

Speeches by Walter J. Hickel on Earth and Environment
The Irvine Lectures, University of California, Oct. 12-28, 1976

- * Introduction
- * What the Environment is All About
- * The Politics of the Environment
- * The Emptiness of the World (Inexhaustible Earth)
- * Energy and Life
- * A Nation of Renters of Money
- * Let the Sunshine In
- * A Nation of the Soil
- * Why Our Civilization Won't Fail

The Irvine Lectures
Lecture No. 1
Introduction

I have been looking forward eagerly to this opportunity to visit your campus.

And to explore with you some issues that are fundamental to the success of our civilization..... And of mankind as a whole.

For the past five years I have criss-crossed America and have traveled to other continents.

I have talked with large groups and small listened to the scientists working on the frontiers of physics and medicine . . .

. . . I have argued with the world's philosophers and economists. Debated with the students in many countries.....fought with the politicians . . . And pounded the table of the top labor leaders and company presidents in America.

In the process I have hammered out and refined my ideas and approaches to many problems . . . Some of which I want to work on here with you in the weeks ahead.

I am grateful for your invitation to make this lecture series.

It has given me the opportunity to compile and organize these thoughts and ideas.

It is the first time I have done this since writing my book, Who Owns America?, In 1971.

I want to structure these lectures a little differently from what you may be used to.

I want a wide-open feeling here.

Each day I will begin with my prepared comments, but that will rarely take over thirty minutes.

The remainder of the time I want to use to field your questions. I want you to ask the best questions you can dream up. I don't care if they sound foolish.

We will be walking some new country and to do that you can't be afraid of making mistakes.

Those of us who have spent our lives on the frontier respect people who have the confidence to try, perhaps fail, and try again.

Because that's what it takes to explore the unknown.

Twenty years ago I began looking for that type of man and woman to invite to Alaska to help our young country.

I spoke in Fairbanks in 1956 calling for a new generation of Alaskans called "the searchers."

We're still looking for that kind of person.

I hope many of you here are cut of that cloth.

My definition of a searcher is someone who, no matter what he accomplishes, or what he might do, isn't satisfied.

He's a combination of the dreamer and the doer . . . The contented man and the ambitious man . . . All molded into one.

He doesn't put a ceiling on his expectations.

He is constantly trying to improve upon solutions for problems he finds while searching. It may sound easy but it's not.

The searcher is opposed by closed minds . . .

. . . Those who say, "we have ours, let's stop everything." These are the tired individuals . . .

. . . Or those who have made it and want to protect what they have.

They don't want you to come around challenging their values and their things.

They want to live in the isolation of their luxury while brainwashing the young that there are no opportunities or frontiers left.

Well, my approach is the exact opposite.

I believe the greatest frontiers haven't even been discovered yet.

For someone with imagination, opportunities are everywhere. In this class, I want a "gloves off" approach.

I do ask that your questions be sincere that they come from a real desire to understand and explore and to take a new thought one step further.

But don't hesitate to ask me something that sounds uncomfortable or hostile.

I have spent a good part of my public life answering hostile questions from the press. And quite frankly, I enjoy it.

I do recommend that you obtain a copy of *Who Owns America?*, The book I wrote after being fired from the cabinet by president Nixon.

It's not required reading, but I would ask you to read the last two pages of the book . . . Or maybe the last chapter . . . And make your own decision.

I wrote it in story form . . . The story of my twenty-two stormy months as U.S. Secretary of the Interior.

But woven into the story line is a blueprint for government.

It's my philosophy of how government can be made to respond to critical needs . . . Needs such as the environment and national energy policy.

You will also get some background on who I am.

It tells the tale of growing up on a farm in dust-bowl Kansas during the depression . . .

. . . And how, through boxing and the golden gloves, I had a chance to see some of the country.

And then left for California with the idea of emigrating to Australia. As I was still under age, I couldn't get a passport. So I pooled my resources and took off for Alaska.

. . . Arriving in 1940, when Anchorage had a total population of 3500 and only one paved street. I had just 37 cents in my pocket.

But I had found my country.

You know, it is so easy today to make the excuse that "one person can't do anything . .

"society is so big and so complex, the individual is no longer important."

If nothing else, by the end of this course, I hope to demolish that theory forever.

The individual does count.

In the lectures ahead, I expect you will be startled by some of my thoughts and beliefs.

For instance, tomorrow I'm going to explore what the environment is all about . . .

. . . To examine some of the cliches that have become gospel truth to the public, the press, and the political leadership.

The following lecture -t have called "the politics of the environment."

This will be a look at American government . . . To discuss its strengths and weaknesses when it comes to meeting a very real problem.

I have spent many years in politics and as it's the presidential election season, I'm sure we will have an interesting discussion.

The following day we will take a look at the world's resources.

I have picked as my example the area on earth that most fascinates me at this time . . . Siberia.

Siberia is only fifty miles across a narrow stretch of water from my home state, Alaska.

The following lecture will be keyed on a visit I made a year ago to Yugoslavia. I attended a conference on future energy production in Dubrovnik.

I keynoted that meeting and then debated ideas for alternate energy sources with representatives of Russia, Western Europe, and Asia.

This gave me the clearest view I have had as to the realism of the various ways to produce energy and where we should put our priorities.

The remaining lectures will include a discussion of the myths and the very real issues involved in America's and the world's energy crisis.

They will probe the toughest environmental issue to get at . . . Our cities.

They will talk about the role of oil in feeding mankind . . . And how it's a crime to waste natural gas by burning it in a boiler.

And finally, I will make a prediction about what chances our civilization has of surviving.

In preparation for tomorrow's discussions, I want you to read chapter 6 of Who Owns America?

It is probably the shortest chapter in the book. It is called "The cry of the whale."

The stories in that chapter will set the state for tomorrow's discussion that will re-examine what the environment is all about. Pay special attention in that chapter to the story of the whale.

Suddenly, within a generation, this great creature's survival is at the mercy of man.

Our intentional slaughter of thousands of whales for profit every year and our unintentional polluting of their watery environment has rapidly diminished their numbers.

The person who has no heart for the value of a living creature such as the whale has no heart for his fellow human.

The cry of the smallest child in the ghetto forgotten in the crowd, or the cry of the greatest animal forgotten in the vast open sea—these are both part of the same fabric of life.

After I became Secretary of the Interior in 1969, I asked my staff to research the problems involved in placing all eight species of great whales on the endangered list.

The whaling nations were still viewing whale resources on a short-term basis.

If present trends were to continue, all large whales would be driven to extinction within a few years.

If, however, the whales' breeding stocks were allowed to build back up, a sustained annual harvest, far larger than currently being taken, would be possible.

But the whaling nations and their organizing body, the international whaling commission, or I.W.C., were not regarding this resource with a long-term, wise-use outlook.

During the peak whaling year, 1930-31, whalers took almost 30,000 blue whales, the mightiest creature ever to live on the face of the earth..... Three times bigger than brontosaurus, the largest dinosaur.

Today, some estimates of the number surviving are as low as 100!

Some observers fear there are not enough of these animals left for males to find females across the great oceans.

It would be a crime beyond belief that in the same decade that we walked on the moon we also destroyed the largest animal god ever put on earth.

In 1970 the eighty-foot finback was also being pursued down the same path.

From a peak Antarctic harvest of over 30,000 in the early 1900s, these waters yielded only some 2,500 whales a year.

With the fins on the way out, the whalers began concentrating on the smaller sei and sperm whales.

They had to kill more whales and even porpoises to make the business barely pay.

I have never been against using renewable resources, but to drive any animal to extinction for short-term profits is inexcusable.

What's more they were driving their business to extinction right along with the whales.

The complexity of the problem was caused by the international character of the industry.

The United States, a member and strong supporter of the I.W.C., could not dictate policy to the other nations.

For months we worked on the whale project, and the battle grew intense.

Often the issue became confusing. If I were to prevent the importation of any parts or products from these animals into this country, it would cause difficulties.

Although the United States had not been a major whaling nation for 100 years, it did use 25 to 30 percent of the world's whale products in making soap, margarine, beauty cream, machine oil, and pet food.

My friend, the late Charles Lindbergh, wrote me on September 26, 1970, after returning from Japan where he had studied the situation.

His opinion was that if all eight species were placed on the U.S. endangered species list, including the three species still commercially hunted (sperm, finback and sei), it would not deter the great whaling nations, Japan and Russia.

In fact, he feared unilateral action on our part would encourage them to exploit the situation further.

I was convinced, however, that the United States had to take the lead.

Foreign whaling, which reached its height in the last decade, was launching a massive technological onslaught that no animal could endure.

The lookouts of the past have been supplemented with radar

And helicopters, the longboats with twenty-knot whale catchers.

A factory ship can dispose of an eighty-ton carcass in thirty minutes.

The endangered species act bars the importation, except for certain educational and scientific purposes, of those species listed by the secretary of the interior as threatened with extinction.

The question I raised was, when is a species endangered?

My belief was that the endangered species act must be more than a last-ditch effort to save a species with its back against the wall.

It must also be used to prevent other species from reaching that point.

Some people remember the seemingly infinite supply of passenger pigeons.

They used to come over the countryside like great clouds.

They were hunted without thought that they might be threatened.

In 1898 there were perhaps a million of them.

The next year there were practically none.

In 1900 the last wild passenger pigeon was shot.

The species came to an end at 1:00 p.m. eastern standard time, September 1, 1914, in the Cincinnati Zoo. Her name was Martha. She was 29.

Man was not equipped to recognize their point of no return. I decided to act on the whales.

The showdown came with representatives of the state department and the sperm oil industry.

When I had disposed of the majority of their arguments, they produced an argument I had not expected.

"We have to have whale oil for the space program," the state department official declared.

I demanded, "What are you going to use when the whale is extinct?"

Taken aback, the official stammered, "I suppose we'll have to find a substitute."

I said, "you find that substitute right now, because those whales are going on the endangered species list!"

The impact on the other nations involved was dramatic.

General Lindbergh later reported to me on the result of my action.

"You touched their conscience," he said. "while others were just talking about the problem, you cared enough to take the action necessary. "

This wasn't the end of the battle. But it was a landmark. A turning point.

An example that events don't just happen. Someone has to make them happen.

What I want to examine with you in the weeks ahead is how will we leave America?

Will the heritage this generation leaves behind be an exhausted earth and a human who is degraded?

Will the rugged individualism on which we have prided ourselves result in collective destruction?

Are we truly running out of resources . . . And, if so, what

Should we do about it?

How can government be made to respond to the issues we truly care about?

These are the most urgent questions facing our country.

These are some of the questions we will try to answer during this lecture series.

Tomorrow we'll begin with a look at what the environment is truly all about.

Thank you.

#

The Irvine Lectures
Lecture No. 2
What the Environment is all About

In 1972, I was asked to be a world observer at the United Nations conference on the human environment in Stockholm, Sweden.

The invitation came from Maurice Strong, the Canadian Secretary General of that conference who later became head of the U.N. environmental program.

In the months prior to the conference, Strong asked me to do some trouble-shooting for him.

When Australia began dragging its feet and showing a strong lack of interest, he sent me to Melbourne, Canberra, and Sydney, to meet with governmental and business leaders.

Our aim with this conference was to draw the attention of all nations of the world to the importance of the environmental issue. My argument to the cabinet of Australia was that no nation can isolate itself.

Every major river eventually empties into the oceans.

A river doesn't know if it is flowing through a socialist country or a capitalist country . . .
But if we pollute it, it will carry that pollution into our common seas.

Regardless of political, racial, or language differences no matter how remote a nation like Australia may feel the problems of pollution force us to look at ourselves as one world.

This trip was extremely successful, and the Australians eventually played a significant role in the conference.

As I was not appointed to the U.S. delegation, Secretary General Strong wanted to make sure I was there, so he named me one of a select few world observers.

Others in the group included Margaret Mead, Lady Jackson, and Dr. Renee Dubos. My fear was that this great meeting, that had captured the imagination and attention of the world, would be a flop.

The history of the United Nations is a lot of talk but little action. Before I left Anchorage, as I analyzed the situation, I felt that if this world gathering could take one action with some teeth in it . . . early in the meeting it could set the tone for the conference.

In a few days time I put together a tiny pamphlet with a drawing of a blue whale on the cover.

Inside I told the story of the whale. And on the last page I wrote a resolution calling for a ten year moratorium on all commercial whaling.

I had no idea how important this issue was to become. A week before the conference began, I sent one of my assistants, Malcolm Roberts, ahead to Stockholm.

He discovered a movement afoot to throw politics into the middle of the entire conference. Young people from around the world had set up a tent city south of Stockholm. They were being mobilized to turn this historic world conference on the environment into a confrontation on Vietnam. Although I was against our country's actions in Vietnam, I was opposed to seeing this issue overshadow the conference and the environmental issues facing the world, just as I oppose those who exploit the Olympic Games for political purposes.

So we launched a counter strategy. We decided to rally those young people in that tent city behind another issue. That issue was our resolution on whales.

Secretary General Strong was contacted and enthusiastically gave his behind-the-scenes support. The morning after I arrived in Stockholm, I led a march on the old parliament building, the headquarters for the U.N. conference. Following me was a forty-foot whale built by the young people in the tent city. Out of that whale were broadcast tapes of whale music the beautiful sounds whales make as they communicate beneath the sea.

Following the whale were several hundred people, from every corner of the world, speaking many languages and representing every race. The police stopped us before we got to the old parliament. We invited them to join our march, and though they refused, and we weren't allowed to enter the parliament grounds, the delegates from around the world got the message.

That evening Malcolm and my son Joe slipped into the old parliament building and put a copy of the whale booklet in the mail box of every delegate and member of the press. The next day I lobbied the U.S. delegation and debated the Japanese delegate on TV. The following afternoon, as I sat in the gallery, the resources committee passed our resolution 51-3.

As I watched, I saw my little pamphlet on nearly two-thirds of the delegates' desks. This action had a galvanizing effect on the conference. It was the first real evidence that the governments of the world were serious about addressing these problems.

The next day, the Stockholm morning paper carried the blue whale symbol from the front of my pamphlet and called it "the new symbol of the United Nations."

Of course, the battle for the whales didn't end in Stockholm. The American delegation to the International Whaling Commission in London the following month buckled before the pressure of the Russians and the Japanese. But the fight has continued . . . and now more species have been placed off-limits and harvesting quotas are for the first time being honored.

During those fascinating days in Stockholm, there was one comment that hit me harder than any other. It lives with me today . . . and it is critical to understanding what the environment is really all about.

Although the Russians boycotted the conference, the Chinese were there in force. When their spokesman, Tang Yi, took the podium before the general assembly . . . Secretary General Strong sent a messenger to me in the gallery and asked me to come down and sit in the front row. I was very impressed by this man from China.

Of course I couldn't understand his language, and the translation through the earphones is always delivered in a monotone, void of emotion and conviction . . . but the man's beliefs were very obvious.

I could read them in his face and the intonation of his voice. He began with a counter-argument to those in the conference who wanted to blame all the world's ills on population growth. "In 1949, we had 450 million people in my country," he said. "They were miserable . . . living in poverty, sickness, and ignorance." "Now we have 800 million, nearly twice as many, and they are just a little better off."

He didn't say that his people had solved all their problems. But he made the point, that through hard work, in spite of the fact that his population was growing, the environment for those people had been, to some degree, improved.

Then he hit us with the clincher. The thought that is as timeless as Chinese philosophy of old. He said, "People are the most precious things on earth." It sounds so simple . . . so obvious., but in that phrase, Tang Yi gave the world a yardstick . . . a way to measure the many thousands of judgments we must make regarding our environment and the development of the earth's resources.

A world that does not conserve its children does not conserve its whales. It does not conserve its environment or its resources or its knowledge or its values. It is neither competent nor compassionate. Its ends are neither human nor humane. Those who have sold the environmental movement to the American public on television . . . have done so in terms of beautiful forests and open beaches, rolling hills, and tumbling brooks.

These are all extremely important. . . but there is a lot more to the environment than that. The environment can be a junkyard across the street. It can be a dust storm. It can be ugly architecture. In my view, it even includes the attitude of people. If there's a racist in your neighborhood, it's a bad environment. And if . . . and this is very basic if a man is cold, and hungry, and unemployed, he is in an ugly environment.

So what I want to do today is to shatter an image. To explore a narrow concept that has been peddled to the public. And to expand it to touch on all areas of life all living creatures including, and especially, the human being.

Some individuals in their zest for cleaning up the mistakes of the past, have so over-reacted they would ignore the needs of man. They equate the using of nature with the destruction of nature. When in reality, man cannot exist without using nature. In fact, it is meant to be used.

Just as a young woman must dedicate great amounts of time and energy to have and raise a child. Just so, nature must be used to fulfill its purpose. The secret is so well known that it sounds like a cliché . . . but it is so very true. We must use it, but not abuse it.

We must not isolate man from nature but make him compatible with nature.

God put a tree on earth to be used not just to be cut down, but to be used . . . perhaps for birds to nest in, or simply to be looked at for mere enjoyment to restore the spirit and perspective of man. If a tree grows somewhere unused by man or animal it is somehow wasted. Like a human being, it must be needed by someone.

But likewise, like a human being, it should not be exploited. Man, the only reasoning animal, has to be the one concerned about all life on earth. There's a bitter struggle going on in America. I call it the civil war of priorities . . . neighbor against neighbor, man against need . . . over preservation or use of nature and its resources.

Voices are raised, on the one side pleading, "give us work, give us energy for our homes." On the other side, they shout, "stop the rape of our environment, protect our wildlife and our wilderness." Somewhere in between there's a still small voice that says, "if we work together . . .if we look at the total picture . . .we can do it right."

We cannot condone exploitation of one resource at the expense of another resource, even if that resource has no dollar value . . .such as a sunset, a lonely stretch of beach, or the right to roam. But neither can we preserve untouched all those resources that man needs. All human needs must be taken into consideration, those of everyday necessity such as food and energy, and those of lasting beauty such as a wilderness, I am convinced we can make use and conservation compatible.

For the good of the human, they must be made compatible. I have no time for those who say they are dedicated to the environment but disregard people's needs. When you talk about the environment you are really talking about the world.

Wilderness is not the world.

The world is both in wilderness and people, in animals of rich variety, in water and air, in the world of modern technology and the world of timeless nature. Some people want to stop everything. They want to drive their sportscar but not produce the energy to make it go. They want other nations to do the drilling, pumping, refining, and transporting of oil, so that their own water and land be untouched by man.

This is no answer in a closed world system.

In fact it is a new form of imperialism under the guise of the holy cause of the environment.

In reality, they are saying, "Let other people's children choke on smog and play in polluted streams. Let other nation's wildlife be destroyed. All we care about is our own."

This philosophy, however misguided, is very persuasive.

I've encountered it in the country clubs of South Carolina and the beautiful homes in Santa Barbara, in the halls of universities, and the news rooms of large newspapers. I'll never forget my disappointment when I revisited a community in the south I had helped in 1970.

A company was going to build a plant that would destroy a beautiful estuary and the wildlife and marine resources that depended on it. As Interior Secretary, I stepped in. My position was not that the company shouldn't build. Instead I laid down the necessary standards so they could construct their plant and still protect the area.

When I returned two years later, several individuals told me they were going to fight against any industry using the resources in their area. They said they didn't care where industry found their resources as long as it wasn't where they lived. "We're going to keep them out at all cost," they said. "we can buy our resources from somewhere else." I was appalled by their attitude. I had thought they were environmentalists, but they couldn't care less about the environment in other parts of the earth. They just wanted to protect their own.

This double standard will come to haunt us. In fact, it has already begun. It is the worst kind of conservation. It is impossible to export pollution. We must clean it up. Because of this selfishness, and those preservationists who have taken an extreme position, disregarding human needs

We are witnessing now an environmental backlash in America. The pendulum is swinging. This is the result . . . not of those who legitimately want to clean up the environment . . . it's the result of those few . . . the minority of a minority . . . who want to stop everything.

Their aim is not to help us learn to do things right, but to stop us from doing anything at all. This was the faction that tied up the Trans-Alaska pipeline in the courts long after we had solved the legitimate environmental concerns. In 1969 and 1970 the environmentalists raised some very real issues about the Trans-Alaska pipeline, and they were right.

These questions had to be answered, because neither industry nor government nor the scientific community had the answers at that time.

Had the pipeline been pushed through in 1969 it would not have been just an environmental disaster, it would have been a total engineering disaster.

Let me explain.

By 1972, the scientific community, industry, and the government leaders had solved all the very real problems of the arctic environment and had answered the questions that were asked.

And yet most—not all—of the leading conservation groups still fought the pipeline project. That is where they lost a vast majority of the American public. That is where they lost their credibility. That is where they lost me.

They weren't committed to protect the environment at that point as much as they were committed to defend a position.. .the position that the pipeline . . . right or wrong. . . should not be built at all.

That was a drastic mistake.

I talked with many of the leaders privately, and I said, "it will hurt the cause for the environment, because you are going to alienate the people." Those who cared about the total, those who believed that man's needs had to be met in a compatible way, were forced to the other side.

They wanted the pipeline built, as long as it was being built correctly and safely and up to standard. We now know that American industry can incorporate environmental safeguards into the cost of doing business.

And the American public is willing to pay a little more to have blue skies, clean rivers, and open beaches open to all. But we cannot accommodate those who fanatically believe that to build is to destroy.

It's ironic how we honor the builders of the past . . .the brilliant mathematicians who designed the pyramids. . . the artists of Greece who fashioned their philosophy in stone. . . . the men of god in Europe who constructed cathedrals to elevate the human spirit.

These are the champions of civilizations past, and yet, many times, the builders of today are viewed as the bad guys. They used to roll out the red carpet for the doers. Now they roll out the criticisms, the restrictions, the bad press.

Developer has become a dirty word. In some cases this was justified. Many businessmen had no vision beyond the bottom line. We didn't build buildings that would produce a Michelangelo to paint their ceilings. We lost that sense of calling that creates a culture. Some builders use as their excuse the high cost of everything. . .and that, in turn, is blamed on environmental concern. . .and regulations for pollution control.

But the real issue is an attitude. . . an attitude in our builders our governmental leaders . . . our media . . . and our people as a whole. With the right attitude we can build a culture, a civilization to be proud of, and create an environment that enables the human being as well as the natural world.

That is what the true environmental movement is all about.

Your questions please.

###

The Irvine Lectures
Lecture No. 3
The Politics of the Environment

YESTERDAY WE TOOK A LOOK AT A REDEFINITION OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

WE BROADENED IT TO INCLUDE THE WHOLE LIVING OF LIFE.

AND WE TOOK IT AS FAR AS THE ATTITUDES OF PEOPLE.

THE QUESTION TODAY IS HOW DO WE DEAL WITH THE VERY REAL PROBLEMS OF THE ENVIRONMENT?

HOW DO WE FIGHT EFFECTIVELY TO BRING ABOUT CHANGE?

WE ARE IN AN ELECTION YEAR.

AND THE THEME OF THIS ELECTION . . . FROM BOTH CONSERVATIVE

REPUBLICANS AND LIBERAL DEMOCRATS IS THAT . . . IS THAT
GOVERNMENT IS TOO BIG . . . GOVERNMENT IS TOO OPPRESSIVE . . .
GOVERNMENT IS THE ENEMY.

THIS MAKES FOR GOOD SLOGANS . . . AND WILL WIN MANY VOTES . . . BUT
IT IS NOT THE WHOLE TRUTH.

WHEN IT COMES TO GRAPPLING WITH THE GUTTY ISSUES OF THE
CONDITIONS IN OUR CITIES AND THOSE PROBLEMS OF POLLUTION AND
PLANNING THAT KNOW NO BORDERS . .

. THE AVERAGE PERSON MUST LOOK TO GOVERNMENT FOR LEADERSHIP.

THAT'S WHY, THE TITLE OF THIS LECTURE IS "THE POLITICS OF THE
ENVIRONMENT."

OF COURSE, GOVERNMENT IS NOT THE ONLY VEHICLE.

CITIZEN ACTION IS ANOTHER VITAL WAY TO BRING AN ISSUE TO THE
PUBLIC'S ATTENTION.

AND WHEN THESE TWO FORCES START WORKING TOGETHER.....
SPONTANEOUS INVOLVEMENT FROM PEOPLE AND THE AGENCIES OF
GOVERNMENT . . . THEN YOU HAVE A WINNING COMBINATION.

I REMEMBER WELL THE FIRST EARTH DAY . . . APRIL 22, 1970.

I WAS IN THE CABINET AT THAT TIME AND VICE PRESIDENT SPIRO AGNEW
CALLED A MEETING OF SOME OF THE ACTIVE CABINET MEMBERS TO TRY
TO TALK US OUT OF PARTICIPATING.

IN FACT, A CERTAIN BLOCK IN THE WHITE HOUSE DIDN'T WANT ANY OF
THE ADMINISTRATION TO GET INVOLVED IN THE EARTH DAY ACTIVITIES.

THEY THOUGHT IT WAS SOME KIND OF SUBVERSIVE ORGANIZATION.

IN FACT, SOMEONE EVEN MENTIONED THAT APRIL 22 WAS LENIN'S
BIRTHDAY.

BUT THEY FORGOT IT WAS ALSO ARBOR DAY . . . THE TRADITIONAL
FESTIVAL FOR PLANTING TREES.

THE MEETING CAME TO NO AVAIL.

I HAD ALREADY GIVEN MARCHING ORDERS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF THE
INTERIOR.

ELEVEN HUNDRED OF OUR EMPLOYEES THROUGHOUT AMERICA APPEARED ON MOST OF THE COLLEGE CAMPUSES THAT WERE PARTICIPATING AND THAT ASKED US TO SPEAK.

IT WAS A WONDERFUL OCCASION.

A PERFECT EXAMPLE OF THE PUBLIC AND GOVERNMENT WORKING TOGETHER TO MAKE SOMETHING HAPPEN.

AMERICA IS MEANT TO BE A SOCIETY IN WHICH THE PEOPLE DECIDE. THIS IS A GOOD CONCEPT. IN FACT, IT IS A GREAT CONCEPT. WE WERE THE FIRST HUMANS IN HISTORY TO TRY IT.

OF COURSE, THE PUBLIC CAN ONLY BE EXPECTED TO MAKE WISE DECISIONS IF THEY HAVE ENOUGH INFORMATION ON WHICH TO BASE THEIR JUDGMENT.

THE TRUTH ABOUT WASHINGTON TODAY, AND THOSE WHO LEAD BOTH POLITICAL PARTIES, IS THAT THEY ONLY TRY TO EDUCATE THE PUBLIC ENOUGH TO WIN AN ELECTION.

THEY ARE NOT TRYING TO LEAD THE AMERICAN PUBLIC INTO A SOLUTION, BUT TO PUSH THEMSELVES INTO VICTORY.

ONE OF THE VICTIMS OF THIS CYNICAL APPROACH IS THE ENVIRONMENT.

PUBLIC CONCERN OVER THIS ALL-ENCOMPASSING ISSUE WAS CREATED BY SOMETHING MUCH DEEPER AND MUCH MORE FUNDAMENTAL THAN JUST POLLUTION.

IT STARTED IN THE AFTERMATH OF WORLD WAR 11 WHEN SOMEHOW WE LOST OUR DIRECTION AND BECAME A METALLIC, MATERIALISTIC SOCIETY.

WE STARTED TO CONFUSE FREE ENTERPRISE WITH FREE SOCIETY.

AND ALTHOUGH FREE ENTERPRISE IS VITALLY IMPORTANT . . . I AM A PRODUCT OF THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM AND MOST OF US ARE. . .IT IS NOT THE TOTALITY OF LIFE.

CERTAINLY IN THE MINDS OF OUR FOREFATHERS, IT WAS NOT MEANT TO DOMINATE ALL THE OTHER ESSENTIAL PARTS OF LIVING.

SOME SINCERE INDIVIDUALS AFTER THE WAR SPOKE OUT ON BEHALF OF VALUES OTHER THAN ECONOMICS AND WERE ACCUSED OF BEING AGAINST THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM.

IF YOU WERE NOT PRO-BUSINESS . . . RIGHT OR WRONG . . . YOU WERE LABELED ANTI-PATRIOTIC.

THIS LED TO A DEEP ALIENATION ON THE PART OF MANY DEDICATED AND GENUINE THINKERS.

THEIR FRUSTRATION INCREASED AND MULTIPLIED DURING OUR INVOLVEMENT IN THE VIETNAM WAR.

WITH THAT FRUSTRATION CAME DISILLUSIONMENT, AND THE TURMOIL THAT FOLLOWED IN THE STREETS AND ON THE CAMPUSES PRODUCED A RE-EVALUATION OF ALL THOSE VALUES THAT WE WERE TAUGHT AND ALL THOSE CONCEPTS WITH WHICH WE WERE BORN.

OUR ROLE AS A WORLD POWER WAS QUESTIONED, AS WAS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT.

SO WERE OUR PERSONAL LIFESTYLES AND GOALS . . . AND OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH NATURE AND THE WORLD GOD GAVE US TO LIVE IN.

THIS AWAKENING, THAT CAME INTO BEING IN THE LATE 1950s AND EARLY '60s, WAS SOMETHING WITH WHICH THE AMERICAN PUBLIC WASN'T COMFORTABLE.

BUT IT WAS THE BEGINNING OF THE RE-VITALIZATION OF AMERICA. THE CRITICS WERE QUESTIONING WHERE WE HAD PLACED OUR VALUES.

THEY WERE SEARCHING FOR WHAT AMERICA'S CONCEPT OF A FREE SOCIETY WAS ALL ABOUT IN THE FIRST PLACE.

WHEN THE PROTESTS MOVED TO THE STREETS, PEOPLE CAME TO ME AS SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR AND SAID THAT AMERICAN SOCIETY WAS BREAKING DOWN.

I DIDN'T SEE THIS AS A BREAK-DOWN IN AMERICAN SOCIETY . . . I SAW THIS AS A BREAK-THROUGH.

PART OF THIS BREAK-THROUGH WAS THE AWAKENING ON THE PART OF A NATION TO THE CONCERNS OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

TODAY THE SMALLEST CHILD IN THE FAMILY, OR IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD, OR IN THE CLASSROOM, UNDERSTANDS ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT.

HE UNDERSTANDS ABOUT THE GUM WRAPPER ON THE GROUND, THE WASTE OF ELECTRICITY WHEN LIGHT BULBS ARE LEFT ON, THE NEED FOR PEOPLE TO CARE ABOUT THE WONDERFUL CREATURES IN THE ANIMAL KINGDOM.

AND LIKEWISE, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE LARGEST INDUSTRY HAS COME TO UNDERSTAND THESE ISSUES TOO.

SO WE HAVE COME A LONG WAY.

MANY BATTLES HAVE BEEN FOUGHT, SOME HAVE BEEN WON, SOME HAVE BEEN LOST, BUT THEY ALL HAVE BEEN GOOD.

BUT AT THIS MOMENT, THE FUTURE OF THE CAUSE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT IS IN QUESTION.

THE OUTCOME WILL DEPEND UPON THE ABILITY OF ITS SPOKESMEN TO RE-ENLIST WIDESPREAD PUBLIC SUPPORT.

AND THIS MEANS POLITICS.

WE CAN ALL WORK AS INDIVIDUALS, AND THAT CAN HELP; BUT NO INDIVIDUAL CAN SOLVE PROBLEMS OF NATIONAL DIMENSIONS.

AND NO NATION CAN SOLVE THEM ON A WORLD SCALE.

GOVERNMENT MUST SET THE TONE BY WHICH THE ENVIRONMENT CAN BE PROTECTED AND BY WHICH THE ENVIRONMENT CAN BE USED.

IF YOU ARGUE THAT POLITICS IS INEFFECTIVE, I WOULD SAY YOU ARE BADLY MISTAKEN.

I DON'T SAY IT IS WITHOUT FAULT, BUT I SAY THAT THOSE WHO STAND ASIDE FROM THE POLITICAL PROCESS WILL BE SPECTATORS TO THE OUTCOME OF WHERE OUR SOCIETY ENDS UP.

THE WATERGATE TRAGEDY IS SEEN AS AN ILLUSTRATION OF THE CORRUPTION OF OUR SYSTEM.

BUT WATERGATE WAS THE WATERSHED OF 20TH CENTURY POLITICS.

I'M GLAD WE WENT THROUGH IT.

WE ARE PROBABLY THE ONLY NATION ON EARTH THAT COULD STAND IN FRONT OF THE WORLD NAKED AND SAY WE HAVE NOTHING TO HIDE.

WHERE WATERGATE APPEARED TO BE A WEAKNESS, IT REALLY WAS THE STRENGTH OF THIS NATION.

I KNOW OF NO OTHER SYSTEM ON EARTH THAT COULD GO THROUGH THE TURMOIL OF A RESIGNATION OF A VICE PRESIDENT, THE RESIGNATION OF A PRESIDENT, AND THEN THE APPOINTMENT OF A VICE PRESIDENT, AND THE APPOINTMENT OF A PRESIDENT, WITHOUT TERRIBLE UPHEAVAL.

NO, THE SYSTEM IS SOUND. WE CAN BE THANKFUL FOR THAT.

BUT OUR SYSTEM'S EFFECTIVENESS DEPENDS UPON THE KIND OF PEOPLE THAT WE PUT INTO THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.

YOU MIGHT SAY I HAVE A CONTRACTOR'S APPROACH.

I BELIEVE EVERY EXECUTIVE IN GOVERNMENT SHOULD HAVE TWO OR THREE YEARS EXPERIENCE IN CONTRACTING.

THE CONTRACTOR HAS TO RACE AGAINST THE CLOCK TO PUT HIMSELF OUT OF BUSINESS.

MUCH OF THE HEAVINESS IN GOVERNMENT TODAY COMES FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE MORE INTERESTED IN PROLONGING PROBLEMS THAN SOLVING THEM.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IS ESPECIALLY PRONE TO THIS TYPE OF THINKING.

SO OFTEN THE PLEA TO CONGRESS FOR LEGISLATION IS A COVER-UP . . . AN EXCUSE FOR SOMEONE WHO IS TOO AFRAID OR COMPLACENT TO ACT.

I'VE WATCHED THE PROCESS TIME AND AGAIN.

THE PUBLIC OR THE MEDIA PINPOINT A PROBLEM. GOVERNMENT REACTS.

BUT INSTEAD OF DEALING WITH THE ISSUE, THEY PREPARE LEGISLATION. . . SUBMIT IT TO CONGRESS WITH GREAT FANFARE . . . THE PUBLIC CALMS DOWN . . . AND NOTHING HAPPENS.

THE KEY TO GOOD GOVERNMENT IS AN ATTITUDE.

AS INTERIOR SECRETARY, I DISCOVERED THAT IF YOU WANT TO SOLVE A PROBLEM BADLY ENOUGH AND YOU'RE ACTING FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD, THERE ALMOST ALWAYS IS A WAY.

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND THE BODY OF LAW ALREADY ON THE BOOKS MAKES IT POSSIBLE FOR THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH TO ACT . . . IF IT HAS THE WILL AND THE DESIRE.

I WAS JUST FOUR DAYS IN OFFICE WHEN A SITUATION DEVELOPED THAT ILLUSTRATES MY POINT.

AN OFF-SHORE OIL RIG IN SANTA BARBARA BLEW OUT . . .

I TELL THE STORY IN MY BOOK . . . AND I WANT TO EMPHASIZE THE POINT OF THAT STORY.

I IMMEDIATELY FLEW TO THE WEST COAST TO INSPECT THE SITUATION.

ALL THE DRILLING RIGS IN THE CHANNEL WERE STOPPED SO THAT WE COULD ASSESS THE PROBLEM.

MY SOLICITOR AT THE TIME TOLD ME I COULDN'T STOP THEM. THEY HADN'T BROKEN A LAW. THEY WERE OPERATING WITHIN THEIR LEASES.

I COULD HAVE SAID, "THE LAW HAS TO BE CHANGED, AND THAT'S THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS."

BUT THAT BEAUTIFUL SANTA BARBARA AREA WOULD HAVE BEEN DEVASTATED.

I REFUSED TO LISTEN TO MY SOLICITOR. IN FACT I FIRED HIM.

IT WASN'T SO MUCH WHAT HE WAS TELLING ME, IT WAS HIS ATTITUDE.

I TURNED TO THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, EXPLAINED THE SITUATION AND TOLD THEM THAT BY MIDNIGHT I NEEDED AN ANSWER.

AT 10 P.M. I HAD A CALL.

THE STAFF AT JUSTICE HAD DISCOVERED THAT THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR COULD STOP OIL RIGS, NOT FOR AN OIL SPILL, BUT FOR "WASTING A RESOURCE."

I CLOSED THEM DOWN, UPGRADED THE REGULATIONS, AND BEGAN A FOUR-MONTH BATTLE FOR THE OIL COMPANIES TO ACCEPT ABSOLUTE LIABILITY WITHOUT CAUSE FOR POLLUTION ON THEIR LEASES.

WHEN THE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT WAS PASSED, IT WAS A BASIC ERROR TO SEPARATE NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

THE RESULT IS THAT WE HAVE ONE AGENCY, THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT, SET UP TO ENCOURAGE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT.

WE HAVE ANOTHER AGENCY . . . E.P.A THAT DOES ITS UTMOST TO DISCOURAGE THAT DEVELOPMENT.

THE RESULT IS THAT ONE FIGHTS THE OTHER, AND THE ENVIRONMENT IS THE LOSER.

THAT'S WHY IN 1970 I URGED THE "ASH" COMMITTEE ON EXECUTIVE RE-ORGANIZATION TO CREATE A DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

I HAD SOLD THEM ON THE IDEA..... BUT OTHER EVENTS INTERVENED . . . THE INVASION OF CAMBODIA, THE TRAGEDY AT KENT STATE, MY LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT, AND PROBLEMS WITH THE WHITE HOUSE STAFF.

OUR GREATEST MISTAKE IS THE KIND OF PEOPLE WE GROOM FOR THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT. WE HAVE LOOKED TO THE WRONG PLACE. WE HAVE BEEN IN A RUT IN OUR SEARCH FOR EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP.

IN MY BELIEF WE HAVE NOT HAD AN EXECUTIVE IN THE WHITE HOUSE SINCE FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT.

WITH THE EXCEPTION OF DWIGHT EISENHOWER, A MILITARY MAN, ALL OF OUR PRESIDENTS CAME OUT OF THE LEGISLATIVE SYSTEM.

THE LEGISLATIVE SYSTEM IS A SYSTEM OF COMPROMISE.

EACH REPRESENTATIVE HAS A SMALL CONSTITUENCY.

HE MUST FIGHT FOR HIS PEOPLE, YET HE HAS TO GIVE IN FROM TIME TO TIME TO MAKE THE TOTAL WORK.

THIS IS GOOD . . .THE WAY IT SHOULD BE.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS IS ALSO THE ROLE OF THE ADVERSARY TO WHOMEVER MIGHT BE IN THE WHITE HOUSE.

BUT THE JOB OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH IS TO MAKE SOMETHING HAPPEN . . . TO SET POLICY, TO GIVE GUIDELINES, TO PROVIDE THE CHARISMA THAT WILL UNITE AND SPARK THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

THIS REQUIRES THE EXECUTIVE MENTALITY.

LET ME GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE.

WHEN I BECAME INTERIOR SECRETARY I WAS DETERMINED TO REORGANIZE THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

THIS AGENCY, LODGED IN INTERIOR SINCE THE 19TH CENTURY, BECAME AN OPPRESSIVE BUREAUCRACY, STUNTING THE INITIATIVE OF GENERATIONS OF INDIAN MEN AND WOMEN WHO HAD LEADERSHIP ABILITY BUT WERE NOT ALLOWED TO EXERCISE IT.

I CALLED IN THE LEGAL STAFF OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND TOLD THEM I WANTED TO REORGANIZE THE BUREAU.

I WANTED TO PUT TALENTED INDIAN LEADERSHIP INTO THE TOP POSITIONS AND RESTRUCTURE ITS PROGRAMS FROM MANAGING THE INDIAN PEOPLE TO SUPPORTING AND SERVING THEIR NEEDS.

THE LEGAL ADVISORS TOLD ME THIS WAS A RADICAL CHANCE AND WOULD DEMAND A CHANGE IN THE LAWS.

I ASKED HOW LONG THAT WOULD TAKE.

THEY SAID THREE TO FOUR MONTHS TO WRITE THE LEGISLATION AND ANOTHER YEAR OR TWO TO GET IT THROUGH CONGRESS . . . IF AT ALL.

NOT BEING OF A LEGISLATIVE TEMPERMENT, I REFUSED TO ACCEPT THEIR PLAN.

I KNEW THAT WHAT I WANTED TO DO WAS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE.

AND I HAD THE STRONG BELIEF THAT THERE MUST BE A WAY WITHIN OUR SYSTEM TO MAKE IT HAPPEN.

I ALSO SUSPECTED THAT IF I WENT THE LEGISLATIVE ROUTE,

PLAN I HAD WOULD BE UNRECOGNIZABLE BY THE TIME CONGRESS WAS THROUGH WITH IT.

I TOLD MY LEGAL STAFF, "WE'RE NOT GOING TO PLAY THAT GAME. THIS RE-ORGANIZATION IS URGENTLY NEEDED. FIND ME A WAY."

AFTER A FEW WEEKS OF RESEARCH, THE SOLICITOR CAME INTO MY OFFICE WITH A REPORT.

HE AND HIS STAFF HAD DISCOVERED A LAW WRITTEN IN 1834, THAT GAVE THE SECRETARY THE AUTHORITY I NEEDED TO REORGANIZE THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

WE LAUNCHED THE PROGRAM IMMEDIATELY.

THE SUCCESS OF THE ENVIRONMENT IN THE POLITICAL WORLD DEPENDS ON ANOTHER FACTOR.

WE MUST NOT LET THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT BECOME THE SPECIAL INTEREST OF A FEW.

IT MUST REPRESENT THE TOTAL, AND THAT MEANS THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE AS WELL AS THE NEEDS OF NATURE.

SOME OF THE SPOKESMEN FOR THE ENVIRONMENT THAT I KNOW PERSONALLY, IN THEIR ZEAL TO MAKE A POINT, HAVE ALLOWED THEIR VIEWPOINTS TO BECOME NARROW.

THE ENVIRONMENT HAS BECOME PLANTED IN THEIR MINDS AS LITERALLY A WORLD WITHOUT HUMANS.

I HAVE SEEN THE ENVIRONMENT MOVE FROM A CAUSE TO A CRUSADE .. .AND, IN A RELATIVELY SHORT TIME, TO A SPECIAL INTEREST.

MY PLEA TO THESE FRIENDS OF MINE, AND TO ANYONE ELSE WHO CARES, IS NOT TO LET THE MOVEMENT REMAIN A SPECIAL INTEREST.

IT IS TOO IMPORTANT, BECAUSE THE ENVIRONMENT IS EVERYWHERE.

IT IS RELATIVELY EASY TO BE A CHAMPION FOR THE WALRUS, OR THE BEAVER, OR THE CARIBOU, OR A FAVORITE LAKE; BUT PART OF THE TRUTH THAT SOME ENVIRONMENTALISTS WILL NOT FACE IS THAT SOMEBODY SOMEWHERE HAS TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE TOTAL.

AND TO BE ABLE TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE TOTAL, YOU HAVE TO UNDERSTAND THE TOTAL; AND TO UNDERSTAND THE TOTAL, YOU HAVE TO ACCEPT THE FACT THAT NATURE HAS TO BE USED AND RESOURCES HAVE TO BE UTILIZED.

IT IS JUST AS IMPORTANT THAT MAN BE ABLE TO USE FRESH WATER AND WOOD FOR SHELTER AND FOOD TO EAT, AS IT IS TO SEE A CLEAR LAKE TO PADDLE A CANOE ON, OR JUST TO LOOK AT, OR TO WALK THROUGH A FOREST AND MEDITATE AND REJUVENATE ONESELF.

WHETHER IT IS IN AN ARCTIC VILLAGE OR A CITY SLUM, IT IS THIS OUTLOOK . . . THE OUTLOOK FOR THE TOTAL . . . THAT WE MUST EXPECT FROM OUR LEADERS IN GOVERNMENT AND INDUSTRY.

SOMETIMES THIS OUTLOOK CAN BE MISUNDERSTOOD OR UNPOPULAR.

IN DECEMBER 1972, I WROTE AN ARTICLE FOR THE NEW YORK TIMES, WARNING OF THE POSSIBILITY OF AN OIL EMBARGO BY THE ARAB NATIONS.

I WARNED OF THE DANGER OF VAST AMOUNTS OF MONEY BEING HELD BY THE OIL EXPORTING COUNTRIES, AND THE IMPACT SUCH FUNDS COULD HAVE ON THE MONEY MARKETS OF THE FREE WORLD.

I PREDICTED WHAT THIS SPECTACLE WOULD DO TO THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS.

THE LAST PARAGRAPH OF THE ARTICLE WAS THIS:

"IF WE WAIT UNTIL WE ARE FACED BY A DRAMATIC OIL SHORTAGE, THE CRIES OF THOSE OF US WHO CARE ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT WILL BE UNHEARD ABOVE THE ROAR OF HEAVY MACHINERY."

THE IMPENDING DANGER IN THE OIL IMPORT SITUATION HAD BEEN OBVIOUS FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS.

I WAS FACED WITH IT SOON AFTER I ARRIVED IN WASHINGTON IN 1969.

I DISCOVERED A POWERFUL CAMPAIGN TO CHANGE THE OIL QUOTA SYSTEM.

WE HAVE TRADITIONALLY PLACED QUOTAS ON FOREIGN OIL TO ENCOURAGE OUR DOMESTIC PRODUCTION.

THE CAMPAIGN WAS TO REMOVE THESE QUOTAS.

IT WAS A VERY POPULAR EFFORT LED BY A VERY ABLE MAN A FRIEND OF MINE . . . SENATOR MUSKIE OF MAINE.

THE AIM OF THAT GROUP WAS TO OPEN THE FLOODGATES TO FOREIGN OIL BECAUSE IT WAS CHEAPER.

THE AMERICAN CONSUMER COULD RELATE TO THAT.

WELL, I UNDERSTOOD THE POPULARITY OF THE ISSUE, BUT I ALSO UNDERSTOOD THE ECONOMICS OF IT . . . SO I OPPOSED IT.

PRESIDENT NIXON FORMED A CABINET COMMITTEE TO RESOLVE THE MATTER IN THE SPRING OF 1969.

GEORGE SCHULTZ, THEN SECRETARY OF LABOR, WAS CHAIRMAN, AND THERE WERE SEVEN MEMBERS ON THAT COMMITTEE, EACH WITH A VOTE.

AFTER ABOUT FOUR MONTHS, THE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED FIVE-TWO THAT THE FOREIGN OIL QUOTAS BE DROPPED.

I VIOLENTLY OPPOSED THE RECOMMENDATION, KNOWING FULL WELL THAT MY STAND WAS UNPOPULAR BOTH POLITICALLY AND ENVIRONMENTALLY.

PEOPLE WANTED CHEAPER OIL.

AND THE CONSERVATIONISTS WERE TRYING TO DISCOURAGE US FROM DOMESTIC PRODUCTION.

I HELPED HOLD UP THAT REPORT FOR ABOUT NINETY DAYS.

A MINORITY REPORT WAS WRITTEN.

IT WAS A VERY SMALL, THIN REPORT, COMPARED TO THE VOLUMINOUS REPORT OF THE FULL COMMITTEE.

I AGREED THAT FOREIGN OIL WAS CHEAPER . . . CHEAPER AT THE MOMENT . . . BUT I STATED THAT IF WE BECAME TOO DEPENDENT ON -IT, SAY OVER TWENTY PERCENT, IT WOULD NEITHER BE CHEAP NOR AVAILABLE WHEN WE NEEDED IT.

I WAS CONVINCED THAT IF THE SCHULTZ COMMITTEE REPORT WAS ACCEPTED, WE WOULD ONLY HAVE TO WAIT FIVE YEARS BEFORE WE WOULD BE SUBJECTED TO BLACKMAIL BY ANY OIL EXPORTING COUNTRY THAT WE DEPENDED ON.

YOU ALL KNOW NOW EXACTLY WHAT HAPPENED.

WE BOUGHT MORE AND MORE FOREIGN CRUDE OIL, UNTIL WE REACHED THE POINT WHERE WE WERE 25 AND THEN 30 AND THEN 35 PERCENT DEPENDENT.

THEN IT WAS SHUT OFF.

OIL QUADRUPLED IN PRICE RAISING THE COST OF LIVING TO THE AMERICAN PUBLIC RIGHT ACROSS THE BOARD.

THIS BECAME THE MOST INFLATIONARY FORCE IN AMERICAN SOCIETY . . .MUCH GREATER THAN THE OFTEN-ACCUSED REQUIREMENT OF PLACING ANTI-POLLUTION TECHNOLOGY ON OUR FACTORIES AND MANUFACTURERS.

IN SUMMARY, IF YOU CARE ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT, YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO GET INVOLVED IN DECISIONS OF THIS KIND.

YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE TO GET INVOLVED TN THE POLITICAL PROCESS.

DON'T WRITE OFF GOVERNMENT. MAKE THE SYSTEM WORK AS IT WAS DESIGNED TO WORK. THE ENVIRONMENT CAN BE PROTECTED.

IT CAN EVEN BE ENHANCED, BUT IT WILL NEVER HAPPEN IF WE TRY TO MAINTAIN THE STATUS QUO OR REDUCE THOSE SERVICES THAT MEET PEOPLES' NEEDS.

IT IS GOING TO TAKE DYNAMIC LEADERSHIP. IT IS GOING TO TAKE PUBLIC EDUCATION. IT IS GOING TO TAKE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT.

I THINK THE ENVIRONMENT IS A GREAT OPPORTUNITY. THERE'S A GREAT CHALLENGE THERE, BUT THERE IS A GREAT HOPE . . .

I BELIEVE AS AMERICANS, WE ARE CAPABLE OF MEETING THAT CHALLENGE.

IF WE IN AMERICA CAN'T DO IT, WE CERTAINLY CAN'T EXPECT ANY OTHER NATION TO DO SO.

YOUR QUESTIONS PLEASE.

###