

## 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 64 soil conservation districts in Pennsylvania 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.

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

---

Address by Norman A. Berg, Deputy Administrator for Field Services, Soil Conservation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., at the Joint SCS-Extension Service Meeting, State College, Pennsylvania, May 16, 1967

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 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.

In a mill a great bar of steel was suspended vertically by a delicate chain. Nearby a bottle cork was suspended by a silk thread. Could the small cork held only by a fragile thread set the steel bar into motion? The cork was swung gently against the steel bar. The bar remained motionless. But this was repeated again and again. In ten minutes the bar gave some evidence of feeling uncomfortable, and a "nervous chill" ran over it. Then ten minutes later the chill was followed by a tremor of vibration. At the end of an hour the great bar was swinging like a pendulum in concert with the tiny cork.

How many "potential" leaders "give up the ghost" and desert their goal because they stopped just before a "nervous chill" ran over their bar of steel? How many conservation districts are now on the very verge of greatness.

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!

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.

During the next 33 years the population of North America is expected to increase by 64 percent--to 350 million; Latin America, by 157 percent--to 630 million; Europe, by 15 percent--to 780 million; Africa, by 151 percent--to 775 million; and Asia, by 89 percent--to 3,400,000,000. The total number of people on our planet is expected to rise to six billion by the year 2000--an increase of 2,900,000,000 in just 33 years.

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.

"What he knows at fifty that he did not know at twenty boils down to something like this:

"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 Albany and Allentown, of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, of Wilkes-Barre and Washington, D. C.

Common concerns derive from such typically metropolitan problems as traffic, smog, housing, crime, schools, pollution, recreation, and taxes.

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 "hinter-land," 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 Nation whose people demand quality in the marketplace, but have failed to provide for it in the natural environment.

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.

To clarify the picture for the public and the Congress, and to help USDA's own employees see better where we are and where we are going, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman launched a series of major speeches in 1967 to highlight the major missions of the Department, and to outline the goals and objectives for the rest of this century--to the year 2000. These major missions are:

1. Income and Abundance--to assure that Americans have adequate supplies of high quality food products at reasonable prices, and that efficient producers achieve parity of income.
2. Growing Nations--New Markets--to use our successful agricultural system in a world-wide war on hunger and to help developing countries through expanded trade, food aid, and direct technical assistance to agriculture.
3. Dimensions for Living--to extend the services of the Department to consumers everywhere, and improve the quality of daily living by research, extension, food inspection and grading, and using abundant food supplies to improve nutrition of the underprivileged through school lunches, food stamps, and commodity distribution programs.
4. Communities of Tomorrow--to help rural communities grow and develop so Americans have real alternatives to the continued congestion of urban life.
5. Resources in Action--to develop and use our ample natural resource wisely for the physical and spiritual well-being of all Americans.

6. Science in Service of Man--to fully exploit the creative genius of agricultural science for the benefit of all mankind.

USDA is now engaged in an intensive exercise--involving all of the top policy level officials in the Department and its various agencies--to develop qualitative targets for each of these missions for the year 2000, and a specific plan of action to achieve these targets.

Under leadership of Assistant Secretary John A. Baker, SCS Administrator D. A. Williams and I serve on separate task forces dealing with:

- Resources in Action, and
- Communities of Tomorrow.

Extension Service Administrator Lloyd Davis tells me he serves on at least three.

The Secretary and his staff approach today's problems and tomorrow's opportunities with a philosophy that says:

"Most of our organizations and administrative arrangements were developed a generation ago--or more--to meet the felt needs and pressing priorities of a different age.

"They represented imaginative innovations then--born of hope, tempered by desperation. They carved out new patterns of cooperative Federalism.

"The men who pioneered then in public management took great chances--boldly risked great failures to win great victories over the stern challenges of human hunger, desperate poverty, eroding natural resources, and a nearly destroyed family farm economy.

"Those who now run the large, complex, varied, and expansive operations of the Department of Agriculture are--for the most part--men who reached manhood in those grave days; men whose education and early job training took place in the pressure cooker of the great depression.

"They have spent their lives perfecting the programmatic and administrative solutions to the terrible problems of the first half of the twentieth century.

"They have recruited and trained a generation of superbly skilled, extremely dedicated, experts in agriculture and forestry, farm management and soil conservation, animal husbandry and hydrology, farm electrification and cooperative marketing, crop insurance and agricultural statistics, and many more.

"The devoted efforts of these men, together with their counterparts in the great agricultural colleges and universities, and the cooperating employees in the State and local governments, have successfully met the challenges they faced.

"The unmatched performance of the successful commercial farm, ranch, and forest enterprises in this country is eloquent testimony to the outstanding job they have done--and continue to do.. .

"But there are other problems afflicting the country now--other challenges, other needs, new priorities."

We, too, know that success and fame are fleeting. What would have been sufficient for yesterday is apt to be too little and too late for tomorrow.

Tonight I'll discuss briefly two of the six major missions in which my particular agency is most directly involved.

First, Resources in Action--

Second, Communities of Tomorrow.

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

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, ranches, 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 conservation, in the Appalachia program, and in wise land use adjustments critical to worldwide food demands.

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.

*your problems  
our problems*

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 them are the same, or that farming and ranching have not changed, or that the social pattern of our population is the same as it was.

*We know*

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.

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

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?

This is the new America that we face. This is the new resource climate in which we exist. What are the central issues?

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) the Nation, (2) our 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 battle for jobs, the cities have been winning. Each year, 3 million more Americans jam into our already overcrowded cities. Why? What is there about the city that attracts people? In a single word--jobs. Although that is a 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 resources upon which we can build. Rural USA also contains considerable space with both natural beauty and recreational opportunities--an almost 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 inter-working of private as well as public resources--including local leadership with an enthusiasm and zest for the task.

As I hear the Secretary--and our Task Force--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, USA, is a promising alternative that permits us to solve the problems of both city and rural living with one vigorous stroke.

— In this quest, we--in and of--rural America may find some strange bed fellows, although many will deny any relationship. I accept the emphasis and parallel thrusts as being purely coincidental.

I'm referring to the Essay on the New Radicals in "Time Magazine" for April 28, 1967. In part, it said:

"The New Leftists resemble Russia's 19th century narodiks (populists), mostly middle-class students, who idealized the peasants and went to live among them, trying to rouse them to action. . .To make this possible, life must center on small communities, cities must be broken up. Scratch utopia and you find nostalgia: the New Leftists really look backward, to a time of small social units and close personal relations. With yearnings for an almost medieval setting, they want to repeal bigness--which some men have been hankering to do ever since the Industrial Revolution. In News from Nowhere, William Morris visualized a new London broken up into idyllic villages. Charles Fourier and Robert Owen envisioned small, self-sufficient communities, inspiring such American utopian experiments as Brook Farm and New Harmony. Sometimes the New Left's vision sounds like New Harmony computerized. Says James Weinstein, an editor of Studies on the Left: "People will meet in little communities and decide what they want. All their desires will be fed into the computers, which will pass their needs on to the industries."

"Something else the New Leftists have in common with other utopians is a remarkably detailed concern for the physical environment. They dream of 'the total beautiful society' with smogless air, unpolluted rivers, swift and clean public transportation. . .

"Ultimately, the New Leftists, like all utopians, not only want to reform society: they really want to reform human nature. They want men to work not for gain or glory but for the satisfaction of contributing to the general good.

"Critics may perform a service to a society by pointing out evil and injustice without necessarily offering alternatives. Some of the things the New Left says about modern American life need to be said and evoke certain echoes in anyone who has ever been in white-hot anger over a slum, or a traffic jam. . . or has felt alone in a big organization.

"Practically everybody has a kind word for decentralization, in the interests of efficiency if not humanity. . .Thus quite a few of the New Left proposals, in modified form, will be taken over by the liberals and by the managers. . .The present New Left will undoubtedly fade without producing many middle-aged radicals. But it will have performed a function. There should always be a New Left--to drive conventional society to a constant, sometimes painful review of its own values."



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 times?

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 the goals of the new conservation. This is the challenge leaders at all levels must 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 and forests to be protected against heedless destruction and wildlife benefits must be recognized, improved, and made more useful for public and private benefit.

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

In the several years just passed Pennsylvania has made great strides in comprehensive resource planning. Much of this has been done through the long-range programs of conservation districts. In fact, district long-range programs laid the groundwork for basic interest in resource conservation and development projects. The development of basic natural

The effectiveness of the resource conservation and development planning approach utilizing local committees to isolate resource problems and seek means of reaching their solution has been a major contribution in itself. This system involved hundreds of local people in the plan development and thus in the solution of their resource and economic problems. These committees continue to function efficiently and effectively with the local project coordinator and all agencies concerned.

The interest in expanding and accelerating the small watershed program in the project area is definitely showing up which will result in flood control, recreation and the results of this type of development will enhance agricultural and industrial development of the area.

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."

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. We, as a Nation, have perhaps reached that stage of the "nervous chill" experienced by the steel bar.

Are we now ready to commit ourselves to meet this great challenge, 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. The full swing of the pendulum! To this challenging and rewarding task your National and State government is dedicated. I have read your Governor's Conservation Message of April 4, 1967. Working together with districts we can achieve our loftiest goals.

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.