

CREATIVE CONSERVATION
FOR
COMMUNITIES OF TOMORROW

I welcome this opportunity to join you. I have long been concerned about your problems and progress. I appreciate being affiliated with your conference and the future of the 70 conservation districts in South Dakota and the 3,010 in our land. There is deep personal pleasure in meeting old friends and making new ones. 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--more than I bring. Memories of this State--and this town are forever imprinted deeply in the minds of the Berg family.

Your conference provides for a timely discussion of vital issues. The accelerating demands of our time place a premium on effort. Dedication and work are basic to soil and water conservation, to resource development, and to the basic welfare of our great Nation.

It is nothing new to say 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 for accomplishment.

Material used by Norman A. Berg, Deputy Administrator for Field Services, Soil Conservation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., for talk before the South Dakota Work Unit Conservationists' Conference, Hickory House Motor Inn, Huron, South Dakota, March 6, 1968.

Therefore, I feel 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 will meet the oncoming demands of a growing Nation. Above all, it is a time to help 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 key, as always, is people, and their desire, urge, or will to achieve. Psychologists tell us most people in this world can be divided into two broad groups. There is first that minority challenged by opportunity and willing to work hard to achieve something. Second, is the majority who really do not care all that much. Your record of over 40,000 district cooperators and more than one-third of the needed soil and water conservation work completed on farms and ranches suggests you are in that former group--you care!

I'll take a few minutes first to quote from three of our national leaders. I promise you a moral when I finish.

Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, had this to say on long-range planning in this Nation:

"What we are really doing now is flying the most powerful economic engine in history--and I mean to include all our scientific and technological developments--and we are flying it by the seat of our pants. We're flying by luck, by instinct, with almost no instruments at all in the cockpit. I'm not sure that on this basis we are going to be able to keep up, flying this blind, with the amount of technological development being brought about."

John W. Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, in his book "Excellence" writes,

"We must recognize that there may be excellence or shoddiness in every line of human endeavor. We must learn to honor excellence (indeed, to demand it) in every socially accepted human activity, however humble the activity, and to scorn shoddiness, however exalted the activity.

"An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy.

"Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water."

Orville L. Freeman, our Secretary of Agriculture, points out at every chance:

"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. . . Today, 70 percent of our people live on one percent of the land; 30 percent, on the other 99 percent.

"Is that good for the people and the Nation? If not, why not? Should we have a clearly defined policy of urban-rural balance or should we let matters drift? Should we give a high investment priority to building opportunity in rural America, or should we resign ourselves as a Nation to larger and larger cities?

"These questions demand an answer."

I promised you a moral from these three quotations. Perhaps as good a way as any of expressing it is to recall what John Glenn said when a reporter asked him how it felt to take the first manned space flight:

"Well," Colonel Glenn replied, "In those final minutes, when the liquid oxygen is smoking. . . and the gantry falls away. . . and I hear the flight control officer counting, . . . 4. . . 3. . . 2. . . 1. . . I think to myself what a marvelous bird this space vehicle is. . . literally millions of separate parts. . . valves, pipes, wiring, combustion chambers. . . and every one of them supplied by the low bidder!"

The Colonel, of course, was kidding. The vehicle he rode was the culmination of literally millions of man-hours of planning, the result of an advanced aero-space technology that has surpassed in fact a generation of science fiction. . . the result of billions of dollars of national treasure.

Every piece in that rocket had to perform perfectly the first time. Like a parachute jump, there is no "second time" if it doesn't. It was produced by hundreds of thousands of brains, all perfectly meshed and pointing toward a single target, a technology that will take us to the moon in the nineteen seventies, to the planets in another generation; someday, even to the stars. And so John Glenn was kidding.

As a Nation, though, we have apparently been dead-serious in the belief that random conduct of our affairs--a system which has worked fairly well in the past--will produce desired results into the indefinite future.

It just won't happen!

Reshaping the total environment to make for quality living in both the city and the countryside can't possibly take place if another 80 to 100 million people pour into the Nation's cities. This is where they will pour in if present trends continue over the next three decades.

In short, it isn't enough, as Mr. Wirtz said, to "fly by the seat of our pants."

We are, in fact, on the edge of one of those rare, turbulent division points in the affairs of man which decisively separate one era from another.

It is an uncomfortable period, full of uncertainty, full of gropings--for it is difficult to part with the realities of the past.

We're still asking the question--an important one--"What is man doing to the environment?" But now we're also asking a much more profound one, "What is the environment doing to the man?"

These are questions demanding answers. The demands come from an urban society now in the majority. They now decide increasingly what programs we shall have, including soil and water conservation, and how much financial help we shall receive. And these people are looking at the picture from the standpoint of resource users.

We are proud that the Soil Conservation Service has long recognized that erosion, floods, inadequate drainage and water shortages do not stop at property lines or at city limits! Conservation must be everyone's responsibility, if the species man now is to survive. But people cannot properly accept a responsibility if they are ignorant of what it is or how they can help.

In the time I have, perhaps I can help--in a modest way--to identify and to help clarify three major aspects of the national resource conservation and community scene. Understanding the broader picture can aid you as you make decisions at the local and State level. There are no certain answers to complex problems. But we do need to at least pose intelligent questions and to discuss trends and alternative actions. People don't always know what they want--until they understand what they can get. There is also a caution that we may be wise not to plan at all--if the long range planning is wrong.

You do recognize from experience that decisions ahead will not be easy, for right is not always evident, nor are the alternatives necessarily wrong. Key issues are interwoven with shades of good and bad. They provoke doubt, and ready-made standards of judgment do not always apply. We do know, for example, that 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 concern, is the awakening sufficient? Is the awareness adequate? Are the alternatives clearly articulated?

There is a new resource and community climate. What are the central issues?

First, creative conservation--challenge or confusion--the quest for a common bond, needs clarification,

Second, concern for conservation--expanding public awareness and involvement--this is District Outlook--at all levels, and

Third, communities and conservation, the cornerstone for a quality countryside, USA--the key to assuring ~~the~~ rural resources contribute their full measure for the benefit of all the people.

First, Creative Conservation

You have heard or read what conservation district leaders at all levels are doing about their future role in conservation and resource development. Each tell their story of problems and progress from their own particular point of view. Mine has been the unique one of counseling with the NACD District Outlook Committee while carrying forward the day by day duties of an Administrator's Deputy dealing with widespread Service activities intimately connected with district work.

Our Service agrees with the District Outlook report that a great and exciting future lies ahead for the district movement if only we are collectively equal to it. Our impression is that your leaders are assessing the future role of conservation districts with realism.

In performing old jobs in conservation and in expanding district programs to meet new needs and in getting additional help on a broad array of new problems they are again showing that they are a major force for action.

We have jointly demonstrated for a third of a century that we can meet change with realism and vision. We have kept abreast of new methods--alert to new ways of doing old jobs. However, the fundamentals that determine success or failure of soil and water conservation have not been neglected in the world of change.

The term "soil conservation" has been effectively broadened. But not without some confusion.

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 too few before had taken account of the fact that the resources--and even the space of the American continent were limited. When men saw that space and resources were indeed finite, 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 beauty."

The confusion is partly a matter of words. But more importantly it arises out of a difference of opinion concerning the extent to which non-material values should be recognized and what the non-material 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.

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--1,804,783
migratory waterfowl stamps were sold last year. (Fiscal Year 1967)

--Those interested mainly in flowers and birds. There are now
8,000,000 bird watchers.

--Those interested mainly in hiking, or boating, or nature study,
or picnicking or swimming.

--Those interested mainly in preserving wilderness and wild rivers.

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

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" now has so many adherents who see it from so many different viewpoints--who view it in many different lights.

However, 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, nor 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, their full development, use and improvement, form the common bond that can join the varied interests of all resource users, whatever their specialized definition of what conservation means.

Second, Concern for Conservation

Concern 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 three decades in the conservation and development of the Nation's lands and waters.

History has been one of steady and progressive evolution. As new problems have appeared, we have moved to help solve these problems. At first the work was 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 recreation work and other area-wide activities.

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

reversing the farmer directed trend toward working together through organized additional ones. Although these efforts were largely unsuccessful in districts already created and concerted opposition to the organization of All was not smooth sailing. There were organized attacks upon the organizations, businesses, and farmer leaders.

measures were given impetus by numerous conservation minded public officials, Formation of conservation districts and application of proven conservation Evidence of the benefits of applied conservation became more prominent.

Importantly, the number of conservation districts continued to increase, not be drawn into the debate as to which was first.

and Tri-County Conservation Districts--were organized that same year, 1911 enacted in South Dakota March 3, 1937. The first districts--Brown-Marshall Legislation authorizing soil and water conservation districts was every county of the State.

active, locally governed Soil and Water Conservation District existed in Organization was issued by the Secretary of State. By this document, an petition for district organization. On May 17, 1967, a Certificate of Also, in November 1966, a group of farmers in Faulk County filed a --69 districts have updated their long-range programs.

--672 non-landowners received technical help in 1967

--11 watershed projects are approved for operations

--18 watershed projects have been authorized for planning

farms and ranches is being completed annually

--2 percent of the needed soil and water conservation work on --19.3 million acres have basic soil and water conservation plans

A look at progress in South Dakota tells the story:

districts, they did cause some to want further evidence of need and benefits before acting. Finally, one by one the farmers of the few remaining counties set in motion the process of forming needed districts.

Another excellent example of progress is the construction of multiple purpose watershed structures. For example, Pattee Creek Structure No. 1 in the Pattee Creek Watershed District. This is in an area of small farms, numerous small towns and the highest population density in the State. Outdoor recreational facilities are much in demand but very limited.

The work plan, one that has some of my personal blood, sweat, and tears, was adopted by the Watershed District Board in 1958. It recognized the need for including multiple purpose features in one of the main structures in order to provide additional recreational facilities. Provision was made for adding, by amendment, these features to the work plan.

It was the first experience of this nature for everyone so there was much educational, exploratory and negotiating activity on the part of all concerned. Obtaining land rights proved to be a formidable barrier. This was accomplished after much work by the State Game, Fish and Parks Department clearing the way to the awarding of the contract for this structure on June 14, 1966. Earthwork, seeding and fencing were completed early in the spring of 1967.

A permanent lake with a surface area of 93 acres and a maximum depth of 29 feet was created. June rains partially filled the pool. It already has had limited recreational use. Adjacent to this lake (which borders an existing State Park) a recreational area is being developed by the Department of Game, Fish and Parks. Included will be access roads, boat ramp, swimming beach and bath house, shelter house, and picnic tables. Access roads will be built and the entire area will be appropriately landscaped.

Thus, ten years after the initial approval in 1957, the cooperative efforts of many groups and individuals have provided a much needed multi-purpose and recreational facility. The State Game, Fish and Parks Department estimates that 12,000 persons will utilize this facility annually. Congratulations!

So no one I know believes that the problems of conservation districts are exactly the same today as they were in 1937--nor that the solutions to them are the same, nor that farming has not changed, nor that the social pattern of our population is the same as it was.

A rural and limited soil conservation concept simply no longer suffices 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.

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.

In February 1967 on the other end of the State the Black Hills Area Study was released.

The primary objective was to: 1) examine the long-range needs and potentials of the area, and 2) determine whether some further development or management of the natural resource base might serve to reinforce the economy and insure the greater productivity in the public interest.

The scope of the study included all natural resources, particularly the land, water, agriculture, minerals, timber, recreation, and fish and wildlife. This study does not yet include detailed economic analyses of the area nor projections of economic impacts resulting from development of the natural resources.

This work has been a worthwhile collaborative experience for the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and the bureaus involved. The report provides an up-to-date compendium of facts and data on the area's natural resource capabilities and future possibilities. It could lead to a resource conservation and development project. Time limits describing other excellent examples of progress and adapting to change.

I want to make a most significant point as clear as I can at this time. The original mission of conservation districts and SCS has not been abandoned, however much it has been broadened to include new responsibilities.

Our continuing concern with new aspects of resource conservation--development of outdoor recreation, enhancement of natural beauty, economic development of rural communities, and other important problems in the use and management of land and water resources--could without proper understanding cause responsible landowners and conservationists to lose sight of the fundamental problem of soil erosion.

The job of erosion control and sediment reduction has not been completed. The need has not disappeared. The Conservation Needs Inventory revealed that two-thirds of the non-Federal rural land still needs soil and water conservation treatment of some kind. The seriousness of this need is recognized by the task force that formulated the recent Department statement on Resources in Action/Agriculture 2000.

Significantly, the new blueprint of USDA action does not set up erosion control as an objective to be sought for its own sake. It is, rather, a means of implementing stated policies to attain objectives of broad economic and social significance.

Soil conservation today means many things unthought of in the early days but it still means, among all the others, keeping the soil in place and in productive condition under agricultural or nonagricultural uses to meet human needs. District Outlook fully examined and endorsed this concept!

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 1968 needs, somebody else will and should!

In some cases, however, conservation districts could perform some of the work being taken on by 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. And, of needed work there is no end!

Let us never again 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 woodlands to be protected against destruction. 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 for greater financial support at all levels to extend the benefits of this effort throughout the land.

There is urgent need for strong leadership in conservation districts, in farm organization and rural community chambers of commerce--among conservationists, tradesmen, bankers, and newsmen--to identify the array of new issues now facing the countryside and the soil, and to help devise constructive programs for dealing with them. Concern for conservation requires that we each feel deeply a new call to initiative and involvement.

Third, Communities and Conservation

The late Adlai E. Stevenson said something once that has become pertinent to me. In a week, 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, (half has been as a Service career employee), a nation of city dwellers. Each day and each year, more and still more Americans concentrate in the towns, cities, and suburbs.

Many rural people--especially the younger generation--have found urban communities more attractive and have migrated to the cities. A recent University of Illinois survey of 2,929 of the State's rural high school juniors and seniors showed an astonishing 95 percent want no part of farming as their life's work. In the battle for jobs have the cities been winning? Each year, 3 million more Americans jam into our already over-crowded cities. Why? What is there about the city that attracts people?

In a single word--jobs! Although that is simplification. There are, of course, additional human, cultural, and aesthetic factors as well as variety and 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.

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?

And what then happens to the countryside? Increasingly, to many it becomes an obstacle in time and space--merely landscape separating cities. It is to 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 real danger that rural America will be regarded increasingly as just "undeveloped" space, the "hinterland," only there for nourishment of the urban center.

We know, but many do not, that the American countryside--that expanse of landscape 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.

There are diverse opinions as to how to strengthen rural growth and development. Obviously, no community seeks oblivion. To hold people-- or attract them--we've got to create jobs--good jobs. Job creation means that we must begin to develop economically. Economic development must be generated in terms of the resource base that is present in the area. In many parts of the U. S. the resource base that is present is almost totally agricultural. Therefore, in many cases, successful planning for economic development in rural America is of necessity going to be tied to the soil--and water.

There are those who will say that many regions have a history of lagging growth because they have primarily concentrated on extractive industries that have long been slow-growing, and largely low-income activities nationally.

These extractive industries--agricultural, forestry, and mining--it is argued--have already had vast efforts of Federal research and expenditures. Therefore, it does not seem likely, it is said by some, that a little more spending now will revolutionize these industries. In fact, it can be pointed out, large absolute declines in employment have been occurring in these resource-based industries largely because of cost reducing technology, eliminating more jobs than price reductions can create. On the other hand, it is stated that manufacturing has been a demonstrated source of rapid expansion and development. However, not without heavy costs, as attested by the recent Detroit and Newark, New Jersey, riots.

As Secretary Freeman stressed:

"For too many years too many people have crowded themselves into central cities--people attracted by the hope, often the illusion, of greater opportunity.

"As a result, our metropolitan area have more people and problems than they can cope with--all around us they are exploding with violence. At the same time, many villages, small towns, and their surrounding countryside are being drained of people and economic vigor."

We seek, collectively, the solution to this imbalance of people and opportunity.

A current Oklahoma State University research project should be of interest. Oklahoma's economic growth was analyzed from several angles. Two results are worth noting. The questions asked were:

1. Where will money invested in directly creating jobs have the greatest impact in generating additional jobs?
2. Where will the dollar increase in personal incomes for one group have the greatest impact in creating additional income for all groups?

The job multiplier analysis showed that a job created in manufacturing industries other than agricultural processing created the largest number of other jobs.

However, a job in agricultural processing industries is a very close second. Oil drilling and other mining is third.

The implication of the study is that if you wish to create the maximum number of new jobs, attract non-agricultural manufacturing types. However, since agricultural processing firms are very near manufacturing in job creating potential, they likewise are highly desirable firms. Further, since these firms are tied to the raw materials of the soil and water in the area, once they are established they are probably going to stay. Whereas the "cut and sew" type of firm can get up and leave on short notice.

In any case, more new jobs in rural areas is highly desirable. However, to really get solid economic development, some of that money must stay in the rural area as personal income. This study further showed that (in answer to the second question) a dollar of income in the agricultural processing industries had the greatest impact on the local economy. The total impact of a dollar of personal income in agricultural processing firms is \$4.32. For each \$1.00 earned an additional \$3.32 was created in local personal income.

The story these multipliers give us is that the greatest potential for development in Oklahoma lies in the further development of agricultural processing businesses--and livestock production--both of which are dependent upon the productivity of the States' soil and water. Now this may not apply to South Dakota, but something similar may very well fit this great State!

Local economic development, based on the development of soil and water resources in other studies included here, have been pretty impressive!

I can make the case that Resources in Action is the cornerstone of Communities of Tomorrow.

Finally, then, on this most critical question. Is the congestion, the tensions, the urban sprawl to continually worsen? The USDA says, "No." We are taking direct issue with the notion that continued mass migration from country to city is inevitable. Tomorrow's America need not be 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 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 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 solve the problems of both city and rural living with one vigorous stroke.

Our collective goal should be 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 agriculture and the expanding needs of commerce and industry, and finally the broad acres on which to build garden communities for tomorrow's generations.

New Conservation and Community Charters for USDA

Two of the most important conservation and community documents of our times are now in your hands. Resources in Action and Communities of Tomorrow are the product of Department-wide studies under the direct leadership of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. They redefine the resource conservation and community missions of USDA in light of needs today and for the rest of the century. They outline timely new policies and goals. They point to ways these policies and goals will be implemented.

The publications have threefold significance:

1. Spelling out the nature and dimension of action urgently required to meet the resource and community needs of American people between now and the year 2000.
2. Demonstrating that, by the very location and character of these problems, USDA has major responsibility for leadership, and
3. Finally, charting for USDA the essential steps we must take in our cooperative efforts with other agencies and units of government, and with citizen groups, to achieve the goals.

The unmatched performance of the successful commercial farm, ranch, and forest enterprises in this country is eloquent testimony to the outstanding job conservation districts, their cooperators, you, and others have done--and continue to do.

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

You know that success and fame are fleeting. What would have sufficed yesterday is apt to be too little--too late for tomorrow. The past is history. South Dakota's conservation history is a proud chapter--but only a chapter. There are many more chapters to be written. There is no set deadline to complete the book. Urgency, yes,--urgency to get man and his environment in harmony. And as long as we have millions more who will depend on the land; we will have new chapters in the book.

Conservation requires man in order to have meaning; it does not require an end to the technology which serves man--in many cases--extremely well.

What it does mean is that man must exercise control--over himself, first; and then over his tools.

Secretary Freeman--at a recent Graduate School Seminar on Providing Quality Environment in our Communities--declared:

"I am an optimist. I do believe the Nation will decide to fashion the tools and allocate the resources for a renaissance in rural America. . . There is now an awareness and movement toward these goals never before present in rural America, and this is the reason I am optimistic. I have seen the communities taking shape with my own eyes. All down the line. . . from rural renewal to Resource Conservation and Development projects, more money is being invested, new ideas, new concepts are being tried. And you can see the results."

The boundary between rural and urban is fading rapidly. There is only one America with one set of interlocking natural resource problems. They can be solved. But it won't just happen.

The story is told of a student who came upon Louis Pasteur, late at night, bent over his microscope:

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

Replied Pasteur, "I was."

The challenge of creating a quality of civilization that fully reflects man's aspirations suggests we too should seek Divine guidance from he, who in a world of change has placed eternity in our hearts and has given us power to discern good from evil: Grant us sincerity that we may persistently seek the things that endure, refusing those which perish, and that, amid things vanishing and deceptive, we may see the truth steadily, follow the light faithfully, and grow ever richer in understanding which is the life of men.