Now Only You Can Save Grand Canyon From Being Flooded...For Profit

Yes, that's right, Grand Canyon! The facts are these:

1. Bill H.R. 4671 is now before Rep. Wayne Aspinall's (Colo.) House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This bill provides for two dams—Bridge Canyon and Marble Gorge—which would stop the Colorado River and flood water back into the canyon.

2. Should the bill pass, two standing lakes will fill what is presently 130 miles of canyon gorge. As for the wild, running Colorado River, the canyon's sculptor for 25,000,000 years, it will be dead water.

3. If places the canyon will be submerged five hundred feet deep. "The most revealing single page of the earth's history," as Joseph Wood Krutch has described the fantastic canyon walls, will be drowned.

4. New artificial shorelines will fluctuate on hydroelectric demand. Some days there will only be an area of mud where the flowing river and living canyon now are.

4. Why are these dams being built, then? For commercial power. They are dams of the sort which their sponsor, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, calls "cash registers.

In other words, the dams aren't even to store water for people and farms, but to provide auxiliary power for industry. Arizona power politics in your Grand Canyon.

Moreover, Arizona doesn't need the dams to carry out its water development. Actually, it would have more water without the dams.

5. For, the most remarkable fact is that, as Congressional hearings have confirmed, seepage and evaporation at these remote damsites would annually lose enough water to supply both Phoenix and Tucson.

As for the remainder, far more efficient power sources are available right now, and at lower net cost. For the truth is, that the Grand Canyon dams will cost far more than they can earn.

6. Recognizing the threat to Grand Canyon, the Bureau of the Budget (which speaks for the President on such matters) has already suggested a moratorium on one of the dams and proposed a commission consider alternatives.

This suggestion has been steadily resisted by Mr. Aspinall's House Committee, which continues to proceed with H.R. 4671. It has been actively fought by the Bureau of Reclamation.

7. At the same time, interestingly, other Bureaus within Secretary Udall's domain (notably National Parks, Fish and Wildlife, Indian Affairs, Mines, Outdoor Recreation, Geological Survey) have been discouraged from presenting their findings, obtained at public expense. Only the Reclamation Bureau has been heard.

8. Meanwhile, in a matter of days the bill will be on the floor of Congress and—let us make the shocking fact completely clear—it will probably pass. The only thing that can stop it is your prompt action.

PLEASE CLIP THESE AND MAIL THEM.

<table>
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<tr>
<th>No. 1</th>
<th>No. 2</th>
<th>No. 3</th>
<th>No. 4</th>
<th>No. 5</th>
<th>No. 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The President</td>
<td>The White House</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>The President</td>
<td>The White House</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of the Interior</td>
<td>Stewart Udall</td>
<td>Department of the Interior</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>Wayne Aspinall</td>
<td>House of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 20, 1966

SIR: I urge you to return this newspaper with your personal endorsement of the NAS program on H.R. 4671.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 20, 1966


Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 20, 1966


Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 20, 1966


Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 20, 1966


Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 20, 1966


Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 20, 1966


Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]

THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 20, 1966


Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

[Name]
"Grand Canyon National Monument Is Hereby Abolished"
—From a bill submitted to Congress 15 days ago by Rep. Wayne Aspinall

Had You Thought The Battle Against Dams In Grand Canyon Was Over?

I "GOLIATH AND THE PHILISTINES"

ON FEBRUARY 1, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, speaking for the Administration, announced that the President had withdrawn all support for the Marble Canyon Dam, which would have altered irrevocably the Colorado River and ruined a large part of Grand Canyon. In fact, the Secretary reported, the Administration was now advocating expansion of Grand Canyon National Park to include this dam site (see map).

A great victory, everyone felt, and the Sierra Club offices were inundated with wires, letters, flowers, and pleasant encomiums praising us, as one note said, "for having slain Goliath and turned away the Philistines."

Naturally enough, most people assumed the whole struggle was over. But, as usual, it is not so simple. By now we have several "Goliaths" and as for the Philistines, they're coming back over the hill.

II "CASH REGISTERS"

FOR while we can now look forward to Administration support, this must be understood:

A number of special interest groups are still planning to push dam bills through Congress (and several have already been submitted). Or, failing that, Arizona could build them itself—without Administration support.

The key advocates of Grand Canyon dams are these:
1) Commercial interests within the Colorado Basin states, who see these dams (commonly called "cash registers") as a hypothetical means of financing an altogether different project: the turning of part of the Columbia River southward, benefiting themselves, particularly California.

2) Southern California real estate developers also gain from presumed dam revenues. (They would like to create still more of Los Angeles.)

3) And the Arizona Power Authority favors the dams. It contends they will provide cheap new sources of power to subsidize Arizona agriculture. (Two-thirds of Arizona's water goes to cattlefeed and cotton, already subsidized products.)

The dams will not provide anyone with water. In fact, through evaporation and transpiration they will waste enough water to supply Phoenix.

III TOURISTS IN POWER BOATS

SUPPORTERS of the dams suggest that building them in Grand Canyon is only good sense.

They point out that the new "recreational lakes" will benefit tourists in power boats who will enjoy viewing the upper canyon walls more closely.

Should we flood the Sistine Chapel so tourists can get nearer the ceiling?

And, to express their "willingness to compromise," some of the dam builders have lately suggested just one dam in Grand Canyon instead of two. Like one bullet in the heart instead of two. (The point, you see, is that if you alter the river's flow at any point you interfere with the life force of the canyon, the element which has made it what writers have called "a museum of the history of the world").

In some quarters, even Mr. Aspinall's bill (see headline) is considered a "compromise," as it would extend Grand Canyon National Park upstream while eliminating Grand Canyon National Monument (to make room for a 93-mile reservoir). It is felt that if you are flooding in the upper part of the park system, the public will no longer think it important.

But changing official names around don't change the fact that it is all part of Grand Canyon, and once flooded, whatever is under the water is gone forever.

IV MENTALITY

SO in summary, while the President's action is heartening, and the Grand Canyon struggle is beginning to turn, we remain in the same essential position, and that is this:

There exists today a mentality which condones destruction done in the name of commerce.

Commercial interests claim we who love the land refuse their "reasonable compromises." But it is forgotten that nearly the whole natural landscape has already been compromised...tract houses creep over the hillsides, concrete covers the landscape, forests are gone, waters are fouled, and even the air is heavy with waste.

It is not much to ask that some things at least be left "unimproved" to show we have love for those who follow.

If we can't save Grand Canyon for them, is there hope for saving whatever else nature our our still offers?

We have been taking ads, therefore, suggesting that there is something one can do. Thousands have already responded by writing letters (especially important), sending coupons, and also funds to continue the effort; and prospects have thereby improved. But as Grand Canyon legislation still stands a good chance of passage, please don't stop now.

Thank you.

(Better Hold Up On The Flowers and Cheery Wires, Just A Bit Longer)
SHOULD WE ALSO FLOOD THE SISTINE CHAPEL SO TOURISTS CAN GET NEARER THE CEILING?

EARTH began four billion years ago and Man two million. The Age of Technology, on the other hand, is hardly a hundred years old, and on our time chart we have been generous to give it even the little line we have. It seems to us hasty, therefore, during this blip of time, for Man to think of directing his fascinating new tools toward altering irrevocably the forces which made him. Nonetheless, in these few brief years among four billion, wilderness has all but disappeared. And now these:

1) There are proposals before Congress to “improve” Grand Canyon. Two dams would back up artificial lakes into 148 miles of canyon gorge. This would benefit tourists in power boats, it is argued, who would enjoy viewing the canyon wall more closely. (See headline). Submerged underneath the tourists would be part of the most revealing single page of earth’s history. The lakes would be as deep as 600 feet (deeper for example, than all but a handful of New York buildings are high) but in a century, silting would have replaced the water with that much mud, wall to wall.

There is no part of the wild Colorado River, the Grand Canyon’s sculptor, that would not be maimed.

Tourist recreation, as a reason for the dams, is in fact an afterthought. The Bureau of Reclamation, which has backed them, has called the dams “cash registers.” It expects the dams would make money by sale of commercial power.

They will not provide anyone with water.

2) In Northern California, four lumber companies have nearly completed logging the private virgin redwood forests, an operation which to give you an idea of its size, has taken fifty years.

Where nature’s tallest living things have stood silently since the age of the dinosaurs, much further cutting could make creation of a redwood national park absurd.

The companies have said tourists want only enough roadside trees for the snapping of photos. They offered to spare trees for this purpose, and not much more. The result would remind you of the places on your face you missed while you were shaving.

3) And up the Hudson, there are plans for a power complex—a plant, transmission lines, and a reservoir near and on Storm King Mountain—effectively destroying one of the last wild and high and beautiful spots near New York City.

4) A proposal to flood a region in Alaska as large as Lake Erie would eliminate at once the breeding grounds of more wildlife than conservationists have preserved in history.

5) In San Francisco, real estate interests have for years been filling a bay that made the city famous, putting truck houses over the fill; and now there’s a new idea—still more fill, enough for an air cargo terminal as big as Manhattan.

There exists today a mentality which can conceive such destruction, giving commerce as ample reason. For 74 years, the Sierra Club (now with 46,000 members) has opposed that mentality. But now, when even Grand Canyon is endangered, we are at a critical moment in time.

This generation will decide if something untrammelled and free remains, as testimony we had love for those who follow.

We have been taking ads, therefore, asking people to write their Congressmen and Senators; Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall; The President; and to send us funds to continue the battle. Thousands have written, but meanwhile, Grand Canyon legislation still stands a chance of passage. More letters are needed and much more money, to help fight the notion that Man no longer needs nature.

David Brower, Executive Director
Sierra Club
Mills Tower, San Francisco

☐ Please send me more details on how I may help.
☐ Here is a donation of $____ to continue your effort to keep the public informed.
☐ Send me “Time and the River Flowing,” famous four color book which tells the complete story of Grand Canyon, and why T. Roosevelt said, “leave it as it is.” ($25.00)
☐ Send me “The Last Redwoods” which tells the complete story of the opportunity as well as the destruction in the redwoods. ($17.50)
☐ I would like to be a member of the Sierra Club. Enclosed is $14.00 for entrance and first year’s dues.

Name
Address
City
State
Zip

*The previous ads, urging that readers exercise a constitutional right of petition, to save Grand Canyon, produced an unprecedented reaction by the Internal Revenue Service threatening our tax deductible status. IRS says the ads may be a “substantial” effort to “influence legislation.” Undefined, these terms leave organizations like ours at the mercy of administrative whim. (The question has not been raised with any organizations that favor Grand Canyon dams.) So we cannot now promise that contributions you send us are deductible—pending results of what may be a long legal battle.

The Sierra Club, founded in 1892 by John Muir, is nonprofit, supported by people who, like Thoreau, believe “In wilderness is the preservation of the world.” The club’s program is nationwide, includes wilderness trips, books and films—as well as such efforts as this to protect the remnant of wilderness in the Americas. There are now twenty chapters, branch offices in New York (Biltmore Hotel), Washington (Dupont Circle Building), Los Angeles (Auditorium Building), Albuquerque, Seattle, and main office in San Francisco.