

chosen by the Tribal Council, not by the people, and the people do not view the Board as a distinct entity.

Local meetings in the communities, though not provided for in the tribal constitution, are formally structured. There is regular membership, scheduled meetings, and a formal organizational hierarchy. These local community councils are the major means of communication between the grass-roots and the Tribal Council. To win support for Tribal Council decisions, or for the projects of any tribal agency, support of the local communities must be gained through discussions at these local council meetings.

Organization of the local community councils is not uniform. Generally there is one council per district, with the exception of District Six which has two. It should be noted that these local councils are not the district councils. The constitution calls for the district councils to be chaired by the senior councilman of the district; the local community councils, while generally functioning for one district, are not chaired by any of the councilmen, but by a resident of the district elected by the people. An interesting situation arises in the Maricopa section of the reservation where a community council exists but rarely meets. Instead, most community meetings are called by the leadership of two farm cooperatives, this leadership being parallel to that of the community councils in Maricopa Colony.

The local community council appears to be an effective line of communication to the people. The community councils may be more representative and may more closely express the wishes of the local people, though not a formal part of the tribal government.

The Community Action Agency has a formally designated position in the governmental organization. The CAP Director was hired by the Advisory Board. If the Advisory Board makes recommendations for changes in CAP structure or activities, it must take these matters to the Tribal Council.

The hiring of the CAP Director illustrates the way the tribal government has functions with the Community Action Agency. At the Tribal Council meeting on 16 March 1965, a number of applications for the post of CAP Director were considered. The Tribal Council had not been involved up to this point in the selection of the nominees. The CAP Committee had been working with Task Force member Dr. Robert Roessel, and later with BIA Special Consultant, Dr. Brenda Brush. The temporary CAP Committee was partly made up of members of the Advisory Board. Therefore the CAP Committee and the Advisory Board were responsible for presenting the program and the nominees for CAP Director to the Tribal Council at the 16 March meeting.

Three nominees for Director of CAP were presented at the latter meeting. The nominee whose chances were considered best was a former BIA and PHS employee who at the time was program analyst for the OEO Indian Desk in Washington. This man had the backing of most of the Advisory Board and the Governor. Another nominee was the brother of the Tribal Treasurer. A third nominee was a counsellor at the Sacaton public school.

The Tribal Council meeting appeared to be a formality to approve the first nominee, but one Board member opposed to the first nominee managed to divert the proceedings. Using the dress of the delegate from the BIA as a diversion, this person ranted about not backing anyone who was a candidate of "that naked woman" and wore down the opposition until the third nominee was picked as a compromise candidate.

The Tribal Council, the Advisory Board, and the CAP Administration have not followed the formally designated chain of command. In proposals submitted to OEO Washington in January 1965 the chain of command is again explicitly designated: "The ultimate responsibility for program direction, policy making, and advisory responsibility rests with the Tribal Council and Advisory Board." The proposal states that the CAP Director would meet regularly with the Advisory Board and Tribal Council.

The CAP administrators have met with the Tribal Council as formally designated. However, the Tribal Council has shown apathy toward the efforts of the CAP Administration to keep them informed. At one Tribal Council meeting the CAP Administration was awaiting Tribal Council decision on proposals; the meeting went on for quite a while when a Council member moved that the motions be tabled until the members could read the proposals. One Council member pointed out that they all had had the proposals to read for at least a week. Further examples of apathy and ineptitude are to be found in comments of Councilmen interviewed who demonstrated little knowledge of CAP proposals with which they have dealt. Some Councilmen complained that the people did not know enough about the CAP projects, yet none mentioned that they were the people responsible for communicating Tribal Council business to the communities.