

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Barr, William: Files
Folder Title: Indian Policy (13)
Box: 8

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 10, 1982

*File
Indians
Policy
Sout*

FOR: EDWIN L. HARPER
FROM: WILLIAM P. BARR *WPB*
SUBJECT: Need for Presidential Meeting with Indians

The President's policy statement on Indians has been ready since early September. It is imperative that we release it soon. This should be done at a Presidential meeting with tribal leaders.

- o At the start of our Administration we had broader and stronger support among the Indians than perhaps any other Administration in recent history.
- o Over the last two years, our position has markedly deteriorated. The complaint is that Indian affairs are being handled just as they were under the Carter Administration.
- o Over the past month articles have appeared in Newsweek and other general media attacking the Administration's neglect of the Indians and using this as a prime example of our lack of "fairness".
- o The policy statement that was painstakingly developed over the summer and which was approved by the President should be very popular with the Indian people.
- o In the face of our eroding position, it is difficult to understand why we have sat around for four months while we have had such an excellent statement in the can.
- o We have an active Republican group among the Indians, and they have been pleading with us to release the statement.
- o The Indians are one of the only major groups that has not had an event with the President, a fact which is noted, and widely commented upon, in Indian country -- and a fact that is starting to rankle.
- o Since September, at least three separate scheduling requests have gone nowhere.

Action Needed:

1) The latest scheduling request, endorsed by you and Secretary Watt, has been pending in Red Cavaney's office since December 3. Elizabeth Dole has endorsed previous scheduling requests. You should encourage Dole to get the scheduling request over to Sadlier as soon as possible. A copy of the latest scheduling request is attached.

2) Advise the Senior Staff of the urgency of scheduling the Indian event.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

SCHEDULE PROPOSAL

NOVEMBER 24, 1982

TO: WILLIAM K. SADLEIR, DIRECTOR
PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS AND SCHEDULING

FROM: ELIZABETH H. DOLE

REQUEST: Meeting with tribal leaders and to make an address on the occasion of the release of the President's major statement on Indian policy.

PURPOSE: To outline and encourage support for the Administration's Indian Policy of tribal sovereignty and self-determination for federally-recognized tribes.

BACKGROUND: November 22 New Republic cover story slams the President for neglect of Indian issues. The Indian population numbers 1.4 million, primarily in 500 federally-recognized tribes and organizations. Decisions on the content of the President's Indian Policy Statement were made by the President in the Cabinet Council meeting September 20. This statement is in keeping with the President's 1980 campaign government-to-government relationship; self-government; repudiation of "termination", and the need for developing Indian economic self-sufficiency. This policy is in accord with this Administration's New Federalism policy; the Administration's Economic Recovery Plan; deregulation, and involvement of the private sector in addressing national needs.

PREVIOUS PARTICIPATION: To date the President has had no event with Indian tribal leaders, a fact which has been noted in Indian country.

DATE: Before new budget announcement

LOCATION: State Dining Room DURATION: 1 hour

PARTICIPANTS: 100 tribal leaders

OUTLINE OF EVENT: -Briefing with Q&A by Sec. Watt and Asst. Sec. Ken Smith
-Press enters
-President enters and makes statement
-President exits

REMARKS REQUIRED: Remarks

MEDIA COVERAGE: Full press

RECOMMENDED BY: Elizabeth H. Dole, Sec. Watt, Ed Harper

OPPOSED BY:

PROJECT OFFICER: Morton C. Blackwell

2-28-82

'Indian Business' Fast Becoming a Force to Reckon With

Knight-Ridder Newspapers

ALBUQUERQUE, New Mexico — For decades, dealing with questions of Indian life, land and economics — “the Indian business” as its practitioners call it — has been a highly profitable endeavor. It has been highly profitable to lawyers, consultants, western landowners, utility and energy companies, sociologists, anthropologists and roadside turquoise vendors.

Today there are signs that the Indian business is undergoing a major change — that it might even be turning profitable for Indians.

Economically, American Indians are the least among us, the poorest group in the land. On some reservations today, the unemployment rate is running beyond 80 percent. On all the reservations, federal cuts in social programs have been deep and traumatic. On virtually none of the reservations have economic times ever been very good.

But despite all that, there is optimistic talk abroad in Indian lands, because in ways that might overshadow the economics and politics of the moment, the great tribes of the West, shunted onto reservations and out of the broader public mind a century ago, are beginning to emerge as forces to be reckoned with.

There are three main reasons.

First, beneath some of the 52 million acres of Indian reservation land lie significant deposits of undeveloped energy resources, including 15 percent of the nation's coal reserves. Those resources promise to be tremendously valuable in years to come.

Water Rights Issue

Second, many of the tribes are on their way to acquiring rights to a great deal of water, as pressure mounts from Indians and other interests to resolve long-standing, Supreme Court-endorsed Indian water claims, at a time when water has never been more precious to Indian and non-Indian visions of a prosperous future.

And third, in matters of water and energy development, western Indians are steadily gaining the kind of expertise and sophistication that is essential if they are to sidestep history and avoid once again losing what they have.

For Indians and everyone else in the West, those three commodities

— energy, water and the savvy to deal with them — are the prime requisites of a healthy future, the economic makers or breakers of people, businesses, governments and Indian reservations in more than a dozen western states.

The details of Indian progress in matters of water and energy might seem a bit basic — developments like this year's U.S. Supreme Court approval of an energy severance tax for the Jicarilla Apaches of New Mexico, congressionally guaranteed water and water development money for the Papagos of southern Arizona, a proposed bill freeing Indian tribes from the outdated and costly restrictions in the standard mineral lease agreement whose use is required by the Department of Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Prosaic as those changes may appear, they need to be understood in the context of recent conditions on the reservations; the Indians are coming from far behind.

Levying taxes, pinning down rights to water for use or resale, making better deals with companies interested in reservation resources — all these pursuits are intended to mean new income and new possibilities for the reservations.

Magnanimous Treaties

But if the 1980s indeed bring major Indian economic progress, many of those advances will be most traceable to decisions made in the 1800s, when federal officials repeatedly endorsed blithely magnanimous treaties and policies that the U.S. government then spent the next century treating as little more than a documentary collection of ethnic jokes.

Salt Lake Trib
12-28-82

They aren't jokes any more. John Echohawk, an Oklahoma Pawnee and executive director of the Native American Rights Fund, the most important Indian legal arm, has been pressing in court for treaty-guaranteed tribal rights for more than a decade.

He says, “When we first started doing this, a lot of these interests — states and businesses — didn't know what we were doing. They said, ‘What do you mean, “treaties”?’ That was all over a century ago.”

“Now they find themselves in a situation where they have to deal with us.”

That late-coming affirmation of reservation rights would seem to have the makings of one of the great ironic reversals of American history, were it not for uncertainties raised by the tawdry record of federal-Indian relations and the fact that most of the dozens of Indian groups anxious to prosper from their water and underground resources still are a long way from turning their claims into productive wealth.

For as the tribes press for more equitable treatment in matters of water and other resources, they are putting themselves and their potential holdings at risk during a period when resource decisions are being made that could affect the nation, the West and the Indians for generations to come.

Sam DeLoria is a Hunkpapa Sioux from South Dakota, the head of the American Indian Law Center in Albuquerque and bearer of a half-humorous fatalism nurtured by a lifetime watching Indians try to cope with the white world around them.

“A set of bad decisions,” DeLoria says, “could have ultimate repercussions. A set of good decisions could at least delay a new round of bad decisions, or it could put us on the road to some plateau.... The kinds of uses to which Indian resources can be put now are not as reversible as, say, cancelling a (grazing) lease and chasing the rancher off your land.”

In short, the deals Indians make over energy and water now could be with them for decades. And as the tribes press for more independence, faster development and larger roles in resource exploitation, they will severely test their own skills and the ability of the overseeing Bureau of Indian Affairs at matching wits with energy companies and water-hungry state governments.

14

Pg. 172

Loria has another worry as that the appearance of success will create the same sort of public misconception that has recurred from the 1920s heydays of the oil-rich, Cadillac-driving Osage Indians of Oklahoma to the more recent years of Indian land-claim settlements, when tribes were being awarded sums of money that seemed huge, even though they often represented only pennies per acre for land taken from them in times past.

What DeLoria fears is a backlash, based on the assumption that Indians everywhere are getting rich.

"The stereotype is that Indians are poor and kind of klutzy and are talking to eagles all the time," DeLoria says. "When they don't behave that way, society says, 'Why should we help you? You're the same as us!'"

DeLoria sees in that attitude the potential for Indians to lose precious political support outside the Indian community, and hence the government financial support that is all

that stands between some reservations and utter destitution.

He recalls the reaction of one New Mexico politician after the Supreme Court's Jicarilla severance tax decision: "He said, 'If these guys have the power to tax, then I don't know why we have all these (Indian) social programs.' Of course, every other body with the power to tax has social programs...."

Robert Nordhaus, the non-Indian lawyer who won the case allowing the Jicarilla tax, shares some of DeLoria's concern about people who jump to the conclusion that severance taxes, for instance, are suddenly going to bring prosperity to the tribes. (The taxes are paid to resource holders by those who remove the resources — coal mining companies, for instance.)

"That's an unrealistic position," Nordhaus says. "Take an Indian tax of a couple million dollars a year and divide it up among a couple thousand Indians, and that's a thousand dollars a year. But these tribes also have to provide many services — police protection, road maintenance and construction...."

"The average person looks at the Indians like they should be relegated to the poverty level. He says they're rich because they have a couple thousand coming in, and the guy talking is making \$60,000 or \$70,000."

For the record, an average white male worker in 1970 (the latest cen-

sus data available) earned \$6,772 a year, a Hispanic male earned \$5,210, a black man earned \$4,067, an Indian earned \$3,509. That relative order hasn't changed in the 1980s.

And in a time of economic slump, low energy demand and low energy prices, reservation resources are not particularly valuable right now. Further, a big question exists about what Indian reservations are going to do with guaranteed water rights if they have no funds to build facilities, so the water can be used for irrigation and other purposes.

Numerous tribes with firmly established water rights are simply watching that water run downstream to other users, because they have no means of capitalizing on it.

Almost certainly, the federal government is not going to be spending much money soon for Indian water development. The Reagan administration has not shown any special concern for Indians (earlier this month it proposed eliminating a \$29 million Indian health program for reservation residents without access to hospitals), and after decades of federal dam and irrigation construction in the West, no new major U.S. water project of any kind has been launched for a half-dozen years.

Cost-sharing is the key to water development now, and the tribes have very little money with which to share costs.

In that, DeLoria sees yet another twist of the knife for Indians: "It's like the post office at Christmas, when you get to the window just as they close it. Now that everybody else has an irrigation project, let's start keeping score and see what's fair...."

But Echohawk of the Native American Rights Fund sees some reason for optimism, especially because of this year's Papago water settlement in Arizona. In exchange for dropping its water claims in court, the tribe received a congressional guarantee of specific amounts of Colorado River water, to be delivered when the Central Arizona Water Project is completed around 1990, and a \$15 million trust fund for development.

After President Reagan vetoed a bill that would have financed the fund solely with federal money, the Reagan administration agreed to contribute \$5.25 million, half of the fund's principal amount (which is expected to earn enough in interest to produce that \$15 million by the time Central Arizona Project water reaches the reservation).

The Administration insisted that the other half be paid by the state and some private interests — in the words of one Indian advocate, "by the people who've been stealing it for so long."

Echohawk says, "Other tribes may be in a position, given the water rights they hold, to demand that sort of thing."

Partly because of the Papago experience and partly because of the strength of Indian water arguments in court (the Supreme Court in 1908 ruled that every reservation was entitled to its own water), substantial impetus has built this year to define Indian water rights all over the West.

Groups involved include not only Indian tribes and national organizations, but also, the energy, mining and power companies that comprise the Western Regional Council and most western state governors.

The reason for their common interest is this: Before any of them can do accurate water planning, they all need to know what specific amounts of water Indians will be entitled to.

And they would prefer to arrive at those figures by negotiation rather than litigation, not only because it is quicker, but because non-Indian interests fear sever court decisions. (For instance, the head of the Arizona Water Department has said that if all Indian water claims in his state were legally recognized, there literally would be no water for anyone else.) Right now, more than 50 tribes are in various courts fighting for resolution of water rights.

Just last week, Interior Secretary James Watt told water-interested parties that the federal government would provide assistance and dollars — \$4 million for research in 1983 — to get those water questions resolved.

USA Today
1-11-83
Kickapoos become eligible for citizenship
EAGLE PASS, Texas — The 600 Kickapoo Indians who live in carboard huts under the International Bridge here, will be eligible for citizenship and federal aid under legislation signed Monday by President Reagan. The tribe may also get a reservation of its own.
Pg. 282

1/13

Tricia -

Will you please
hold on to this
original.

Thanks,

Louise

Indian Policy Statement

DRAFT

FACT SHEET

SUMMARY

Strong and effective tribal governments are essential in the fight to solve the economic, health, educational, social and other problems of some 735,000 American Indians living on or near reservations. Just as the Federal government deals with States and local governments in meeting the needs of other citizens, so should the Federal government deal with tribal governments in promoting the well-being of American Indians.

The President's Indian Policy Statement emphasizes the Administration's commitment to encourage and strengthen tribal government as called for by President Nixon in 1970 and by Congress in the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975. The 1970 policy and 1975 law have not been adequately implemented because the Federal government has inhibited the political and economic development of the tribes. Excessive regulations and self-perpetuating bureaucracy have stifled tribal decisionmaking, thwarted Indian control of reservation resources, and promoted dependency rather than self-sufficiency.

This Administration will reverse this trend by removing obstacles to self-government and by creating a more favorable environment for development of healthy reservation economies. This policy recognizes the diversity of the tribes and the right of each to set its own priorities and goals, and to proceed at its own pace. At the same time, the Federal government will continue to fulfill its traditional responsibility for the physical and financial resources held in trust for the tribes and their members.

Indian tribes are tribal governments because they retain all aspects of their original sovereignty not otherwise given up or taken away by Congress. There are 283 Federally-recognized tribal governments in the United States.

In addition, there are 193 Alaska village organizations which are served by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). According to figures released by the U.S. Census Bureau, there were 1,418,195 American Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts in the United States in 1980.

MAJOR POLICY POINTS

-- The Administration will deal with Indian tribes on a government-to-government basis.

-- Tribal governments will be strengthened through these actions:

* Today's signing of the Indian Tribal Governmental Tax Status Act. This legislation provides tribes with essentially the same treatment under Federal tax laws as applies to other governments with regard to revenue raising and saving mechanisms.

* Encouragement for tribes to assume responsibilities for services such as the enforcement of tribal laws, developing and managing tribal resources, providing health and social services, and education.

remove { * A request that Congress provide full funding in FY 1984 for the Administration's Small Tribes Initiative designed to help under-developed tribal organizations become more proficient in management and administration.

- * Designation of the White House Office of Intergovernmental Affairs as liaison for tribes. By moving this function from the White House Office of Public Liaison, the President recognizes that tribal organizations are governments rather than interest groups such as veterans, businessmen and religious leaders.

- * Ask Congress to expand the authorized membership of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to include a representative of Indian tribal governments.

- * A request that Congress repudiate House Concurrent Resolution 108 of the 83rd Congress which called for termination of the Federal-tribal relationship. The Administration wants this lingering threat of termination withdrawn and replaced by a resolution expressing its support of a government-to-government relationship.

- * Support for direct funding to Indian tribes under Title XX social services block grants to States. In keeping with the government-to-government relationship, Indian tribes are defined by law as eligible entities and receive direct funding, if they wish, in five block grant programs administered by the Department of Health and Human Services. These and other blocks to the States consolidated dozens of categorical Federal domestic assistance programs to reduce fragmentation and overlap, eliminate excessive Federal regulation, and provide for more local control. This Administration proposes that Indian tribes be eligible for direct funding in the Title XX social services block, the block with the largest appropriation and the greatest flexibility in service delivery. Grants for social services would be made directly to the tribal governments, at the option of the tribe, and would not be channeled through the States.

DRAFT

Concurrent Resolution on National Indian Policy

Whereas it is recognized by the Congress that the Indian people stand in a unique political relationship to the Federal Government, which is based upon the Constitution, treaties, statutes, and judicial decisions; and

Whereas it is further recognized that this unique relationship is the basis for the Federal trust responsibility to protect lands and resources of the Indian people; and

Whereas the Congress has from time to time, and particularly in House Concurrent Resolution 108 of the Eighty-third Congress, declared congressional policy disavowing this unique relationship between the Indian people and the Federal Government, which policy has come to be known as the termination policy; and

Whereas the termination policy declared in House Concurrent Resolution 108 has not been repudiated specifically by a concurrent resolution, it has and continues to create among the Indian people an apprehension that the United States may not in the future honor the unique relationship between the Indian people and the Federal Government; and

Whereas the Congress has, in the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975, declared its commitment to the maintenance of the Federal Government's unique and continuing relationship with and responsibility to the Indian people through the establishment of a meaningful Indian self-determination policy; and

Whereas it is understood that as citizens of the United States and the communities in which they reside, the Indian people are entitled to share and participate on the same basis as all other citizens in the full range of social and economic development programs authorized by Federal, State, and local units of government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is declared to be the sense of Congress that --

(1) the policy set forth in House Concurrent Resolution 108 of the Eighty-third Congress was replaced by the Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 and no longer represents the policy of the Congress and is hereby repudiated as a policy of the Congress;

(2) our national Indian policy will give full recognition to and be predicated upon a government-to-government relationship between the Indian people and the Federal Government, and that a government-wide commitment shall derive from this relationship that will be designed to give the Indian people the freedom and encouragement to develop their governmental, social, and economic potential and to determine their own future to the maximum extent possible;

(3) increasing the opportunities for Indian tribes to strengthen their governments, to provide services to their people and to develop their resources according to the goals and priorities set by the tribes will be a major objective of our national Indian policy;

(4) the Indian people and their governments are by this resolution assured that the United States will continue to implement its trust responsibility in accordance with the highest standards;

(5) there is recognized a Federal responsibility to see that those Indians residing beyond the areas served by special Indian programs and services are given equal consideration with other citizens in the provision of services by other Federal, State, and local agencies; and

(6) as used in this resolution the term "Indian people" includes the Alaska Native people.

Information About...

THE INDIAN PEOPLE



Who is an Indian?

There is no one Federal or tribal definition that establishes a person's identity as Indian. Government agencies use different criteria for determining who is an Indian. Similarly, tribal groups have varying requirements for determining tribal membership.

For purposes of the Bureau of the Census, anyone who declares himself to be an Indian is considered an Indian.

To be designated as an Indian eligible for Bureau of Indian Affairs services, an individual must be a member of a tribe of Indians recognized by the Federal Government, and for some purposes, be of one-fourth or more Indian descent. By legislative and administrative decision, the Aleuts, Eskimos and Indians of Alaska are eligible for Bureau of Indian Affairs services. Most Bureau of Indian Affairs services and programs are limited to Indians living on or near a reservation.

How many Indians are there in the United States?

According to provisional figures released by the U. S. Census Bureau, there were 1,418,195 American Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts in the United States in 1980. This is a 71 percent increase over the 1970 recorded total of 827,268. There are 282 federally recognized tribes in the United States. In addition, there are 219 Alaska village communities which are served by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

What is an Indian Tribe?

"Tribe" among the North American Indians originally meant a body of persons bound together by blood ties who were socially, politically, and religiously organized, and who lived together, occupying a definite territory and speaking a common language or dialect.

With the relegation of Indians to reservations, the word "tribe" developed a number of different meanings. Today, it can be a distinct group within an Indian village or community, the entire community, a large number of communities, several different groups or villages speaking different languages but sharing a common government, or a widely scattered number of villages with a common language but no common government.

Do Indians have the Right to Vote?

Indians have the right to vote on the same basis as other citizens of their respective States. In 1948, disenfranchising interpretations of the Arizona Constitution were declared unconstitutional by the Arizona Supreme Court, and Indians were permitted to vote as they were in most other States. A 1953 Utah State law declared that persons living on Indian reservations were not residents of the State and could not vote. That law was repealed several years later. In 1954, Indians in Maine who were not under Federal jurisdiction were given the right to vote, and in 1962, New Mexico extended the right to vote to Indians.

Today civil rights laws are designed to prevent violations of the constitutional rights, including voting, of all citizens, Indians and non-Indians alike.

Qualifications for voting in Indian tribal elections have no relationship to the right of the Indian to vote in national, state, or local elections. Each tribe determines which of their members can vote.

Do Indians have the Right to hold Federal, State, and Local Government Offices?

Indians may hold government office like any other citizens. In fact, Indian men and women have held responsible elective and appointive posts at all levels of government. Charles Curtis, a Kaw Indian from Oklahoma, served as Vice President of the United States under President Herbert Hoover. Indians have been elected to the Congress from time to time for more than 60 years. Ben Reifel, a Sioux Indian from South Dakota, served five terms in the U. S. House of Representatives.

In addition, Indians have served and are serving in a number of State legislatures. Others have served on elected or appointed positions in State judiciary systems as well as in county and city government positions. Indians are increasingly winning elections to local school boards.

Do Indians have the Right to own Land?

Again, Indians have the same right to own land as other citizens.

Nearly all lands of Indian tribes, however, are held by the United States in trust for those tribes, and there is no general law that permits the tribe to sell its land. Individuals also own trust land, and upon the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or his representative, such an individual may sell his land. If an individual Indian wishes to extinguish the trust title to his land and hold title like any other citizen, he can do so only after the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative makes a determination that he is capable of managing his own affairs.

If an Indian wishes to buy "non-trust" land and has the money to do so, he may buy it and hold the same type of title to it as would any other citizen.

National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration, repository of the originals of all treaties, will duplicate a treaty and send it to anyone who requests it for a fee. It will also answer questions about a specific Indian treaty. Inquiries should be directed to: Diplomatic Branch, National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D. C. 20408.

Do Indian Tribes have their own Governments?

Most do. The governing body of the tribe is generally referred to as the tribal council and is made up of councilmen elected by vote of the adult members of the tribe and presided over by the tribal chairman. The tribal council elected in this way has authority to speak and act for the tribe and to represent it in negotiations with Federal, State, and local governments.

Tribal governments, in general, define conditions of tribal membership, regulate domestic relations of members, prescribe rules of inheritance for property not in trust status, levy taxes, regulate property under tribal jurisdiction, control conduct of members by municipal legislation, and administer justice.

Many tribes are organized under the Indian Reorganization Act (IRA) of 1934, including a number of Alaska Native villages, which adopted formal governing documents under the provisions of a 1936 amendment to the IRA. However, the passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 has provided for the creation of village and regional corporations under State law for the purpose of managing the money and lands granted by that act. The Oklahoma Indian Welfare Act of 1936 provides for the organization of Indian tribes within the State of Oklahoma. Some tribes do not operate under these acts but are organized under documents approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Some tribes continue their traditional form of government.

Does the U. S. Constitution apply to Tribal Governments?

While individual Indians have the same rights in relation to State and Federal Governments as any other citizen, several court decisions have held that restrictions found in the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment do not apply to tribal governments. In 1968, the Congress passed the Indian Civil Rights Act which restricts tribal governments in most of the same ways that Federal and State Governments are restricted by the Constitution. Federal courts may now review the actions of tribal governments, police, and courts when suit is brought alleging that rights protected by the 1968 law have been violated.

NEWS RELEASE

FROM: RICHARD A. VIGUERIE, EXECUTIVE PRODUCER, NATIONAL TELEVISION CORPORATION, 7777 LEESBURG PIKE, FALLS CHURCH, VA 22043

CONTACT: ART KELLY, (703) 356-0440, EXT. 277

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

In a recorded interview on Conservative Counterpoint, to be telecast at 6:30 PM, EST, Wednesday, January 19, 1983, on the Satellite Program Network (SPN), Secretary of Interior James G. Watt has advocated abolition of federal Indian reservations.

"If you want an example of the failures of socialism, don't go to Russia -- come to America and go to the Indian reservations," Watt said.

Watt stated that the 1.4 million American Indians who live on the 50 million acres of reservations maintained by the federal government were experiencing tremendous difficulties, especially drug abuse, alcoholism, unemployment, divorce, and venereal disease.

"Every social problem is exaggerated because of socialistic government policies on the Indian reservation...because the people have been trained through 100 years of government oppression to look to the government as the creator, as the provider, as the supplier, and have not been trained to use the initiative to integrate into the American system," Watt said.

"If we had treated the black people in America like we're now treating the Indians...there would be a social revolution that would tear the country up. But Congress tolerates the abusive government actions on Indians. I try to liberate them and get squashed by the liberal Democrats in the House of Representatives," he said.

Watt was interviewed by Howard Phillips, national director of The Conservative Caucus, and Jeffrey St. John, a columnist and commentator. Conservative Counterpoint is produced by Richard A. Viguerie through National Television Corporation.

How does an Indian become a Member of a Tribe?

By meeting membership requirements established by the tribe, or through adoption by the tribal governing body according to rules established by the tribe. Congress, too, can establish tribal membership criteria. The minimum amount of Indian blood needed to qualify an individual for membership in a tribe - apart from adoption - varies. Some tribes require only a trace of Indian blood while others require as much as one-half.

How many Indian Languages are there?

At the end of the 15th century there were more than 300 different languages spoken by American Indians in what is now the United States. Today only about 250 languages are spoken, some of which are spoken by just a few people. Others such as Cherokee, Navajo, and Teton Sioux are spoken by many thousands of people.

THE LEGAL STATUS OF INDIANS

Are Indians "wards of the Federal Government?"

The Federal Government is a trustee of Indian property, not the guardian of the individual Indian. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized by law in many instances to protect the interest of minors and incompetents, but this protection does not confer a guardian-ward relationship. The relationship is more aptly described as a trustee/beneficiary relationship, according to the American Indian Policy Review Commission's final report in 1977.

Do Indians get Payments from the Government?

There is no automatic payment to a person because he or she is Indian. The Federal Government has made and continues to make payments to Indian tribes or individuals for losses which resulted from treaty violations, or for encroachments on Indian lands, or for interests reserved to the tribe by the Government. Tribes or individuals may receive Government checks for income from their land and resources, but only because the assets are held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior and payment for the use of the Indian resources has been collected by the Federal Government.

Are Indians Citizens?

The U. S. Congress extended American citizenship in 1924 to all Indians born in the territorial limits of the United States. Before that, citizenship had been conferred upon approximately two-thirds of the Indians through treaty agreements, statutes, naturalization proceedings, and by "service in the Armed Forces with an honorable discharge" in World War I.

Do Indians pay Taxes?

Indians pay local, State, and Federal taxes the same as other citizens unless a treaty, agreement, or statute exempts them. Most tax exemptions that have been granted relate to lands held in trust for Indians and to income from such lands.

Do laws that apply to non-Indians also apply to Indians?

Like non-Indians, Indians are generally subject to Federal, State, and local laws. Only Federal and tribal laws apply on reservations, however, unless the Congress has provided otherwise.

Pursuant to Public Law 83-280, of August 15, 1953, Alaska, California, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota (except the Red Lake Reservation), Nebraska (except the Omaha Reservation), New York, Oregon (except the Warm Springs Reservation), and Wisconsin all have jurisdiction over Indian reservations. Florida, Idaho, Nevada, and Washington have assumed jurisdiction in whole or in part over Indian reservations through their own legislative action under authority of this same act.

On reservations where only Federal and tribal laws apply, Federal jurisdiction is limited, applying to 14 serious crimes under the Major Crimes Act of 1885 like murder, manslaughter, rape, assault with intent to kill, arson, burglary, and robbery. In addition, the general laws of the United States apply to Indians not on reservations as they do to other citizens.

Lesser crimes, committed by Indians on reservations, however, are solely within the jurisdiction of tribal courts. Where tribes have not established codes of laws and tribal courts, the Secretary of the Interior has established a code of offenses and an Indian court.

Does the United States Government still make Treaties with Indians?

The negotiation of treaties with Indian tribes ended in 1871 by congressional action. Since that time, agreements with Indian groups have been made by congressional acts, Executive orders, and executive agreements.

The treaties that have been made often contain obsolete commitments which either have been fulfilled or have been superseded by congressional legislation after consultation with the tribe or tribes concerned. Particularly in recent years, the Government has provided educational, health, welfare, and other services to tribal Indians to an extent far beyond that required by treaties. Several large Indian groups have no treaties and yet share in the many services for Indians financed by annual appropriations by the Congress.

A five-volume work available in most large law libraries, one volume of which contains treaties signed by Government negotiators with Indians, is Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties. Now out of print, it was compiled, annotated, and edited by Charles J. Kappler and published by the Government Printing Office. However, one private publisher has reprinted the treaty volume as Indian Treaties, 1778-1883.

INDIAN LANDS

What is an Indian Reservation?

An Indian reservation is an area of land reserved for Indian use. The name comes from the early days of Indian-white relations when Indian tribes relinquished land through treaties, "reserving" a portion for their own use. Congressional acts, Executive orders, and agreements have also created reservations. Many reservations today, however, have some non-Indian residents and non-Indian landowners.

Are Indians required to stay on Reservations?

Indians can move about as freely as other Americans.

How much land does the Bureau of Indian Affairs hold in trust for Indians?

As of 1978, the Bureau of Indian Affairs held a total of 51,789,249 acres of Indian land in trust. Of this total, 41,678,875 acres are held by tribes, and the remaining 10,110,374 acres are individually held.

March 1981

Q: At the heart of the problem is a reservation policy which distinguishes Native Americans, distinguishes Indians from the rest of the population. Instead of a policy assimilation and integration with respect to the Indian, the policy is one of distinction, of separation. Do you think that's right?

WATT: We have tremendous problems on the Indian reservations. (How) I frequently talk about it by telling people if you want an example of the failures of socialism, don't go to Russia--come to America and go to the Indian Reservations.

We have 50 million acres of Indian reservations, 1.4 million American Indians, and every social problem is exaggerated because of socialistic government policies on the Indian Reservations. Highest divorce rate, highest drug rate, highest alcoholism rate, highest unemployment rate, highest social diseasesbecause the people have been trained through 100 years of government oppression to look to the government as the creator, as the provider, as the supplier, and they've not been trained to use the initiative to integrate into the American system.

We have terrible schools on the Indian reservations and we've tried to change that. Congress won't. The liberal eastern idea is that.... I'll support the Indian people and they drive out to my home state of Wyoming in August for (a) two-week vacation, buy an Indian bead necklace, and think they have done their thing for Indian America. Terrible socialism. We ought to give them freedom, we ought to give them liberty, we ought to give them their rights, but we treat them as incompetent wards. I'm their trustee. They can't make a decision on the reservations about their water, their lands, they can't own land on the reservations.

Q: Is that the basis of much of the legitimate anger of many of the Indian leaders, forgetting the radicals for a moment (who) are using the Indian issues...the fact that they literally live on a plantation?

WATT: That's correct with big Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior controlling their rights. Now there are some benefits to that.

Q: Sure. Isn't it true that some of the established Indian leaders have a strong personal stake in the present policy and oppose what they call termination?

WATT: In the Great Society, we came in with all these legal aides and all these programs and made federal funds available to fund Indian Governments. So if you're the chief or the chairman, you're interested in keeping this group of people assembled on a desert environment where there are no jobs, no agriculture potential, no water, because if the Indians were allowed to be liberated, they'd go and get a job and that guy wouldn't have his government handout as a government Indian paid official.

STATION OR NETWORK:

ABC TELEVISION NETWORK

TIME:

7:00 AM, EST

SECRETARY WATT RESPONDS TO INDIAN CALLS FOR RESIGNATION

STEVE BELL: The leaders of 154 American Indian tribes are meeting here in Washington next Monday to issue a formal response to what they call anti-Indian rhetoric by Interior Secretary Watt. Joe Spencer reports the response has been bitter so far.

(FILM SHOWN)

JOE SPENCER: As word of Secretary Watt's statements spread throughout Indian reservations across the country, reaction was swift and angry.

BILL HOULE (CHIPPEWA CHAIRMAN): Secretary Watt should immediately submit his resignation.

PAM CHIBITTY (OKLAHOMA NATIVE AMERICAN COUNCIL): It's very obvious that he's not knowledgeable of the federal trust relationship between the federal government and the Indian people.

SPENCER: However, there were Indian leaders who agreed with Watt's assessment that a wide range of social problems does exist on the reservations.

JERRY SHAW (MID AMERICAN INDIAN CENTER): We're hearing on some reservations the alcoholism rate is as high as 50 percent. I know; I just got back from the Navajo country. Unemployment out there is 75 percent. No doubt there's a lot of serious problems in Indian country.

SPENCER: Although Watt and the White House would like to see the controversy surrounding his statements forgotten, it appears some Indian leaders are not about to forget, or forgive.

NOAH BILLIE (SEMINOLE INDIAN): I don't know why he should make such a hard statement. To me, that's a direct attack

on my own land. And if he wants war, then we'll go to war. I feel that strongly about it.

Joe Spencer, ABC News.

* * * * *

DAVID HARTMAN: In a television interview aired yesterday, James Watt, the Secretary of the Interior, said that Indian reservations in America represent, to quote him, "the failure of socialism."

Now, many Indian leaders have protested his remarks, accusing the Secretary of racism. There have also been many calls for the Secretary's resignation.

And James Watt is in Washington this morning, and Steve Bell, of course, is joining us as well. Good morning, Mr. Secretary.

JAMES WATT: Good to be with you, David.

HARTMAN: Thank you very much. Let me quote you: "If you want an example of the failure of socialism, don't go to Russia come to America and go to the Indian reservations." Also, you said that Indians on the reservations have "the highest divorce rate, highest drug rate, highest alcoholism rate, highest unemployment rate, and the highest social diseases in the country."

One tribal chairman from the state of Washington said quote, "That's the kind of racism talk the country doesn't need from the Secretary of the Interior." And another tribal leader is saying, "That's the most racial (sic) slur that they've heard from a government official." unquote.

How do you respond, Mr. Watt?

WATT: I've been trying for two years to draw attention to the terrible plight of the American Indian. The American Indian has been abused for years and years. And for too many years politicians have simply been trying to sweep it under the rug, acting like it's not there. They deserve better. The federal government is abusive to them. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has not done a good job.

We need to help these people overcome their problems. As I've travelled, and been on the reservations with these Indians -- they're tremendously talented people, they have good governments. If we'll let their government function, and get the federal government off their backs.

HARTMAN: If that's been your attitude, Mr. Secretary, how do you account for this tremendous outpouring of reaction from the entire Indian community, or from most of the Indian community?

WATT: Yes, I think you need to point out, it's a very small segment of the Indian community, and any day of the week you can get some of those people calling for my resignation. I think that's healthy. We need to have this issue debated. I have trust responsibilities. I have legal and treaty responsibilities that I must live up to. So I don't have the option of doing very much about these problems.

We've focused our attention on a few issues. We've tried to bring some help to the Indian reservations but most of the debate has to be carried out between the Indians and Congress. And I've tried for two years to focus attention on this terrible plight of the American Indian. And hopefully we'll get some attention and coverage out.

STEVE BELL: Mr. Secretary, just for the record, 154 tribal representatives are going to be meeting here Monday to draft a formal response to what they consider slurs from you. How do you have this communications gap, if you will?

WATT: We don't know what that 154 are going to do. We've talked to most of them. I've been telling the Indians that -- this is not new rhetoric, I've been saying this for two years to the Indians, to every news conference I've had, to groups around. The American Indian needs help. They have too much unemployment. All these social problems are symptoms of the basic cause. Let's address causes instead of just addressing the symptoms.

BELL: What do you mean that it's an example of socialism failed?

WATT: Good. Let's start with some examples. Education. The American Indian deserves a good education. I believe in public education where the local public government will manage their own schools. We have government schools. The Washington bureaucrats that I'm responsible -- I'm a bureaucrat in a sense. I run the local school systems for the Indians. Obviously that education system is not good enough for the Indian. They are not employed, they're not having the opportunities that other Americans are. We ought to give it to them. The education system is wrong because it's a government system run out of Washington rather than a public school run by the Indians.

HARTMAN: And yet, Mr. Secretary, John Echohawk, who is of native American Nations (?) Fund says, quote, "The Indians need tribal self-government. If that's what Mr. Watt calls socialism,

then he doesn't know what he's talking about. That's good old American democracy."

WATT: O.K. What we really want is tribal self-government not government from Washington by the BIA officials, the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The tribal governments, the elected people, are good people. I've been meeting with them. I've been on the reservations more than other past secretaries. And the tribal governments are good. Give them a chance. Get Washington off their backs. That's the problem: Washington, not the governments. The Indian governments are good. The Washington government is oppressive. That's what needs to be reduced.

HARTMAN: If you have been clear -- in making yourself clear -- that this is your attitude, Mr. Secretary, why has the Governor of New Mexico, Governor Hayes, called for your resignation?

WATT: I've not met the Governor. I imagine it's good old partisan American politics. I think that's healthy. That doesn't bother me a bit.

BELL: You just said the Indian governments are good, yet you're quoted as having said on that television interview, that some tribal Indian leaders are interested in keeping their people, quote, "assembled on a desert environment where there are no jobs, no agriculture potential, no water, because if the Indians were allowed to be liberated, they would go and get a job and he, the tribal leader wouldn't have his government handout as a paid government Indian official."

WATT: Well, we've seen that problem too but the -- pluralism in the Indian community, in the Indian country, is strong. There's some powerfully good leaders. And they're wanting what I'm talking about, as your news program called earlier. They're saying Jim Watt is correct. Let's address the cause and not the symptoms.

BELL: One of the specific criticisms in one of our reports from an Indian was: "He's trying to drive us off the reservations, our only land."

WATT: It is their land. I want them to be able to run their land and not a bunch of bureaucrats like Jim Watt and others dictating from Washington how they should handle their land. It's theirs, let them have it, not a bunch of bureaucrats here in Washington running it. They're better able than we are.

HARTMAN: Mr. Secretary, do you think you ought to resign?

WATT: If I can draw attention to this Indian issue and get that solved, I will have made a significant contribution to

America, and particularly to the American Indian who deserves so much better attention than the government has given him for 100 years. It's a problem we cannot afford to sweep under the rug. Let's address it, let's solve it. Let's don't just throw money at symptoms. Let's help those people help themselves rather than abuse them like the government has done in the past 100 years. It's a shameful thing we've done.

HARTMAN: Secretary James Watt, thank you for joining us this morning.

WATT: Great, good to be with you.

PROGRAM: ABC NEWS NIGHTLINE	DATE: WED., JAN. 19, 1983
STATION OR NETWORK: ABC TELEVISION NETWORK	TIME: 11:30 PM, EST

REACTION TO WATT'S REMARKS ABOUT INDIANS

JAMES WATT (SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR): If you want an example of the failures of socialism, don't go to Russia; come to the United States and go to the Indian reservation.

TED KOPPEL: American Indians have long suspected that James Watt is anything but their best friend in Washington. And when a television interview was released today in which Secretary Watt cited the high rate of Indian alcoholism, drug addiction and venereal disease, that made things even worse.

But then Watt was quoted -- inaccurately -- as calling for the abolition of Indian reservations, and the fat was really in the fire. Calls for his resignation have swept through almost all the tribal councils. Tonight we'll look at what James Watt really said and at what Indian leaders thought he meant.

* * * * *

Good evening. The television program on which Interior Secretary James Watt was interviewed -- and the interview actually took place last Thursday and was broadcast this evening -- that program is called "Conservative Counterpoint." It is hosted by a conservative columnist and the national director of the Conservative Caucus. It is produced by the most successful conservative fund raiser in the country, Richard Viguerie.

It was Mr. Viguerie who put out a press release following the interview with James Watt claiming that Watt had called for the abolition of all Indian reservations. UPI, the wire service, ran that story, and the heat was on. Indian leaders, responding to press reports, called for Watt's immediate resignation -- except that Watt never said what he was quoted as saying. What he did say, however, was controversial enough.

WATT: We have tremendous problems on the Indian reservation. I frequently talk about it by telling people, if you want an example of the failures of socialism, don't go to Russia; come to America and go to the Indian reservation.

We have 50 million acres of Indian reservations, 1.4 million American Indians, and every social problem is exaggerated because of socialistic government policies on the Indian reservation: highest divorce rate, highest drug rate, highest alcoholism rate, highest unemployment rate, highest social diseases -- because the people have been trained through a hundred years of government oppression to look to the government as the creator, as the provider, as the supplier. And they've not been trained to use the initiative to integrate into the American system.

JAMES BILLIE (SEMINOLE TRIBAL CHAIRMAN): To single out just one group of people and say that we're all -- what are we -- I've seen one particular part where he says the reservations are plagued by drugs and alcohol abuse, unemployment, divorce and venereal disease. I can guarantee I can go off my reservation right now into the Broward County system and show you the same thing. The United States is plagued -- I could keep on going.

ELMER SAVILLA (NATIONAL TRIBAL CHAIRMANS ASSN.): The National Tribal Chairmans Association is appalled and dismayed at the distortions and misinformation about conditions on the reservation that Secretary Watt made at an interview broadcast today -- being broadcast today on the Satellite Program Network.

PAM IRON (TULSA INDIAN AFFAIRS CHAIRMAN): True, there are a lot of alcoholism; there is a lot of social problems that do exist. But in the last ten years, the Indian people have been determining their own policies. When the self-determination act went into effect, this is when the Indian tribes had the right to determine their fate instead of social policy set by the government always being the one that made the decisions on how the Indians should live.

WATT: We came in with all these legal aid and all these programs and made federal funds available to fund Indian governments. So if you're the chief or the chairman, you're interested in keeping this group of people assembled on a desert environment, where there are no jobs, no agricultural potential, no water, because if the Indians were allowed to be liberated, they'd go and get a job and that guy wouldn't have his government handout.

CHIEF BUFFALO TIGER (MICCOSUKEE TRIBE): Our reservation lands are good land for the oil and coal and -- what do you call it? -- the resources, natural resources. I'm sure that the government is interested in taking some of this land and make something out of it, and the Indian have to be sitting on that (sic).

SAVILLA: We charge that Secretary Watt has breached his duties deliberately, and we ask that President Reagan immediately investigate Mr. Watt's actions as the principal trustee for Indian affairs.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Watt, are you suggesting that we do away in any way with the reservations?

WATT: No. The government should not force anything on the Indian community. The Indian country needs to make their own decisions, and bureaucrats in Washington shouldn't be dictating how the Indians handle and manage their lands, their schools, their jobs, their opportunities. That should be their privilege, not the government dictating one thing or another.

PAM CHIBITTY (NATIVE AMERICAN COALITION): I think that Secretary Watt's background is extremely limited when it comes to Indian people. He does not -- you know, it's very obvious from his statements today, it's very obvious that he's not knowledgeable of the federal trust relationship between the federal government and the Indian people. He doesn't realize why he's singling out native Americans in regard to being in a dependency. There is all other kinds of people; there's businesses. Look at Chrysler: you know, they're dependent on the federal government. So I can't understand why he would single out the native American, especially when it's a totally different type of relationship.

KOPPEL: When we return, we'll talk with four Indian leaders about Secretary Watt's remarks, about the furor they've ignited and about the very real problems confronting American Indian communities.

* * * * *

KOPPEL: There are more than 260 Indian reservations scattered across the country. Tonight we'll talk to the leaders of three. The Navajo tribe is the nation's largest, and its 25,000 acre reservation spreads from Arizona into New Mexico and Utah. Joining us from Albuquerque, New Mexico, is Peterson Zah, Chairman of the Navajo Nation. The Rosebud Sioux Reservation is located in south central South Dakota. Rosebud Sioux President Carl Waln joins us from our Denver affiliate, KBTW. From the Florida Everglades is the reservation of the Seminole Tribe. Joining us from our Miami affiliate, WPLG, is Seminole Chairman James Billie. And with us here in Washington is Ron Andrade, Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians.

Mr. Billie, I'd like to begin with you, because at one point today you called for the resignation of Chairman Watt -- not Chairman Watt, of Secretary Watt. Since then you've had occasion to change your mind. Why?

JAMES BILLIE (SEMINOLE TRIBAL CHAIRMAN): About two hours ago I had a -- I was listening to one of the conversations that he had. I think it was an interview somewhere in Tulsa. And before I heard this, the news media approached me and told me

the different type situation that Secretary Watt had said. But as it turned out, when I saw the interview it appeared to me that his conversation was taken out of context. And some of the things that Secretary Watt had indicated there is existing on the reservations.

KOPPEL: Such as?

BILLIE: Such as high unemployment. Like in my particular reservation there's approximately 47 percent. We have a different type of illnesses that's on the reservation; it's probably higher than anyplace else. He was talking about alcoholism; we do have our share of problems with it. The other things that he was talking about, they all fall into place.

KOPPEL: All right. He reached certain conclusions about that; I'm wondering whether you agree with those conclusions. He found that to be the result of a form of socialism, where the American government is doing certain things for the Indian nations which he seems to believe they ought to be doing for themselves.

BILLIE: I don't understand the entire question, what you're saying, but I believe there's a certain amount of problems that we have on the reservations that somewhere down the line the bureaucratic system has failed to help us or help each other get into this modern day and age. And I know that somewhere -- like socialism that he was talking about -- we've confined ourselves to the reservations, where we should be going out and integrating a little bit more but maintaining our culture at the same time.

KOPPEL: All right. Let's jump around the country quickly, and let's go first of all to Peterson Zah, who represents the Navajo Nation. Do you agree, first of all, with what you've heard so far? State your own opinion, Mr. Zah, would you please?

PETERSON ZAH (NAVAJO TRIBE CHAIRMAN): Well, I was really disturbed at what the Secretary has said, quite disturbed because it comes from a federal official, a federal administrator, who has a big huge responsibility in looking after the Indian people in this country. And as Secretary of Interior he is charged by law to look after our resources, the people, our water routes and our land. And I was --

KOPPEL: All right. Let me just -- let me interrupt you for a moment to find out what it is that he said that upset you. Do you take issue with some of the problems he claims exist on many of the reservations?

ZAH: I think mainly the attitude more than anything else -- attitude because I think there is certain interest group

that he is pushing this administration in terminating many of the Indian reservation that has been in dispute for several years. And we're disturbed because there seems to be some attitude that's taking a similar role as what it has in the past.

KOPPEL: All right. Now, we're in agreement, aren't we, Mr. Zah, that he didn't actually call for the abolition of the reservations. But do you see anything in what he did say that leads you to believe that's what he wants?

ZAH: Yes, I do.

KOPPEL: What?

ZAH: If you look at the text of his speech, or the interview, he alludes to some degree of trust responsibility, where he is essentially saying that perhaps the federal government should not be -- or should not have a role in having such a tremendous role on the reservation, as far as the trust responsibility is concerned.

KOPPEL: All right. I just want to keep on going around. Let me go to Carl Waln of the Rosebud Sioux. Pick up with what we've covered so far. With what do you agree, with what do you disagree?

CARL WALN (ROSEBUD SIOUX NATION PRES.): Okay, Ted, I'd like to begin by thanking ABC News and the American public for allowing the tribal Indian governments to have their perspective aired and their voice heard.

We had a tribal council meeting today on our reservation, and one of the things that some of the elders have brought out was the fact that when Watt talks about the social problems and the diseases and the health problems he cited that these were not here before 1492, and a lot of these things we have inherited from the dominant culture. I see this statement and this release as a political ploy type thing on the part of the Secretary.

KOPPEL: To do what?

WALN: Well, I think it's another move toward termination; I think it's a move that concerns environmental issues, concerns our land, concerns our resources. And I think this is the underlying meaning behind this.

KOPPEL: Ron Andrade, you're the executive director of the National Congress of American Indians. Interpret all of that for me. Why would it be to the advantage of the Reagan administration, or why would they think it to be to their advantage, if somehow reservations were disbanded?

RON ANDRADE (CONGRESS OF AMERICAN INDIANS): Well, of course most of the tribes are concerned that if they were disbanded the land would automatically come up for sale. Tribes could never -- or the individual member could never pay the tax rates, the other kind of costs that would happen once the tribe lands were dispersed to individual members.

Additionally, the oil companies and mineral interests would immediately go in and start to buy up the individual lots from the individual members. This is a part of our history from the 1800s, and so many of the tribes are very fearful that the breakup of the land and the breakup of the governments would mean total loss of the lands and, as a result, the loss of our culture.

KOPPEL: All right. I should interject at this point that we invited Secretary Watt, indeed we invited someone from the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to come join us on our program this evening. We can only regret that they chose not to.

Let me come back to you, though, Mr. Andrade. He didn't say that, did he? I mean, he didn't call for the breakup of the reservations -- I mean Secretary Watt. Do you believe that that, however, is either policy or the intended policy of this administration?

ANDRADE: No, I don't think we've been able to pinpoint anything, other than maybe feelings on parts of some of the people. The recent announcements made by the President on January 14 we felt were beginning to strengthen our relationship with the federal government. We didn't see anything particular in the interview with Mr. Watt, at least from his side, that seemed to be an indication. I would not hold the same feeling for Mr. Howard Phillips; he seemed to be more interested in seeing a breakup of the reservations.

KOPPEL: He's the Chairman of the Conservative Caucus, who was conducting the interview.

ANDRADE: Yes, and he seemed to be -- and his questions seemed to be very loaded to try to get an answer from Mr. Watt that would lead to a statement saying, we should break up the reservations and get rid of the socialistic programs.

KOPPEL: Was there anything, indeed, in that interview that offended you?

ANDRADE: If anything was, I believe it was the -- our feeling was the attitude of Mr. Phillips and the other interviewers. Those kind of statements we believe were an attempt to try to draw out a statement, and maybe seen as a trial balloon by the conservatives, to see whether or not -- how many Americans

would buy these kind of answers, would buy this kind of questioning, against Indians. I think their attitude is the most offensive thing I think we got from this interview.

KOPPEL: Mr. Zah, do you -- what did you find most offensive?

ZAH: Well, we're more concerned about the lack of policy on the part of this administration. In other words, there is no Reagan policy on American Indians or native Americans in this country. And in absence of a clear-cut policy in terms of how they're going to deal with these programs, you have somebody like a secretary saying and doing all these things. And we have been quite concerned about that.

KOPPEL: Well, I mean, what kind of a policy do you think Secretary Watt is trying to impose, if indeed he is? Some of the things he said sounded, on the face of it, to be quite sympathetic to problems faced by many of the Indian nations.

ZAH: Well, I think many of those things that he is saying right now -- for example, the social program that he indicated -- there are some problems on the reservation. This administration had a chance to see if they can help us with some of those problems, but instead -- for example, he mentions the unemployment. On the Navajo Reservation the Reagan administration has saw fit to pull back \$152 million during the year 1982, and at the same time they're complaining that there is such a high unemployment rate and that the tribal government ought to do something about it.

KOPPEL: What is the unemployment rate on your reservation?

ZAH: About 75 percent unemployment rate now.

KOPPEL: And what about -- let's take a look at the Rosebud Sioux Reservation. What's the unemployment rate there?

WALN: The last figures that came out of our planning office, Ted, were around 80 percent.

KOPPEL: And the Seminoles?

BILLIE: Forty-seven percent.

KOPPEL: And Mr. Andrade, on a national basis, are you able to put a number to it?

ANDRADE: Well, the Bureau of Indian Affairs estimates approximately about a 55 percent unemployment rate.

KOPPEL: And does that have to do largely with the fact that Indians choose to stay on reservations or are clannish, as some people would suggest? Or does it have to do with the fact that you have a very difficult time getting off the reservations and finding jobs? Any one of you can pick up on that.

ANDRADE: Well, Ted, we don't think it's because we choose to stay on the reservations, that it's anything of that nature. After 200 years with bureau domination, there's no industry, no private sector industry; there's not sufficient jobs on the reservation that they could have created, helped create with the tribes. They've not given tribal support -- the tribes the support they needed to create jobs on the reservation, and as a result, we have a high unemployment rate.

KOPPEL: And yet the way Secretary Watt puts it, he's suggesting that the very fact that the government has intruded too much over the last few years into Indian life has brought the state of affairs to where it is today.

ANDRADE: Well, I don't think the tribes have been asking for a handout; they've been asking for a hand. They said, help us develop the jobs, help us develop the industry. Instead the government has usually held back the tribes from doing that because of no assistance. And I think if the tribes had the proper assistance from the federal government we would have had many, many more jobs on the reservation.

KOPPEL: In a word, then, what is it you would like to see from the Reagan administration? Let's -- we have only about a minute left. I'd like to whip around very quickly. Mr. Zah, what would you like to say?

ZAH: Probably more funding to the Indian reservation, with less strings attached to those dollars.

KOPPEL: Mr. Waln?

WALN: One thing the Secretary has said, and the President also has stated, that they want to deal directly with tribal governments. It will be a government-to-government relationship. And we agree with this, and they have agreed with it. And we feel that the funds channeled directly to the tribal government, we would be able to develop our own resources and provide employment for the reservation.

KOPPEL: All right. We have time enough only for you, Mr. Billie.

BILLIE: I would like to go ahead and acquire some land near larger cities, where I can get my people out of the swamps and get to where the jobs are. And I've been quite successful in

some areas to this day -- and with some oppositions. And now, with the 47 percent unemployment, I think by going out closer to the city areas and putting my reservation there, I can slow down the unemployment rate.

KOPPEL: All right. Mr. Billie, Mr. Andrade, Mr. Waln, Mr. Zah, thank you all. When we return, we'll see what life is like at the Rosebud Sioux Reservation and how the people who live on it feel about Secretary Watt's remarks.

* * * * *

KOPPEL: When reports of Secretary Watt's controversial interview first surfaced yesterday, the news spread through Indian communities like so much wildfire, and so did the anger and resentment. It's clear that many Indians agree with Watt on two points: that they should have a freer hand to govern themselves, and that they're plagued by serious social problems. Where they disagree with Secretary Watt is on where to place the blame. Jerry King reports from Pine Ridge, South Dakota.

(FILM SHOWN)

JERRY KING: He is a Sioux Indian; his name is Crazy Horse. His wife is a full-blooded niece of the legendary Indian chief. Together they, some of their 12 children and some of their grandchildren live just outside Pine Ridge, South Dakota. There is no running water in their trailer. It is not an easy life.

DAVID LONG (CRAZY HORSE): A lot of persons living in a small room, and not very much to eat. And now this alcoholics comes into the picture (sic). And I guess that is true all over the world, but as far as our Indian reservation, there is really nothing to do, especially the younger people.

G. WAYNE TAPIO (COUNCIL MEMBER): This is about the worst -- expert I ever seen, because Watt's never came here, he never asked anybody, he never listened.

KING: A special meeting of the Oglalo Sioux Tribal Council today interpreted Watt as pushing Indian integration with the rest of America, which they see as endangering their very existence as a Sioux nation.

JOHN STEELE (OGLALO SIOUX COUNCIL): Termination, as advocated by Secretary Watt, is genocide and, if continued or carried out against Indian people, makes President Reagan and the Secretary of Interior, James Watt, as guilty as Adolph Hitler in committing acts of genocide.

MARIO GONZALEZ (INDIAN ATTORNEY): We want to be left as a separate and distinct people, but yet we want to live and get along with everybody.

KING: Many on this reservation agree with Watt that alcoholism is rampant and so is drug abuse, that unemployment at 70 to 85 percent is horrendous, housing and medical facilities are terrible. But they feel these problems were exacerbated by Washington.

Sioux Indian leaders here on the Pine Ridge Reservation acknowledge the social problems prevalent among their tribe, but they say the fault is not with the system of reservations but rather with the way the reservations are administered by the federal government.

This is the Sioux Indians' national anthem. It is not a war chant, but there is certainly a feeling here that General Custer is alive and well in Washington. Jerry King, for Nightline, on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota.

(END FILM)

* * * * *

KOPPEL: That's our report on Nightline for tonight. For all of us here at ABC News, this is Ted Koppel in Washington. Good night.