

They tended, instead, to funnel the funds into immediate cash for CAP aides and other temporary employees, in consonance with long-standing beliefs as to short-range gains, kin-group loyalties, and the expectation of an early demise of the OEO program.

As to fostering the economic viability of reservation communities, the creation of the necessary infrastructure, for such efforts to succeed, requires the coordinated efforts of many Government agencies (e.g., OEO, BIA, EDA, PHS, and PHA) since OEO alone is not legally empowered to deal with employment, construction, or materials needs, but is devoted primarily to the development of human potential. Human potential, to be developed in the context of Indian reservations, needs almost simultaneous motivation, training, and opportunity—in the face of apathy, lack of skills, and frequently total lack of economic resources. The loans to low-income families and local cooperatives, and assistance to migrants authorized under Title III of the Economic Opportunity Act will not have a permanent impact where enthusiasm, training, and opportunities are absent. Nor is relocation, under present conditions, an answer to Indian problems, since, aside from the fairly well-documented (see Chapter I, p. 2 footnote) antipathy toward leaving the reservation on the part of Indian, the present birth-rate exceeds the current relocation rate, and many of those relocated return to the reservation after a few years, even when relatively successful in the outside world.

An examination of the background and course of such problems in the context of OEO Community Action Programs on the six selected reservations, and suggested solutions to them, constitute the balance of this report, following brief discussion of the research approach employed in this study.

4. *Some Notes on Poverty*

Before discussing aspects of research design pertinent to data collection on the six reservations studied, it is important to examine one further context in which Indian CAPs operate: the context of poverty as such. There are certain commonalities in the situation of the poor, whether Indian, Negro, or white, urban or rural, which are relevant to understanding the dynamics of their involvement in programs designed to benefit them, and to understanding of the potentiality of poverty programs per se.

The characteristic Governmental definition of poverty is economic, measuring resources (primarily net cash income) against a standard of "minimal needs." The figure of \$3,000 for families (regardless of size or geographic location) and \$1,500 for individuals (regardless of location) was used in the 1964 Annual Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

The characteristic social definition of poverty is related to, but differs in basis from, the economic definition. In a social system frame of reference, a man is poor if he is considered poor by those around him and thinks of himself as poor.

By this economic definition of poverty, the great majority of Federal reservation Indians are poor. By this social definition, the situation is not so clear. Data from White Earth, for example, indicate that a large proportion of the population, poor by the Government's economic definition, were surprised to be told that they were poor. At the same time, many Indians who are poor by economic criteria are very conscious of their lack of amenities and are well aware of the local social position that money buys. On this point we have, for example, the following from the August 1964 CAP Application of Oglala Junior Community, Pine Ridge Reservation:

The poverty program is a new experience for the members of the Oglala Junior Community because it offers to build ideas into reality. Many members expressed that they had not realized that poverty existed, as so many of them grew up in conditions which are now described as poverty but was not identified as such prior to this time.

In short, "poverty" as a social class concept applies on Indian reservations, but not in the sense that it does in, for example, urban areas. The difference is apparent both in the lower income levels among Indians who are socially "non-poor," vis-a-vis their urban counterparts—and in the importance of other factors than income which contribute to social stratification—"progressiveness vs conservatism, among them. This is well to keep in mind in going through the data in later sections.

The focal characteristic of poverty in America, among any ethnic group, is dependency. The poor person is directly dependent upon others for satisfaction of his wants and his needs. All members of a society are, of course, indirectly dependent on others, and in some ways most are directly dependent. The question