

tor of modern mass culture, then maybe we don't need these little pockets of education and isolated cultures, where people preserve a different answer to the question, "Who are we and what is our purpose in life?"

But there are others of us, and I include among that number the National Council of Churches, and I think most of the thoughtful citizens of this country and, I gather, Senator Hansen, by his comments of a moment ago, that we treasure these precious forms of uniqueness that remind us that there are other styles of life than the ones that the majority may have chosen.

Now it is a pity that the conflict arises between these little enclaves that are trying to keep alive a precious answer to the riddles of life that they have found, that a conflict arises between them and what are really the best elements of our majority civilization. I refer to the Forest Service, and to the traditions of the Department of Agriculture, which Senator Anderson had such a distinguished part in determining.

For in their work, going back to the conservationists at the beginning of the century, we see the embodiment of the attempt to preserve the most constructive and creative and growing parts of our Nation's life, to preserve natural resources, to make constructive use of them for the benefit of the whole public.

In my rather limited contacts with the Forest Service in Taos, N. Mex., when I was investigating this, I was constantly impressed with the solicitude on the part of the Forest Service for the welfare of the Indians, and for their religious liberty, and I want to testify to that effect. They tried in every way they could to be considerate of the Indians' wishes and desires as they could understand them.

The problem was that, like most of us, they didn't understand them as well as they might wish, because we think of these things in the terms that we have learned from our own experience.

We talk about shrines, which comes from a European tradition. It is not the way the Indians think about it, unless the shrine encompasses the whole watershed. That is the only way in which the term can be appropriately applied.

As I was saying, I think it is a tragedy that there arises this conflict between a small, isolated Indian culture, which looks regressive, maybe, to many of us, old-fashioned, conservative, undemocratic, between that, and the best that our American civilization has to offer, as represented by the public service interest of the Forest Service.

I would like to think that there was a way that they could both contribute what they have to contribute to our society, and it is in an effort to try to assist in clarifying what the Indian, what he feels, from my interviews with the tribal council and individual members of the tribe, that the Indians are trying to communicate to the rest of us.

That is summed up in a couple of paragraphs in the printed material, which I would like to read at this point.

The relationship between the tribe and the land is an organic one; they feel that the entire watershed is integral to the life of the tribe, and is indissolubly linked with the tribe's long and continuous history of occupation of this region. The tribe and the valley have grown old together. The members of the tribe feel an ancient identity, not only with Blue Lake—the headwaters of their life-sustaining stream—but with the entire watershed, its plants and animals. Anything which mutilates the valley hurts the tribe. If the trees are cut, the tribe bleeds.