THE INSTITUTE FOR GOVERNMENT RESEARCH Washington, D. C.

The Institute for Government Research is an association of citizens for cooperating with public officials in the scientific study of government with a view to promoting efficiency and economy in its operations and advancing the science of administration. It aims to bring into existence such information and materials as will aid in the formation of public opinion and will assist officials, particularly those of the national government, in their efforts to put the public administration upon a more efficient basis.

To this end, it seeks by the thoroughgoing study and examination of the best administrative practice, public and private, American and foreign, to formulate those principles which lie at the basis of all sound administration, and to determine their proper adaptation to the specific needs of our public administration.

The accomplishment of specific reforms the Institute recognizes to be the task of those who are charged with the responsibility of legislation and administration; but it seeks to assist, by scientific study and research, in laying a solid foundation of information and experience upon which such reforms may be successfully built.

While some of the Institute's studies find application only in the form of practical cooperation with the administration officers directly concerned, many are of interest to other administrators and of general educational value. The results of such studies the Institute purposes to publish in such form as will insure for them the widest possible utilization.

Officers

Robert S. Brookings,

Harold G. Moulton, Vice-Chairman

Frederic A. Delano,

Trustees

Robert S. Brookings Frederic A. Delano George Eastman Raymond B. Fosdick Frank J. Goodnow Jerome D. Greene Vernon Kellogg John C. Merriam Harold G. Moulton L. S. Rowe

Director

W. F. Willoughby

Editor

F. W. Powell

INSTITUTE FOR GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

STUDIES IN ADMINISTRATION

THE PROBLEM OF INDIAN ADMINISTRATION

Report of a Survey made at the request of Honorable Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, and submitted to him, February 21, 1928

SURVEY STAFF

Lewis Meriam
Technical Director
Ray A. Brown
Henry Roe Cloud
Edward Everett Dale
Emma Duke
Herbert R. Edwards
Fayette Avery McKenzie
Mary Louise Mark
W. Carson Ryan, Jr.
William J. Spillman

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS BALTIMORE MARYLAND

1928

COPVRIGHT, 1928, BY THE INSTITUTE FOR GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Lord Galtimore (Press Baltimore, Md., U. s. A.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith the report of the survey of the economic and social condition of the American Indians, made by the Institute for Government Research in accordance with your request of June 12, 1926.

This survey has been made under the immediate direction of Mr. Lewis Meriam of the regular staff of the Institute in coöperation with nine specialists selected for this particular project by the Institute for Government Research. The essential facts regarding the training and experience of these specialists that led to their selection are given, in what I trust will prove sufficient detail, in the foreword to the main report. This foreword describes the origin of the survey, its staff, its scope, and the methods pursued.

To repeat in this letter of transmittal what is set forth in the foreword seems unnecessary, but I should perhaps say that Mr. Meriam has worked continuously on this project from the receipt of your letter of June 12, 1926, to date. The special staff began assembling early in October, 1926. On November 12, 1926, five of them left for the field and were later joined by the others. Field work continued almost without interruption for seven months. One or more members of the special staff visited ninety-five different jurisdictions, either reservations, agencies, hospitals, or schools, and also many communities to which Indians have migrated. Practically all Western states with any considerable Indian population were included in the field work.

The time since June 12, 1927, has been spent in the preparation of the report. Because of the diversity and complexity of Indian affairs this report is necessarily voluminous. The main detailed report contains the following sections: (1) A General Policy for Indian Affairs, (2) Health, (3) Education, (4) General Economic Conditions, (5) Family and Community Life and the Activities of Women, (6) The Migrated Indians, (7) The Legal Aspects of the Indian Problem, and (8) The Missionary Activities among the Indians.

Appreciating the fact that many persons deeply interested in the broader aspects of the Indian problem cannot give the time required for a consideration of the details, we have prepared a summary which will immediately follow this letter of transmittal.

You will appreciate that in the preparation of a report of this character a choice has to be made as to the criterion to be used in measuring progress. One alternative is to compare conditions existing to-day with conditions existing when the various activities undertaken in behalf of the Indians were first begun. The other is to compare the activities as at present conducted with the work of other agencies, both public and private, engaged in comparable activities for the general population or for other special groups. This second method, in other words, may be described as comparing present conditions with the practicable ideal.

Had the Institute for Government Research considered its primary function to be to pass upon the competency and efficiency of the officers and employees of the Indian Service, it would properly have adopted as its criterion the progress made in the several activities; it would have taken the conditions at the beginning as the base line and would have given due consideration to the limitations imposed by appropriations. Such a measure is the only fair one to apply in attempting the difficult task of evaluating the services of individual employees of an organization.

The Institute, however, did not regard this approach to the subject as sufficiently fundamental and constructive. The object of the Institute was not to say whether the Indian Service has done well with the funds at its disposal but rather to look to the future and insofar as possible to indicate what remains to be done to adjust the Indians to the prevailing civilization so that they may maintain themselves in the presence of that civilization according at least to a minimum standard of health and decency.

This use of the practicable ideal as the standard for discussion frequently makes it necessary to criticize adversely the present activities of the Indian Service. Fair-minded readers will appreciate that such criticism is not necessarily a reflection on the officers and employees of the Indian Service. Limited appropriations have often necessitated the employment of persons not possessed of the qualifications requisite for the efficient performance of the duties

of their positions, but the employees generally are as good as could be expected for the salaries paid. Frequently the number of positions is too small for the work to be done. The survey staff estimates roughly that it would take almost twice the present appropriations for the Indian Service if each of its major activities were brought abreast of the better if not the best practice of other organizations doing like work for the general population. In many, if not most cases, the survey is not revealing to responsible officers and employees conditions they do not already know. Their administrative task is to do the best they can with such funds as they are able to secure. The function of the Institute was conceived to be to compare their achievements with the practicable ideal.

In the report the effort has been made to explain the difficulties under which the Indian Service has labored. These explanations are given not in an attempt to evaluate the personnel but to show what changes must be made if the Service is to be raised to the plane of efficiency necessary to accelerate the progress of the Indians.

The members of the survey staff wish me to say clearly in this letter that in almost every activity of the Indian Service they found wide variation between the best and the worst. The best at times approaches the ideal; frequently the survey staff has been able to take as their standard for comparison the attainments of the Indian Service itself. The worst often falls far below the normal.

Inevitably where the variations between the best and the worst are wide, illustrative examples cannot be interpreted as applicable to the Service as a whole. Illustrations have been given both from the better and the poorer jurisdictions, and the effort has generally been made to give some indication as to which the example refers. It follows, therefore, that no fair-minded person will select the best in an effort to commend the Indian Service or the poorest in an effort to condemn it. The object of the survey has been not to take sides for or against the Indian Office, but to endeavor through constructive criticism to aid insofar as possible in pointing the way toward marked improvement in this important activity of the national government. That was our understanding of your request. We hope that our work may be of service to you in the difficult

administrative task which confronts you and your associates who are responsible for the welfare of the Indian wards of the United States.

In accordance with the practice of the Institute for Government Research the report, in preliminary form, was submitted to administrative officers of the Service to afford them an opportunity to call to our attention matters which they believed should be given consideration in the final revision.

In concluding I wish to express our appreciation of the spirit shown by the officers and employees of your Department. They have recognized that the survey should be independent and impartial, and they have not sought to influence our decision regarding the staff, the methods and the scope of the survey, or our findings and recommendations. They have, moreover, extended to us every possible courtesy and have supplied us with all the available information for which we have asked.

Very respectfully,

W. F. WILLOUGHBY,

Director, Institute for Government Research

Hon. Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior February 21, 1928

CONTENTS

	LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	P
	PART I. GENERAL	
т		
1.	GENERAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	
	The Conditions among the Indians.	-
	Health .	
	Living conditions	
	Economic conditions	
	Suffering and discontent The causes of poverty The Work of the Government in Behalf of the Indians.	
	The Work of the Community	
	The Work of the Government in Behalf of the Indians.	
	Absence of well considered, broad educational program	
	Work for the promotion of health.	
	Formal education of Indian children.	
	Economic education and development on the reservations.	
	Family and community development	
	Legal protection and advancement.	
	Failure to develop cooperative relationships	
	Recommendations	
	Planning and development program .	
	Adequate statistics and records	
	Strengthening of personnel in immediate contact with the	
	Indians	
	Adequate salaries	
	better living and working conditions.	
	Retirement	
	Employment of a qualified personnel officer	
	Maximum decentralization of operation	
	Medical service	
	School system	
	IMDFOVING general economic conditions	
	Taxation of property of Indians	
	improving fainity and community life	
	Maintenance of order and administration of justice	
	Protection of the property rights of Indians	
	The settlement of claims	
	Citizenship	
	Missionary activities The economy of efficiency	
	The economy of efficiency	
1.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION	