THE INDIAN STUDIES LAW:

AN EXERCISE IN FUTILITY?

A Report to the Committee on Indian Affairs

Prepared By

Connie Erickson,

Legislative Research Analyst

Published by
April 1996

Legislative Services Division

Legislative Services Division
State Capitol, Room 138
Helena, Montana 59620-1706
PHONE: (406) 444-3064
FAX: (406) 444-3036

THE INDIAN STUDIES LAW: AN EXERCISE IN FUTILITY?

A Report to the Committee on Indian Affairs

INTRODUCTION

With the adoption of the new constitution in 1972, the people of Montana committed themselves to the preservation of the cultural integrity of American Indians. The next year, the Montana Legislature took on the task of translating that commitment into action. The result was the Indian Studies Law. The purpose of the Law was to ensure that every Montana teacher had an understanding of and an appreciation for American Indian people. What the Law became was a source of irritation and confusion and an example of what happens when the Legislature mandates a program in an area not normally within legislative purview.

The purpose of this report is to relate the history of the Indian Studies Law: its initial implementation, its problems, and its ultimate demise. The purpose is also to analyze why the Law has failed in its mission to ensure that teachers are knowledgeable about Montana's Indian people.

MEETING THE CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE

In the fall of 1972, following adoption of the new constitution, Indian educators developed a plan of action to implement Article X, section 1(2), of the constitution. Their first goal was to prepare teachers to teach Indian children by calling for all teacher training institutions in the state to incorporate Indian studies coursework into the teacher training curriculum. The second goal of the Indian educators was to ensure that American Indian history, contemporary Indian affairs, and the contributions made by American Indians to the development of Montana and of the United States were included in the curriculum of every public school, elementary and secondary, in Montana. A third but less important goal was to promote greater involvement by teachers in the lives of their Indian students by instituting programs to orient and acquaint teachers with the Indian community and Indian parents.[1]

With their action plan in hand, the Indian educators approached the 1973 legislative session. Their efforts resulted in the passage of House Bill No. 343,

Chapter 464, Laws of 1973:

> An Act Requiring American Indian Studies to be Part of the Educational Background of Public School Teaching Personnel Employed on, or in Public Schools Located in the Vicinity of, Indian Reservations Where the Enrollment of Indian Children Qualifies the School For Federal Funds for Indian Education Programs, and Encouraging American Indian Studies as Part of the Educational Background of all School Personnel Employed in the State.

Commonly referred to as the "Indian Studies Law", House Bill No. 343 required teachers who taught on or near Indian reservations to receive instruction in American Indian studies. After July 1, 1979, all affected school districts could employ only those certified teachers who met the Indian studies requirement. The Indian studies requirement could be met either through college courses or through inservice training developed by the Office of Public Instruction or by the local school district. The bill met with little opposition in the Legislature and, in fact, was supported by the American Federation of Teachers as well as several individual teachers.

House Bill No. 343 was actually a compromise bill. House Bill No. 501, also introduced that session, required that all teachers in Montana complete Indian studies coursework within 10 years, regardless of where they taught, in order to be employed. While this bill may have more accurately reflected the intent of the constitution, it was apparently too drastic a measure for passage and, therefore, paved the way for the acceptance of House Bill No. 343.

A second piece of legislation passed in 1973 was Senate Joint Resolution No. 17, which encouraged public schools to include in their curricula courses on Indian history, culture, and contemporary affairs and encouraged teacher training programs to prepare teachers for teaching Indian children. Although it did not have the force of law, the resolution put the Legislature on record as supporting Indian studies as an integral part of Montana's educational system.

How equipped were Montana's teacher education institutions and the Office of Public Instruction to handle the approximately 3,400 teachers affected by the Indian Studies Law? At the time of the Law's passage, only three teacher

training institutions in the state offered courses under the title of Native American Studies: the University of Montana, Eastern Montana College (now MSU-Billings), and Western Montana College (now Western Montana College of the University of Montana); Montana State University offered some American Indian courses through other disciplines.[2] The offerings were meager at best: nine courses at Billings, four courses at Missoula, three courses at Bozeman, and one course at Dillon. The remaining teacher training institutions--Northern Montana College (now MSU-Northern), Carroll College, Rocky Mountain College, and the College of Great Falls (now the University of Great Falls)--offered nothing at all in the way of Indian studies. The Office of Public Instruction had no developed program for inservice training, although the federal Johnson-O'Malley program, administered by Office of Public Instruction, offered some guidance on how to develop a program of study.

In addition to the lack of resources to meet the needs of all of the teachers who were affected by this Law, House Bill No. 343 provided no guidance on how best to implement the Law. What courses would be acceptable? Who would develop them? Were enough instructors and materials available? What was the minimum requirement in terms of credit hours? What would constitute evidence of compliance? Who would pay for the additional resources that would be needed? Would teacher candidates be required to take Indian studies courses even if they might not teach in Montana? To answer these and the many other questions that arose, the 1974 Legislature passed House Joint Resolution No. 60, instructing the Board of Public Education and the Board of Regents, acting as the State Board of Education, to devise a master plan for enriching the background of all public school teachers in American Indian culture. Although House Bill No. 343 applied only to teachers who taught on or near reservations, House Joint Resolution No. 60 called for all teachers, regardless of where they taught, to receive Indian studies training within 10 years. A committee of 45 members, 41 of whom were Indian, was formed to develop the master plan. The Committee was given 1 year in which to complete its work.

The Committee's first task was to complete a thorough study of current and

potential Indian studies programs in Montana. Out of this, the Committee formulated 17 recommendations from which the Indian Culture Master Plan (Master Plan) was developed (see Appendix A). In developing the plan, the Committee was guided by three objectives:

> (1) The Native American perspective should be emphasized in college courses, in inservice training, and in public school programs.
> (2) The Master Plan should provide a forum for the presentation of accurate, unbiased information about Native Americans.
> (3) The Master Plan should enable non-Indians to develop an appreciation for and an awareness of Native Americans.[3]

In order to meet these objectives, the Committee determined that teachers must become knowledgeable about Montana Indians and their culture and must be sensitive to the needs and concerns of Indian people. This knowledge and sensitivity could only come from exposure to Indian history, traditions, customs, values, beliefs, ethics, and contemporary affairs through programs of study and course offerings developed with the participation and assistance of Indian people.[4] To this end, the Master Plan contained recommendations for both the Montana University System and the Office of Public Instruction.

To the colleges and universities, the Committee recommended that a Native American Studies director be appointed at each teacher training institution. This director would then work with the education department and with various other departments to develop an interdisciplinary program of courses on various aspects of Indian culture from an Indian perspective. At least one of the courses was to be offered every quarter, and if possible, some courses should be available for graduate credit. A list of prospective consultants was to be developed by the director. These consultants were to be selected on the basis of their expertise rather than on their academic background. This would allow for the use of noncollege-educated Native Americans as a resource in developing relevant and appropriate courses.

The Office of Public Instruction was instructed to develop standards of competency and qualifications for persons involved in providing inservice

training in Native American Studies. As with the colleges and universities, academic requirements were not to be a major criteria for fear of excluding competent American Indians who lacked academic credentials. The Office of Public Instruction was also charged with disseminating information to all the school districts, apprising them of their responsibilities and obligations under the Indian Studies Law and the Master Plan. This information included guidelines for use by school officials in developing their own inservice programs of study.

The minimum requirements for meeting the intent of the Indian Studies Law were set at:

(1) six college quarter credits;

(2) 30 clock hours of inservice training; or

(3) a combination of college coursework and inservice training comparable to either of the above.

The Committee went on to encourage public school and University System libraries to collect materials that reflected an accurate interpretation of Native American history and culture. Bilingual and bicultural education programs were also encouraged at teacher training institutions and as a component of inservice training programs.

On December 15, 1975, the Montana State Board of Education adopted the Indian Culture Master Plan. It was now up to the units of the Montana University System, the Office of Public Instruction, and local school districts to bring Article X, section 1(2) of the Montana Constitution to life.

IMPLEMENTING THE INDIAN STUDIES LAW

When the Indian Studies Law was passed in 1974, the teacher training institutions in Montana were ill-equipped to handle the responsibilities that the Law placed on them. With the adoption of the Master Plan, however, these institutions were given the guidance and direction they needed to begin meeting their obligations. Eastern Montana College, the University of Montana, and Montana State University all doubled the number of Native American Studies

courses they offered within 3 years of the Law's adoption. Northern Montana College began offering courses in 1978. Western Montana College, which offered one course in 1973, added a second course a few years later. The University System units in Missoula and Billings were most impacted by the Law because they were within a 200-mile radius of many of the affected school districts.

Although the Master Plan applied only to the units of the Montana University System, the three private colleges in Montana--Carroll College, Rocky Mountain College, and the College of Great Falls--also began offering Native American Studies courses that complied with the Indian Studies Law in order to maintain their teacher training programs. Carroll had offered Native American Studies courses on an irregular basis prior to 1978. To meet the new Law's requirements, Carroll added courses and offered them on a more regular basis. The College of Great Falls began offering classes in 1974; Rocky Mountain College offered Native American Studies classes through its sociology and anthropology departments.

But even with the increase in the availability of Native American Studies courses, the colleges and universities had trouble meeting the demand created by House Bill No. 343. An indication of this demand can be seen in the enrollment figures for Native American Studies courses at the University of Montana: in 1971-72, there were 71 students enrolled in those courses; by 1977-78, this number had increased to over 1,000.[5] In the continuing education program, the enrollment in those courses increased from 103 in 1972-73 to 855 in 1977-78.[6]

While the colleges and universities struggled to meet the growing demand for new courses that complied with the Law, another issue arose to complicate matters. Since teacher candidates were not required to take Native American Studies courses, with the exception of academic year 1977-78, the courses were geared towards experienced teachers. Many of these teachers wanted graduate credit for the coursework for a number of reasons:

(1) Teaching certificate renewal credits generally called for upper division or graduate courses.

(2) Many school districts required graduate credit for advancement on the salary scale.

(3) Completion of a master's degree was needed to attain a "Professional Class 1" teaching certificate.

Unfortunately, those institutions that offered graduate courses were reluctant to extend graduate credit to Native American Studies courses for reasons that remain unknown.[7] The graduate schools may not have understood the need for graduate credit or may have been reluctant to grant graduate credit to a program so newly developed as Native American Studies.

The demand for more courses meant a demand for more resources, namely additional personnel to develop and teach relevant courses. The Master Plan acknowledged that additional funding would be needed to implement the Law but did not go so far as to recommend that the necessary funding be sought from the Legislature. Rather, the Master Plan stated that the costs of implementing the Master Plan should be absorbed into the Board of Regents' budget.[8]

While the teacher training institutions were struggling to comply with the requirements of the Indian Studies Law, the Office of Public Instruction and local school districts were also hard at work developing inservice training programs. Inservice training was much more appealing to teachers because it allowed them to fulfill the requirement without the expense of going away to school.

The Indian Studies Law offered two possibilities for inservice: inservice training developed by Office of Public Instruction and implemented by a local school district and inservice training developed by the local school district itself with approval by Office of Public Instruction. Both programs required 30 instructional contact hours with approximately 2 hours of additional study for

each contact hour and had to follow the curriculum defined in the Indian Studies Law. The inservice model developed by the Office of Public Instruction was entitled "American Indian History and Culture: An In-Service Training Course for Teachers" and contained four components: cross-cultural awareness, an overview of American Indian history and culture, specific tribal and community orientations, and classroom strategy. Each component was accompanied by a resource list, a bibliography, and a directory of resource people to act as possible consultants. If a local school district used the this model, the district was encouraged to adapt the course to its own community.[9]

If a local school district chose to develop its own inservice training program, it was required to use the same four components described above. In addition, the local district had to provide the Office of Public Instruction with the following information:

(1) evidence of local Indian involvement in the planning and design of the training;
(2) the specific objectives to be accomplished in the training;
(3) an outline of the proposed course;
(4) a list of instructors and resource people, including resumes, if possible;
(5) a bibliography of materials;
(6) evidence of Indian participation in the implementation;
(7) the actual number of instructional contact hours and number of additional activities planned;
(8) the number of participants expected; and
(9) a description of the evaluation method to be used in measuring the effectiveness of the training.[10]

In order to help those districts that chose to develop their own inservice programs, the Office of Public Instruction, in cooperation with the Native American Culture Institute at the University of Montana, the General Assistance Center in Ogden, Utah, and the Center for Cross-Cultural Awareness in Denver, Colorado, sponsored a program that trained people in facilitation, cross-cultural

awareness, and classroom strategies. These trainees then returned to their school districts to help set up the inservice training.

While the inservice training was the most popular way for teachers to meet the new Law's requirements, reactions to the training were mixed. The inservice programs that received high marks from participants were those that were well-planned, that offered college credit, that were not mandatory for every teacher, that and were planned by enthusiastic and committed people. Negative reactions to the inservice stemmed from the poor quality of some guest speakers and from speakers who alienated teachers by holding all non-Indians collectively responsible for the past exploitation of Indian people.[11]

Other negative reactions stemmed from opposition to a legislative mandate that forced workshop participation and threatened loss of employment. Tenured teachers were particularly concerned; they felt that they should have been grandfathered into the Law. Their concerns led Georgia Ruth Rice, Superintendent of Public Instruction, to seek an opinion from Attorney General Mike Greely as to whether or not tenured teachers were covered by the Indian Studies Law. Superintendent Rice posed the following question to Attorney General Greely:

> Can boards of trustees for elementary and secondary public schools districts on, or located in the vicinity of Indian reservations, refuse to re-employ tenured teachers who have not satisfied the requirements for instruction in American Indian studies, as defined in section 75-6130, R.C.M. 1947?[12]

In his opinion, Attorney General Greely considered two issues: the applicability of the Law to tenured teachers and, if applicable, the constitutional permissibility.[13] Attorney General Greely concluded that the Law did apply to all certified personnel, tenured and nontenured, and that the imposition of the Law on tenured teachers was constitutionally permissible. Therefore, his opinion provided the following summary:

> The provisions of the Indian Studies Act, section 75-6121 through 75-6132, R.C.M. 1947, are applicable to tenured teachers.[14]

UNRAVELING THE INDIAN STUDIES LAW

For the first 3 years of its existence, the Indian Studies Law barely caused a ripple in the education community. From 1973 until 1976, most teachers and districts forgot about the Law while the Master Plan was being developed. Tenured teachers thought the Law did not apply to them. Therefore, there was no mad rush to comply. However, beginning with the Attorney General's opinion in 1977, the Law began to unravel.

Delay in Implementation

The first problem encountered by the Law was the delay in implementation. The original Law was passed in 1973 with a deadline for compliance of July 1, 1979. To the Law's authors, 6 years seemed a reasonable time period for teachers to complete the requirements. However, implementing legislation (House Joint Resolution No. 60) was not adopted until 1974; the Master Plan, which laid out the requirements and implementation procedures, was not adopted until 1975 and not implemented until 1976. Although the Master Plan laid out the requirements and procedures for the Indian Studies Law, those requirements and procedures needed to be adopted in the form of administrative rules in order to enforce the intent of the Law. However, because the Master Plan was adopted by the State Board of Education (the Board of Public Education and the Board of Regents working in concert), an entity with questionable rulemaking authority, rules were not adopted until 1978, when the Board of Public Education finally decided to adopt rules that basically incorporated the procedures and guidelines recommended in the Master Plan.

Opposition by Teachers

Teachers, the group most affected by the Indian Studies Law, registered little initial opposition to the Law, even though educational organizations, such as the Montana Education Association and the Montana Federation of Teachers, held a fundamental belief that curriculum should not be legislatively mandated. In fact, these organizations worked to inform their members of the Law's requirements and how to comply with them. However, by 1976, teachers

themselves began to oppose the Law. Threatened with termination unless they complied, teachers affected by the Law resented the fact that not all teachers were covered by this Law. In addition, they resented having to pay for the courses out of their own pockets and criticized the lack of worthwhile courses. As this opposition grew, teachers began to support the repeal of the Law. The educational organizations, however, were reluctant to support repeal because they feared their opposition would be interpreted as prejudice.[15] Rather than a repeal, the educational organizations called for amendments that would include all teachers in the Law and require some state or local funding.[16] In 1977, legislation was introduced that included some of these revisions, but the legislation failed to pass.[17]

Lack of Support From Higher Education

While the Master Plan included specific provisions for the implementation of the Indian Studies Law, it was vague and rather abbreviated about funding. The implication in the Master Plan was that the costs of implementing the Master Plan would be incorporated into the Board of Regents' budget. However, as with any new program, startup money was necessary to hire the faculty to implement the Master Plan. Unfortunately, the Board of Regents neither asked for additional funding for the Native American Studies programs nor received additional funding from the Legislature. Also, Native American Studies personnel within the University System charged the Board of Regents with failure to provide information about the Indian Studies Law to those people affected by it.[18] The Board of Regents did adopt a resolution in 1977 requiring six credits in Native American Studies as a graduation requirement for all teachers. However, opposition from the education departments within the University System resulted in the recision of the resolution 1 year later.

With the approach of the 1979 legislative session, opponents to the Indian Studies Law began to lobby their legislators for its repeal, or at least its revision. Representative Carl Seifert of Polson introduced House Bill No. 219: "AN ACT TO AMEND SECTION 20-4-213, MCA, TO MAKE THE Law REQUIRING THAT CERTAIN TEACHERS OBTAIN INSTRUCTION IN AMERICAN

INDIAN STUDIES PERMISSIVE RATHER THAN MANDATORY." Under this legislation, local school districts would have the option of requiring their teachers to comply with the Indian Studies Law. It would be a local district requirement with enforcement and administration solely the responsibility of the local board of trustees. The effect of the legislation would most likely be that few, if any, school districts would require instruction in American Indian studies for their teachers.[19] Proponents of the legislation included the Montana Education Association, the Montana School Boards Association, individual school districts, and individual teachers. The proponents' arguments centered on the issue of local control of schools and the burden imposed on certain teachers by the Law.[20] Opponents to House Bill No. 219 included the Office of Public Instruction, the American Civil Liberties Union, and individuals, both Indian and non-Indian. The opponents stressed the constitutional commitment to the preservation of Indian culture. They also felt that the Law was having positive effects in a number of areas and should be continued.[21]

Supporters of the Indian Studies Law attempted to head off the attempt to water down the Law by proposing legislation that would address some of the concerns of the Law's critics. Senate Bill No. 218 and House Bill No. 880 would have reduced the number of hours required for compliance, grandfathered in tenured teachers, and extended the deadline for meeting the requirements. The bills would have also incorporated the Indian studies requirements into the graduation requirements for teachers. Both bills failed, as did attempts to amend their provisions into House Bill No. 219. The Legislature eventually passed House Bill No. 219, and it was signed into law as Chapter 458, Laws of 1979, by Governor Judge on March 28, 1979.

WHAT HAPPENED? WAS THERE A BETTER WAY?

Why did the Indian Studies Law fail? Given that hindsight is 20-20, what could have been done to better ensure its success? The Law failed for a number of reasons, all of them interrelated.

Delay in Implementation: The Law was passed in 1973, with a deadline for

compliance of July 1, 1979. However, the procedures and guidelines for implementation and compliance were not in place until mid-1976 and were not formally adopted as administrative rules until 1978. Implementation could have been quicker and smoother if the provisions of the Indian Studies Law had been adopted through the teacher certification process administered by the Board of Public Education rather than legislatively mandated.

Confusion Over to Whom the Law Applied: Because the Law read that by July 1, 1979, all school districts on or near reservations were to employ only teachers who have fulfilled the Indian studies requirement, certified, particularly tenured, teachers interpreted the Law to apply to teachers hired after July 1, 1979, not to teachers already employed in the affected districts. After Attorney General Greeley issued his opinion in 1977 that the Law included certified and tenured teachers, many teachers expressed concern that, even though they were certified to teach and had tenure in their district, they could lose their jobs if they did not comply with this new requirement.[22] Even more confusing was whether or not the Indian Studies Law applied to students preparing to be teachers. Because only teachers in certain districts were affected and teacher candidates seldom knew where they were going to teach until graduation or after, education departments seldom steered students into Native American Studies courses. Most college catalogs even failed to mention the Indian Studies Law when discussing the teacher education requirements. Much of the confusion surrounding the issue of to whom the Law applied could have been alleviated by applying the Law to all school districts; grandfathering in certified teachers; and requiring new teachers, teachers reinstating lapsed certificates, and teachers changing their class of certificate to comply with the provisions of the Law.

Lack of Funding: House Joint Resolution No. 60, which directed the Board of Public Education and the Board of Regents to devise a master plan for implementing the Indian Studies Law, stated that the plan should "provide teacher-training institutions in Montana with adequate resources to prepare teachers to understand the history, culture, sociology, and values of American

Indians as seen by Indians".[23] The Master Plan stated that the Board of Regents would include implementation for the Master Plan in its 1977 appropriations request and subsequent requests to the Legislature. A 1975 study by the Inter-Unit Committee on Native American Studies, whose purpose was to coordinate implementation of the Master Plan between the University System campuses and the Commissioner of Higher Education's Office, suggested that $153,619 was needed to simply meet the rise in expected enrollment costs generated by the Indian Studies Law; this amount did not even address the need for developing new Native American Studies courses.[24] The Legislature never provided nor did the Board of Regents ever request additional funding for the purpose of implementing the Master Plan.

Failure to Involve Teacher Organizations: The 45-member advisory committee that developed the Master Plan included three teachers. While these teachers may have been members of a teacher organization, they did not represent the organization on the advisory committee. Had teacher organizations been represented, questions regarding tenure, grandfathering, certificate renewal credits, and salary scale credits could have been addressed right at the beginning, thus avoiding much of the confusion and opposition that surfaced later in the process.

Lack of Administrative Support: While the Office of Public Instruction worked diligently to assist school districts in implementing the Indian Studies Law, support from higher education was less than adequate. Plans by the Commissioner of Higher Education to produce a brochure answering questions about the Law never came to fruition.[25] Pleas for more funding for the Native American Studies programs often fell on deaf ears.[26] The graduate schools failed to recognize the need for graduate credit for Native American Studies courses. Education departments were reluctant to direct students toward those courses because of confusion and misunderstanding as to whether or not teacher candidates were covered by the Law. The advisory committee that wrote the Master Plan did not include a representative from the Board of Regents or from the Commissioner of Higher Education. Perhaps their exclusion

from the process resulted in their failure to provide the needed support for the final product.

THE INDIAN STUDIES LAW IN 1996

It has been 17 years since the Indian Studies Law was made permissive. In that time, there have been no further changes made to the Law. Because administration of the Law is entirely the function of local boards of trustees, there is no official record of exactly how many, if any, school districts require their teachers to comply with the Law's provisions. The Office of Public Instruction encourages teachers to be more effective and have a better understanding of Indian children by sponsoring the "Effective Practice in Teaching Native American Children Institute" every summer. The teacher education programs at the public and private colleges and universities across the state have changed their requirements to include instruction in multiculturalism, of which Native American Studies is a part. However, only one teacher training program, at the University of Great Falls, specifically requires teacher candidates to complete a course in Native American Studies.

In 1972, the Montana electorate adopted a new constitution that provided for the preservation of the cultural integrity of American Indians. In 1973, the Montana Legislature passed House Bill No. 343, the "Indian Studies Law", as a way to implement the constitutional mandate. In 1979, after much confusion, misunderstanding, and criticism, the Indian Studies Law was effectively repealed. In 1996, the constitutional mandate is still in place. The watered-down Indian Studies Law is still in place. Since 1979, there have been a few attempts to "beef up" the Indian Studies Law, but they have met with failure. The question today, then, is how can the State of Montana give life to the constitutional provision calling for the protection of the cultural integrity of American Indians? The answer to that question is not simple, but it is an answer that must be given.

ENDNOTES

1. Janice Lee Midyett, "An Analysis of the Implementation of the Indian Studies Law of 1973" (M.P.A. thesis, University of Montana, 1988), p. 10.

2. Ibid., pp. 18-19.

3. "Indian Culture Master Plan," 15 December 1975, photocopy (Helena, Montana: Legislative Services Division, Committee on Indian Affairs files), p. 3.

4. Ibid.

5. Midyett, "Indian Studies Law," p. 22.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid., p. 29.

8. "Indian Culture Master Plan," p. 5.

9. Midyett, "Indian Studies Law," p. 2.

10. Ibid., p. 3.

11. Edward Eschler, "Indian Studies Law: A Lesson in Policy Change," report submitted in partial fulfillment of the course requirements of Montana Politics 480, Section 71, 23 March 1979, photocopy (Helena, Montana: Legislative Services Division, Committee on Indian Affairs files), p. 9.

12. 37 A.G. Op. 75 (1977), p. 306.

13. Ibid., p. 307.

14. Ibid., p. 316.

15. Midyett, "Indian Studies Law," p. 52.

16. Ibid., pp. 52-53.

17. House Bill No. 463, 45th Montana Legislature, 1977.

18. Midyett, "Indian Studies Law," p. 47.

19. Eschler, "A Lesson in Policy Change," p. 10.

20. House Education Committee, Minutes of 2 February 1979, 46th Montana Legislature, 1979.

21. Ibid.

22. Midyett, "Indian Studies Law," p. 59.

23. House Joint Resolution No. 60, Laws of 1974.

24. Midyett, "Indian Studies Law," p. 60.

25. Ibid., p. 47.

26. Ibid., p. 31.

c25 6093cexa.