

**REMARKS OF LYNN A. GREENWALT,
DIRECTOR-DESIGNATE OF THE BUREAU OF SPORT
FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
THE INTERIOR AT THE 1973 ANNUAL CONFERENCE
OF THE SOUTHEASTERN ASSOCIATION OF GAME
AND FISH COMMISSIONERS, HOT SPRINGS,
ARKANSAS, October 15, 1973.**

Ladies and gentlemen, it's indeed a pleasure to have the opportunity to share with you some of the things about which I feel strongly, and at the same time to have the 1973 annual conference of the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners as the forum for my first official expression as the new Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—almost.

As you may be aware, Secretary Morton was very kind to me at the International Association meeting in Orlando, Florida, when he announced my selection as his candidate for the office of Director. As he indicated, there are still some administrative hurdles to be overcome, but I am confident that my state of "almost" being the Director will be improved shortly and I will, in fact, have the job without that unfortunate qualifier added. "Almost" can be a tragic word, evoking a gulf that is impossible to cross, a success never quite accomplished. It is a word I dislike, and I am unhappy with "almosts" of any kind.

As I considered President Hulse's kind invitation to speak to the Southeastern today, I decided that it would be well to share with you some of my thoughts about the challenges that face fish and wildlife biologists and administrators now and for the next several years. I find it comforting and reassuring that Mr. Hulse has said much the same thing in his remarks this morning. It is doubly gratifying to find that a veteran administrator and well-known and successful conservationist has identified much the same kind of challenge for all of us in the years to come.

Like President Hulse, I am concerned with the proper—and correct—resolution of the conflicts I see arising between the exponents of utter exploitation of the Nation's resources and those who would ask us to forego any exploitation. There are those who speak for progress at any price, and those who advocate no change at all. The former occupy a position on the spectrum of possibilities that denies any need to think about—let alone look after—the welfare of the environment; the latter are exemplified by what a friend of mine characterizes as those who say, "save the environment—join the stone age." Reality dictates that neither is an acceptable course of action, that somewhere in between lies the real world of acceptable alternatives.

The problem I describe is perhaps best displayed by the current energy crisis. As the newspapers reveal, the Nation faces a major shortage of energy, ironically, both that derived from the consumption of fossil fuels, like coal and oil, and the generation of energy by the use of hydroelectric power. We face a bleak and somber winter, it is said, with the real possibility of gasoline rationing and heating fuel allocations. It is clear that this situation will lead to a headlong confrontation between the needs of the Nation's people and the requirements that the environment upon which we all depend be carefully considered. This confrontation can be a dramatic one, I think.

Consider the consequences when—and if—a major segment of the eastern seaboard of the United States wakes up some cold February morning to discover there is no heat and little prospect of any. This event would certainly precipitate intense pressure to improve the situation, probably without real consideration of the environmental consequences. I can tell you from bitter experience that it takes only the expression of displeasure based upon personal deprivation to move mountains—or to mine coal, or drill offshore oil wells, or create Alaskan pipelines.

How does this affect fish and wildlife administrators, biologists, and the host of folks who labor in behalf of the wildlife and wild lands of this country? It's really rather simple: we have pointed out for years that the best indicators of environmental well-being (or lack of it) are the fish and wildlife resources of an area. We have done this well, and with considerable accuracy. We've demonstrated beyond doubt that fish and wildlife populations clearly reflect the condition of the environment, and that we human beings who occupy the same environment are likely to be the next victims—after the birds and the fishes and other wild creatures—of environmental degradation. We have done this so well that we are looked upon as the sources of information about what should be done to keep this from happening.

It follows, then, it seems to me, that we in the fish and wildlife business are going to be cast into the center of the several confrontations that are sure to occur during the next two or three decades. In short, it will be our responsibility to identify the acceptable middle ground—the real world that exists somewhere between the extremes of philosophy I've referred to earlier. It will be up to us to say what can be done and how it should be approached, and to attempt to influence the decision-makers to take the course of action that yields the best of all possible worlds.

It's an awesome challenge, but one that I believe we can meet, if we accept it now. Furthermore, I believe we *can* find an acceptable middle ground. I think it's possible to have oil and wilderness and wildlife in Alaska; I'm sure it is possible to recover coal from the West without compromising environmental values to an unnecessary degree.

All of us should be aware, however, that this is not something that can be left up to "George"—that luckless fellow who is too often left to look after things for which we should all accept responsibility. It *is* something for which we all must be responsible—State and Federal, administrator and biologist, men and women throughout our ranks. It is a challenge that is likely to be more than any of us can meet fully—it is imperative that we work together in full cooperation. The stakes are far too high to do anything less.

Such an effort demands the highest level of professional competence. It will require the ability to predict with the greatest possible accuracy the consequences of the decisions that are likely to be made and to influence the outcome of those decisions with all our efforts. If we fail to do this to the best of our ability we may lose all we have gained during the past half century; failure to strike the right balance between use of the Nation's resources to meet the real needs of the time and the requirement that we strive to protect and preserve the things that make life really worth living for all our fellow citizens can lead to a kind of environmental anarchy that I don't care to contemplate.

I'm confident, however, that we can do it. I'm coming to know my own Bureau in a way that I have never known it before, in spite of almost two decades of service with it. I'm also learning — rapidly — that the Federal Government does not have a corner on the market of skills and commitment to the idea of rational living resource management. I have learned that the ranks of Federal and State resource agencies are filled with skillful, devoted, and knowledgeable people who are fully capable of meeting the challenges of the last years of the twentieth century. I am convinced that if this tough job can be done, our people can do it. Together we can meet this challenge and leave to our descendants a legacy of which we can all be proud.

I pledge to you the full effort and full cooperation of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in this effort; I know that you and your organizations will make a response in kind. I am, therefore, confident that we can almost literally have our environmental cake and eat it, too.

Let me say once again that it is an honor for me to meet with you and to share with you my thoughts about what I feel to be one of the most important issues and responsibilities facing fish and wildlife organizations today. Your hospitality has been exceptional, your reception has been warm and assuring, the evidence of your commitment and professional competence is overwhelming — I am delighted to be among you and to participate in your conference. Thank you all, very much.

AMERICA'S NEW CHALLENGE*

by

*Jim Guy Tucker, Attorney General
State of Arkansas*

Since 1776, the Spirit of America has been characterized by innovative progress. We are a nation with a tenacious adherence to purpose. We are a nation with an insatiable quest for excellence. Reward for these attributes has been our dominant position of power among the nations and our unsurpassed standard of living. However, the efforts expended in these accomplishments have borne heavily on our national resources. History tells us that our affluence — our sense of superiority, fostered an attitude of wastefulness which today presents America its greatest challenge. It is a challenge of a different nature from those of the past. We are now challenged not to expend and consume but to conserve and restrain. Our crisis of energy, a direct result of natural resource depletion, is a reality.

Our attitudes must be shaped to the preservation of these resources which allowed greatness in the past. Our will must be tempered to insure the perpetuation of our greatness for other generations.

You and your organizations have been the store keepers of one great aspect of our nation's wealth. The success with which you have acted in this role is measured by the continued existence of our wild life and woodlands. Your efforts to preserve our natural habitats insure continuing replenishment by allowing this resource to reproduce itself. Your record of achievement stands as an example to be emulated in our new efforts to preserve those resources which are by nature's device exhaustible and cannot reproduce themselves.

A review of the nation's energy and environment today tells us that we operate in a frame work of ideas, of beliefs, of regulations and of laws, developed yesterday. Our attitude towards those laws, indeed the laws themselves, are inadequate today and will be dangerous tomorrow.

Our national attitude towards energy was formed yesterday when we had unlimited quantities of low cost land, natural gas, oil, coal, cooling water and clean air. We sought growth and population, in industry and energy consumption, on the premise that growth was good. Today we face natural gas shortages, rationing, disastrous air pollution, destruction of land resources by strip mining for coal, serious questions concerning the safety and desirability of nuclear power plants, rapidly rising prices for fossil fuels, and urgent problems in locating sites for power plants, oil refineries and transmission lines.¹

All of these factors, hopefully, will bring us to a serious re-evaluation of the growth ethic.

How much energy should we use? What is the role of the State? In fact, what is your role?

*Given at the 27th Annual Conference of the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissioners, Arlington Hotel Hot Springs, Arkansas, October 15, 1973.

¹"Energy and the Environment: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow", speech presented by Jerome Kohl, Nuclear Engineering Extension Specialist, at the 26th Annual Southern Regional Conference of Attorneys General, Wilmington, North Carolina, April 17, 1973.