



**United States
Department of
Agriculture**

Natural Resources
Conservation Service


**Resource Economics
and Social Science
Division**

Historical Notes
Number 6

Conservation and Culture:

**The Soil Conservation Service,
Social Science,
and Conservation
on Tribal Lands in the Southwest**

Rebekah C Beatty Davis



The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in its programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs and marital or familial status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint, write the Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., 20250, or call 1-800-245-6340 (voice) or (202) 720-1127 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity employer.

Conservation and Culture:
The Soil Conservation Service, Social Science and
Conservation on Tribal Land in the Southwest, 1934-1994

Rebekah C. Beatty Davis

**United States Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service
Resource Economics and Social Science Division
Washington, DC 20013-2890**

July 1997

Table of Contents

PREFACE III

ABBREVIATIONS V

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I: 1934-1939 7

 CREATION OF THE SCS AND TC-BIA 7

 EARLY SOCIAL STUDIES 11

 DEVELOPING THE HUMAN DEPENDENCY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC SURVEYS, 1936-1939 17

 THE END OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES 27

PART II: 1953-1994 31

 GETTING BACK TO WORK ON THE RESERVATIONS 32

 OLD AND NEW ISSUES IN CULTURE AND CONSERVATION 37

 THE NAVAJO NATION: A CASE STUDY 41

CONCLUSION: WHY CULTURE COUNTS 51

**APPENDIX A: HUMAN DEPENDENCY AND ECONOMIC STUDIES CONDUCTED BY
TC-BIA, 1935-1939** 53

APPENDIX B: SUGGESTED READING FOR NRCS FIELD STAFF 56

APPENDIX C: SUGGESTIONS FROM THE FIELD 57

BIBLIOGRAPHY 59

Illustrations

Map: Indian Reservations in Arizona and New Mexico 5

Map: Navajo Nation, Chapter, Grazing District, and SWCD Boundaries 45

Preface

In late September 1995, I had the opportunity to visit some of the American Indian reservations in Arizona which this paper discusses and to meet with some of the people who work on and with the land in those areas. The Navajo Nation is one of the most beautiful places I have seen. From the piñon forests to the Painted Desert, to the red mesas and vast, seemingly endless plains of grass that stretch from horizon to horizon, it is a land of great extremes and great diversity. Canyon de Chelly, one of the most popular tourist destinations in the Nation, is not only an archeological and historic site, but also the home of Navajo families who still farm the once-fertile canyon bottom. The Canyon was the site of one of the Soil Erosion Service's early experiments: in the early 1930's, Spanish olive trees were planted in the canyon bottom to halt to erosion during the regular floods. The olive trees did slow erosion, but they also began to take over the Canyon, overwhelming indigenous plants and trees and encroaching on the Navajo farms. Eventually, the trees performed their job so well that they significantly lowered the water table in the Canyon; this reduced the flood hazard but also made farming and living in the Canyon extremely difficult for the few families that remained.

Today you can take a jeep ride through the Canyon with a Navajo guide and he or she will tell you about the Anasazi ruins and the vibrant pre-historic culture which once dominated the region and then mysteriously disappeared. Your guide may also point out the cliff where Navajo warriors made a last, heroic stand against Spanish troops that sought to remove them from their home in the Canyon. It is only with some prodding, however, that you will

Conservation and Culture

learn about the history of the people who live in the Canyon today, the changes in their lives and land over the past seventy years, their struggle to cope with a changing landscape as well as a transformed society, and their relationship with the foreign forces that shaped both of these things.

I am grateful for the assistance of a number of people in completing this project. First, I would like to thank the U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) for supporting this research. The staff at the National Archives, College Park, particularly Joe Schwarz; and the staff at the DC Reference branch of the National Agricultural Library. The staff of the Office of the Executive Secretariat, USDA, and Suzanne Schenckle, American Indian Liaison, NRCS for letting me poke through their files. Special thanks to Steve Charmichael who went above and beyond the call of duty to facilitate my research in Arizona and New Mexico and accompanied me on much of the trip; Jerry Hammond and J. Douglas Helms for supervising and encouraging this research. Jacques Seronde for taking time out of his busy schedule to speak with me on several occasions. The NRCS Staff at the Parker Valley Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) and the Navajo Nation for their willingness to discuss their experiences and suggestions for the future. The members of the Navajo Soil and Water Conservation Districts were kind enough to let me participate in their annual meeting at Page, Arizona, where I was able to meet some of the Navajo cooperators as well as the SWCD Board Members, members of the Navajo Tribal Council, and the Manager of the Natural Resources Division of the Navajo Nation. I would like to extend particular thanks to Lavar Bedoni, a Navajo singer, who spoke to me about his farm and his life on the Navajo Reservation, and even tried to get me to dance at the closing dinner. This paper is dedicated to Michael.

Abbreviations

BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
NA	National Archives, Washington, DC and College Park, MD.
NAC-HQ	Files of the American Indian Coordinator, Headquarters, Washington, DC
NAC-SW	Files of the American Indian Coordinator, Southwest region, Pheonix, AZ
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA (formerly SCS)
RG114	Records of the Soil Conservation Service, USDA
RG75	Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, USDO I
SCS	Soil Conservation Service, USDA
SES	Soil Erosion Service, USDA (precursor to the SCS)
TC-BIA	Project for Technical Cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs
USDA	U. S. Department of Agriculture
USDO I	U. S. Department of the Interior

During the progressive era, a particular vision of utilitarian land use developed which largely ignored the human component of conservation. The conservationists' assumption that "efficiency"¹ was necessarily the best test of good land use, and was—because of its scientific nature—value-free, proved not only false but violently deficient in the case of the American Indians. The Federal conservationists' attempts at development, which were ignorant of or indifferent to the society and culture of the American Indians, used models based upon an entrepreneurial form of economic organization entirely inappropriate to the predominantly communal societies of the reservations in the Southwest.² This failure to comprehend the basic structure of American Indian societies in the Federal planning process resulted in "substantial social disruption, with only meager economic returns."³

INTRODUCTION

The history of American Indian land use after the imposition of the reservation system is checkered by abuse, overuse, and degradation largely as a result of the policies of the U. S. Government up until the mid 1930s. In 1887, the Government passed the Allotment Act which "broke up the community organization of the tribes as it was frankly intended to

¹ See S. Hays, *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959). This book is an excellent critical introduction to the history of the Federal Government's role in natural resource conservation.

² Lorraine Ruffing, "Navajo Economic Development Subject to Cultural Constraints," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 24(April 1976): 611. Ruffing argues that "development which minimizes social costs will be a more efficient strategy than one which requires forced cultural change as a precondition for economic development," 612. Ruffing comes to the same conclusion that TC-BIA researchers came to in the late 1930s: that the Navajo resource development should be addressed through the consumption group.

³ Ibid.

do”⁴ while also speeding the alienation of tribal lands and fragmenting Indian land holdings to such a degree that reconstructing contiguous land groups was often impossible later. According to a 1930 hearing on the *Survey of Conditions of Indians in the U. S.*, despite the fact that “In his primitive condition the only use the Indian had for land was as a hunting ground, and hence he knew nothing of land ownership as we understand the term...” American opinion held that “Since some of the eastern tribes had practiced a limited agriculture in a crude way, and a few tribes in the Southwest had even progressed to the extent that they practiced farming under irrigation, it was but natural to look to the land as a source of subsistence for the Indians.”⁵ However, according to the Natural Resources Board’s 1935 study, about two-thirds of the American Indians were “completely landless or own insufficient land on which to make a living on a subsistence level....Many of the tribes have assets which are not in usable form through the checker boarding of the land by sale to white persons....Still others own land rendered practically unproductive through overgrazing, erosion, or destructive logging.”⁶

The U. S. Government, in an attempt to rehabilitate and modernize the ailing economies of the reservations, encouraged farming and stock-raising and provided the basic tools for these pursuits. Ironically, in the Southwest, where American Indians had developed the most advanced indigenous farming techniques, stock-raising rapidly became the main endeavor. As the human population on the reservations expanded, so did the sheep, cattle and goat populations until the limited rangeland was severely overgrazed. In the eyes of the U. S. Government, the depletion of the range reduced the quality of the stock, lowering their market price, and requiring the American Indians to raise more animals to obtain the same eco-

⁴ Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, *Indian Land Tenure, Economic Status and Population Trends; Part X of the Report on Land Planning*, Supplementary Report of the Land Planning Committee, Natural Resources Board (Washington, DC: USGPO, 1935).

⁵ US Senate, Committee on Indian Affairs, *Hearings on the Survey of Conditions of Indians in the U. S.*, Part 6, 2232-2233.

⁶ *Indian Land Tenure...*, 1.

conomic returns, introducing a vicious cycle of environmental depletion and economic depression. The Federal Government's solution was the controversial and ultimately devastating stock reduction program. A large part of the program's failure was due to the Government's inability to understand that the reduction of livestock was not just a technical or economic problem, but was bound up with Navajo social structure, culture, and perceptions of prosperity.⁷

A theory has been advanced, and contradicted, that the increase in stock raising on the Navajo Reservation coincided with a long cycle of climatic change which periodically caused severe erosion and gulying in the arid region. Fossil evidence uncovered in the 1940s and 50s suggested that this erosion cycle, which had begun about 1880, might have been similar to earlier erosion "epicycles".⁸ The most important work on this subject was John Hack's 1942 study which was a part of the Awatovi expedition of the Peabody Museum at Harvard University. Hack believed that without significant climatic change, the vegetative cover in Navajo country would not have been susceptible to overgrazing.⁹ This hypothesis suggested that overgrazing in the early 20th century contributed to the regional erosion problem, but was not, as most of the contemporaneous planners believed, its sole cause.


⁷ Richard White, *The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment and Social Change Among the Choctaws, Pawnees and Navajo* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1983), 236-237. According to White, the Navajo sheep herds were the focus of residential group cooperative efforts and as such represented an important element in community social structure; the herds also represented important resources for food and trade, and were symbols of prosperity. This volume offers an excellent critical discussion of the stock reduction program on the Navajo Reservation and the long-term cultural, economic and social consequences of the program. Alexander Thal also offers an interesting perspective on the BIA's controversial stock reduction program. According to Thal, the BIA's system for assigning and quantifying stock ownership was faulty and resulted in a fundamentally flawed system of grazing permits which persist to the present. Thal, "Navajo Land Tenure," *Southwest Review of Management and Economics* 2, 2(Spring 1982): 175-206.

⁸ White, 229; and W. W. Hill, *Navaho Agriculture and Hunting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, and London: Oxford University Press, 1938), 20.

⁹ John Hack, *The Changing Physical Environment of the Hopi Indians of Arizona*, Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Vol. 35, no. 1 (Cambridge, MA: The Museum, 1942).


Conservation and Culture

The erosion on tribal land led to siltation which clogged not only American Indian crop-land, but also threatened White irrigation and hydroelectric projects in the Southwest like Boulder Dam. Though it may be argued that concern for these projects engendered early attempts to solve the reservations' erosion problems, other factors likely took precedence. The crisis in land degradation, swiftly approaching irreversibility as a result of the concurrent over-grazing and climatic change on the reservations, coincided with a growing recognition of the problem that soil erosion presented for the future of American agriculture as a whole and the availability of funds through the various depression-era relief projects to do something about it.



- LEGEND**
- STATE LINE
 - == DIVIDED ROAD
 - DRAINAGE
 - CITY
 - Ⓜ INTERSTATE HIGHWAY
 - ▨ INDIAN RESERVATIONS

INDIAN RESERVATIONS IN ARIZONA AND NEW MEXICO



Source:
USGS 1:2,000,000 DLG data
and information from NRCS Field personnel.
UTM Projection, Zone 12, NAD27.

PART I: 1934-1939

Creation of the SCS and TC-BIA

The election of Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Presidency and a majority of Democratic Senators and Representatives to Congress in 1932 created “conditions more favorable for the enactment of conservation measures regarding Indian lands than had existed at any time previously...”¹⁰ Both the President and John Collier, the newly appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs, were committed to active conservation and the improvement of the living conditions of the American Indians still living on the reservations. However, the elimination of erosion was not as simple as it might have first appeared. One of the earliest and largest demonstration projects of the nascent Soil Erosion Service was constructed at Mexican Springs on the severely overgrazed and eroded range land of the Navajo Reservation that spanned large parts of Arizona, Utah and New Mexico. The Navajo, Papago and Pueblo Indians in the Southwest all relied upon livestock to varying degrees for their “precarious living”.¹¹ The immediate depredation that reducing the animal stocks would cause seemed a much more real threat to people on the wrong edge of subsistence than the gradual depletion of the range.

¹⁰ Lawrence Kinney, *A Continent Lost—A Civilization Won: Indian Land Tenure in America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937), 109.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 317.

Conservation and Culture

In addition, the combined livestock and agricultural bases of the Navajo economy were “deeply imbedded in Navajo culture.”¹² Thus, when the Soil Erosion Service, and its successor the Soil Conservation Service created in in 1935, began work on conserving the reservation land, they found that much more than cattle and sheep stood in the way of their conservation works. The basic assumptions that had functioned in other early soil conservation projects dealing with White farmers ceased to function in the special social and economic conditions of the reservation. The “reorientation of the entire agricultural-economic system of 45,000 Navajo Indians”¹³ was not easily accomplished. Human problems and perceptions, the unsuspecting engineers soon found, were inextricably linked to erosion problems. At the same time, the problems of the American Indians in the Southwest were completely different from any that the Soil Conservation Service had encountered before; in fact, the SCS was largely unsure of just what their problems were. Detailed information on Navajo society, income and subsistence was not available in the early 1930s;¹⁴ even as late as 1971, a Brookings Institute study of American Indians stated that “less socioeconomic information exists about the Indian than about any other minority group in the U. S..”¹⁵

To deal with the newly discovered problem of the American Indians, in 1935 the SCS and the Indian Service established a joint program called Technical Cooperation—Bureau of Indian Affairs (TC-BIA). TC-BIA was originally composed of four staffs: technical, educational, research-compilation, and “social-economic-ethnological” which dealt with the “human problems involved” in soil conservation. The Socio-Economic Survey Section, which enjoyed considerable interchange with the Human Dependency and Economic Survey Unit

¹² White, 236.

¹³ *Summary: Annual Report of the Soil Erosion Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934*, 30.

¹⁴ This information would be provided by the human dependency studies of region 8 discussed in this paper.

¹⁵ Alan L. Sorkin, *American Indians and Federal Aid*, Studies in Social Economics Series (Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1971), 19.

in SCS Region 8 and often used the same title, was organized to study the social and economic conditions and organization of the reservations in order to determine what programs of soil conservation were necessary and appropriate and how best to implement them. By the time TC-BIA was disbanded in 1939, its Socio-Economic Survey team had completed at least 22 studies of American Indian culture, society, and land use in four SCS Regions.¹⁶

In the very early days of its existence, when TC-BIA was known as the Project for Technical Assistance to the Office of Indian Affairs, H. Scudder Mekeel, an employee of the BIA, was acting director of the Socio-Economic Staff. Mekeel stressed a highly pragmatic version of the staff's function, asserting that the primary objective of the project was to produce land-utilization plans appropriate for the reservations. Therefore, it was the task of the socio-economic staff to "outline the best possible use of the reservation's resources, a use which will bring human carrying capacity of the reservations to its maximum, with complete conservation of the reservation's soil resources, and with the maintenance of an adequate standard of living." In order to accomplish this they would need to

determine...the potentialities and limitations of the Indian population on each reservation in terms of its economic system, its own standard of living as well as its economic drives;...[and]to plan the way in which such land utilization plans may be introduced into the reservation social and economic organization so as to strengthen it as well as to foster the life values of the people.¹⁷

However, Mekeel betrayed his promising rhetoric when he suggested in a tentative outline for the research of his division that the staff should undertake "an intensive study of one

¹⁶ Allan Harper, "Report to the Chief of the Soil Conservation Service on the Operation of the Unit, 'Technical Cooperation - Bureau of Indian Affairs', 1935-1939," App. B, transmitted with Allan G. Harper to H. H. Bennett, July 6, 1939; Reports - General (Report to the Chief); TC-BIA General Files 1936-1939; Records of the Soil Conservation Service [RG 114]; National Archives, Washington, DC [NA]. See Appendix A.

¹⁷H. Scudder Mekeel, "SCS Project for Technical Assistance to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Socio-Economic Division" (n.d.); AO Organization; TC-BIA General Files; RG 114; NA.

Conservation and Culture

reservation community” in order to “obtain an insight into the human possibilities of [the] culture,…” It was an doubtful proposition that one community could provide insight into the conditions and beliefs of all of the others. In all, Mekeel seemed to continuously emphasize the human failure of the American Indians in land degradation, viewing poor land use as a symptom of their culture, rather than their conditions.

Early social studies

Though the SES had employed rural sociologists on some early demonstration project studies, the goals and methods of their work had been quite different from those of social scientists studying the American Indians. The earliest social studies were largely performed by economists and were designed with the limited goal of showing the existing relationship between soil conditions and financial and physical resources of the farmers; population characteristics of the demonstration areas and their association with soil quality; and to establish basic material to be used in education.¹⁸ Essentially, they aimed to show that the farmers who participated in the demonstration erosion control projects enjoyed an improvement in their standard of living over the five-year period of the initial project. Those studies were largely simple attempts to quantify benefits and costs to justify the early demonstration projects.¹⁹ Those studies with even slightly more ambitious goals ran into considerable obstacles. Max White, who was in charge of Economic and Social Studies for SES/SCS, reported in 1934/35 that his attempts to develop a method for finding the relationship between soil erosion and social factors using census data had been largely unsuccessful. White predicted that “the development of a research methodology for this type of study” would be “very difficult and will take considerable time, but the results should be commensurate with

¹⁸ [memo?] Louisiana State University Agricultural Experiment Station, Baton Rouge Louisiana, subject: Economic and Social Study of Soil Erosion Areas....[1934]; 221 Economic Survey May 1934-Sept 1934; Central Records, 1933-1935; RG 114; NA. SES employed T. Lynn Smith as a rural sociologist in these studies of Louisiana.

¹⁹ Untitled report [title page missing], see particularly pages 60-63; 100 Administration and Organization Summaries; Central Records, 1933-1935; RG 114; NA.

Conservation and Culture

the effort.”²⁰ White and his staff were not even attempting to produce comprehensive studies of an essentially foreign culture, but to evaluate changes in the familiar pattern of rural Anglo-American life.

As socio-economic studies had been an important factor missing from the early demonstration projects on the Navajo Reservation,²¹ it was natural that they would be of concern once formal cooperation between SCS and BIA was established. As early as the end of 1935, however, the USDA raised objections to the proposed inclusion of social and economic studies as a part of the TC-BIA program. The Secretary of Agriculture argued that the Indian Service was duplicating the studies, as well as some of the conservation projects for which TC-BIA would be responsible. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) had conducted a broad survey of Indian reservations in 1933 financed by the Civilian Works Administration (CWA). However, the CWA survey was brought to an abrupt end by the withdrawal of funds in 1934 leaving a number of the surveys incomplete. The studies had been intended to fill a function similar to that of TC-BIA’s Socio-Economic Survey Unit, however, the BIA’s reports tended to be either highly normative and general,²² or compilations of tabular information with no sustained or convincing attempt to explain the data.²³ According to Lawrence Kelly’s article, “Anthropology in the Soil Conservation Service,” Milton Eisenhower also challenged the appropriateness of the human dependency surveys of the Indian population conducted by the TC-BIA, even questioning the legality of their funding through the SCS.²⁴

²⁰ “Progress Report on Economic and Social Studies by Max R. White,” [1934-1935 pre-SCS]; 221 Social and Economic Survey; Central Records, 1933-1935; RG 114; NA.

²¹ For an excellent brief history of the early work on the Navajo Reservation see Lawrence Kelly, “Anthropology in the Soil Conservation Service,” in *The History of Soil and Water Conservation*, Douglas Helms and Susan Flader, editors (Washington, DC: The Agricultural History Society, 1985).

²² See Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Record Group 75; Records Relating to Social and Economic Surveys; NA. Particularly “The CWA Social and Economic Survey of Selected Indian Reservations,” prepared by Vance Rogers for the Indian Land Unit of the Natural Resources Board, October 1934 (released January 1935); NRB Compilation Survey, 1934; Box 1: Blackfeet to Coleville; Records relating to Social and Economic Surveys; RG 75; NA.

²³ See General Survey File; Records relating to Social and Economic Surveys; RG 75; NA. Especially “An outline for making an economic and social study on _____ reservation” (1933?).

²⁴ Kelly, 42.

Collier asserted that the BIA did not have the resources to do justice to either the social research or the conservation projects, and he felt, based on the Navajo experience, that one without the other would be impracticable. He argued, contrary to the USDA, that the “social-economic aspect...is the essence of the soil conservation program....soil conservation is not merely a business of mechanical or botanical operations....It is a business of finding out how the land owners and the populations...can be enabled and persuaded to conserve their soil.”²⁵

Mekeel originally recommended appointing four “anthropological consultants” to perform sociological studies on the reservations. He advocated placing one on each of four reservations which would be selected in order to make a “complete study of the contemporary socio-economic organization for that reservation, so that he would be able to give competent advice to the technical staff upon their arrival.”²⁶ This approach placed more emphasis upon the recommendations of the social scientists than most of the SCS was comfortable with because their findings would constrain the physical studies. Walter Woehlke, the Coordinator of TC-BIA, felt that in order for the socio-economic surveys to be really useful, basic physical surveys had to be completed first.²⁷ The procedure was soon altered so that technical studies were performed first, then sociological studies were made to provide information on how best to implement, refine, and amend the existing technical plans to make them practical in the social and economic environment of the reservation.

²⁵ John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Memorandum for Dr. H. H. Bennett, December 20, 1935; AO Organization Correspondence; TC-BIA General Files; RG 114; NA.

²⁶ Memo, Mekeel to Woehlke, January 23, 1936, p. 1; AO Organization Correspondence; TC-BIA General Files; RG 114; NA. Copies of this memo were also sent to Eshref Shevky—indicating his involvement in the early conception of the TC-BIA social studies—, Collier, and Calkins.

²⁷ Letter, Woehlke to Collier, February 7, 1936; AO Organization Correspondence; TC-BIA General Files; RG 114; NA. This is enclosed with a set of letters regarding some proposed studies that were beyond the TC-BIA scope and would have required additional WPA funding. The search for a non-Federal institution to do the research so that WPA funding could be obtained seems to be how Provinse first got involved with TC-BIA and the sociological studies, as he was the person mentioned for contact at the University of Arizona by a WPA staffer.

Conservation and Culture

At almost the same time, John Pearmain and Walter Woehlke were attempting to construct a standard outline of work for the Compilation and Research Section of TC-BIA. Their work, although all secondary research, also focused heavily upon economic, social, and ethnological issues. They sought to use the facts gathered by the Bureau of the Census, the BIA's research, and other sources to provide a more holistic picture of American Indian life. Pearmain's detailed plans called for his reports to include information on Native populations and population trends; miscegenation; occupations; understudied economic pursuits like timber, arts and crafts, hunting, and small scale industry; housing and furniture; agricultural development; and tribal social and economic organization including early organization; contemporaneous organization; and attitude toward the Indian Reorganization Act. He also sought to study the "main economic drives as stimulated by their cultural patterns," the "economics of Indian consumption," and their economic attitudes as in their attitude toward wealth and their definition of a "good provider". They also sought to understand the effect of the "impinging economic white world" of traders, economic exploiters, the Indian Service, Missionaries, and the Law.²⁸ It was an ambitious vision, and soon proved impracticable.

After several months of TC-BIA operation, Woehlke wrote to Bennett about the progress of his work. What Woehlke didn't report was the continued reluctance of the regional conservators to support the work of TC-BIA and its Socio-Economic Survey team in their regions.²⁹ Reiterating the project's mission, Woehlke emphasized that the conservation plans for American Indian reservations had to be oriented so that "their application to the reservation resources will conserve the soil, check erosion, and maintain soil fertility with the smallest possible disturbance to the economic and social organization" of the reservations.

²⁸ "Compilation and Research Section - Work Sheet - Tentative Outline," transmitted with, Memo, John Pearmain to Walter Woehlke, January 24, 1936; AO Organization Correspondence; TC-BIA General Files; RG 114; NA.

²⁹ Walter Woehlke to Alida Bowler, October 23, 1936; SE General; TC-BIA General Files; RG 114; NA.

In order to accomplish this last goal, Woehlke asserted that “in almost every instance, the technically perfect plan must be modified so as to make possible its application and execution by the inhabitants of the area.” Those modifications had to be based on “authentic knowledge of the affected population.”³⁰ This authentic knowledge could only be acquired through the type of social studies that had been so objectionable to the USDA.

³⁰ Woehlke to Bennett, March 10, 1936; AO Organization Correspondence; TC-BIA General Files; RG 114; NA.

Developing the human dependency and socio-economic surveys, 1936-1939

In May 1936, the studies of the human population of the Navajo Reservation, which had previously been conducted along with the land management surveys, were reorganized into an independent unit called the Sociological Survey of the Navajo Reservation. According to a 1937 SCS regional report, "...in spite of the scores of volumes of interesting and romantic information on dances, religion, mythology, dress, and general picturesqueness..." of the Navajo, there was an almost complete lack of information about their "real economic life and needs..."³¹ The Sociological Survey was established to collect this basic information. The work of the new unit was "conceived to be a continuous series of dynamic studies related to the work of planning. In the initial stages it will be essentially a survey of human dependency on resources,"³² and primarily economic.³³ The studies were primarily concerned with measuring the level of dependency in such a way that it could be quantified into the planning process. The survey was "predicated on the assumption that the behavior of mankind is susceptible to analysis by a single methodology." The methodology was to focus on social behavior and deal with ethnological concepts only when "relevant to the understanding of a significant contemporary activity." The surveyors were attempting to avoid the type of ethnological research common in the Southwest at the time—which focused on mythology, religion, and arts rather than modern society—and also wanted to address relevant

³¹ USDA, SCS, Region 8, *Navajo District Annual Report, 1936-1937*, Navajo Service (Window Rock, Arizona, June 1937), 61; Files of the Natural Resources Conservation Service American Indian Coordinator—Southwest Region, Arizona State Office, Phoenix, AZ (NAC-SW).

³² *Sociological Survey of the Navajo Reservation: Statement of Procedure*, SCS Region 8, Albuquerque, NM: Regional Bulletin no. 32; Conservation Economics Series no. 5, May 1936.

³³ *Navajo District Annual Report, 1936-1937*, 62.

economic issues, and so chose the term Sociological to represent an interdisciplinary approach to the “single problem of social behaviour.”³⁴

The survey team recognized that “The problem of continuous Navajo livelihood is more complex than a simple sufficiency of resources. If the Navajo are to have a continuous sufficiency of resources, the complex influences to which they are subject must be correctly evaluated.”³⁵ In order to accomplish this, both the external and internal institutional influences on the Navajo economy would be evaluated with particular emphasis on the role of the white trader in the Navajo economy, the consumption group, group obligations, and the division of labor among groups.

The same month that the new survey unit’s *Statement of Procedure* was published, Eshref Shevky³⁶ sent a memorandum to Hugh Calkins, the Regional Conservator for SCS Region 8, headquartered in Albuquerque, New Mexico, suggesting a broad reconnaissance study of the region. This effort would include the type of sociological studies that would become the hallmark of the short-lived Human Dependency Survey Unit of Region 8, as well as heavily influence the sociological work of TC-BIA.³⁷ At the time, Shevky was a part of the SCS Division of Regional Planning. Calkins concern for these specialized studies had begun much earlier, dating back to the problems on the Navajo project,³⁸ and he was receptive to Shevky’s suggestions. Shevky aimed to follow the path he had begun in a BIA study of the Tewa Basin begun in 1935 and later completed and published as an SCS Regional Bulletin.³⁹

³⁴ Ibid., p. 9.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 26.

³⁶ For Shevky’s background see, Don Parman, *Navajos and the New Deal*.

³⁷ Eshrev Shevky, “Memorandum for Mr. Calkins on the Subject of a Reconnaissance Study of the South West Region,” May 25, 1936; Rep. Survey; HD-Reports; TC-BIA General Files; RG 114; NA.

³⁸ Calkins to Bennett, November 2, 1934, letter on social and economic studies on the Navajo Reservation; 221 Economic Survey, October 1, 1934; Central Records, 1933-1935; RG 114; NA.

³⁹ Hugh Calkins, *Inventory of Material on the Rio Grande Watershed (An Evaluation of Surveys and Reports): I Tewa Basin Study*. Soil Conservation Service, Region 8; Regional Bulletin no. 34; Conservation Economic Series No. 7; February 1937, 2. The initial survey of the Tewa Basin was made by the BIA’s Indian Research Unit in collaboration with the Forest Service and the SES in 1935. Many of the staff members also participated in the final study completed by TC-BIA in early 1937.

Conservation and Culture

The Tewa Basin Study was the crucible for the development of a number of important ideas about and methodologies for the analysis of the link between culture and environment. According to the study's authors, these were that the "study of land-man relationships" required numerous techniques, rather than a unitary approach toward population or the physical environment; methodologies did not exist at that time to perform the type of complex analysis required; new techniques needed to be designed that would "more adequately serve to define the pertinent facts and to indicate their mutual relevancy."⁴⁰ Schedules and surveys of the traditional kind could not provide the information that these researchers sought. The Tewa Basin Study confronted problems that continue to plague contemporary researchers trying to understand how society and environment interact.⁴¹ As Piers and Blaikie wrote in 1987, "land degradation is *par excellence* an interdisciplinary issue, a comprehensive theory requires the combination of analytical tools of both the natural and social sciences."⁴² They advanced the theory that the human dependency studies suggested but never made explicit, that "damage to the land and damage to certain classes in society are interrelated."⁴³

In 1937, the division of Human Surveys under Shevky's direction, issued an evaluation of prior surveys and reports on the Rio Grande Watershed, the region covered by the Tewa Basin Study. They found its more dynamic approach to studying the American Indian populations more compelling than their original direction. However, they also recognized that the study had "remained largely on the conceptual level. Attempts to objectify the notions of method which were developing were largely unsuccessful."⁴⁴ The study lacked both

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹For an interesting example of contemporary scholarship relevant to this discussion see Piers Blaikie and Harold Brookfield, *Land Degradation and Society* (London and New York: Methuen, 1987). This book focuses on land degradation in colonial and post-colonial nations of the third world, the parallels between these areas and the situation of American Indians are, not surprisingly, strong.

⁴² Ibid., xix.

⁴³ Ibid., 19.

⁴⁴ *Inventory of Material on the Rio Grande Watershed*, 3.

“developmental organization” and the connection with an administrative agency that would have made it less theoretical and more practical. Without the information or analysis that was necessary to understand land use, and how to achieve land-use adjustment on the reservation, the study failed the SCS’s test of utility.

Despite these shortcomings, the Tewa Basin Study’s proposals for the Santa Cruz Area had some impressive results. The proposals “differed in every essential respect from previous Government efforts in the area. In the first place, the plan recognized that the problems...did not result from the variations in human aptitude...but rather from the deterioration of resources in the area. Therefore the intended reconstruction was regional rather than individual.”⁴⁵ However, the administrative reorganization that occurred shortly after the completion of the proposals precluded implementing them.

Negative racial characterizations of American Indians made the survey’s work even more difficult and even more important to planning for conservation. As the Statement of Procedure pointed out, “Navajo agriculture has often been characterized as ‘primitive’. From the term ‘primitive’ certain value judgments are drawn....This inference has apparently been so pervasive that little information exists on yields of Navajo crops under Navajo techniques of cultivation.”⁴⁶ Without information on native techniques, TC-BIA and SCS suggestions on improving land use would be of little use. Another interesting example is a rare laudatory report of American Indian land use and management in Turtle Mountain, South Dakota. The physical reconnaissance report of the region noted that there was no significant erosion and that the Native farmers were “land conscious husbandmen” despite “tremendous social and economic problems” so severe that they suggested curtailing SCS involvement in the region.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 34.

⁴⁶ *Sociological Study of the Navajo Reservation: Statement of Procedure*, 22.

Conservation and Culture

However, before complementing their farming, the report stressed that the tribe at Turtle Mountain had a lot of French blood among them, suggesting that this European ancestry explained their unusual farming skill.⁴⁷ Interestingly, these assumptions were challenged by a 1937 anthropological study by BIA which suggested that among the Blackfeet Indians, those tribal members with mixed-blood ancestry had a greater propensity than full-blood tribal members to sell-off, misuse, or ignore their land.⁴⁸ Despite the stereotypes of poor or irresponsible Native land use, John Pearmain, one of the last remaining TC-BIA Human Dependency Study Unit members, asserted in a 1939 memo written near the end of the Unit's life that it was "susceptible to proof that white-induced methods, in water development, and lack of method in regulating livestock numbers...are primarily, if indirectly, responsible for...the fact that serious erosion is found throughout the reservation today."⁴⁹

One of the earliest studies of the TC-BIA socio-economic survey unit was a survey of the Sacramento, California Indian Jurisdiction undertaken in 1936. The study made some significant findings about the relationship between the American Indian and White communities. Contrary to what the Government had assumed, it was found that the American Indians in California were rapidly being acculturated rather than assimilated, adapting to "White life and economy" but "Continuing to live on rancherias as separate social groups retaining some of their traditional life." This realization formed the central element around which the survey team attempted to "develop a realistic program of economic and social rehabilitation, dealing with the Indian people as they are and as they want to be."⁵⁰

⁴⁷ "Report of the Regional Office Representative on TC-BIA Reconnaissance surveys of the Crow, Tongue River, Turtle Mountain and Devil's Lake Indian Reservations," (1938/39?); AO - Workplans - Devil's Lake; Chief of Operations, Project for Technical Cooperation with the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Project Records [CO, TC-BIA, Project Records]; RG 114; NA.

⁴⁸ "Report on the Blackfeet Reservation, Montana," October 22, 1937; Blackfeet; Narrative and Statistical Reports; RG 75; NA.

⁴⁹ Memorandum to Allan Harper from John Pearmain, su: reply to request of 4/24/39 for comment on implications of the proposed conservation program for the Papago Indian Reservation Arizona, May 1, 1939; SE General; TC-BIA General Files; RG 114; NA.

⁵⁰ Office of Indian Affairs/TC-BIA, *Human Dependency and Economic Survey, Sacramento, California, Indian Jurisdiction, 1936* (Denver, CO, 1939), I-II.

The Sacramento study argued that although American Indian society, social habits, and psychology, their “past and present cultural position”, were not quantifiable, they were “of equal importance with statistics on income or on land and its utilization...” and were in fact “the main...underlying causes of such statistical reflections of their economic life.”⁵¹ The problem, as TC-BIA defined it, was that the basic resources of the American Indian’s land were incapable of supporting the population. Further depletion and erosion of the already poor land was worsened by “complicated land-ownership patterns, mal-distribution of resources, lack of Indian community organization and incentives, the physical condition of the Indians and the maladjustment of their relations to the social and economic framework of the state in which they are compelled to function.”⁵² Following this assumption, the survey team compiled an extensive history of the reservations in the Sacramento Jurisdiction, including information on the tribal origins of the members of the reservations, their pre-removal relations, and the history of land use and ownership among the tribes and reservations during the Spanish and American periods in the area.

According to the Survey, during the 19th Century many of the American Indians established small farms and orchards. When the gold rush ended, White Californians turned to farming in the State’s fertile valley and “pounced on these Indian homes, filing on the land and ruthlessly driving off the Indian owners. Finally made utterly landless the Indians scattered...”⁵³ The Round Valley Reservation was “established in 1858 as a concentration camp

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁵² “Land-use and Conservation Surveys California Indian Reservations,” [December 1936]; SE General; TC-BIA General Files; RG 114; NA.

⁵³ *Human Dependency Survey, Sacramento...*, 9.

Conservation and Culture

for 8 hostile tribes, placed there that Whites might occupy their lands in peace.” From 1906 to 1927 rancherias, either as miniature reservations or as simple land purchases, were established for the homeless American Indians. The grants of land were “shockingly inadequate....To the philosophic and social compulsion towards incorporation into White communities...was added the most effective and compelling condition of establishing amounts of land which by every standard could not, except in a few cases, support a living.”⁵⁴ According a Resettlement Administration report, only about 5% of the American Indian land had good agricultural, timber or grazing value, and about 10% was fairly productive. The rest of the land, 85%, was desert or valueless. The dire situation “led to privation among the Indians and abuse of the land resources which, in turn,...resulted in...cultivation of...‘sub-marginal land’, overgrazing, erosion, lack of irrigation water or misuse of such water, high relief loads, and poverty among the Indians.”⁵⁵

As a result of their inadequate lands, the American Indians were dependent upon seasonal labor to sustain their livelihood. A system similar to tenant farming in the South developed which approached debt peonage: seasonal laborers would borrow from their employers in the winter to meet their basic needs for food and fuel, the summer months would be spent working to pay off the debt acquired. Despite the problems with the wage-labor system, the surveyors contended that it fit more closely with the rhythms of traditional Indian cultural patterns than did agriculture. However, the depression had led to an influx of white laborers which increased competition for these low paying jobs. The result of this loss in cash income was “chronic under-nourishment and disease and...living at the lowest subsistence level.”⁵⁶ The end recommendations of the Survey suggested a combination of contin-

⁵⁴ Ibid., 12.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 17.

⁵⁶ “T.C.-B.I.A. Land Use Survey - Sacramento Indian Agency,” attached to “Land-use and Conservation Surveys California Indian Reservations,” [December 1936]; SE General; TC-BIA General Files; RG 114; NA.

ued wage work for some and the provision of adequate community-owned agricultural land for those with the desire to learn to farm it, coupled with a harsh prescription for withdrawing Government assistance during the winter, forcing the American Indian to “learn by bitter experience that he must make a greater effort to provide for himself and for the future.”⁵⁷ Though the report tended to be normative and lacked sensitivity to the desires of the Native population, it provided new insights into the life and predicament of the American Indians and the interaction between these things and the condition of the land upon which they lived.⁵⁸

The Human Survey unit also “discovered” a number of important facts about the Navajo. According to Edward Spicer and John Collier, the Human Dependency unit’s studies uncovered a complex Navajo economy combining different levels of dependence upon agriculture, herding, and a combination of the two. The grazing district system imposed to control overgrazing conflicted with traditional land use patterns and aroused hostility and frustration among the Navajo.⁵⁹ Solon T. Kimball and John Provinse, members of Shevky’s cadre, discovered the Navajo Land Use Community, a group of extended family land-use and management units based upon matrilineal ties.⁶⁰ Once identified, this group explained some of the failure of the grazing district system and became the focus of a limited and highly successful experiment in SCS planning on the Navajo reservation. Historically, the land use communities had remained fairly stable geographic units managed by one social group whose major function was the management and use of the resources in the area. The community, “in

⁵⁷ *Human Dependency Survey, Sacramento*, 41.

⁵⁸ For more specific discussions of some of the important findings on American Indians by the Soil Conservation Service’s studies see Lawrence Kelly, “Anthropology in the Soil Conservation Service,” in *The History of Soil and Water Conservation*.

⁵⁹ Spicer and Collier, “Sheepmen and Technicians: A Program of Soil Conservation on the Navajo Indian Reservation,” in *Human Problems and Technological Change: A Casebook*, Spicer, ed. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1952).

⁶⁰ Solon T. Kimball and John Provinse, “Navajo Social Organization in Land Use Planning,” *Applied Anthropology* 1(July-September 1942): 18-25.

Conservation and Culture

its own right...accepted and executed planning for and administration of resources on the area which it claim[ed].” As a result, though the SCS had not recognized it earlier, the “required leadership and responsibility to assume the burden of correct land use practices is already present in the community.”⁶¹ The SCS found that it encountered much less resistance when it addressed the land use problems of the region on a small scale, rather than through the titular reservation leaders and broad, general policies.⁶²

The work of the Human Dependency and Sociological Surveys had some real impact within the SCS, and by 1938, the *Navajo District Annual Report* asserted that there was “a closer realization on the part of the Soil Conservation Service and Indian Service personnel that the land management problem on the Reservation is in significant part a human one.” It was clear that “stock adjustment, agricultural development, and conservation operations” would be impossible without consideration of the people who used and depended on the land, their values, their culture, and their priorities.⁶³

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 23. The accuracy of this observation is illustrated by the success of the recent programs which allow (and demand) local initiative and planning rather than imposing outside plans for development and use of local resources.

⁶² See Kelly, “Anthropologists and the SCS” for an excellent discussion of John Provinse and his work with the Navajo.

⁶³ USDA, SCS, Region 8, *Navajo District Annual Report, 1937-1938* (Window Rock, AZ, 1938), 59.