

instruments for ultimate Indian acquisition of them, and negotiation formulas for leasing might also be developed in cooperation with relevant agencies.

8. *Dissatisfaction with CAP Components*

a. Problems

Indians find two chief problems in connection with presently implemented CAP components. Primarily, they are disturbed because there is so little orientation toward the employment of family heads. Most components deal with children or adolescents. The intent behind this approach, of preparing the next generation for the future, does not impress many Indians. They see it either as one more effort leading ultimately toward acculturation, relocation, and termination (which they oppose), or, if this connection is not made, it conflicts with the philosophy, described earlier, that the future is beyond control and what is needed is jobs and money now.

The other objection rests upon the widely held feeling that many CAP jobs are "make work" operations and contribute nothing that the reservation can use except the wages of those employed, which funds immediately flow out of the reservation to the surrounding white communities where the stores and services patronized by Indians are largely to be found. This means that, should CAP operations cease, the reservation population would be just as poor as before. Many look back to WPA days as having been more fruitful in that people produced things of long-term use, such as roads and buildings.⁸

b. Recommendations

(1) *Suggested Action.*—The solution to both these dissatisfactions lies primarily in the realm of the development of economic infrastructure on reservations, which will be discussed in some detail in the following section (V.C., Toward Economic Viability of Reservations). Essentially, jobs for family heads (without relocation) will not be available until such time as methods are developed to motivate and train Indians for modern business and industry, and at the same time induce modern business and industry to the reservations. A more immediate practicable modification of this approach may be to train Indians for, and help establish, service trades and small stores (perhaps cooperatives) on the reservations themselves. This would diminish the outflow of funds from CAP activities, welfare or whatever source, and possibly the well-known "multiplier effect" (to be discussed below) would at long last catalyze the development of self-sustained economic viability on Indian reservations.

(2) *Suggested Research.*—Intensive study of both successful and unsuccessful economic programs for disaster-stricken or underdeveloped areas and countries, from the Marshall Plan on down to such operations as the Cornell Vicos experiment, might suggest appropriate steps to take in developing infrastructure and small businesses on Indian reservations. Due caution would have to be exercised in such studies to take into consideration the cultural differences from the American norm to be found in some Indian communities regarding individualism, aggressiveness in relation to one's fellow Indians, and the like. Many Indians subscribe to a concept similar to the "image of limited good" ascribed to certain peasant societies by George Foster (1965), whereby it is assumed that there is a finite amount of "good things," so that if some Indians profit, others must lose, a condition to which few Indians would knowingly (or, at least, overtly) contribute. This inhibits Indians generally from undertaking proprietorship in most forms.

9. *Factionalism*

a. Problems

The kinship orientation of most Indian groups leads to factionalism, somewhat differently expressed among Northern Plains Indians as opposed to Southwestern Indians, as noted above. The atomistic tendencies of the former lead to what has been termed, in other contexts, the "segmentary opposition of [kindreds]," where the several segments of a kin-group are suspicious and wary of each other at each level of distance in relationship, but unite against common threats or in pursuit of proffered opportunities only available through cooperation. Each segment appears to fear that the other segments at the same level (say, several sets of brothers and their descendants, each set being cousin

⁸ See III, pp. 76, 133-134, 149, 184, 194-195, 201-203, 206-207, 251, 256, 259-260, 266, 282, 310-311, 324-325, 350.