control their behaviour with the inherent savagery of Indian society, for example, indicating a lack of manliness and vice-versa. The highly sexual and lazy nature attributed to Indian men was deemed unmanly by white society, resulting in the Carlisle students being required to prove their manliness at all times. [50] Masculinity, by comparison, became linked to an attempt to rediscover the inner "primitive" man. Although the

---

White Masks (London: Pluto Press, 1986), 81; Paul Hoch, *White Hero, Black Beast: Racism, Sexism and the Mask of Masculinity* (London: Pluto Press, 1979), 43-54.

[48] Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 19.

[49] Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 27.

[50] Smits, "The Squaw Drudge," 299-300.

superior masculinity of the white race had been proven through their "success" on the frontier, there was a belief that civilisation had feminised American manhood.[51] Men, such as Theodore Roosevelt, challenged such notions by using their experiences of both the masculine frontier and civilised manliness to construct a powerful manhood.[52] Yet, this manhood was restricted to civilised men as during the frontier conflict the Indian had been demeaned as savage so as to justify white actions. As soon as the Indian was defeated and confined to the reservation, they were conversely deemed effeminate for relying on government aid. [53] No longer deemed a threat to white society, the Indian was ironically criticised for lacking the self-sufficiency necessary for civilised manhood. As such, due to the emasculation of their race on the frontier, the Carlisle school was required to teach Indian students manhood.

A central concept to overcome when teaching manhood at Carlisle was the link between masculinity and the primitive. As the school aimed to eliminate savagery, any display of primitive masculinity by students could be interpreted as evidence of Indianness. Carlisle, hopeful of civilising students, was thus treading a tightrope when teaching manhood. It aimed to offer students equal civilisation, which included manhood, but students being too masculine would be detrimental to Carlisle's public transcript. Carlisle needed to circumnavigate assumptions of Indian savagery if school officials wished to implement masculinity into the students' manhood.

In order to allow students to prove masculinity, Carlisle officials introduced sport onto campus. Sport was seen as an ideal method of affirming both manliness and masculinity during the late nineteenth century. The rise of sport had coincided with the so-called crisis in

---

[51] Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 91; E. Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1993), 185-193.
[52] For an examination of Roosevelt's construction of manhood, see Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization*, 170-216.
[53] Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 65.

masculinity, with football being considered a replacement of the frontier.[54] In this line of thought, football was an arena where men could demonstrate masculinity.[55] The obvious need for strength to secure victory was most apparent in football.[56] Yet, some commentators, such as the "father of football" Walter Camp, also considered it an ideal arena for displays of manliness too. The inherent violence of football allowed athletes an opportunity to demonstrate self-control by not reacting to opposition brutality.[57] This, combined with the demonstration of leadership and tactics, was interpreted as evidence of self-control and manliness. Thus, sport offered Carlisle students the ideal opportunity to demonstrate both manliness and masculinity while remaining within the wider construct of civilisation.

Carlisle introduced games against external collegiate opposition in the early 1890s.[58] While Carlisle also played baseball and, in later years, lacrosse, my thesis will examine the construction of an athletic manhood based primarily on football.[59] Carlisle's football team

---

[54] Michael Kimmel, "Baseball and the Reconstitution of American Masculinity, 1880-1920," in *Sport, Men, and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives*, ed. Michael A. Messner and Donald F. Sabo (Champaign, Illinois: Human Kinetics Books, 1990), 56; Kimmel, *Manhood in America*, 92.

[55] Michael Oriard, *Reading Football: How the Popular Press Created an American Spectacle* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 191; David Wallace Adams, "More Than a Game: The Carlisle Indians Take to the Gridiron, 1893-1917," *Western Historical Quarterly* 32 (Spring 2001), 28.

[56] Michael A. Messner, *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem of Masculinity* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992), 61-84.

[57] Oriard, *Reading Football*, 206-215.

[58] For sport at Carlisle see, Sally Jenkins, *The Real All-Americans: The Team that Changed a Game, a People, a Nation* (New York: Doubleday, 2007); Lars Anderson, *Carlisle vs. Army: Jim Thorpe, Dwight Eisenhower, Pop Warner, and the Forgotten Story of Football's Greatest Battle* (New York: Random House, 2007). For a more academic approach to Carlisle sport, see John Bloom, *To Show What an Indian Can Do: Sports at Native American Boarding Schools* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2000); Michael Oriard, *Reading Football*, 229-247; Ray Gamache, "Sport as Cultural Assimilation: Representations of American Indian Athletes in the Carlisle School Newspaper," *American Journalism*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Spring 2009): 7-37; Adams, "More Than a Game, 25-53; Joseph B. Oxendine, *American Indian Sports Heritage* (Champaign, Illinois: Human Kinetic Books, 1988), 183-238; Philip J. Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 2004), 109-135. For general histories of American sport, see Benjamin G. Rader, *American Sports: From the Age of Folk Games to the Age of Spectators* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1983); Elliot J. Gorn and Warren Goldstein, *A Brief History of American Sports* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993); John A. Lucas and Ronald A. Smith, *Saga of American Sport* (Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1978).

[59] For baseball at Carlisle, see Jeffrey Powers-Beck, "'Chief': The American Indian Integration of Baseball, 1897-1945," *American Indian Quarterly*, vol. 25, no. 4 (Fall 2001): 508-538.