

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON

file

April 13, 1965

To: Roger

From: Neal

Re: Vice President's Speech on Wildlife

This is a Xerox copy of the Vice
President's speech on Beauty.

This appeared in the Congressional
Record of March 29, 1965.

many ounces of food, with a limited tolerance on the higher side. If you will fill it with any one combination of food or drink, you cannot fill it with other food or drink. If hamburger fills the stomach's meat requirement, the steak will be squeezed out of it. This then becomes a matter of competition between this food and that food, or even grades of food.

A butchered steer or cow does not yield only steaks. You, of course, will be surprised to learn this, I am sure. Some Government economists, at least, have not learned this fact. As I understand it, packers seek to dispose of all parts of the carcass. This automatically calls for a market for meat other than steaks and roasts. As competition fills up in the lower levels, from whatever source, prices will drop in those levels also. I do not know what share of a steer will butcher out as prime or choice beef, but I am sure the percentage is low enough to leave a high poundage of other meat to sell from the same carcass.

If the market gets glutted from the bottom, the pressure rises toward the higher levels and meets at the middle levels. The price of the whole steer must therefore fall if the packer is to make a profit, and that is the purpose of his business. If human stomachs would expand to let in all the additional meat without crowding away the surplus, it could then be said that the imports do not compete with the domestic product; but that is not the nature of the stomach.

There can therefore be no doubt that when meat production was already adequate to the demand in this country, rising imports could produce only one effect; and that is what they did cause in 1963 and 1964. Prices tobogganed.

Let me, as one who has been on the Washington scene long enough to have some familiarity with the pitfalls, say that the cattle industry took the only course that was open to it and pressed vigorously on the Congress. The course taken showed a thorough appreciation of the deployment of power in Washington and of the only approach that had a chance of success. The campaign was energetic, unrelenting, and it produced results that few old hands on the scene would have thought possible.

This is not to say that everything was accomplished that you need; but if politics is the art of the possible, the cattle industry earned a high mark.

At this point I would like to sketch for you as accurately as I can some elements of the Washington scene as it relates to the subject of import competition.

I should not have to tell you that since the last war and even before, a shift has taken place in the seat of power so far as the tariff and imports are concerned. Congress under the Constitution is to regulate our foreign commerce and also to make the tariff. In recent decades, Congress has shown an inclination to shift this power to the executive branch, and the latter has been more than eager, in fact quite greedy, to receive it—all of course without changing the Constitution.

The fact is that today Congress has been set to one side as far as its function in foreign commerce regulation is concerned. That is another reason why the cattle industry's success in 1964 was all the more remarkable. But let us not deceive ourselves. The State Department is not happy over any exceptions that are made to the principles of GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) to all of which the United States subscribes and in fact initiated. One of these is the establishment of import quotas. These are outlawed by GATT. Several exceptions are allowed but none of them applies in your case. Should an actual quota be set up under the legislation, GATT would contest its legality under the general agreement.

The whole sweep and force of State Department policy is against quotas or continuing tariff protection and in the direction of dismantling what is left of the tariff and other trade restrictions. The Kennedy round or further tariff reduction is getting underway and the 50-percent cut authorized under it has the full support of State Department policy behind it.

I need hardly tell you that under the circumstances any measure of protection that now exists will be the object of disfavor and a candidate for removal as soon as it becomes politically feasible to do so. It is for this reason that I wish to impress on you the imperative need for joint effort, all across the front, among all the industries that face the common problem of import competition.

There are scores of such industries, and the number is growing as the other industrial countries, armed with modern technology and low wages, draw a bead on this market.

On this side many of our industries are lured by the view of export markets; but I think it can be demonstrated that total benefits from exports under existing international deployment of competitive forces cannot outrun the damage that would be inflicted on home industry by further reduction of our tariff and elimination of import quotas.

Our economy in the past generation and even more so since the war has become more dependent for its prosperity on the production and consumption of goods that are non-essential, goods that lie above the subsistence level. This fact has greatly increased the sensitivity of our economy to outside competition and to unfavorable or uncertain business outlook.

There is no worse offender in this respect than imports that are armed with a cost advantage that cannot be met by our own producers without going broke. We need to maintain our consumer purchasing power and even to expand it if production is to expand—something that will be necessary if we are not to be swamped with unemployment.

Lower tariff or absence of import quotas will expose our sensitive industries to a type of competition that will chill their confidence in the market and cause retrenchment rather than expansion. It will press them to install more labor-saving machinery in order to remain competitive, and this will produce unemployment. More and more of our large firms will open up overseas and do most of their expanding there. This country will be left behind, holding the bag of unemployment while other countries suffer from labor shortages.

The stake of the cattle industry in the economic prosperity of this country is not merely indirect. It is direct. Your interests intertwine with all the other agricultural and industrial groups that find themselves in the same boat. This means working with them through Congress for the preservation of our domestic market.

The notion that rising exports will come to the rescue is doomed to failure for years to come. As more of our capital goes overseas, it automatically shrinks our foreign markets for many products. But for subsidization of exports we are running a deficit in our foreign trade account today. Therefore that road is blocked.

A sharp modification of the national foreign trade policy bringing it into focus of present-day national and international competitive realities is long overdue. You have a part to play in this task, and you have already demonstrated your competence.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the great resources of America—the soil, the timber, the minerals, the wildlife—have

sustained us for hundreds of years. But now we have to think about sustaining them.

The frontier is gone and any examination of our resources will show that during the past 100 years we have wrought more wanton destruction of our landscape than any previous civilization accomplished in 1,000 years.

We cannot continue to use up our land and still be the land of our children. If we continue to destroy our rivers and lakes, if we continue to plunder our forests and rip up our mountainsides, and if we continue to foul our air and water, there will be no new green paradise awaiting us over the horizon.

A few days ago, more than 1,500 conservationists from the United States, Canada, Mexico and several other countries came to Washington for the 30th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference.

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, a long-time leader in the fight to conserve this Nation's resources, made a most thoughtful plea for the conservation of our natural and human resources. I think all of us should have a chance to read this superb presentation.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Vice President of the United States). Thank you very much, Mr. Brooks.

My old friend, "Pink" Gutermuth and Ira Gabrielson and my fellow conservationists: In these days of electronics, modern inventions, it is getting difficult to see the audience over the contraptions. [Laughter.] But I know you are there and I'm delighted.

Gathered here in this great assembly at the Nation's Capital are some of the most peaceful people, some of the most constructive people that will ever come together at one time in this city and it is rather hard to realize, having said that, that we are about to rejoin a great struggle and, indeed, join in revolt or revolution, but the fact is that we are—and, by the way—our Government is helping to lead that revolt.

I'm speaking of the century-long war, a century-long revolt against the waste of our natural bounty; against the desecration and the ugliness of our beautiful land. We meet here in Washington and of all the places that we need to have meet, it's here, to add new fervor to that cause of conservation and development which, having reached a critical stage, needs your fire, daring and dedication more than ever before.

I know that you have heard a powerful address from the minority whip of the U.S. Senate, one of the finest gentlemen in the Congress of the United States—a progressive-minded, forward-looking man and a real conservationist—and might I add that in this area of conservation that there is no room for partisanship; all there's room is for dedication and constructive action.

We are here to talk about the conservation of resources and, of course, we emphasize what we call natural resources—those resources of land and water, of timber and minerals, of wildlife—but we are also here to emphasize the conservation of another resource—the human resource—because the land and the man go together.

I can say to this audience that this Government and this administration headed by President Johnson and with his partner, HUBERT HUMPHREY, and his Cabinet and this

Congress, is a conservation administration, dedicated to the conservation of natural resources and human resources and dedicated to their development for the good and the use of mankind. I am proud to be a part of this—proud to have stood alongside of your own resources managers in the ranks of this great conservation movement; and this meeting holds much of the pleasure and nostalgia perhaps of a family reunion for me—we have been together on other occasions.

Now, we have labeled our cause, and I hope you will permit me to join you and say "our" cause, "conservation." To many, that term speaks only of the quiet glades, the smooth waters of Minnesota lakes and wild creatures that inhabit the forests, but some say—"Are we not a nation of builders? Nature is fine but now let's move on to important business." These are supposed to be the practical ones that say these things.

Well, we reply that buildings must stand on firm foundations and in the long run this, our Nation, has no business more important than conserving her great basic resource, the earth, that sustains all life, because land and man should be and in fact are inseparable.

Resources are not fixed objects on a fixed plot and resource conservation is not a matter of tending to a changeless garden. We apply this term of resources to whatever men demand from the earth at any given time. As these demands change, so must our concept of conservation change.

Oil was not much of a resource before the automobile and wildlife today satisfies other hungers than those of the stomach. Nothing on earth is eternal or fixed. As an old Greek philosopher once said: "You cannot step twice into the same river for fresh waters are ever flowing upon you."

The conservation movement in America must understand change—the ever widening rush of these new waters—and that is what has expanded our movement from the dreams of a few idealists to a great national crusade and that is what makes it uniquely an American revolution, for we are leading a movement still unique in our national experience.

Conservation as we know it is an American phenomenon, born of social reform, weaned by a dynamic national spirit and shocked to its maturity by a recognition that we, the people, have defiled a bountiful and beautiful land. Conservationists are trying to demonstrate that free people can act in their own behalf, voluntarily, willfully, and can dedicate their lands not to the profit of the few but to the good of the many—and this is the principle—the good of the many—the greatest good for the greatest number—that I want to reaffirm today.

Oh, but how slow and agonizing has been the establishment of this principle; how frustrating it has been to see private empires built on public lands; how hard to watch resources exploited to the point of depletion and how heartbreaking it has been to witness the assault on our wildlife and the withering of our land's natural beauty, and how painful, oh, how painful, the illusion that the land was limitless and its products inexhaustible. Sometimes, my friends, we have acted like gluttons—just devouring all that which God created. But then, how thankful—how thankful we must be that the land was not easily pauperized, it didn't give up, and how grateful for the courage and the vision of those early conservation pioneers, because it was they who made possible the great progress that we're making today.

Now, these valiant pioneers reminded us that a nation stands or falls on the firmness of its resource base, and we meet today to strengthen that base; they warned that a peoples' spirit and its will to greatness can be sapped by a barren land and we

meet here today to perpetuate that spirit.

There is, my dear fellow Americans, something spiritual about conservation effort and dedication to conservation because a true conservationist is a steward of the Lord—he truly protects that which God has created. That's why I have always felt that the conservation movement extended far beyond the commonplace of politics, far beyond even economics; it is a communion of the soul, it is a unity of the spirit.

Now, these valiant conservation pioneers began what is indeed a battle, a war, a call to arms against three malignant forces and masters—first, the overexploitation of the land and its products; an ancient adversary, yes, whose subjects or results through history had been decline and decay. You know it to be a true fact. Nations that have withered away into oblivion, into weakness and nothingness, first exploited their land. Then exploited their people and soon were forgotten.

The second malignant master that we must wage war upon is corruption of the landscape, the countryside, the highways, the wild and the scenic spots which denies us pleasure in the natural world and, my fellow Americans, we ought to bow our heads in shame, our beautiful countryside is being made into a junkyard and don't tell me we can't do something about that; don't tell me that the mayor of a city (I was once one) cannot keep his streets clean, his boulevards well cared for. Don't tell me that Governors and legislatures are helpless to see to it that there are rules and regulations that prevent the defiling of the landscape, the corruption of it—or does America want to show that its main objective in life is the piling up of scrap iron, or of garbage pits or dump grounds? Have we no pride? I'd like to arouse in this country almost a feverish emotional outburst against this defiling of the countryside, this corruption of the landscape. The least that a people ought to have that live almost encased in asphalt and concrete is that when they leave the environs of the city they can see nature and commune with God without having to look over a pile of old-worn-out automobiles. [Applause.] I have a lot of these ideas that I could share with you. [Laughter.] My wife says I scold when I talk like that; well, I do, because there are some things that can be done so easily.

There is a third malignant master that we need to conquer—the overgrowth and the underplanning of our cities, where population pressures damage not only the tranquility of our people, but the air they breathe and the water that they drink.

Once again I say that it is possible, through the enforcement of zoning ordinance and health codes, to see to it that our cities are more beautiful; to see to it that the landscape (yes, the yards, for lack of a better phrase, the front lawn and the backyard) looks a little bit more like we loved the land that is ours.

Now, more importantly, these erie prophets led us to learn that our land is a community of all living things—not just a series of human subdivision. We have learned (at least some of us have) that nature will care for us only if we care for it as a part of life within the natural context. This is our lesson—to learn and teach—and history will not forgive us for a failure but for all the headway that we have made. Our greatest challenges lie ahead because our population is growing rather fast too.

By the year 2000 (and that's not long, it's just around the corner) the population of the United States will be over 300 million people; daily water needs will increase from 345 to at least 560 to 600 billion gallons a day. Needs for agricultural products will double and if my friend Secretary Freeman can last as Secretary until the year 2000, he

will have licked the surplus problem—there will be no doubt about that. [Laughter.]

In a country where people have ever more leisure time (and we will have more) and, we trust, more money to enjoy it, the burden on parks and on recreation areas will double or triple. The number of big game hunters, for example, could well grow from the present 6,300,000 in 1960 to well over 12 million by 1980, if we maintain the species and the spaces for them to hunt.

Thus the forces that united us in the conservation cause will have to be replenished because the task is so much greater and one of these forces and, I think, the most powerful of all, is the love of our people for the land. Americans have always been people of the land and while building a nation—a great republic from forests and plains—the pulse of the wild, of the natural, of the native so to speak, beats in the American bloodstream.

While most of us today live, as I mentioned, in concrete and asphalt environments, we remember our youth—our own and our Nation's youth—the time of the open land and broad horizons. My, how I like to talk about those days when I could walk down the creek (old Timber Creek out in South Dakota), when I could go pheasant hunting, when I could dream dreams like boys do. Like most of you, I knew this world as a boy, when I could be a Robinson Crusoe in my mind's eye and in my imagination, or a Daniel Boone, frankly, almost right in my own back yard or at least in the nearby community. I sympathize with youngsters today, who are literally imprisoned in asphalt and concrete. Is it any wonder that there becomes a harshness in our society, a coldness at times? How can you really feel the sweetness and gentleness until you can touch the grass with your hands and toes? You remember when you used to like to go barefooted earlier than your mother would want you to? You remember how you would like to just feel the grass and you still do. Well, let's save some of it. [Laughter.] Let's save some of it, for this memory, this imagination is something to be cherished, isn't it, but also to be encouraged and made possible as a memory for generations yet unborn.

But an opposing force was the American will to conquer this same land, to tame the wild, and loving this land, yet we abused it. Thriving on its challenges, we demanded total surrender and it took us long years to learn restraint and moderation; to teach ourselves to turn away from wanton waste. We were like that little boy that got into the watermelon patch—just dig into the heart of the melon—never intend at any time nibbling close to the rind.

Meanwhile growth, which was our goal and almost our ideal, became our nemesis. Our natural bounty allowed us to expand in huge numbers but booming numbers, even in a bounteous land, can drain that bounty and drain it dangerously.

Witness the sprawling of our suburbs. People sought a cleaner and less confining life than in the cities and by their numbers, moving out helter-skelter to the suburbs, many times without plan or without any order at all, they destroyed these very values.

Cities, the cradles of social progress, all too often became prisons for those who could not escape even in the less crowded suburbs. This afternoon I am going to be meeting with the mayors of the largest cities of this Nation and I'm going to talk to them about making our cities livable. Cities ought not to be merely bedrooms so that we can get up and go to work. Cities ought to be citadels of culture; they ought to be places that make life enjoyable—the thrill of the good life—and they should not be without the birds, the parks and the grass and the hill and the open spaces.

So you see, we seek now a new conservation, one of people as well as land and resources;

one of metropolitan areas as well as open country. Our times demand it.

We enter a new phase of the continuing revolution in an urbanized, industrialized society. The first phase began when the great journey of Lewis and Clark lifted our eyes to the West; it reached fruition in the bold and strong hands of Teddy Roosevelt. It was Teddy Roosevelt who first consolidated Federal powers on ground broken by such men as Shures, Marsh, Powell, and Pinchot. It was time for awakening the American conscience; for recognizing that this land had limits after all for protecting public lands from ruthless exploitation; and Teddy Roosevelt will be remembered, as will Governor Pinchot and others, not for just some of the political decisions, like the war on the trusts and the monopolies, but, more importantly, for the love of the land; for setting the example and for conserving, at least starting the fight to conserve our great heritage.

It was also time, and that time was growing short, to heed the words of John Muir. You will remember what he said—everyone needs beauty as well as bread, places to play in and pray in, where nature may help and cheer and give strength to the body and the soul. That is some of the best therapy that you can have. I think we just ought to repeat that time after time. Everyone needs beauty as well as brains, places to play in and pray in, where nature can help and cheer and give strength to the body and soul; and also somewhere recalling what Sir Thomas Brown once said—nature is the art of God. This is why I said before that conservation should have a religious impulse to it.

The conservation movement was carried a giant step forward under Franklin Roosevelt, who made it an instrument of public welfare with such projects as the TVA, the Great Plains shelter belts, the soil conservation program, the Civilian Conservation Corps. The spur of his leadership drove us to find better ways of utilizing our resources, new means of using and managing them, and he broadened the definition of what we mean by resources.

Then, during the post-World War II years, with our major attention still focused on international turbulence, our conservation forces had to be gathered anew for a new thrust and one that is now underway—and may I say were it not for the people in this room, right here, you and your leaders and your spokesmen, we would have lost this war, lost this fight for conservation, because the war years, understandably took our minds off it and in the postwar years of international tension and crisis, without our thinking of the land and human and physical resources of this country, we could have been like a ship without a rudder—lost, storm tossed.

Our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy set the theme for this modern period when he told Congress in 1962, and I quote him, "we depend on our natural resources to sustain us but in turn, their continued availability depend on our using them prudently, improving them wisely, and, where possible, restoring them properly."

Just 1 month ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson amplified the theme in his message to Congress on natural beauty, and what a beautiful message. "Our conservation," he said, "must be not just a classic conservation of protection and development but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. It's concern is not with nature alone but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare but with the dignity of man's spirit."

But whose business is this, I ask? Some in this great enterprise ask the same. Who should take the lead? Who should take the first step, which is the longest journey?

This administration answers that the concerns of conservation are the concerns of every American in and out of government.

Nearly a year ago, in his first delineation of America's internal problems, President Johnson said that solution to these problems does not rest on a massive program in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority—they require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities.

So you see, we can no longer afford to think of conservation as the special province of conservationists or preservationists; nor is it the exclusive domain of our resource developers—it is clearly the concern of everyone.

Conservation is a patchwork of needs and problems; the patches come in all shapes and sizes, but each is vital to the finished work. The true conservationist can no more ignore problems outside his narrow interest than the seamstress can leave out center patches because she is a specialist on edges. [Laughter.]

The common thread running through all conservation work is a concern with this American land of ours—this American continent—using it for the maximum public benefit today while maintaining its value for the tremendous needs of tomorrow. Conservation today, more than ever, insists therefore upon cooperation between all levels of government and all segments of the population but let us remember that this word "cooperation" like conservation itself, can be used by some as a pious title for uncooperative and unproductive ends. Even among men of good will, great injustices can be done in the name of good causes. Progress is often stymied by bureaucratic bickering, by question of who owns the land and who is responsible for what job. We have spent more time arguing about that than we have about conserving.

I say that where conservation is concerned land titles are irrelevant. When a water table falls it doesn't matter really who owns the surface—the important thing is to get the table restored and that ought to be a challenge to us. Erosion and fire attack land without consulting the clerk of courts or the registrar of deeds or ownership records. All of us lose when one of us loses soil, or when a deer dies of a damaged habitat, or when the bass dies from water pollution. Our real question is not who owns it, not who should do it first, but who can do the job.

The job begins with this question, and this is where the public, private, local, and Federal interests begin to merge and it was this philosophy that moved the recent 88th Congress to become the most effective Congress in history for conservation legislation, and I shall ever be grateful for the opportunity that I have had as a Member of that Congress and as a majority whip of the U.S. Senate to help make that record. I know that in passing more than 30 important conservation bills in 1 Congress that the 88th Congress was responding to the will of the majority of our people and to the needs of this Republic. As a result, we have today a whole new charter of conservation; a new land and water conservation fund to help States and cities preserve areas of beauty and health for the pleasure of all; a Wilderness Act—oh, I remember my old friend Zahnheizer, this was one of my major proposals as a Senator. I can remember the heat we took. My, you would have thought that we were going to deny certain interests in this country a chance to even make a nickel. I was one of those fellows that was wanted. They had my picture posted in certain places—private enemy, I think it was, No. 1. [Laughter.] Yes, we took the early heat. They took a little bark off me once in a while, a little skin here and there, but I am happy to tell you that the bill is passed and the Wilderness Act will guarantee that future Americans will

be able to touch the majesty of untrammelled land that our forebears knew.

Then there is the water research and planning funds to prepare for tomorrow's sorry needs and we began construction on more than 200 water resources projects with 70 more scheduled for this year. More than 5,500 miles of new transmission lines and an increase of flood control funds of more than 50 percent was the record of that Congress.

A Public Law Review Commission to study the laws and the administration of our public domain and the Classification and Multiple-Use Act under which the administrators can finally determine which lands should be retained in Federal ownership and which disposed of and then began long-range programs on the retained lands. Now, this act is creating federalism in action for its demands the closest coordination and consultation between Federal and local authorities and then, among the most important of all conservation acts, we have the Economic Opportunity Act, the War on Poverty Act, which establishes amongst many other things a Job Corps conservation program, or Job Corps conservation camps, a goal I may say that I set in 1957. That particular aspect of that bill went past the Senate three times and, my dear friends, on the issue of racism, youth and the land, human resources and natural resources were denied attention for year after year and finally, in this last Congress, we passed the Youth Opportunity Act, we passed this Economic Opportunity Act, and we have set in motion today a tremendous new program that is going to be of benefit to millions and millions of Americans yet unborn. Here is an example of how the conservation concept has expanded, by bringing young men, many of whom have never known the feel of earth or the shade of trees; by bringing them to work on the land we do more than repair the damage that is done to the land. We believe that the land can help a program that is going to be of benefit to the youth.

We are in one of the greatest healing programs. We are binding up wounds that have been opened for far too long and I can tell you, my dear friends, when I witnessed the opening of that first camp, when I read about it and when I saw all the films, I am not ashamed to tell you that the tears flowed down my face because I saw there young men that had never had a chance getting a chance and what bothers me is why did we wait so long? Why all this self-righteousness about the evil of our young and the delinquency of our youth while the adults bickered over how to get the job done? And today, my fellow Americans, we have room in these camps, in this first year for only a few thousand and hundreds, yea thousands and thousands, over a hundred thousand young men already, have pleaded with this Government, this rich country, for a chance to work in a camp. Youngsters that are 16, 17, and 18 years of age, are saying to camp counselors, "this is my last chance, if I can't make it here, I will go down in defeat"; a step away from disaster, and yet we parade around talking about our stock market and our wealth, while we forget the real wealth of the Nation all too often, the youth.

I will be eternally grateful to the President of the United States for his leadership in this fight. An NYA boy in his youth, National Youth Administration, a little country schoolteacher, President of the United States. And he's made up his mind that this country is going to see to it that every boy and girls, regardless of race, color, creed, or economic station, has an opportunity for the best education that this Republic can offer at any time in its history. That's the commitment of your President and I hope it's yours. [Applause.]

While you are here, call on your Congressman. Don't just talk to each other—

you're all together anyway. [Laughter.] Because we have these programs before the Congress. I have attended too many meetings where we went around patting each other on the back. I'm the biggest meeting attendee that this country ever had. [Laughter.]

What this country needs right now is a good shot of conscience adrenalin. Just get busy. Get these cities of ours rebuilt; get these illiterates taught; get these young men and women and some of them older that have no skills, get them some training. Conserve and develop human resources at the same time that you conserve and develop the great physical resources—man and the land.

Government's role, indeed its obligation, is to put this people power into action programs wherever conservation needs have been neglected. Always the need must determine the program's scope and shape.

Government's role is—its real reason for even being is the welfare of its citizens and with tomorrow's citizens threatened with a blighted landscape and environment, of congestion and ugliness, the Government that fails to act swiftly and effectively will have failed in its sacred trust.

My fellow Americans, by the year 1980, 85 out of every hundred Americans will be living in large cities and we have to teach people who live in the cities; to love the land that surrounds the cities and not to exploit it. We are going to have to teach one another to keep the water clean and pure. There won't be a river left in America that isn't polluted—I doubt that there are many now—when I think of my own beloved State of Minnesota with what some people call its ten thousand lakes, depending on who you are sometimes you call it 20,000. [Laughter.] But be that as it may, why don't they tell you how many of them are already polluted. The land of the sky-blue water, but the water in all too many instances is contaminated by man. Now we can't do this and be a strong country and be worthy of our heritage. Can we do less, I ask, than to pass on to the next generation the natural legacy that we were left? In fact, each generation owes a little something more to the one that succeeds it. Does man have a right to destroy that which God created or don't you talk about that in church, or at your family altar or in the quietness of your own conscience?

What is it that gives us the feeling that somehow or another we have a right to destroy that which we say we believe came from the Divine?

President Johnson's proposals to conserve that legacy are of historic importance. He has asked Congress for sweeping programs to create open spaces in our cities—providing space for wild animals—protecting air and water from pollution—beautifying the highways—increasing our park and recreation systems—developing new systems of wild rivers and scenic hiking trails—reducing the harmful effects of pesticides—researching the still mysterious relationship between man and his environment.

By 1970, my fellow Americans, 90 million automobiles on our highways—90 million. It seems to me that we have something to be concerned about in air pollution, in beautification. In short, this Government is acting to insure that as we increase the quantity of our goods, we do not diminish the quality of our lives.

So now we have this new impetus—new laws and new proposals. It's time to put them into effect in a joint effort. To do this, we need foresight, hindsight and we need some insight to see that our cause is a historic one. And that we must ride with the tide of history. Yesterday's traditions may be today's myths. Such is the legend of the America, the horn of plenty. Such is the legend that all good comes to those who merely tend to their own gardens.

We conservationists cannot and do not claim to have a special pipeline to eternal verities but I think that we do have a moral mission to protect the dignity and the well-being of our people and this requires more than Federal funds and programs—money won't do it alone. It requires that Americans of all walks of life and interest speak out against complacency; against the mischievous idea that conservation problems will somehow be solved by someone else; for the problems will not be solved by someone else—we cannot let George do it because maybe George isn't there—maybe George doesn't even hear us—he may have a hearing defect. [Laughter.]

And we are not going to let someone else do it either—not Fred or John. We are just going to have to buckle down and get going and do it ourselves and I think we are firmly on that course—that's why I came here.

You who administer these conservation programs; you who outline them and feed them, you know your program goals but let us work together in moving more rapidly toward those goals—be a little bit restless, be anxious to see that this job is done.

You who are missionaries in this vital cause of conservation, may I suggest that you work with a missionary zeal. Let us together in the love of this great land of ours, this America that we herald in that beautiful song, "America The Beautiful"—let us build our land into a cathedral of beauty and of conservation and then let us call all the people to its portals. Thank you. [Rising applause.]

U.S. OVERSEA BOOK PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a speech delivered in New York City on November 18, 1964, before the 51st National Foreign Trade Convention of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., by Mr. Curtis S. Benjamin, chairman of the board of McGraw-Hill Book Co. Entitled "Books As Forces in National Development and International Relations," the speech is an outline of some of the problems faced by our overseas book programs.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BOOKS AS FORCES IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(An address by Curtis S. Benjamin, chairman of the board, McGraw-Hill Book Co., before the final general session, 51st National Foreign Trade Convention, the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., New York City, November 18, 1964.)

Let me confess that as I address this audience I feel like a pygmy among giants. I say this because I represent an industry which among the great American export industries is truly a pygmy in size. We book publishers have a fierce pride in our product—a fact that you will observe as I go along. Yet we must ruefully note that our industry in sales volume ranks way down on the national scale, down somewhere between the dog food industry and the peanut industry. We must sorrowfully face the fact that our fellow Americans spend annually more on food for their dogs' stomachs than on food—or our particular brand of food—for their own minds. However, we do find some solace in the fact that we have somehow managed each year to stay just ahead of peanuts.

But size is not everything. Books have a large seminal importance that far exceeds their small dollar value as a commercial

product at home or an export commodity abroad. Let me describe briefly just how books can serve as powerful forces in national development and international relations. If in doing this I may seem to be reciting a panegyric to books and their high uses and values, then so be it. Of books—of books at home, of books abroad, of books of every kind everywhere—of thee I proudly sing.

First, I sing of books serving a basic role in keeping English as the lingua franca of the free world. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of our having English as the international language of education, science, industry, and commerce, or to exaggerate the power of books in keeping it as such.

Second, I sing of books as vehicles for international understanding of political, social, and cultural ideas and institutions. I think it no exaggeration to say that next to people, books are the best ambassadors of international enlightenment and good will. Let me elaborate this theme, this second stanza of my song, a bit.

In the area of political knowledge and motivation, U.S. book publishers are happy to note that, matching their export sales with the political graph in each of the 80 or 90 countries where American books are sold, we can observe that American books and tyranny appear to live together in inverse proportion.

In most countries of the world the students are the revolutionaries of today and the leaders of tomorrow. As events of the recent past have proved in Korea, Turkey, Japan, and several Latin American countries, the political power of the student can be ignored by a government only at its own peril. American books abroad—and especially American textbooks—are thus directed to the hands of men who are vital both to the future of their country and to the future of relations between their country and ours. Many years ago F.D.R. made this point dramatically when he said, "Books are bullets in the battle for men's minds." As we shall see later, this fact has not escaped either the U.S. Government or the U.S. book industry.

In the area of international cultural understanding, the book is, again, both basic and powerful. This is an obvious fact, but the need abroad for more knowledge and appreciation of the cultural achievements of America is not so obvious as it should be to many of our citizens. Our books serve not only as direct evidence of our literary achievement but also as reflectors of our achievements in all the other arts. We should not underestimate the critical nature of this particular battlefield of the cold war.

Next let me sing, in my third stanza, of books as basic tools for education and training—or to use the newer catch-phrase, for "the development of human resources." In Washington and almost all other capital cities of the world, one hears much talk these days of the urgent and universal need for greater "development of human resources." While this phraseology is new, the need itself is both old and familiar. In more simple and conventional terms, the need is for more and better education and training.

Now all this urge to both national and international action for more and better education and training is very heartening to book publishers. For books have always served in all countries as the best and most essential of tools for the development of human resources. Of the place of the U.S. textbook in the international scene and of the problems peculiar to its distribution abroad, I shall have more to say later.

Meanwhile, let me sing my fourth stanza in praise of books as basic guides in the development of national economic resources and in the extension of international trade. I take it that everyone here knows the essentiality of books—of operating manuals, of



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org