

## CHANGE, CONSERVATION, AND COMMUNITIES

I welcome this opportunity to join you. I am concerned about your problems. I want to be associated with your progress and the future of the <sup>3 SCSA chap in Tenn</sup> 95 soil conservation districts in Tennessee and the 3,000 in our land. There is the personal pleasure of meeting friends again. Too, there is the professional pleasure of discussing soil and water conservation with those in the field. I always carry away from these meetings new ideas, fresh viewpoints--perhaps more than I bring. *Tree men*

Words are still the legitimate weapons of civilized man facing the issues of his time. Your conference, as I see it, provides for a timely discussion of vital issues. The accelerating demands of our time place a premium on effort, which is basic to soil conservation, and to resource development, and to the basic welfare of our great Nation.

It is less than profound to observe that a good community can be produced only by good men--or that we get out of life about what we put into it. Yet men of good will and their efforts are, indeed, essential ingredients of a useful, civilized community.

There are other ingredients, of course: skills, planning, and vision--sacrifice, determination and faith--encouragement, investment, and opportunity for self-expression and accomplishment. Therefore, I increasingly sense that this is the time to speak for the unity of the countryside in all its values and uses. It is the time to advocate the protection and development of our resources as a whole, in accordance with their capabilities and the goals of the community. It is a time to speak for action that

---

Material used by Norman A. Berg, Deputy Administrator for Field Services, SCS, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., for Keynote Talk at Sixth Annual Convention, Tennessee Chapters Soil Conservation Society of America, Mountain View Hotel, Gatlinburg, Tennessee, June 30, 1967.

will meet the oncoming demands of a growing Nation. Above all, it is a time to assist conservation district governing boards to assume fully their responsibilities of local leadership in soil, in water, and in related conservation and resource development work.

The founders of our Nation regarded water and air the way the Indian did the buffalo. There was always more where the last supply came from, and nature took away whatever people polluted. Smog and streams no longer safe to swim in have sharply reminded our generation that nature's bounty is not infinite. The same realization occurred earlier for soils and still earlier for forests <sup>PARIES</sup> and wildlife.

However, any serious concern in the United States over any aspect of environment is largely a phenomenon of the 20th century. This is so chiefly because <sup>too</sup> few before had taken account of the fact that the resources-- and even the space of the American continent were not inexhaustible. When men saw that space and resources were indeed limited, the concept of "conservation" was born.

At first the word meant primarily the wise exploitation of material resources with some regard for the future. Then some men began to include in it preservation of the natural environment for its intellectual and aesthetic as well as utilitarian values. Confusion inevitably resulted and it has increased with the further inclusion of the need to provide for what is somewhat more precisely designated as "recreation" and "natural

The confusion is partly a matter of words. But more importantly it arises out of a difference of opinion concerning the extent to which nonmaterial values should be recognized and what the nonmaterial values are. It is perfectly possible to dislike billboards without caring whether or not wildlife disappears, and perfectly possible to consider recreation facilities important without believing that the preservation of any aspect of the natural environment is also important. Superhighways, suitably landscaped, are to some people simply nature improved; to others they isolate the tourist from the land he traverses and make nature itself seem artificial.

When our plight is examined, we resemble somewhat a country described by Wilford Owen of the Brookings Institute:

"At the national level the inhabitants were very rich but at the local level they turned out to be quite poor. And, as luck would have it, they all lived at the local level."

Conservation has become increasingly competitive.

--as to meaning

--as to function .

--within government

--outside government.

Conservation means many different things to many different people!

Conservation is many different things to many different people!

Even within the realm of renewable natural resources there are many highly specialized interest groups:

--Those interested mainly in hunting and fishing--1,558,755

migratory waterfowl stamps were sold last year.

--Those interested mainly in flowers or birds. There are now

8,000,000 bird watchers.

*2 All re*

--Those interested mainly in hiking, or boating, or nature study,

or picnicking or swimming (especially in the Potomac River).

--Those interested mainly in preserving wilderness and wild

rivers.

--And those interested mainly in soil--and water.

Conservation is all these things and more!

It is a complex matter. It has great diversity. It is little understood in its broad totality because "conservation" not has so many adherents who see it from so many different viewpoints--who view it in many different lights.

Patriotism may well be the first preserve of an idiot and the last refuge of a scoundrel but for all that, love of country is none the less natural. I'm almost tempted to say instinctual among men.

"Life" editor Phillip Kunhardt wrote recently:

"This is my land

"It is good to be out in this country again. You read and hear so much nowadays about how it has gone sour, and you start believing it, until you get out and see for yourself that it

hasn't, that it is pretty much the same friendly, free, bold, naive, surging nation it has always been. It is still an open land, full of space, so much earth and rock and forest and water and sky that it makes you wonder about all the talk about a population explosion. It is still a land of titanic beauty. You are struck with that everywhere--standing on a bank of the Mississippi and watching that yellow giant snake its way home through lush Louisiana; riding the cable car to the top of Stone Mountain outside Atlanta and seeing the monumental carvings of Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson and Jefferson Davis on its blue granite face with all of green Georgia beyond; coming upon a thin hidden lake in the brown, thirsty Austin hills; seeing clumpy, solid, clean Denver or sprouting, sprawling, surprisingly green Dallas from the tops of their tallest buildings; or driving into the shoulder country of the Rockies, each rise opening new vistas, until finally you can't bear it any longer and you stop the car and get out and just stand in awe of the might of those white, fierce peaks. Yes, it is still a land of beauty, and excitement, too, of raw possibilities, of hard work and ingenuity, of dreams, of opportunity and patriotism and pride."

On the other hand, Joseph Wood Krutch in his recent review of "Future Environments of North America"<sup>1/</sup>, said:

- 
1. Edited by F. Fraser Darling and John P. Milton. Illustrated. The Natural History Press/Doubleday. 767 pp. \$12.50.

"If the city dweller does not leave his city, he is aware only of the streets growing more crowded and dirty and of air thickening with the exhaust fumes of automobiles. If he tries to escape from these disagreeable things, he discovers a shrinking countryside crowded by both permanent inhabitants and others who, like himself, are trying to get away from what is increasingly difficult to get away from. Automobile junkyards and other hideous accumulations clutter the roadside; beaches and parks are littered with rubbish; streams are polluted, and almost everywhere are evidences of the filth in which modern man seems about to bury himself.

"Meanwhile, nearly everybody is in favor of 'conservation' but is as likely as not to be engaged in bitter controversy with others enlisted under that ambiguous banner. Some are concerned only with the management of resources, some only with the development of recreational areas, and both of these groups are sometimes contemptuous of those to whom conservation includes "preservation" of areas and forms of life not fundamentally transformed by man's occupancy. Perhaps in the end it comes down to a difference between those who believe that the ideal civilization would be one in which man had achieved complete independence of nature and those who believe that, to some extent, he needs to be part of the natural

Most basic resources are in the ownership and under the care of private citizens. About three-fourths of the area of our 48 mainland States is privately owned.

The conservation practiced on these lands makes it possible for all citizens to ultimately enjoy their own particular form of conservation.

Far too few realize that the principal guardian of our heritage of forests, soil, water, trees, grass, and wildlife is not the Federal Government, or the State conservation departments, but the millions of individual landowners throughout the Nation.

The Federal and State conservation agencies can counsel and assist the private owners, but the responsibility and the initiative are theirs. Their collective response is the reality of conservation.

Conservation also has a common denominator. Underlying conservation in all its varieties and forms--and upon which all kinds of conservation depend completely--is the land itself and its soil and its water and its plants.

From these basics spring all forms of conservation. Without them conservation by any definition has no form or substance. Without them conservation is only a meaningless word.

Conservation begins with soil, water, and plants. They are the base.

These basic resources form the common bond joining the varied interests of all resource users, whatever may be their specialized definition of what

Upon this base is built a policy of cooperation between the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the owners and operators of three-fourths of the American land--a policy that recognizes the legitimate ends of resource use for the benefit both of the individual and of the larger society.

At this point you can well ask--what does this all mean to me?

What does this portend for communities, for collective action, for organizations, for the Soil Conservation Society of America?

There is a direct relationship, for conservation and resource development programs have a significant impact on each of us and on our communities today and tomorrow.

The late, great Adlai E. Stevenson said something once that has recently become pertinent to me. In March of next year, God willing, I'll attain that age of which he spoke so eloquently,

"What a man knows at fifty that he did not know at twenty years, for the most part, is incommunicable...The laws, the aphorisms, the generalizations, the universal truths, the parables and old saws--all the observations about life which can be communicated readily in handy verbal packages--are as well known to a man at twenty as at fifty. He has been told them all, he has read them all, and he has probably repeated them all before he graduates--but he has not lived them all.



"The knowledge he has acquired with age is not a knowledge of formulas, or forms of words, but of people, places, actions-- a knowledge not gained by words, but by touch, sight, sound, victories, failures, sleeplessness, devotion, love--the human experience and emotions of this earth and of one's self and other men. Perhaps, too, a little faith, a little reverence for things you cannot see."

The point I want to make is that we have become, in my half-century, a nation of city dwellers. Each day and each year, more and still more Americans concentrate in the towns, cities, and suburbs. To them naturally life centers where they work, make their homes--raise their families. And from these centers of population emerge a pattern of mutual interests, problems, and understanding. A kinship is growing up among these people of Knoxville and Nashville, of Memphis and Minneapolis, of Atlanta and Albuquerque. Common concerns derive from such typically metropolitan problems as traffic, smog, housing, crime, schools, pollution, recreation, and taxes.

On the Eastern seaboard, airline pilots flying north at dusk from Washington to Boston look down on a coruscating corridor of light, an unbroken, 450-mile-long conglomeration of 37 million Americans that is referred to by demographers as the "Eastern Megalopolis." Another area is growing even faster--will ultimately pose bigger problems--this is the potential "Great Lakes Megalopolis," soon to stretch without interruption from Pittsburgh to Chicago, by the year 2000, containing a population of 45 million.

Extraordinary population growth at home and abroad provides substance for mounting demands on the land--and on the resources associated with land. The forecasts of human increase project figures of such magnitude that they are hard to comprehend.

What then happens to the countryside? Increasingly, it becomes an obstacle in time and space--merely landscape separating cities. It is to many--far too many--a "land in between" to be crossed as quickly as possible via superhighways, fast trains, or faster planes. Among our young and urban oriented generation, there is danger that rural America will be regarded increasingly as just "undeveloped" space, the "hinterland", only there for the nourishment of the urban center.

That American countryside--the expanse of nature separating our cities and towns and rural hamlets--represents the land we have left to grow in, to feed and clothe our people, to play in, and to build on the American dream.

That is all we have--and when divided and divided again for the multiple needs of a Nation growing rapidly in population, in urban development, in highway mileage, in an array of man-oriented uses alien to nature--this natural landscape that once seemed so limitless shrinks before us at every turn--and we are made aware of the challenging crisis in the countryside.

The crisis we face in the countryside is a crisis of quality in a

It is a crisis of quantity in a land whose rich natural endowment has been vandalized to a degree of grave proportions.

This conservation and community crisis is a matter of urgent public concern. At stake is our total environment. The crisis will not go away. It demands action now. It requires increasingly intelligent, purposeful direction at all levels of government. It will demand personal involvement eventually by all citizens.

There is an old Greek proverb that says, "Before you score, you must have a goal."

As you ramble on through life, brother  
Whatever be your goal,  
Keep your eye upon the doughnut  
And not upon the hole.

Our collective goal is that the Nation's future still lies in rural America. The vast countryside can offer relief from the teeming cities and their congested suburbs, can provide ample land and water to serve the expanding needs of commerce and industry, and broad acres on which to build garden communities for tomorrow's generations.

If we act in time with wisdom!

The trends for conservationists are easy to discern. Our Nation is facing the prospect of unlimited demands on its limited resources. All the evidence of our times supports a forecast of ever increasing needs for intensive management of its limited resources--including their planning, development, multiple use, and conservation.

The dimensions of the demands on U. S. land and water resources underscore the urgency of conservation action. By 2000, in just 33 years, we expect to see:

- U. S. population up 130 million--world number doubled
- Food needs more than doubled
- Irrigation withdrawals up 50 percent
- Municipal water use doubled
- Manufacturing use quadrupled
- Wood products needs about doubled
- Land for homes, schools, and factories up 200 percent
- Land for reservoirs up 100 percent
- Outdoor recreation demand up 300 percent
- Land for wildlife purposes up 130 percent
- Land for highways, airports--transportation--up 125 percent

Therefore, there can be no turning back--change and its effects press heavily upon us. New problems roll over the horizon in increasingly complex numbers. Conservation districts do see the need for better and more representative governing boards. Planning for "conservation" by farms, and communities is being accelerated--putting the plans into operation must be speeded up. A proper role must be carved out for conservation districts and their helpers in watershed and river basin work in rural and non-rural community development, in recreation areas, in cropland

On many matters ahead I feel that we and our allies in conservation may no longer have a black-and white kind of decision. The kind of complexity that we face in the future suggests we're going to have to begin choosing from several colors of gray.

At the moment, somewhere between three and five percent of prime arable land in this country is covered by asphalt and concrete. That's an area the size of Georgia. And so decisions are being made, but they're being made without full knowledge of the consequences. It is important for us to realize that we must answer some immediate and critical questions. For instance:

Should a proposed highway location be contested?--or land cleared of trees to produce row crops? Will the benefits of a proposed reservoir outweigh the forced abandonment of a dozen valley farms?

Should the right of eminent domain be exercised to obtain easements for a watershed project?--or for the development of a community playground? What are the risks to the water supply, and to wildlife, in my use of pesticides? Should my district fight to prevent drainage of a waterfowl marsh that would provide a factory site?

Decisions on questions like these are not easy, for right is not always evident, nor are the alternatives necessarily wrong. Issues are interwoven with shades of good and bad. They provoke doubt, and ready-made standards of judgment do not always apply.

No one I know believes that the problems of conservation districts are exactly the same today as they were in 1937--or that the solutions to

A rural and limited soil conservation concept simply is no longer sufficient in a society that has become increasingly urban, a society in which the interests of the users of resources have become equal to those of the owners of resources.

As cities enlarge, serious problems of land-use erosion, sedimentation, pollution, recreation and the like spring up around urban areas. This is a whole new series of major conservation problems affecting large numbers of people that simply did not exist a few years ago.

Two weeks ago I co-chaired a successful conference on Soil, Water and Suburbia. It was indeed a new landmark in resource conservation and development. It brought together for the first time, on a national basis, people responsible for soil and water conservation and land-use planning in both rural and urban areas.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, sharing the rostrum with Robert C. Weaver, Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, said:

"The total cost to the nation of our careless lack of planning in urban, suburban, and rural America is beyond our power to calculate. And it is growing. Modern technology has given man far greater capacity to abuse land and water resources than was ever possible before. Every year at least a million acres of farm land are being chewed up by bulldozers and entombed beneath asphalt,

Secretary Weaver said:

"Past tendencies to bulldoze trees and pleasant rolling land contours in a hurried effort to build as quickly and often as cheaply as possible violate nature and logic. This destroys the very attributes that recommend suburban living--a return to open spaces and enjoyment of beauty. . . We must develop an urban land policy and an urban conservation ethic comparable to that which we practice on farm and forest. Starting from the premise that land is a national resource, then we must acknowledge that proper land use is in the national interest. To do this we must have an effective partnership of government--at all levels--and between government and the private sector."

These are problems demanding solution, and the demands come from the urban society that is now in the majority, that now decides increasingly what programs we shall have, including conservation, and how much financial help they shall receive. And these people are looking at the picture from the standpoint of resource users.

Pure air, clean water, stable soils, productive forests, abundant wildlife, natural beauty, and the opportunity for man to live in harmony with his natural environment are essential. They are interrelated and mutually supporting objectives.

Conservation today encompasses the full sweep of interrelated natural resources and their management and use. Use, restoration, and preservation are compatible aims. Man is but one element of the ecological whole. Emerging now is a special challenge to fit the activities and needs of man harmoniously into his total environment. The recognition of this crisis in the countryside has given birth to a new concept of creative conservation.

This concept of "full use" conservation says that as populations grow and people live in greater and greater concentrations, we must consider the total environment and not just those values that can be measured in dollars and cents.

We are seeing a definite blossoming of concern for such benefits--benefits that are essential if we are to enjoy an environment of real quality. Throughout the Nation there is a growing feeling that our generation has a special responsibility, in a world of change, to protect the qualities of environment that have enduring value in our civilization.

Along with the new concept has come an awakening--a greater awareness--in conservation today.

Conservation is moving from the province of the few to the embrace of millions. This is as it should be. Yet we cannot help asking, with considerable anxiety, is the awakening sufficient? Is the awareness adequate?



First, there are steeply increasing demands on resources.

Second, the kinds of demands on resources are changing. The quality of resources is becoming more important, and the location of resource problems is shifting.

Third, it is apparent that resource matters are growing more complex. We face new problems of conflict and competition. A given resource may have to do double--or triple--duty. Concurrently, the interests of resource "users"--as well as resource "owners"--are assuming greater importance. And somebody is going to have to make decisions--unpopular decisions in many cases--about the allocation of resources to any given uses.

This brings me to the second mission. What are the social and economic consequences of current trends toward intensive urbanization for the (1) Nation, (2) cities, and (3) rural areas. Can we afford to continue our present course of trying to deal with problems of cities and rural areas separately? Is there now need for a national policy position on rural-urban balance?

Most people now live in urban communities--core cities and their surrounding suburban areas. The trend, I mentioned earlier, suggests a few major megalopolis (3 to 13). Only one-fourth of the U. S. people live in rural communities. Many suffer from declining job opportunities. Many rural people--especially the younger generation--have found urban communities more attractive and have migrated to the cities. In the

about the city that attracts people? In a single word--jobs. Although that is simplification. There are, of course additional human, cultural, and asthetic factors as well as economic values. For this, though, they pay a heavy price. It's farewell to old friends, family homes, and familiar surroundings. In the cities we face further sacrifices. Increased traffic, smog, inner city decay, loss of individuality, rising taxes, more demands, and less incentive to response.

Mayor John Lindsay of New York City said:

"Our cities exact too much from those who live in them. They are not only increasingly expensive places in which to live and work; more and more, the price of city living is being paid by a sacrifice of fundamental personal freedoms."

Is the congestion, the tensions, the urban sprawl to continually worsen? Secretary Freeman says, "No." He is taking direct issue with the notion that continued mass migration from country to city is inevitable. That tomorrow's America need not be a few huge megalopolitan complexes strung together by super highways running through miles of rural land--depopulated, lacking in business and industry, without the tax base to support roads, schools, and other public services needed for adequate living.

The community of tomorrow must be a functional and viable economic area. The alternative--a solution to these problems--lies in the development of new and better planned communities which can serve as the location for a larger share of job opportunities in rural America. There are many

priceless asset. The focus is on total resources and total human needs. This will demand the development of the best institutional arrangements for meeting these needs, for creating human satisfaction that makes life worth living.

This is rural areas development with depth. It is not simply a matter of attracting new job possibilities to rural towns. It involves an array of programs. Improved quality of education, community facilities, job training, social services, cultural and recreational facilities--and an interworking of private as well as public resources--including local leadership with an enthusiasm and zest for the task.

As I hear the Secretary of Agriculture, no one is advocating that we abolish our cities. We are not, emphasis not, suggesting a back-to-the-farm movement. We are interested in what can be called a more rational or planned process of urbanization. As population increases, it should take place in areas where we have and can preserve more open space for both aesthetic quality and greater recreational opportunity. They need not reach the size, population, and industrial density that brings traffic congestion, smog--that prices space, land and privacy beyond the reach of the ordinary inhabitant.

Until the forced influx of people into megalopolis living is stopped--and turned around--the fight to save the cities can never really be won.

Countryside, U.S.A., is a promising alternative that permits us to

An outstanding accomplishment in Tennessee is the Hull-York Lake-land RC&D project.

This project, located in northeast middle Tennessee, has eleven counties containing 2,578,500 acres.

The project approved for planning in November 1965, is sponsored by 11 soil conservation districts, 8 watershed districts, 11 counties, and 21 municipalities.

The RC&D steering committee and 11 special committees have completed a plan of action for the project. Representatives from some 25 State and Federal agencies assisted the committees in preparing the plan.

The project plan outlines area problems, needs and opportunities, and includes some 200 proposed project measures.

The brochure, "The Upper Cumberland--Tennessee's Family Fun Land," partially tells the story.

These are the challenges that conservation and communities pose in our age as we confront the new America.

This raises another significant problem--the effect of resource demands on local self-government and our democratic system.

A question that should also concern us is the role of conservation districts in this more complicated resource picture. What would districts attempt to contribute, what responsibilities would district boards seek to fulfill? How can districts strengthen their capacity to meet the challenge of the

The history of districts has been one of steady and progressive evolution. As new problems have appeared, districts have moved to help solve these problems. At first they worked mostly with individual farmers. Next came work with groups of farmers. Later, programs expanded to include whole communities--in watershed projects, resource conservation and development projects, and planning, zoning and other area-wide activities.

In other words, as the times have changed, districts have changed.

Now, the question really becomes one of the next step. Are districts ready to move ahead? Are they ready to make further adjustments in their programs and to legislative authorities to enable them to do an even better job?

Regardless of how we answer these and other questions, the needs are more than evident. There is need, for example, to re-identify the resource assets of each community, county, and conservation district to project the probable demands that will be made on these resources and to guide the development and use of these same resources along wise and orderly lines.

There is need for leadership in conservation districts, in farm organizations and chambers of commerce--among conservationists, tradesmen, bankers, and newsmen--to identify the array of new issues now facing the countryside and the soil, and devise constructive programs for dealing with them.

The key to the new approach in a nutshell seems to be that of:

1. Involving more people in resource work,
2. Extending district services to additional people, and
3. Placing more emphasis on broad-based resource planning.

At the same time continuing the original purpose of the district as an effective local action organization to get as much total conservation on the land as fast as possible!

This is a fortunate development, for there is evidence that if districts do not assume these responsibilities and carry out truly active and comprehensive natural resource programs that meet today's needs, somebody else will and should!

In many cases, conservation districts could perform some of the work being taken on by the new groups, the result being less duplication, better coordination, and a more efficient and useful program. But if this is to be so, districts must take the initiative. It is not a case of taking on responsibilities already being performed effectively by others; but rather digging into the work that remains undone, and which needs to be done.

Simply stated, an expanding national economy cannot long endure on a declining resource base. A rising standard of living cannot be sustained in a deteriorating environment. Fulfilling the needs of millions of people yet unborn cannot be assured unless we achieve full use of natural resources and planned patterns of land use without delay. The fruits of an expanding technology cannot be enjoyed unless technology itself is harnessed to meet

Conservation still begins on the land, on each individual acre. As a nation, we have developed our resource conservation policies on the firm basis of essential involvement at the local level, for we are a people wedded to the concept of individual initiative and grass-roots participation in the public affairs that concern us.

But we must understand, too, that our State and Federal governments also represent the interests of the individual and the local community. And we have wisely and properly drawn upon State and Federal resources to support the local effort. We have done this in the national interest because the summation of local interest is national interest. That is how we have advanced for more than a quarter of a century in the conservation and development of the nation's lands and waters.

We can do those things in the new conservation that have been born of local initiative and cooperation, and advanced by the dedication and wise efforts of an enlightened State and national government.

Let us not, however, erroneously assume that all is well with the land. There remains a serious backlog of conservation projects to be initiated and accomplished. There are dams to be built and land measures to be applied. There are studies of soil types to be made so that we may be assured of building our country on a sound footing. There are rivers and streams to be protected against siltation and cleansed of pollution. There are lakes to be established and others to be restored. There are ranges

There remains a need for more professional conservationists to guide the nation's conservation work. And there is need for greater financial support at all levels to extend the benefits of this effort throughout the land.

Conservation is now accepted as a physical task, is becoming a social philosophy, and will be a very real economic necessity in the foreseeable future.

Speaking a few weeks ago in Chicago, the Secretary said that agriculture's job is far from done and never will be. For example:

"We expect that remote sensing equipment in spacecraft will be linked with computers to identify and measure land use. . . detect plant diseases, insect infestations and drought. . . assess crop stands and vigor and to predict future yields. . . and determine whether soils are suitable for growing needed crops. . . We are also hard at work to devise better methods for disposing of farm and processing wastes."

In closing the Secretary said:

"Today's world, much of which is hungry and despairing, needs all that science can give, and more."

Then he told the story of a student who came upon Louis Pasteur bent over his microscope:

"Pardon me," said the student, "I thought you were praying."

"Replied Pasteur, "I was."

We are committed as conservators of the great American estate to provide for the future as we draw upon the resources that are available for our use and our care.



to continue our tradition of helping men throughout the world to help themselves, to move forward with the bold, new actions needed to restore, conserve, and wisely use our natural heritage and preserve it for future generations?

With continued dedication to the task of conserving our vital land and water resources we will insure the future prosperity of this great Nation.

We enjoy a period of grace--even now--before the remaining vestiges of nature unspoiled by man are erased. We still have time to protect, restore, and develop the lands and waters of rural America--if we act with resolve and dispatch.

We can--and must--return to an alliance with nature. It is simply a matter of desire, of discipline, and of dedication.