

CHAPTER III

FOREWORD TO THE DETAILED REPORT

Origin of the Survey. In the spring of 1926, Dr. Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, initiated a series of informal conferences between representatives of the Department of the Interior and representatives of the Institute for Government Research regarding the possibility of having the Institute undertake an independent survey of Indian affairs, embracing particularly the educational, industrial, social, and medical activities maintained among the Indians, their property rights, and their general economic condition.

These informal conferences promptly disclosed a complete agreement regarding the desirability of having such a survey made by an impartial group of specialists in the fields of health, education, agriculture, economics, family life, and law, working under the auspices of an agency like the Institute, entirely free from governmental support and control. A common understanding was also readily arrived at regarding the broad general methods which should be followed in making such a survey. The Secretary of the Interior emphasized the importance of having the work done promptly, once it was undertaken, so that the results might be quickly available for administrative action. He suggested the desirability of having it completed in six months. The representatives of the Institute, on the other hand, were impressed by the variety of the problems presented and the great distances to be covered in absolutely essential field work. Their initial view was that approximately two years would be required. It was then pointed out that a report submitted in two years might come in too late in the administration of the Secretary to be of any real value to him. As the Institute was more concerned with the production of a report that might be adequate and sound for administrative purposes than with preparing possibly a more finished one which might prove only of academic interest, because of the time spent in its preparation, it agreed so to plan and conduct its work that a report might be submitted approximately a year after field work should be started.

The Institute made it clear to the Secretary that the only member of the permanent staff of the Institute who could be detailed to the survey was Mr. Lewis Meriam, who would be placed in charge of the project as technical director. The other specialists would have to be secured temporarily for this particular undertaking. The Institute at that time was not prepared to submit to the Department the names of the persons whom it would appoint to the survey staff, as it could not make such selections until the project had been agreed upon and funds for its prosecution had been secured. It did, however, describe the type of personnel it would endeavor to secure; persons highly qualified as specialists in their respective fields, scientific in their approach, not sensationalists, and free from preconceived views and opinions that would interfere with their impartiality and fairness in gathering and interpreting the facts. It was recognized that to get this impartiality and fairness it would often be necessary to select persons who had not previously made any special study of Indians and Indian affairs. The Secretary was further assured that, although the Institute for Government Research would make the selections for appointment to the staff, it would discuss with the proper officers of the Interior Department the training, experience, and personal qualifications of the persons considered for special employment so that it might be sure that these officers were reasonably satisfied at the outset. The Institute had no desire to appoint anyone whose work would be discounted from the beginning by officers of the Department or by public spirited citizens interested in the problems considered. Its object would be not to have different sides represented on its staff but to select persons qualified as specialists who had not previously taken sides.

On June 12, 1926, the Secretary of the Interior sent the following letter to the Director of the Institute for Government Research:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

WASHINGTON

June 12, 1926.

*Dr. W. F. Willoughby, 26 Jackson Place, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR DR. WILLOUGHBY:

Referring to your letter of May 26 in reply to mine of May 21, I am pleased to note that we are in substantial agreement regard-

ing the nature of the survey of Indian affairs and the general procedure which should be followed in conducting it. It should embrace the educational, industrial, social and medical activities maintained among the Indians, their property rights and their general economic conditions. It should be conducted by persons selected because of their impartiality and special qualifications who will command the confidence of those concerned, the government officials, the Indians and the general public. The correspondence with you and my knowledge of the Institute for Government Research convince me that the Institute is specially well qualified to conduct such a survey in a thoroughly impartial and scientific spirit with the object of making the result of its work a constructive contribution in this difficult field of government administration. I wish, therefore, formally to request that the Institute for Government Research undertake a comprehensive survey and to assure you, if you can undertake it, of the full coöperation of the Department of the Interior.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) HUBERT WORK, *Secretary.*

The Survey Privately Financed Through the Institute. Upon receipt of this letter the Institute agreed at once to take steps to see if it could raise the funds necessary for this special project, as its regular funds were appropriated for other activities already under way. It secured very promptly a small special gift to enable it to carry on the preliminary planning of the project. By the first of October pledges had been received guaranteeing to the Institute the entire amount which it believed would be required. All the money came from private sources. The Institute is entirely supported from private funds and receives no contributions or grants from the government. All expenses of the survey were met from the special funds of the Institute, except that the government contributed to the project indirectly in two ways. It generally furnished members of the survey staff with local transportation about the schools and reservations, and where guest rooms or other lodgings were available the members of the survey staff were permitted to use them without charge or with a very nominal charge for care and cleaning. When staff members were accorded the privileges of the employees' mess at a school or reservation, they paid the standard price for meals.

The Survey Staff. The Institute during the summer had been making its tentative selections for its special technical staff. This staff was made up as follows:

Technical director: Lewis Meriam, a member of the permanent staff of the Institute for Government Research.

Specialist in legal aspects of Indian problems: Ray A. Brown, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin.

Indian adviser: Henry Roe Cloud, President of the American Indian Institute, Wichita, Kansas.

Specialist in economic conditions: Edward Everett Dale, Head of the department of history of the University of Oklahoma, specialist in the economic history of the West.

Specialist to study conditions of Indian migrants to urban communities: Miss Emma Duke.

Specialist in health: Dr. Herbert R. Edwards, on appointment, Medical Field Secretary of the National Tuberculosis Association, now Director, Bureau of Tuberculosis Control, New Haven Department of Health.

Specialist in existing material relating to Indians: Fayette Avery McKenzie, Professor of Sociology and Dean of Men, Juniata College.

Specialist in family life and activities of women: Miss Mary Louise Mark, Professor of Sociology, Ohio State University.

Specialist in education: W. Carson Ryan, Jr., Professor of Education, Swarthmore College.

Specialist in agriculture: William J. Spillman, Agricultural Economist, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture.

For the use of persons who desire to know in detail the training and experience of the specialists that led to their selection, a statement of the essential facts regarding each of them is given at the end of the present foreword (pages 79 to 85).

In addition to the technical staff the survey has been assisted by a corps of clerks and research assistants. Mr. R. B. Stambaugh served as executive field clerk. Special mention should be made of the statistical clerks under the direction of Mrs. Ada T. Briggs,

who have been continuously employed since the organization of the survey, compiling existing statistical material and other data from the files of the Indian Office.

In every instance the persons appointed were selected by the Institute for Government Research upon its own motion without suggestion either from the Indian Office or the Department of the Interior. In no case was any objection raised by any officers of the Department to any of the names submitted by the Institute.¹

The Area Covered. The selection of the special staff was of course the first administrative problem that confronted the Institute. The second was how effectively to cover the Indian country and to prepare a report within the time limit of approximately one year from the beginning of the field work.

¹The question of whether several years of service in the Indian Office and on an Indian reservation should be considered as a barrier to appointment was discussed informally with one officer of the Indian Service. It was agreed that such a selection would be inadvisable. If a person who had been long in the Service made findings favorable to it, he would be open to the charge of undue friendliness and if he made adverse reports, he might be alleged to be actuated by personal motives. A member of the board of trustees of one of the Indian associations took the same view, and felt it would be unwise even to select as executive field clerk one who had been employed in the Department, despite the fact that such a previous knowledge of the reservations and transportation arrangements would be invaluable to the survey. The Institute made it a rule not to select employees or former employees of the Indian Service; but Dr. F. A. McKenzie's year as teacher at the Wind River School in Wyoming in 1903-04, when he was gathering material for his doctor's thesis, was not regarded as a barrier. Similarly, in seeking a lawyer the Institute took the position that it would be unwise to select a person who had been actively engaged in Indian cases either before the courts, the Department, or Congress. Although such a lawyer would have brought valuable knowledge of Indian law and procedure, he would be open to a charge of bias. It seemed preferable to turn to the law schools for recommendations. Mr. Ray A. Brown was suggested independently, by both Dean Pound and Professor Frankfurter of the Harvard Law School.

Henry Roe Cloud was mentioned among the outstanding representative Indians by all who were consulted on this appointment. His name was used from the very beginning of the informal conferences with the government officials as the type of Indian the Institute would seek as Indian adviser, if it should be decided, as it ultimately was, to have a single Indian adviser for the entire work of the survey.

The Institute was extremely fortunate in being able to secure the services of Mr. Cloud and is under deep obligation to the Board of Trustees of the American Indian Institute for releasing him for the year from his duties at his school.

The Institute had before it the statistical tables in the annual report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs showing the number of Indians in the United States and their distribution. It was extremely fortunate, too, in the fact that Dr. Laurence F. Schmeckebier, of the permanent staff of the Institute, already had nearing completion a descriptive monograph on the Office of Indian Affairs, covering its history, activities, organization, plant, basic law, and finances, one of the series of service monographs being prepared by the Institute for each of the important units of the government service.² Dr. Schmeckebier, an experienced statistician, had compiled for this monograph a great body of statistical data which was available for the use of the survey staff. For this monograph a bibliography had already been prepared. The bibliographer of the Institute, Mrs. Sophy H. Powell, therefore, was already prepared promptly to gather for the survey staff an effective working library.

According to the statistics in the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, which in part are compiled by the Office of Indian Affairs and in part are taken from the report of the Census Bureau,³ the Indian population numbers approximately 325,000, excluding the Freedmen and the inter-married whites of the Five Civilized Tribes, with both of which non-Indian groups the Service had something to do. If they are included the number approximates 350,000.

In this figure of 350,000 are included 101,506 of the Five Civilized Tribes, of which 75,519 are Indians by blood, 23,405 Freedmen, and 2582 inter-married whites. Among the 75,519 Indians by blood are many who have so small an admixture of Indian blood and who are so far advanced in their social and economic status that they do not enter into the real Indian problem. The figures

²This monograph is now published as "The Office of Indian Affairs," 591 pp., Service Monograph No. 48, Institute for Government Research. The Johns Hopkins Press, 1927. It is purely descriptive in character and is based on a study of the documentary material and the general literature. This monograph, with the present survey report, gives a fairly complete study of the Indian Service.

³The Indian Service compiles figures only for the states in which it operates. For other states it accepts census figures. For Indian Service states there is a discrepancy between the Indian Office and the Census Bureau figures. For the figures of the two organizations by states and for a discussion of the discrepancy see Schmeckebier, Office of Indian Affairs, pp. 310-12.

for the Five Civilized Tribes, too, may be very far from showing the present number, as they are those of the present roll made in 1907. Exclusive of the Five Civilized Tribes, the number of Indians is about 250,000.

Every state in the Union has some Indians, but in most of the eastern states the numbers are small. According to the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for 1926, twenty-three states each had one thousand or more. Arranged in the descending order, according to number of Indians, these twenty-three were:

Oklahoma ⁴	120,487	Oregon	6,662
Arizona	44,729	Nevada	5,692
South Dakota	24,676	New York	5,342
New Mexico	22,527	Idaho	3,959
California	18,913	Nebraska	2,639
Minnesota	14,819	Texas	2,110
Montana	13,273	Wyoming	1,899
Washington	12,436	Utah	1,584
North Carolina	12,191	Kansas	1,527
North Dakota	10,119	Mississippi	1,200
Wisconsin	8,089	Louisiana	1,066
Michigan	7,610		

The Indian Service does not operate in Texas and Louisiana and is only nominally in charge of the Indians in New York. Of the Indians in North Carolina 2833 are under the supervision of the Indian Service and 9358 are scattered throughout the state; of those in Michigan 1193 are under the Indian Service and 6417 are scattered. In three states the Indian population under the Indian Service is less than 1000, namely, Colorado 790, Florida 460, and Iowa 374, although in Colorado the total number of Indians according to the Census figure for 1920 is over 1000.

Study of such figures quickly disclosed that it would be impracticable in a year's time to have the entire survey staff visit each jurisdiction and make a thorough first-hand investigation. Examination of existing material and interviews with persons familiar with the Indian situation disclosed that conditions in the various jurisdictions were very different, and that it would be impossible to study a few and generalize from them to the remainder, a fact

⁴ The 120,487 figure for Oklahoma is made up as follows: Indians other than those of Five Civilized Tribes, 18,981; Five Civilized Tribes Indians by blood, 75,519, Intermarried whites, 2582 and Freedmen, 23,405.

which was fully borne out by the subsequent work of the survey. The practicable course appeared to be to lay out an itinerary with due regard to geography and climate in such a way that most of the larger and hence more important jurisdictions could be visited by most of the survey staff, and insofar as practicable to send one or two members of the party on brief inspectional trips to smaller jurisdictions within reach from the main itinerary. Thus, although the staff as a whole had a more or less common itinerary, there were many individual departures from it. The departures were to a considerable extent governed by the relative importance of different phases of the problem in various sections. The specialist in the field of health modified the general itinerary to enable him to see most of the important health activities of the Service. Likewise, the specialist on education arranged to see most of the larger government schools. The specialist in agriculture had to make many departures from the general itinerary because of weather conditions. The legal specialist found relatively less to do in the field and more to do in Washington than did the others and governed his time accordingly.

The specialist studying the condition of migrated Indians worked generally apart from the rest of the staff. She secured such leads as were available from Indian schools and reservations and went to a number of centers where Indians were known to live. She visited their homes and secured case histories and also visited their places of employment, schools their children attended, and social and civic agencies which touched their lives.

What was covered is summarized in the following tabular statement, which lists the jurisdictions in the stub and gives the names of the members of the survey staff in the heading. The numeral one under the name of a staff member and opposite the name of a jurisdiction shows that the staff member named visited the jurisdiction indicated. The first column shows the population of the jurisdiction and the second column the total number of members of the staff who visited the jurisdiction. A statement of the jurisdictions not visited follows the table.

River 192 and Western Shoshone 680; in North Carolina, Eastern Cherokees 2833; in North Dakota, Standing Rock 3626, and Turtle Mountain 4202; in Oklahoma, Cantonment, 724; in South Dakota, Crow Creek 924, and Lower Brule 595; in Wisconsin, Hayward 1365, Lac du Flambeau 839, Laona 875, and La Pointe 1731.

The time spent by any one person at any one place was of course limited. Only in exceptional instances did it exceed three or four days. The several specialists, however, had more or less separate and distinct fields to which they mainly devoted themselves, and thus a great deal could be covered in any one jurisdiction even if the time spent there was short. A three-day visit from all ten of the staff was much more than the equivalent of thirty days' work by one person, because each individual was a specialist in his particular field, and brought to the problems the years of experience in that field. Then, too, despite the differences in jurisdictions, much was common to all, especially as it related to matters of administration of more or less standardized activities. Thus the evidence was often cumulative. The outstanding illustration of this similarity is perhaps the uniform course of study in government Indian schools, though much else about the schools was almost equally so. Civil Service standards and practices have been fairly uniform so that conditions with respect to personnel tended to repeat themselves. The conditions with respect to accounting, purchases, supplies, and so forth, are other illustrations. Fairly early in the work it became possible in many fields to note quickly general conformity and to look mainly for differences.

The Methods of the Survey. Several persons interested in Indian affairs have expressed a desire for information regarding the methods followed by the survey staff. It seems advisable therefore in this foreword to attempt to give a brief statement of the methods pursued.

Study of Existing Material. Before the survey staff visited a jurisdiction the effort was made to have compiled from the records of the Indian Office the available statistics relating to the major subjects of interest for that jurisdiction. For the first jurisdictions visited Dr. Dale had found it practicable, while in Washington, to examine the narrative reports of the superintendents for the past several years, and the reports of the Board of Indian Commis-

sioners, and to prepare from them summaries of their statements of existing conditions and needs which were studied by the members of the staff before visiting the jurisdictions. For the jurisdictions visited later, it was not practicable to take his time from field work for this task. Through the courtesy of the Indian Office and the Board of Indian Commissioners, however, duplicates of reports asked for were kindly forwarded to the survey staff while in the field so that they could be studied prior to the visit. For the Five Civilized Tribes the survey had the advantage of a special memorandum prepared for it from existing reports by Dr. L. F. Schmeckebier of the regular staff of the Institute. Each member of the staff had also a set of documents regarding the Service as a whole, furnished by the Indian Office, and the executive clerk carried a small library, including recent congressional hearings and certain of the reports of the Bureau of Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution.

Conferences with Superintendents. Upon arrival at a jurisdiction the first step was generally to hold an informal staff conference with the superintendent and such of his assistants as he called in. These conferences generally began with a general discussion of conditions on the reservation. The object was primarily to get the views and opinions of the superintendent himself. Some superintendents took the lead and presented fully and freely a comprehensive general statement. Others waited for specific questions from the survey staff and confined their answers fairly closely to the questions asked. These differences were due primarily to differences in temperament, for almost all the superintendents apparently welcomed the visits and sought to give the staff all the information desired and to furnish them with all facilities for studying the situation.

After discussing the general situation with the superintendent each member of the staff took up with him the question as to the most practicable means of seeing those activities that lay in his particular field. At the schools this problem was generally simple enough because everything was close at hand, the different staff members could say fairly precisely what they wished to see and all could be arranged in a few minutes. On reservations the problem was very different, complicated as it was by the factors of distance, road conditions, means of transportation, and sometimes lodgings at the far end of the trip. An outstanding illustration was at San

Carlos, Arizona, where the members of the survey staff were not only tremendously interested in Superintendent Kitch's description of his work with the tribal herd and the Indian cattle, but expressed the keen desire that Dr. Dale, the cattleman of the survey and Mr. Meriam should actually see the activities. Superintendent Kitch explained the difficulties, such as distance, mountain roads, early start and late return. He expressed the view that the trip would be too rough an experience. For a few moments it seemed somewhat doubtful whether he wanted the two members of the staff to make the trip, but as they continued to insist his real attitude became apparent. He was really extremely anxious for his work to be seen, but he did not wish to assume the responsibility for the decision. He promptly arranged not only to have his chief stockman go but to go himself, thus providing two cars in case of an accident to one. Mr. Hunter, assistant district superintendent for the district, was present and arranged to go too. Such a trip, lasting from early morning to late at night, afforded the opportunity not only for seeing the cattle and the activities in connection with them but also for full, free, and uninterrupted discussions with the superintendent, the assistant district superintendent, and the chief live-stock man and some chance to visit the cowboy in immediate charge of the herd at Ashe Flat.

In a general way that illustration typifies the arrangements made. Each member of the survey staff would indicate the particular activities he or she wished to see first hand and the superintendent would arrange that he be taken to see them, usually by the persons on the reservations most intimately concerned with that particular brand of work. Many superintendents themselves accompanied some one of the party. Others took a somewhat different attitude and preferred not themselves to accompany any of the groups.

Examining and Checking Statistics. The specialist on existing information generally went to the office where he checked and verified the statistics secured from the Washington Office and discussed problems in general with the chief clerk and others in the office.

Examining Health Activities. The specialist on health would meet the doctors and the nurses and would visit the hospitals, sanatoria, clinics, and other medical activities. Often he would accompany the doctors in their visits to the homes, and he would see and examine patients, both in the homes and in the institutions. In

some instances he checked up on the diagnosis of tuberculosis, he watched examinations, treatment, and operations for trachoma, and examined cases previously operated, and he was present at clinics for venereal disease. At all jurisdictions visited he inquired into the matter of records of work done and into the accuracy and completeness of mortality and morbidity statistics. At schools he not only inquired into the strictly medical work but also inspected the dormitories, the kitchen and dining room, and the dairy herd, and gave special consideration to the diet and the preparation of the food. At most of the meals served at the schools during the visit of the survey staff, some member of the party was present despite the early breakfast hour.

Visiting Schools. The specialist on education devoted himself primarily to visiting non-reservation boarding schools, reservation boarding schools, day schools, and public schools having Indian children. His contacts were primarily with superintendents, principals, teachers, and day school inspectors, and with the Indian children in the class rooms. He also visited Indian homes and attended Indian councils to get first hand impressions of the school problems from the Indian point of view.

Visiting Farms. The specialist in agriculture sought out primarily the school and the agency farmers. At the schools it was generally a simple matter to visit the farms, the dairy barns, the horse barns, the hog pens, and the poultry houses and to attend the class room work in agricultural education. On the reservations the problem was to get out on the Indian farms to visit the Indian farmers in their homes, to inspect their fields, stock, barns, and equipment, and to discuss agriculture with them. Often this meant days of riding about the reservation, generally with the local farmer as a companion. The superintendents and the farmers were invariably told that the desire was to see not the best or the worst but a fair sample; some good, some bad, but perhaps more just average. The most practicable general procedure was to take a given route and to visit all along the way who were found at home. Sometimes unquestionably superintendents and farmers were eager to show the best, and equally unquestionably others were anxious to show the worst, but in general they caught the spirit of the survey and visited farms as they came. Occasionally special trips were made to see someone who was

an outstanding success or someone who was an equally outstanding failure.

Visiting Homes and Schools to Observe Work with Girls and Family Life. The specialist in family life and the activities of women had a most varied and difficult assignment. At the schools she was primarily concerned with the work done by and for girls. This embraced not only the formal education given them in academic subjects, in domestic arts and science, and in training for definite occupations, such as teaching, nursing, and clerical work, but also their industrial work in the school and that most difficult and intangible subject, the effect of the school upon them and their relationship to the white persons with whom they came in close contact, especially teachers and matrons. She had to consider not only what they were formally taught but also what they got indirectly as training for the life which was ahead of them. She had to visit and talk with the teachers and matrons, attend class rooms, spend sometime in the domestic science and arts classes, study the production work in cooking and sewing, inspect the girls' living quarters and determine the conditions under which they live and especially the discipline, leadership, and recreation, and wherever possible to talk with the Indian girls themselves and with Indian women employed in the school or living at or near it. On the reservation her problem was to talk with the field matrons, field nurses, farmers, superintendents, and others to learn what was being done for women, girls, and families, to visit as many families as possible and to talk with Indian women and girls in their own homes to get their point of view and to see for herself the conditions under which they lived. So many comments had been made regarding the difficulties of interviewing Indian women and getting them to talk, that the members of the survey staff were much surprised at the quiet cordiality and friendliness with which they were received by the Indian mothers. Kipling's observation that the Colonel's lady and Judy O'Grady are sisters under the skin is of wider application; it extends across lines of race. Miss Mark has had wide experience in interviewing different classes of women, the poor of urban communities, immigrants, negroes, and native mountain whites in the Appalachian hills; and she found the Indian women, if anything, more approachable if allowance is made for the difficulties of language. Possibly the greatest difficulty encountered was in

ascertaining the number living in the household and their relationship. The families often have not only three generations, but also friends and relatives; and the Indians apparently do not think of relationship in such precise terms as the whites use. Here again the effort was to see the best and the worst, but mostly the average.

A word should be said regarding the almost hungry eagerness with which this woman from the outside was seized upon by the woman employees of the more isolated schools and reservations. In part it may have been due to the fact that she was generally the only woman in the visiting group, but it is also true that since most of the administrative officers and inspectors from Washington are men and the reservations are rarely visited by women interested particularly in the problems of women, women employees naturally feel that a woman's viewpoint on many important matters is not given due consideration.

Work to Determine General Economic Conditions. The specialist in general economic conditions had likewise a subject of great diversity. At the boarding schools he paid particular attention to the prevocational and vocational industrial work and to the purely productive work of maintaining the institution. On the reservations his main work was to look into the chief economic resources and to visit the various economic activities in company with those who were primarily responsible for them. In the cattle country, as has been pointed out, this meant going out to see the cattle with the cattle man. In the timber country it meant visits to the lumbering operations and the mills with foresters and mill men; in the oil country, visits to the oil fields and work in the office studying the methods of leasing and control. Where irrigation and water development have been undertaken these systems were generally gone over. Many family visits were made by Dr. Dale to get by original observation a general understanding of the economic conditions of the people.

The Work of the Legal Specialist. The legal specialist had little or no work at the schools. He visited several reservations to get a general background for his studies, especially with respect to the Indian courts, jurisdiction over criminal offenses and marriage and divorce, and Indian claims; and then concentrated on a relatively small number of special problems, notably the Pueblo Land Board, the legal affairs of the Osages and of the Five Civilized Tribes,

the water rights of the Pimas and of the Flathead Indians, and so on. So much of the material for the study of his problems was located at the Washington office that he returned there before the others, leaving to them the gathering of what more or less fragmentary data could be secured regarding Indian courts, marriage and divorce, and criminal jurisdiction. From time to time specific legal questions were referred to him by other members of the staff. Individual legal claims and individual tribal claims and tangles were often presented, almost any one of which might take months of study for an intelligent comprehension or court presentation. Obviously one lawyer on a survey staff could not assemble the material necessary for a full understanding of any of these. The problem was not one of understanding each individual claim, but of ascertaining or constructing a practical legal device designed to receive and quiet all peculiarly Indian claims within a comparatively brief period of years.

The Work of the Indian Adviser. The Indian adviser not only interpreted the survey to the Indians and the Indian to the survey, he participated actively in every field of endeavor. Himself the founder and head of an accredited high school for Indian boys, he was deeply interested in the schools. On the reservations he was particularly valuable in visiting homes. His particular achievement, however, was in establishing contact with the Indians. In all announcements of the arrival of the survey staff at a jurisdiction the fact was featured that the staff included one Indian. What is commonly termed the Indian "grape vine telegraph" also worked. Added to these aids was the fact that Mr. Cloud has a wide acquaintanceship among the Indians of the United States and has been active for years in constructive work in their behalf. The result was the one hoped for, namely, that the Indians would come to him. Thus conferences with Indians and Indian councils became a regular part of the work of the survey.

Indian Councils. Whenever any group of Indians expressed a desire to hold council with representatives of the survey staff, their wishes were met. At times the entire staff present in the jurisdiction sat in these councils. When this practice too seriously interfered with other activities, only a part of the group would sit. The ordinary practice was for the director of the survey or someone acting for him to make a brief statement of the origin and purposes

of the survey and to invite the Indians to present any matters that they desired to bring to its attention. The Indians' representatives would then come forward in turn with due formality and speak, generally without any interruptions or questions from members of the staff. Members of the staff made careful, but generally not complete verbatim notes. Ordinarily the Indians spoke in their native tongue and their remarks were interpreted. Younger Indians who themselves spoke good English, used the Indian tongue out of respect for the older Indians, sometimes themselves interpreting their own remarks. Often the Indian chief as presiding officer formally requested that all Indians use the native language so that each Indian might understand what was said. In several cases where the Indians offered no objections government employees were present and in certain instances the Indians expressed a preference to have them present. Wherever the Indians expressed any objection to having government officers present, they were either not invited or if they happened to be present, they good naturedly withdrew. At times the Indians wished to express themselves with considerable positiveness with respect to certain government employees. Curiously in one instance in which the superintendent was tactfully requested to withdraw by a motion from one of the Indians that the council go into executive session with the survey staff, nothing was presented in any way that reflected on the superintendent or the other employees and the meeting was characterized by the high general level of the discussion and the freedom from petty and personal complaints. Later when certain fact material was desired, the Indians themselves suggested that the government men be requested to participate in the discussion.

At the close of these councils, as at the beginning, the spokesman for the survey would endeavor to make it clear that members of the survey staff were not government officers, that they had no power to take any administrative action, that their sole function was to investigate and report to the Secretary of the Interior. Occasionally an Indian would come up and ask that every word of the speeches would be personally transmitted to the Secretary, a request with which it is of course impossible to comply.

The survey made no effort to verify and substantiate every complaint and grievance which was presented or to consider the merits of every claim regarding boundaries and treaty rights that was

brought forward. To have done so would have required far more than ten persons for one year and would have taken the staff far beyond the scope of the present undertaking, but everything that was said was given careful consideration as indicative of at least one Indian point of view. Much of what was said was of course verified and confirmed by other work which the survey had done, notably with respect to matters of health, education, economic conditions, and encroachment upon Indian rights.

One fact noted at several of the councils was that the Indians were apparently uninformed regarding the actions of the government in respect to matters of vital concern to them and did not understand the motives and purposes that underlay them. To some extent responsibility for this situation seemed to be with the superintendents. That much time and effort are required to make these matters clear to the Indians and that a superintendent's life is a busy one, are facts readily admitted; but to keep the Indians informed as to the actions and objects of the government in matters of great concern to them is a task of first importance. That it can be done, and done most effectively, has been demonstrated by several superintendents. Especially noteworthy is the issuance of bulletins, pictures, and cartoons, mimeographed in the Indians' own language. They read them. Where the superintendents neglect the opportunity of informing the Indians, they leave the field to the agitators who thereby become the main source of information or misinformation for the Indians. Where the superintendents make it a rule to keep the Indians informed, the most effective antidotes for the irresponsible agitators is the more substantial industrious Indian who is accurately informed as to actions taken and the purposes thereof.

Numerous informal meetings were held with single Indians or small groups, generally at the hotels or rooms where the staff was staying. Often these meetings would come in the evening. Sometimes the Indians wished to present personal grievances which were listened to attentively for what bearing they might have on the general situation. Sometimes the Indians would come to express the fear that the staff would not be shown certain conditions which the Indians felt should be seen. In most cases such matters had already been inquired about by the staff or had been presented by the superintendent or other employees and arrangement had already

been made for such first hand examination as seemed necessary. In a few instances the Indians presented new leads which were followed up. When they volunteered themselves to take certain of the staff out and show them, the invitations were accepted. Otherwise the superintendent would be told that certain members of the staff especially desired to visit certain sections or certain homes. The general impression of the staff was not so much that the superintendents were trying to hide something as that in the selection of what should be seen in a limited visit, judgments necessarily varied. In one instance the suggestion of the Indians necessitated a long, all-day trip in extremely cold weather to a remote part of the reservation, which the superintendent had not suggested because of the discomforts involved. The conditions there were not unlike the worst which the superintendent had already shown. The only difference was that they were more uniformly depressing and accentuated by the distance from the agency.

Interviews with Missionaries. At each jurisdiction visited the effort was made to visit the missionaries who were within reach, to see their work and equipment, and to talk with them about the Indian problem in general. Right Reverend Monsignor William Hughes, Director of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, most courteously supplied each member of the survey staff with a general letter of introduction to the Catholic missions in the field. The staff was everywhere most cordially received by missionaries of all denominations, and is deeply indebted to them for the opportunity of seeing their work in considerable detail and of discussing with them freely the problems from their point of view.

Interviews with Indian Traders. At several jurisdictions the staff found traders with a great fund of valuable information. In a few cases the traders were able to supply accounts of Indian purchases which were believed to represent practically all purchases made for a given family in a given period, thus throwing considerable additional light on the way in which the native diet was supplemented from the white man's store. More often they could only discuss Indian purchases in a very general way. Several traders are well posted on the production and sale of the Indians' output, both native Indian articles and ordinary commercial goods. No effort was made, however, to make any detailed examination of the trader's accounts or to attempt to determine whether the Indians

were dealt with fairly, because such work was impracticable in a survey such as this. Such evidence as is available suggests the very plausible conclusion that traders differ widely. That some exploit the Indians, especially where the government cannot readily control the situation, is notorious. That others are actually philanthropic, extending a very considerable amount of credit where prospects of early repayment are, to say the least, doubtful, is not so commonly known. In the Navajo country it was almost the rule to find the traders with large collections of native silver work upon which they had advanced goods or money, sometimes in very considerable amounts. Although under the law or the regulations they could sell those pawns after a certain time, they almost invariably declined to take advantage of this means of liquidating assets. The general comment was to the effect that "these are good Indians, they pay when they can, and we don't want to sell these things which they prize as long as they are living." At Darrington, Washington, two members of the staff visited some desperately poor Indians, who were said to have been, several years ago, summarily ejected from their homes, built on land which they believed to have been allotted to them, because the land had been included in a national forest. Because of the inaccessibility of their old homes they said they were obliged to leave behind practically all their household goods, among which they enumerated such things as stoves, beds and bedding, sewing machines, and a phonograph. They had for some years been squatters on a rough hillside, living by casual labor. The local trader and his wife had extended them considerable credit. At the time of the visit the trader's store was a smouldering ruin having been destroyed by fire that very night. Both the Indians and the trader and his wife were wondering how the Indians would manage without the credit which the store had been willing to extend. Several of the traders have lived for years in their present locations and know the Indians more intimately than do the changing government officers. In a few cases, traders took members of the staff out to see Indians whom they thought the staff ought particularly to meet.

Contact with Officers of State and Local Governments. Insofar as the limits of time and distance would permit members of the staff visited officers of state and local governments who were concerned with Indians. The ones most commonly seen were in the

departments of education, health, and welfare, although at times county agricultural agents were found who had given considerable attention to the Indians. In California, Minnesota, Washington, and Wisconsin the state officers were actively interested and supplied much valuable information. At Independence, California, the district attorney who grew up in the vicinity, and also the county sheriff gave valuable material on general conditions in that vicinity.

Relations with Friends of the Indians. At several places it proved feasible for individual members of the staff to call on white persons who can perhaps be best described as "friends of the Indian." Some of them were simply private individuals who have taken a deep personal interest in the Indians in their vicinity. Others are members of associations interested in Indian welfare. Special mention should be made of the courtesies extended to the survey staff by the Indian Defense Association. At San Francisco the files of this association were opened to the staff and Miss Alida C. Bowler, at that time its secretary in California, rendered invaluable assistance in gathering together for each specialist the particular papers which she thought he or she ought especially to see. She also arranged for conferences between members of the staff and members of the association particularly interested in special subjects, and the staff of the survey attended a general luncheon of the membership held specially for it, at which there was general discussion. Mr. John Collier, executive secretary of the association, after a meeting with Mr. Meriam in Washington, kindly furnished from time to time names of persons whom he believed the survey would find helpful. Unfortunately, he was not present when the staff was in San Francisco, but later it proved possible for almost the entire group to meet him in Albuquerque. One very helpful meeting was arranged at Santa Fé by Mr. Francis Wilson, former attorney for the Pueblo Indians, which enabled the members of the staff then present to meet a considerable number of friends of the Indian. Here again there was general discussion.

Technical Aid and Advice. When the survey was first considered, some thought was given to the possibility of organizing more or less formally a board of advisers composed mainly of persons distinguished in their respective fields who could help the active staff members by their expert knowledge of special subjects.

This plan was abandoned in favor of the more informal and more practicable one of having each staff member consult experts in the different fields as he felt that he needed expert aid. The Institute for Government Research wishes to express its indebtedness to the large number of persons who have in this way generously given of their time in aiding different members of its staff.

How the Report was Prepared. In the preparation of the report, the survey staff resorted to the committee system. Each specialist was the chairman of a committee upon which were placed all other members of the staff whose fields overlapped that of the special committee. The specialist on existing data, the Indian adviser, and the technical director were members of all or practically all committees. The chairman of each committee, in informal conference with the members of his committee, then outlined his section of the report. When the outline was completed in first draft it was gone over in detail in committee meetings and was revised on the basis of discussion. The chairman of the committee then wrote the text on the basis of the outline. The report in its entirety, after necessary editorial revision, was submitted to each member of the staff for further suggestions regarding revision. The various sections of the report represent, therefore, insofar as possible the work of the staff as a whole rather than of individual members.

It will be found fairly frequently that the same general subject will be considered in the different sections of the report. For example, native arts and handicrafts are mentioned in the chapter dealing with education, activities of women, and general economic conditions, because they are directly related to each of these three subjects. The treatment of these major subjects would be incomplete without reference to native arts and handicrafts. Although the point of view from which they are approached is always different, there is inevitably some duplication. No special effort has been made to eliminate it and to substitute cross references, because it seemed preferable to make each section reasonably complete in itself. It may be found, too, that there are some slight variations in the wording or form of the detailed constructive recommendations in the several chapters, but if one will look not at the precise wording but at the underlying principle, it is believed that what may seem to be slight inconsistencies are chiefly differences in

emphasis or in the way the thought is clothed in words. If such differences were to have been avoided and if all differences in style of writing were to have been eliminated, it would have been necessary for one person to have written the entire final draft of the report, something which would have been repugnant to the whole spirit of the survey, which was one of coöperation of specialists in different fields with a maximum of team work.

The survey staff and the Institute for Government Research wish to express their appreciation of the cordiality and coöperativeness with which the staff was received by the officers and employees of the Indian Service. Although both the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs asked to be notified personally if the staff found any difficulty in getting access to material desired, it was never necessary to take any such matter up with them. Here and there a little skepticism was naturally encountered, but the usual attitude was one of wanting to do everything possible, not only to further the work but also to make the staff comfortable. The superintendents generally appreciated the reasons that underlay the request of the survey staff that no special entertainments or exhibits be arranged for them and that the work be permitted to run as nearly as possible in a normal channel. Yet many of them and their associates were ingenious in finding little ways in which they could show hospitality. Many employees and many Indians expressed the belief and the hope that the survey would prove of great benefit to the government and to the Indian race. This is the hope of the survey staff, the Institute for Government Research, and those who made the survey possible. It is the purpose of the whole undertaking.

THE SURVEY STAFF

TECHNICAL DIRECTOR. Lewis Meriam, a member of the permanent staff of the Institute for Government Research.

Education: A. B., Harvard (1905); A. M., Harvard (1906) (in the fields of economics and government); LL. B., National University Law School (1908); L. B., Law School of George Washington University (1909).

Positions held: United States Census Bureau (1905-12), Editorial and Statistical Assistant, Special Agent, and Chief, Division

of Revision and Results; United States Children's Bureau (1912-15), Assistant Chief of Bureau; New York Bureau of Municipal Research (1915), member of the staff; Institute for Government Research (1916 to date), member of staff; United States Shipping Board (1918-19), Production Manager, Division of Planning and Statistics; Congressional Joint Commission on Reclassification of Salaries (1919-20), Statistician; Congressional Committee, on Civil Service, Technical Aide on Reclassification Bills; Salary and Wage Commission of North Carolina (1925), Technical Aide.

Publications: Census Bureau Bulletin 94, Statistics of Employees Executive Civil Service, Census Report on Marriage and Divorce (with Dr. Joseph A. Hill), Sections of Census Reports on Women at Work and Child Labor; Principles Governing the Retirement of Public Employees, for the Institute for Government Research, Appleton, 1918, and several papers on social statistical subjects for National Conference of Charities and Corrections, American Statistical Society, International Congress of Hygiene and Demography, American Political Science Association, etc.

SPECIALIST IN LEGAL ASPECTS. Ray A. Brown, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin.

Education: A. B., University of Minnesota (1913); LL. B., University of Minnesota (1915); S. J. D., Harvard Law School (1923); Yale (summer of 1921).

Positions held: Private practice of law, Minneapolis and Duluth (1915-20); University of Minnesota Law School Assistant (1916-17); University of South Dakota Law School (1920-22); University of Wisconsin Law School since 1923.

Publications: Author of articles in Harvard Law Review, Wisconsin Law Review, and American Law School Review.

INDIAN ADVISER. Henry Roe Cloud of the Winnebago Tribe, Founder and President of the American Indian Institute, a non-governmental accredited high school for Indian boys at Wichita, Kansas.

Early history: Born in a tepee in Nebraska about 1884; attended Government Indian School at Winnebago, Nebraska (1891-97), attended Santee Mission School (1899-1901), attended Mount Hermon School (Mass.) (1901-06).

Higher education: A. B., Yale (1910); Oberlin Seminary (1910-11); B. D., Auburn Seminary (1913); A. M., Yale (1912) (in field of anthropology).

Publications: Editor of Indian Outlook, published by American Indian Institute. Has devoted entire life as teacher, minister, writer, and speaker, to Indian cause.

SPECIALIST IN GENERAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS. Edward Everett Dale, Head of the Department of History of the University of Oklahoma. Specialist in the economic history of the West.

Early history: Born in Texas. Grew up on a homestead near the border of the Kiowa-Comanche Indian Reservation. Finished the common school course and worked for five years as cowboy and ranchman. Hunted and trapped for two winters. Kept post office and worked in a store that sold goods to Indians and whites. Served as deputy sheriff and taught country schools.

Higher education: Central State Normal School, Edmond, Oklahoma (1906-09); A. B., University of Oklahoma (1911) (Thesis: The Removal of the Indian Tribes to Oklahoma); A. M., Harvard (1914) (Subject: The White Settlement of Oklahoma); Ph. D., Harvard (1922) (Thesis: A History of the Range Cattle Industry in Oklahoma).

Positions held: Superintendent of Schools, Roosevelt, Oklahoma (1909-10); Superintendent of Schools, Blair, Oklahoma (1911-13); Special Instructor in Summer School, Central State Normal, Edmond, Oklahoma, summers of 1912 and 1913; Instructor in History, University of Oklahoma (1914-17); Assistant Professor (1917-21); Associate Professor (1922); Professor (1923); Head of Department (1924 to date). Was President of the Oklahoma State Folk Lore Association (1915-19); Research Agent, United States Department of Agriculture (1925); Special Instructor in History, University of Texas, Summer Session (1926); President of Agricultural History Society (1926-27); gives courses in Historical Research and Western History with special reference to the Indians, ranch cattle industry, and pioneer farmers.

SPECIALIST ON CONDITION OF INDIAN MIGRANTS TO URBAN COMMUNITIES. Emma Duke.

Education: George Washington University (1899-1901); Statistical Course, New York University (1915).

Positions held: United States Census Bureau, Division of Population (1900-07); United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, Special Agent, investigating conditions of women and children in industry (1907-08); United States Census Bureau, Revision and Results (1908-12); United States Children's Bureau, successively Child Field Agent, Director of Statistical Division and Director of Industrial Division (1912-18); National Child Labor Committee Specialist in Research (1919-20); American Red Cross, National Director of Statistics (1920-21); American Child Health Association in Coöperation with Commonwealth Fund, Director of Research in Child Health Demonstrations and Statistician of Research Unit (1921-26); Promotion of Birth Registration, American Public Health Association (1926).

Publications: Official reports for Bureau of Labor Statistics, Children's Bureau, National Child Labor Committee, Proceedings of National Tuberculosis Association, Illinois Academy of Sciences, magazine articles.

SPECIALIST IN HEALTH. Herbert R. Edwards, on appointment Medical Field Secretary of the National Tuberculosis Association, now Director Bureau of Tuberculosis Control, New Haven Department of Health.

Education: M. D., College of Medical Evangelists, Loma Linda and Los Angeles (1918).

Positions held: Intern, Alleghany General Hospital, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1918); Trudeau Sanitarium, Trudeau, New York, Volunteer on Medical Staff (1920); Bon Air Sanitarium, Bradford, Pa., Superintendent (1921); Virginia State Board of Health, Clinician to Bureau of Tuberculosis Control (1922-24); National Tuberculosis Association, Medical Field Secretary (1924-28). Has made tuberculosis surveys for the National Association in Delaware, Florida, Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska, Idaho, Oklahoma, and Utah. These surveys were general in character and include a study

of the facilities available, both governmental and volunteer, and recommendations for improvement.

SPECIALIST IN EXISTING MATERIAL RELATING TO INDIANS. Fayette Avery McKenzie, Professor of Sociology and Dean of Men, Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa.

Education: B. S., Lehigh University (1895); Ph. D., University of Pennsylvania (1906), (Thesis: The American Indian); LL. D., Lehigh (1916).

Positions held: Juniata, Instructor, Modern Languages and Social Sciences (1897-1900); Blight School, Philadelphia, Instructor, Modern Languages (1900-03); Wind River Government Indian School, Teacher (1903-04); Ohio State University, successively Instructor to Professor of Sociology (1905-15); Fiske University, President (1915-26); Public Recreation Commission, Columbus, Ohio, President (1910-12); Universities and Social Settlement Division of Ohio State Conference of Charities and Correction, President (1909-15); United States Census Bureau, Joint Editor of Indian Census (1910); Recreation Survey of Washington, D. C., Joint Director (1914); The Society of American Indians, Founder.

SPECIALIST IN FAMILY LIFE AND ACTIVITIES OF WOMEN. Mary Louise Mark, Professor of Sociology, Ohio State University.

Education: B. A., Ohio State University (1903); M. A., Columbia University (1907).

Positions held: United States Immigration Commission, Special Agent in charge of New York and Chicago Studies, and Assistant Statistician (1907-10); United States Census Bureau, Special Agent detailed to editorial and research work (1911); United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, Special Agent detailed to retail and wholesale price studies (1912-13); Ohio State Board of Health, Statistician (1913-14); Ohio State University, successively Assistant to Professor of Sociology (1914-28).

Publications: The Upper East Side: A study of Living Conditions and Migration (master's thesis) in American Statistical Quarterly, 1907; Immigration Commission report on Immigration in Cities (with Dr. E. A. Goldenweiser); Section on Cost of Living in report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics on the Lawrence Strike; various articles in Ohio state bulletins.

SPECIALIST IN EDUCATION. W. Carson Ryan, Jr., Professor of Education, Swarthmore College.

Education: A. B., Harvard (1907); Columbia University (1907-10); Ph. D., George Washington University (1918).

Positions held: Nutley, New Jersey, High School, Teacher of Languages (1909-10); Private tutor (1910-11); University of Wisconsin, instructor (1911-12); United States Bureau of Education, successively assistant editor, editor, and specialist (1912-20); New York Evening Post, Educational Editor (1920-21); Swarthmore College, Professor of Education (1921-28). Also Lecturer on Education, summer schools of George Washington University (1915-18); University of Pittsburgh (1923); University of Pennsylvania (1924); Extension course for teachers, Woolman School and Pennsylvania State College (1924-26); School and Society, Associate Editor (1921-27); National Vocational Guidance Association, Secretary (1915-18), President (1926-27); British Educational Mission to the United States, Secretary (1918); Federal Employees' Union, Local No. 2, Washington, President (1919-20); National Education Association, Editorial Council, member (1923-28), Chairman (1927). Participated in many educational surveys, Province of Saskatchewan, Canada, vocational education and statistics (1916-17), District of Columbia School administration (1924), Porto Rico, secondary schools (1925-26); Newark, New Jersey, all year schools (1926), Friends' schools elementary and secondary (1924-26), Carnegie Foundation, study of school and college athletics (1926-27); also editorial services on numerous state, local, and other surveys while in the U. S. Bureau of Education.

Publications: Various bulletins of the United States Bureau of Education and Chapters in annual report of the Commissioner of Education (1913-1923) including Vocational Guidance in the Public Schools (1918); numerous articles on education in School Life, School and Society, New York Evening Post and Journal of the National Education Association; survey reports, especially on secondary schools in Porto Rico (International Institute of Teachers' College) (1926) and on all year Schools of Newark, N. J. (Newark Board of Education) (1926), Annual reviews of education in the United States, originally in Report of the United States Commissioner of Education, later in the American Year

Book and since 1924 in the Year Book of the International Institute, Teachers' College, Columbia University.

SPECIALIST IN AGRICULTURE. William J. Spillman, Agricultural Economist, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture.

Education: B. S., University of Missouri (1886); M. S., University of Missouri (1889); D. Sc., University of Missouri (1910).

Positions held: Washington State College, Head of Department of Agriculture (1896 to 1902); United States Department of Agriculture (1902-28, except 1918-21), Office of Grass and Forage Plant Investigation (1902), Chief Office of Farm Management (1915-18), Consulting Specialist (1921-28); Farm Journal, Associate Editor (1918-21).

Publications, etc.: Farm Grasses in the United States; Farm Science, Farm Management; The Law of Diminishing Returns; Balancing the Farm Output; many bulletins of the Washington State College and the United States Department of Agriculture and also many magazine articles on agricultural subjects, especially in Farm Journal and Country Gentleman.

By breeding and selection developed wheat seed better adapted to dry conditions in eastern Washington. Several of these wheats are now standard crops in Pacific Northwest, notably Hybrid, 128.