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A PRESIDENTIAL POWER OF MONUMENTAL PROPORTIONS: DOES THE ANTIQUITIES ACT PERMIT THE REVIEW AND REVISION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS OR CAN THE PRESIDENT STEAL YOUR LAND?

On April 26, 2017, President Donald J. Trump issued Executive Order 13792 to the Department of the Interior, calling on them to review the size and scope of the twenty-seven national monuments created since 1996.1 Secretary of the Interior, Ryan K. Zinke, undertook this review with the purpose of providing recommendations as to whether any of these national monuments should be revised.2 While not expressly named in the Order, many had reason to believe that this review would target two of the most controversial and expansive national monuments created in recent years, the Bears Ears and Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monuments in Utah.3 President Trump likely found these monuments of particular interest, as they are home to significant deposits of coal, oil, and gas.4 As predicted, on December 4, 2017, President Trump announced scale backs to both the Bears Ears and the Grand Staircase, resulting in a loss of nearly two million acres combined.5

1. See Exec. Order 13792: Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act, 82 Fed. Reg. 20429, 20429 (Apr. 26, 2017) (issuing order to conduct review of national monument designations). The Order called for the review of all national monuments created since 1996 that were larger than 100,000 acres in size. Id.
2. See id. (permitting Secretary Zinke to suggest national monument scale back).
3. See Jodi Stemler, Trump Executive Order Targets National Monuments, Antiquities Act, 71 OUTDOOR NEWS BULLETIN (May 2017 ed.), https://wildlifemanagementinstitute/outdoor-news-bulletin/may-2017/trump-executive-order-targets-national-monuments-antiquities-act (discussing Order 13792 and actions taken in accordance with Order). During the signing of Order 13792, President Trump indicated that the Bears Ears would be a target by specifically naming this monument as an example of past abuses of the national monument designation power. Id. Secretary of the Interior, Ryan Zinke, also toured both the Bears Ears and Grand Staircase National Monuments shortly after the issuance of the Order 13972, and further indicated that these monuments were of particular interest to President Trump. Id.
While these scale backs are concerning to conservationists, they are also indicative of a larger issue regarding the definition of presidential power afforded under the Antiquities Act. While President Trump’s actions have already prompted the filing of multiple lawsuits, the judiciary has failed to provide an answer to this question. Conservationists in the Legislative Branch should look to define the presidential powers created under the Antiquities Act because their failure to do so could place many of the current national monuments at risk for destruction.

This Comment explores the metes and bounds of the power bestowed on the Executive Branch by the Antiquities Act and the potential impact that expanding this power could have on the fate of numerous national monuments. Part I examines the driving motivations behind the Antiquities Act and the broad powers encompassed therein. Part II discusses President Donald Trump’s Order 13792 and subsequent Proclamation, ordering the review and scale back of multiple national monuments, as well as the various actions taken by the conservationist community in response.


7. See Brent J. Hartman, Extending the Scope of the Antiquities Act, 32 PUB. LAND & RES. L. REV. 153, 154 (2011) (highlighting judiciary’s failure to define or limit powers created under Antiquities Act).

8. See Eric C. Rusnak, The Straw that Broke The Camel’s Back? Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Antiquates the Antiquities Act, 64 OHIO ST. L.J. 669, 723-29 (2003) (calling on legislature to enact bill defining Antiquities Act power); see also U.S. CONST. art. IV, § 3, cl. 2 (conferring Legislative Branch with power to control federal public lands); see generally UPDATE: Mining interests stake claims in Grand Staircase-Escalante and Bears Ears national monuments, THE WILDERNESS SOC’Y (Jun. 27, 2018), https://wilderness.org/blog/update-mining-interests-stake-claims-grand-staircase-escalante-and-bears-ears-national-monuments (discussing Grand Staircase’s scale back impact on landscape and regional economy). “Mining in Grand Staircase-Escalante could mean thousands of acres dug up and stripped, waterways polluted with soil and contaminants and wildlife driven away by dust and noise pollution. Local business owners and outdoor recreationists are also concerned about mining’s impacts on tourism, which has been a huge part of the region’s economy since the monument was established in 1996.” Id. Such effects are not a distant possibility as more than 20 mining claims have been staked on newly opened land since the announcement of the Grand Staircase and the Bears Ears scale backs. Id.

9. For a discussion of the presidential powers created under the Antiquities Act and the potential impact of expanding this power, see infra notes 16-189 and accompanying text.

10. For a discussion of the history and enactment of the Antiquities Act, see infra notes 16-46 and accompanying text.

11. For a discussion of the different interpretations of presidential power afforded under the Antiquities Act, see infra notes 47-76 and accompanying text.
Part III examines the creation of the Bears Ears and the Grand Staircase as examples of the controversy surrounding presidential designation of national monuments under the Antiquities Act. Part IV analyzes the competing interpretations of the powers afforded to the President and the Executive Branch under the Antiquities Act, focusing on the characteristics of the Act, which has created a sharp divide. Part V considers the efficacy of possible solutions to resolving the debate over presidential power under the Act. Finally, Part VI highlights the possible ramifications of permitting President Trump’s Order 13792 and subsequent Proclamation to go unchecked and the effect it could have on the status of all national monuments.

I. As Broad as the Grand Canyon?: History of Enactment and Debate Surrounding the Antiquities Act

On June 8, 1906, President Theodore Roosevelt signed into law what would later become known as the Antiquities Act of 1906. With one swift swoop of his pen, President Roosevelt bestowed upon generations of Presidents the broad discretionary authority to designate any parcel of land, within the borders of the United States, as a “national monument.” Such a designation sets aside the parcel of land for conservation purposes and protects it from development. Since its enactment, sixteen Presidents have used the Antiquities Act to designate 157 different parcels of land as national monuments. Although Congress enacted additional laws

12. For a discussion of the creation of the Bears Ears and Grand Staircase and the resulting backlash, see infra notes 77-99 and accompanying text.
13. For a discussion of competing interpretations and shortcomings of Antiquities Act, see infra notes 100-131 and accompanying text.
14. For a discussion of the possible solutions to resolving the controversy surrounding the Antiquities Act, see infra notes 132-168 and accompanying text.
15. For a discussion of threat posed by Order 13792 and President Trump’s subsequent Proclamation to national monuments, see infra notes 169-189 and accompanying text.
17. See id. at 483, 485 (discussing broad presidential powers delegated by Antiquities Act).
18. See id. at 488 (stating Antiquities Act allows for conservation and preservation of public lands).
allowing for the preservation of public lands and their resources, none proved to be nearly as successful and instrumental as the Antiquities Act in ensuring that American treasures remain protected.20

At the turn of the twentieth century, a desire grew amongst archeologists to provide wide protections for aboriginal objects and artifacts, and prevent private persons from collecting such artifacts and objects on public lands.21 The Antiquities Act of 1906 was a result of this desire.22 Although the protections provided in the bill, which would eventually become the Antiquities Act, were initially limited in scope, the final bill signed into enactment contained broader language.23 In fact, the language that Congress ultimately approved was expansive, and bestowed on Presidents the broad, discretionary authority to protect large tracts of land.24

Not only does this legislative history support the premise that the President has expansive powers under the Antiquities Act, but so does the plain language of the Act.25 The Antiquities Act states in relevant part:

“The President may, in the President’s discretion, declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated on land owned or controlled by the Federal Government to be national monuments . . . . The President may reserve parcels of land as a part of the national monuments.”26

This language unambiguously gives the President free reign to designate and protect any land within the United States as a national monument so long as it is connected in some way to a historic or scientific interest.27 Seemingly, the only limitation on this

then follow “Antiquities Act Designations and Related Actions” hyperlink) (listing all national monuments created by presidential action).

20. See Squillace, supra note 16, at 488-89 (stating Antiquities Act has been carrying much of burden for public land preservation). One reason why the Antiquities Act has been carrying much of the preservation burden is the ease with which a President can make a National Monument designation. Id.


22. See Squillace, supra note 16, at 477-78 (stating lawmakers drafted bill providing protections for archeological, historical, and aesthetic objects).

23. See id. at 477-86 (outlining Antiquities Act’s legislative history).

24. See id. at 485-86 (discussing expansive language that was ultimately approved).

25. See id. at 486 (discussing Act’s plain language).


27. See Squillace, supra note 16, at 486 (discussing Act’s expansive language).
power is that “parcels shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.”28 Although this limitation exists, it is seemingly inconsequential because various Presidents used the Antiquities Act to create expansive national monuments such as the Grand Canyon National Park and Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve.29 When creating a national monument, the President is not required to prove that the monument encompasses the smallest area possible; instead, the President is only required to prove that the object of protection is of “historic or scientific interest.”30 Even this requirement is minimal, however, as it requires the President to simply state that this is so.31

Although the Antiquities Act’s text is plain and clear, the power it instills in the Executive Branch has been challenged on multiple occasions.32 In such cases, challengers, many of who are the states where the monuments are located, sought to invalidate the presidential proclamation that established the national monument.33 Most challengers attempted to do so on the basis that either: (1) the area designated as a monument is devoid of any objects of historical or scientific interest; or (2) that the area designated is overly expansive for the purposes of achieving the proper

28. § 320301(b) (noting President’s limitation under Act).
29. See Monuments Protected Under the Antiquities Act, supra note 19 (listing size of national monuments created under Act). The Grand Canyon National Park in Arizona expands over 800,000 acres. Id. While, Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve in Alaska expands over nearly 1.5 million acres. Id.
30. See Cameron v. U.S., 252 U.S. 450, 455-56 (1920) (holding that President Roosevelt had authority to create Grand Canyon National Park). The Court implied that the size of the park is inconsequential to an analysis of whether the President had authority under the Antiquities Act to create a national monument when it focused its discussion on the fact that the Grand Canyon is of significant scientific interest, rather than the size of the park. Id. For a further discussion of the impacts from Cameron, see Squillace supra note 16, at 492.
31. See Kara McKenna, Trump’s monument review is as secretive as Obama’s designations, THE HILL (Sept. 5, 2017, 6:20 PM), http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/energy-environment/349299-trumps-monument-review-is-as-secretive-as-obamas (stating Antiquities Act does not require President to prove that monument is actually of historic or scientific interest).
32. See Cameron, 252 U.S. at 455-56 (challenging President Roosevelt’s designation of Grand Canyon); Wyoming v. Franke, 58 F. Supp. 890, 892 (D. Wyo. 1945) (seeking judicial declaration voiding presidential proclamation that created Jackson Hole National Monument was void).
33. See Mountain St. Legal Found. v. Bush, 306 F.3d 1132, 1134 (D.C. Cir. 2002) (looking to overturn six proclamations that established monuments in Arizona, Washington, Colorado, and Oregon); Franke, 58 F. Supp. at 892 (looking to have Proclamation No. 2578 overturned).
care and management of the objects protected.\footnote{Franke, 58 F. Supp. at 892 (reciting reasons why plaintiff believes designation is beyond scope of presidential power).} Courts have historically declined to define what an object of historic or scientific interest is or to quantify the area that is necessary to protect such objects.\footnote{See id. at 895-96 (discussing plaintiff’s claims).} Instead, courts found that these determinations fall squarely within the discretion given to the President under the Antiquities Act and that any finding of an abuse of discretion by the judiciary would be an infringement on the powers of the Executive and Legislative Branches.\footnote{See id. at 896 (stating judiciary has no right to question national monument designations made by President under Act).} Accordingly, even when the broad discretion afforded to the President under the Antiquities Act was challenged, it was consistently upheld and affirmed.\footnote{See Johannsen, supra note 21, at 456 (discussing judiciary’s broad interpretation of President’s power under Act).}

It is well established that the Antiquities Act bestows upon the President the power to create national monuments.\footnote{For a discussion of presidential power to create national monuments, see supra notes 16-37 and infra notes 39-46 and accompanying text.} It is much less clear, however, whether this power also permits the scaling back or complete revocation of a national monument’s status.\footnote{See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (discussing powers conferred under Antiquities Act).} Multiple Presidents, including Woodrow Wilson, Calvin Coolidge, William Taft, and Dwight Eisenhower, engaged in downsizing national monuments.\footnote{See Monuments Protected Under the Antiquities Act, supra note 19, at 1-6 (listing instances of downsizing by Presidents).} No President, however, has completely revoked a national monument’s status.\footnote{See id. (listing status of all national monuments designated under Antiquities Act).}

Although Presidents have engaged in the downsizing of national monuments in the past, it remains unclear whether they had the authority to do so because, up until recently, such presidential actions were not challenged.\footnote{See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (stating courts have never ruled on whether President actually has power to make changes to national monuments’ boundaries).} Due to the recent issuance of Executive Order 13792, calling for the review of over twenty-five national
monument designations, this issue has come to the forefront. Since the issuance of this Order, many environmentalists and conservationists have spoken out against it, claiming that the Antiquities Act gives the President the authority to create national monuments but not the authority to undo or modify them without an act of Congress. Such parties argue that the Act’s silence on reversal of a national monument designation is indicative that it is not permitted. To the contrary, parties in favor of the Order claim that the power granted to the President to create monuments also implicitly includes the power of reversal.

II. AS EXPANSIVE AS JACKSON HOLE?: EXECUTIVE ORDER 13792 AND PRESIDENT TRUMP’S ASSAULT ON NATIONAL MONUMENTS

On April 26, 2017, President Donald J. Trump signed Executive Order 13792, calling for:

“a review of all Presidential designations or expansions of designations under the Antiquities Act made since January 1, 1996, where the designation covers more than 100,000 acres, where the designation after expansion covers more than 100,000 acres, or where the Secretary determines that the designation or expansion was made without adequate public outreach and coordination with relevant stakeholders, to determine whether each designation or expansion conforms to the policy set forth in section 1 of this order.”

The Order stated that the review was to be undertaken to ensure that national monument designations made during this time were “made in accordance with the requirements and original objectives of the Act and appropriately balance[d] the protection of...  

43. See id. (stating President’s power to downsize monuments is currently at issue).

44. See Bettina Boxall, California attorney general to Trump: You can’t touch our national monuments, LOS ANGELES TIMES (June 8, 2017, 3:45 PM), http://beta.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-california-monuments-20170608-story.html (arguing President Trump is not permitted to modify or undo national monument designations).


46. See id. (stating argument in favor of review and revision of national monument designations).

landmarks, structures, and objects against the appropriate use of
Federal lands and the effects on surrounding lands and communi-
ties." The Order directed the Secretary of the Interior, Ryan K.
Zinke, to consider a number of different factors in reviewing these
designations and making his recommendations. Additionally, it
directed him to issue a report summarizing the findings of his re-
view. This report was to include recommendations for presiden-
tial actions, legislative proposals, or other actions that should be
appropriately undertaken.

On December 4, 2017, upon the report and recommendations
of Secretary Zinke, President Trump issued a proclamation that
called for the scaling back of both the Bears Ears National Monu-
ment and the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument.
The proclamation called for an eighty-five percent reduction in the
size of the Bears Ears and a near fifty percent reduction in the size
of the Grand Staircase. Together, these scale backs resulted in
the loss of nearly two million acres of national monument land and
constituted the greatest downsizing of protected federal land in his-

48. Id. (stating policy behind review).
49. Id. at 20429-30 (laying out considerations that must be taken into account
when reviewing national monument designations). The order specifically states
that the Secretary should consider:
(1) the requirements and original objective of the [Antiquities] Act, in-
cluding the Act’s requirement that reservations of land not exceed
‘the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management
of the objects to be protected’;
(2) whether the designated lands are appropriately classified under the
Act as ‘historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, [or]
other objects of historic or scientific interest’;
(3) the effects of a designation on the available uses of designated Fed-
eral lands, including consideration of the multiple-use policy of sec-
tion 102(a)(7) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43
U.S.C. 1701(a)(7)), as well as the effects on the available uses of Fed-
eral lands beyond the monument boundaries;
(4) the effects of a designation on the use and enjoyment of non-Federal
lands within or beyond monument boundaries;
(5) concerns of State, tribal, and local governments affected by a desig-
nation, including the economic development and fiscal condition of
affected States, tribes, and localities;
(6) the availability of Federal resources to properly manage designated
areas; and
(7) such other factors as the Secretary deems appropriate.
50. Id. at 20430 (directing Secretary to issue final report 120 days after
Order).
51. See id. (requiring Zinke to create report).
52. See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (discussing President Trump’s scale backs to
two national monuments).
53. See id. (discussing substance of proclamation).
It also opened up this previously protected land to all sorts of commercial activity including: oil and gas extraction, mining, and logging.55

Following President Trump’s proclamation, on December 5, 2017, Ryan Zinke released a copy of his final report and recommendations.56 In this Report, Zinke suggested that in recent years, Presidents have acted outside the “narrow” scope of the Antiquities Act by using it to restrict “public access, prevent hunting and fishing, burden private land, or eliminate traditional land uses.”57 Zinke argued that the authority to make such protective land designations falls not within the power of the Executive Branch but instead, within the power of Congress.58 It is upon this premise that Zinke conducted his review and made his recommendations.59

Zinke’s review was not limited to the Bears Ears and the Grand Staircase.60 In fact, the report reviewed twenty-five other national monuments, placing a total of twenty-seven national monuments under review.61 Of these twenty-seven monuments, Zinke made recommendations regarding ten of them.62

Although Zinke seemingly made individualized recommendations for each of the ten monuments, upon reading the recommendations, it is clear that they were simply a collection of similarly broad language that stated the national monuments “should be amended” or the “boundary should be revised” on the basis of “appropriate authority, including lawful exercise of your discretion granted by the [Antiquities] Act.”63 Zinke’s report offered Presi...
dent Trump no specific recommendations as to how President
Trump should revise each monument and its boundaries.64 Instead, the report ended with a promise for more specific recom-
mendations stating, “[s]pecific monument modification measures
will be submitted separately should you concur with the monument
modification recommendations in this Final Report.”65

Despite the lack of specific recommendations, President
Trump’s proclamation on December 4, 2017 called for specific
scale backs to both the Bears Ears and the Grand Staircase.66 Even
if one agrees that President Trump is authorized under the Antiqui-
ties Act to exercise his discretion in implementing such scale backs,
the issue of determining what information he relied on in exercis-
ing his discretion still remains unknown.67 It is possible that Presi-
dent Trump’s Proclamation relied upon “[s]pecific monument
modification measures” promised at the end of Zinke’s report.68
This, however, calls into question what information Zinke relied
upon in making his report and recommendations.69 Concerned
conservationist groups filed multiple Freedom of Information Act
(FOIA) requests after the proclamation, requesting that the U.S.
Department of the Interior and agencies alike provide them access
to the documents and information Zinke relied upon in making his

64. See id. (lacking any specific recommendations about how national monu-
ments should be downsized and/or changed).
65. Id. at 18 (promising more specific recommendations in future).
66. See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (discussing content of President Trump’s proclam-
ation regarding national monuments).
67. See Zinke, supra note 57, at 9-18 (making general recommendations but
lacking any specific recommendations).
68. See id. at 18 (promising additional information should Zinke’s recommenda-
tions be accepted).
69. See generally id. at 1-20 (discussing methodology and process generally).
While the Zinke Report discusses the review process and factors considered gener-
ally, it fails to provide any specific information about what actually lead him to his
recommendations. Id. In fact, in July 2018, internal documents released dem-
onstrated that Zinke’s team dismissed data received from the Bureau of Land Man-
age ment, which showed that the Bears Ears and Grand Staircase National
Monument protections safeguarded archaeological treasures and boosted tourism
in the region. See Randi Spivak, Unredacted Interior documents show Zinke’s monuments
review was a sham, THE HILL (July 30, 2018, 8:00am), https://thehill.com/opinion/
energy-environment/399275-unredacted-interior-documents-show-zinkes-monu-
ments-review-was-a (discussing contents of internal documents). These internal
documents revealed that Zinke and his team largely ignored significant scientific
economic evidence as well as millions of public comments in recommending
scale backs at these national monuments. Id. These internal documents include
internal emails that revealed oil and gas exploration was the true motivation be-
hind the decision to shrink the Bears Ears National Monument. Id.
The U.S. Department of the Interior and the other agencies, however, failed to respond to these requests, keeping these concerned agencies in the dark about what prompted Zinke to recommend such expansive scale backs. In addition to litigation regarding Zinke’s failure to respond to FOIA claims, multiple parties filed lawsuits in response to President Trump’s Proclamation. On December 4, 2017, just hours after President Trump issued his proclamation, multiple conservation groups as well as several Native American tribes filed lawsuits opposing the scale backs to the Grand Staircase National Monument. Additionally, on December 7, 2017, conservation groups filed a lawsuit opposing the scale backs to the Bears Ears National Monument. Although these lawsuits constitute separate actions, they all make the same allegation: the Antiquities Act authorizes Presidents to create national monuments, but does not authorize Presidents to abolish them in whole or in part. While these lawsuits do not constitute the first attack on presidential power under the Antiquities Act, they are the first to directly raise the question of presidential power to revoke, in whole or in part, a national monument’s status.

---

71. See id. at 3 (highlighting all FOIA requests have not been responded to).
72. See National Monuments At Risk: An Executive Order jeopardizes Monumental Treasures, supra note 6 (discussing lawsuits filed in response to scale backs at Bears Ears and Grand Staircase).
73. See id. (highlighting lawsuits filed by conservationists and Native American tribes regarding Grand Staircase).
74. See id. (discussing lawsuit regarding Bears Ears).
76. See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (discussing how courts have never addressed President’s ability to make changes to national monuments); see also Utah Ass’n of Cty’s v. Bush, 316 F. Supp. 2d 1172, 1177 (D. Utah 2004) (alleging President Clinton’s designation of Grand Staircase was abuse of discretion afforded under Antiquities Act).
III. As Far-Reaching as Glacier Bay?: The Bears Ears and Grand Staircase Demonstrate the Sharp Debate Regarding the Antiquities Act

As there are currently numerous national monuments, it may seem curious that President Trump’s administration singled out the Grand Staircase and the Bears Ears National Monuments for scale backs. The history of and public’s reaction to the creation of these monuments demonstrates why a pro-development President, like President Trump, would choose to target these monuments first. Both monuments serve as good examples of the controversy that lies at the heart of most national monument designations: massive presidential land grabs with little consultation or appreciation for the impact they have on the communities that lie within them.

On September 18, 1996, President Bill Clinton issued Proclamation 6920, setting aside 1.7 million acres of land in Utah and establishing the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. Just over ten years later, President Barack H. Obama set aside an additional 1.35 million acres of Utah’s land, creating the Bears Ears National Monument. This meant that, collectively, President Clinton and President Obama set aside over three million acres of Utah’s land for conservation.

The magnitude of these designations received disapproval from the citizens of Utah. After the creation of the Grand Staircase, Utah senators, Orrin Hatch and Bob Bennett, introduced the

---

77. See Monuments Protected Under the Antiquities Act, supra note 19, at 1-11 (listing all presidentially created national monuments). Some of the 157 national monuments cannot be reviewed and revised in their entirety by presidential order as a handful, while originally preserved under the Antiquities Act, have subsequently been preserved in part pursuant to other congressional laws. See Squillace, supra note 16, at 488-89.

78. For a discussion of the public outcry and implications of the creation of the Grand Staircase and the Bears Ears, see infra notes 83-99 and accompanying text.

79. For a discussion of the controversy that surrounds national monument designations, see infra notes 103-108 and accompanying text.

80. See Rusnak, supra note 8, at 669-70 (discussing creation of Grand Staircase).

81. See Monuments Protected under the Antiquities Act, supra note 19, at 10 (stating information regarding Bears Ear Monument).

82. See id. at 2-7, 10 (listing all national monuments in Utah). These three million acres are not the extent of Utah’s land preserved under the Antiquities Act as there are numerous additional national monuments in this state. Id.

83. See Rusnak, supra note 8, at 671 (discussing reaction of Utahans to Grand Staircase designation).
National Monument Fairness Act of 1997.\textsuperscript{84} In his address to the Senate, Senator Hatch highlighted the lack of local and state consultation required under the Antiquities Act, and compared the designation of the Grand Staircase to the attack on Pearl Harbor, which was taken without notice and by complete surprise.\textsuperscript{85} He called President Clinton’s designation “the mother of all land grabs” and characterized it as “all backwards” as it was designated without full consideration of its impact on the surrounding community.\textsuperscript{86} Finally, Senator Hatch appealed to his colleagues in the Senate to join him in support of his National Monuments Fairness Act of 1997, which would require the President to consult the governor of the state affected by the proposed proclamation and, acquire congressional approval of the designation prior to it taking effect.\textsuperscript{87} Although his proposed Act never became law, Senator Hatch’s statements remain indicative of the sentiments of those opposed to the wide presidential authority afforded under the Antiquities Act.\textsuperscript{88}

In 2016, this debate resurfaced when President Obama created the Bears Ears National Monument.\textsuperscript{89} With the establishment of the Bears Ears, Utah’s Congressmen spoke out vehemently against presidential authority under the Antiquities Act and took action to undue the designation.\textsuperscript{90} Multiple Utah legislators spoke out against the designation calling it an “arrogant act by a lame duck president” and a “midnight monument [that] is a slap in the face to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{85} See id. (stating national monument designation came as complete surprise to lawmakers). Senator Hatch emphasizes that in making this designation, President Clinton engaged Utah in “no consultation, no hearings, no town meetings, no TV or radio discussion shows, no nothing.” Id.
\item \textsuperscript{86} See id. (stating President Clinton designated Grand Staircase and expects Utah to simply make designation work for them). Senator Hatch highlighted the lack of appreciation that Presidents, such as President Clinton, have for the real-life implications that such designations have on local communities, stating that he just “hope[s] the President will be there to help our people in rural Utah” as the designation is implemented. Id.
\item \textsuperscript{87} See id. (discussing safeguards created in his proposed National Monument Fairness Act of 1997 will adequately protect interest of people both in states affected by designations and nationwide).
\item \textsuperscript{88} See id. at S 2564 (stating persons affected by designations).
\item \textsuperscript{90} See id. (discussing reactions of Utah Congressmen to President Obama’s designation).
\end{itemize}
the people of Utah.”91 Utah Congressman, Rob Bishop, referred to the Antiquities Act as the “most evil act ever invented,” telling anyone who likes the way it is constructed to “die.”92

Much like Senator Hatch, Congressman Bishop also introduced a bill to the House of Representatives, H.R. 3990, with the purpose “[t]o amend title 54, United States Code, to reform the Antiquities Act of 1906, and for other purposes.”93 Bill 3990, if enacted, would revise the language of the Antiquities Act and place specific limitations on the permissible size and boundaries of national monuments.94 It would not only place major restrictions on the President’s ability to create new national monuments under the Antiquities Act, but also potentially place many current national monuments under review.95

As they typically do when presented with a proposal to amend the Antiquities Act, conservationists opposed any changes and spoke out against the enactment of Bill 3990.96 A statement made by conservationist, Collin O’Mara, in reaction to Bill 3990, demonstrates conservationists’ sentiments on changing the Antiquities Act, stating that such changes do “[n]othing less than [place] our nation’s public lands heritage and a core part of our American identity at stake . . .” and destroys the “legacy built by Theodore Roosevelt and his successors from both parties.”97 What conserva-

91. Id. (quoting Utah Senator Mike Lee and Utah Congressman Jason Chaffetz).
92. Id. (quoting Congressman Bishop).
94. See id. at § 2 (outlining new qualification requirements for objects of antiquity and size limitations for national monuments). Specifically, Bill 3990 replaces the terms “historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest” with “object or objects of antiquity.” Id. at § 2(1). It also replaces the phrase “confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected” with “in accordance with the limitations outlined in subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h).” Id. at § 2(2). Additionally, Bill 3990 explicitly gives the President the power to reduce the size of national monuments, restrict the federal government’s power to designate privately owned land as a national monument, and explicitly defines terms used throughout the Act. Id. at § 2(j), (k), (n).
95. See id. at § 2(j) (enabling President to review established monuments).
97. Id. (quoting Collin O’Mara regarding Bill 3990). O’Mara, the President and CEO of the National Wildlife Federation, called on conservationists and state affiliates to preserve the long legacy created under the Antiquities Act, which he believes would be at risk if Bill 3990 is enacted. Id.
tionists failed to anticipate, however, was that Utah’s disgruntled legislators would not have to wait until the enactment of Bill 3990 to get what they desired. With the issuance of Order 13792 and his subsequent proclamation, President Trump unilaterally asserted that the presidential review and revision contemplated by Bill 3990 is permitted under the Antiquities Act.

IV. AS AMPLE AS ACADIA?: LOOKING FOR THE ROOT OF THIS DEEP DIVIDE

While President Trump’s Order 13972 and subsequent proclamation unabashedly stands for the proposition that the Antiquities Act bestows upon the President the power to review and revise national monuments designations, in actuality, this power is not so clear. In fact, there exists a deep rift on this issue between conservationists on one side, looking to preserve national monuments, and pro-development minded persons on the other, looking to open access to resource rich national monument land. The ability to review and modify national monuments, encapsulated by both Bill 3990 and President Trump’s proclamation, is controversial because, like many federal laws, the Antiquities Act is silent on how to undo an action taken in accordance with the power it affords.

Conservationists, in favor of national monument preservation, argue that the Antiquities Act gives the President wide authority to simply create national monuments. The Act’s silence on the power to revoke or revise these designations indicates that the President does not have this power. Accordingly, national monument designations made under the Antiquities Act are permanent and unchangeable.

To the contrary, pro-development persons, in favor of national monument review and revision, claim that the Antiquities Act’s si-
lence on the power to revoke or revise is not dispositive. In fact, like many actions taken by the President according to his statutory power, this silence demonstrates that the President has the implied authority to revoke a designation. Presidents often revoke executive orders issued on the basis of statutory power similar to that given in the Antiquities Act, and courts have never held that the law did not permit such revocations.

Seemingly, the reason for such competing interpretations and controversy is the broad and expansive language of the Antiquities Act and the ambiguities created as a result. The United States Constitution gives to Congress the “[p]ower to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . . .” As such, Congress is attributed the task of managing all public lands. With the enactment of the Antiquities Act, however, Congress conveyed some of this power to the Executive Branch permitting the President to create national monuments. While the power conferred on the President in the Act is seemingly concurrent with that of Congress, it is also absolute in the sense that when creating a new national monument, the President is not required to consult with Congress or seek congressional approval.

In addition to not needing the approval of Congress, the President is also not required to consult local or state authorities regarding the designation. As a result, the Antiquities Act empowers the President to create national monuments that are vastly contrary to the valid interests of local residents and their state legislators.

Although the President may view a national monument as territory...
that must be preserved, it is likely that those living in and around the monument see it as a source of income of which they are being robbed.\textsuperscript{116} When this is considered in the context of the breadth with which generations of Presidents exercised this power, it becomes evident why national monument designations have been so controversial.\textsuperscript{117}

Although there are surely conflicting viewpoints regarding the breadth and meaning of the authority created under the Antiquities Act, this conflict truly comes down to one thing: a lack of transparency.\textsuperscript{118} Those opposed to the current construction of the Antiquities Act take issue with the lack of transparency in regard to how a President creates a national monument.\textsuperscript{119} Even those in support of the Act’s current construction take issue with the lack of transparency in regards to how the President would review and revise national monuments.\textsuperscript{120}

The principle reason for this lack of transparency is that the Antiquities Act affords the President almost absolute power to create national monuments.\textsuperscript{121} The Act does not require Presidents to affirmatively prove that the object preserved is an object of historical or scientific significance nor that the parcel preserved encompasses the smallest area necessary for preservation of that object.\textsuperscript{122} Therefore, Presidents are empowered to designate large tracts of land as national monuments without having any actual accountability for their decision-making process and determination.\textsuperscript{123} This lack of accountability applies not only in the context of creation but, assumedly, would also apply to any review and revision of na-

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{116} See Rusnak, \textit{supra} note 8, at 669-70 (contrasting different possible perspectives regarding public land).
\item\textsuperscript{117} See \textit{Monuments Protected under the Antiquities Act, supra} note 19, at 1-11 (listing all 157 national monuments created by Presidents under Antiquities Act).
\item\textsuperscript{118} See McKenna, \textit{supra} note 31 (discussing lack of transparency in application of Antiquities Act).
\item\textsuperscript{119} See id. (stating President may make unilateral designation under Antiquities Act without any explanation).
\item\textsuperscript{120} See id. (discussing how Zinke report has added fuel to fire for lack of transparency critics).
\item\textsuperscript{121} See id. (stating Antiquities Act is ripe for abuse because national monument designations are unilaterally made by President).
\item\textsuperscript{122} See id. (highlighting President does not have to provide proof of determinations). The President does not need to substantiate his decision in any meaningful way but instead, can create a monument with the “use of the few magic words on the face of the proclamation.” \textit{Id}.
\item\textsuperscript{123} See McKenna, \textit{supra} note 31 (highlighting that Antiquities Act leaves monument designations up to President’s sole discretion).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
tional monuments. This makes it simple for Presidents, looking to advance their own political agendas, to abuse the Antiquities Act.

Accordingly, simply expanding the President’s authority under the Antiquities Act to include the power to review and revise national monuments would not provide a remedy for the lack of transparency and abuse of power. In fact, it would exacerbate it. As demonstrated by President Trump’s Order 13792, providing future Presidents with the power to review and revise national monuments does not remedy the concerns of those opposed to the Antiquities Act’s current construction. Similar to the power to create national monuments, Presidents looking to advance their own political agendas and interests could abuse the power to review and revise the designations by either expanding, shrinking, or even completely undoing their predecessors’ actions. This would create the potential for a political back and forth in which monuments would be subject to expansion under more pro-conservation minded Presidents and reduction under more pro-development minded Presidents. The fate of national treasures such as the Grand Staircase and the Bears Ears cannot be subject to such a political tug-of-war.

124. For a discussion of lack of transparency regarding Order 13792 and President Trump’s subsequent Proclamation, see supra notes 63-71 and accompanying text.

125. See McKenna, supra note 31 (stating Antiquities Act is ripe for abuse by Presidents looking to expand their own environmental legacies).

126. See id. (cautioning against instituting review and revision process that lacks transparency). A behind-closed-doors review and revision process further perpetuates one of the biggest criticisms of the Antiquities Act: a lack of transparency. Id.

127. See id. (discussing implications of permitting review and revision).

128. See id. (highlighting President Trump’s review and revision was lacking in transparency).

129. See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (discussing how President Trump’s Order 13792 was aimed at undoing national monuments President Obama created).

130. See id. (highlighting President Trump’s scale backs were aimed at protections put in place by his democratic predecessors). The Trump administration is more development minded, pushing for fewer restrictions for development on public land. Id.

131. See id. (cautioning against reversing protections for national monuments). Environmentalists say that President Trump’s decision threatens to destroy some 100,000 sites of archeological importance. Id.
V. AS IMMENSE AS THE VIRGIN ISLANDS CORAL REEF?: AN APPEAL TO THE LEGISLATURE TO FINALLY SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

As expanding Executive power to include the power to review and revise national monuments does not provide a solution to resolving the controversy surrounding the Antiquities Act, one must turn to the Judicial and Legislative Branches for a resolution.132 Previously, parties looking to oppose national monument designations have sought a judicial determination of presidential power afforded under the Antiquities Act.133 Courts, however, have declined to undertake such an endeavor.134 Accordingly, the real solution does not seem to be one that will come from the judiciary, but instead from the legislature.135

As discussed above, following the Bears Ears and Grand Staircase scale backs, numerous conservationist groups filed lawsuits challenging President Trump’s actions.136 Many in the conservationist community placed great importance on these lawsuits, stating that the decisions made in these cases would likely determine the fate of all current and future national monuments.137 This, however, appears to be a misstatement when considered in light of the court’s prior decisions on this issue.138

Up until this point, courts have consistently declined to define the presidential powers afforded under the Antiquities Act.139 First, courts held on numerous occasions that the issue of reviewability and deference afforded to presidential interpretations of ambiguous statutes has rendered the judiciary unable to review presidential

132. For a discussion of the problems with expanding presidential power under the Antiquities Act, see supra notes 118-131 and accompanying text.
134. See Hartman, supra note 7, at 162-69 (outlining pitfalls of judicial resolution).
135. See id. (discussing effects that court decisions would have). The possible results of a court decision would resolve the dispute regarding the ability of Presidents to review and revise national monuments but would not do anything to resolve the lack of transparency. See id.
136. For a discussion of the various lawsuits filed in response to Order 13792 and President Trump’s subsequent Proclamation, see supra notes 70-76 and accompanying text.
137. See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (placing great importance on decisions resulting from lawsuits filed in response to scale backs).
138. See Hartman, supra note 7, at 162-69 (highlighting judiciary’s failure to define scope of presidential power under Antiquities Act).
139. See id. (analyzing limited ability of judiciary to address Antiquities Act challenges); see also Squillace, supra note 16, at 534-36 (discussing prior cases in which judiciary has declined to rule on confines of presidential power under Antiquity Act).
national monument designations.\footnote{140. See Hartman, \textit{supra} note 7, at 164-65 (discussing judiciary’s limited ability to resolve challenges to Antiquities Act). Due to the wide deference afforded to the President under the Antiquities Act, the judiciary is limited in reviewing designations. \textit{Id.} As such, practically every challenge to a presidential national monument designation is defeated as the President need simply include the “scientific or historic” and “smallest area compatible” language in the proclamation to render the court powerless to review. \textit{Id.} The courts must also afford presidential designations \textit{Chevron} deference, in which the executive agency’s statutory interpretation is granted deference if the statute is silent or ambiguous. \textit{See id.; see also Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc., 467 U.S. 837, 844 (1984) (holding considerable weight should be accorded to executive department’s construction of statutory scheme and afforded deference).} Thus, there is no reason to believe that any court can or will do so here.\footnote{141. See Wyoming v. Franke, 58 F. Supp. 890, 896 (D. Wyo. 1945) (stating that it is legislature’s responsibility to define presidential power under Antiquities Act). “[I]f Congress presumes to delegate its inherent authority to Executive Departments which exercise acquisitive proclivities not actually intended, the burden is on the Congress to pass such remedial legislation as may obviate any injustice brought about as the power and control over and disposition of government lands inherently rests in its Legislative branch.” \textit{Id.}} Second, although not yet specifically invoked by the court, it is possible that the court could decline to define presidential power under the Antiquities Act due to separation of powers issues and the possibility that doing so would be an infringement on power constitutionally mandated to Congress.\footnote{142. See Hartman, \textit{supra} note 7, at 163-65 (discussing possible separation of powers concerns regarding judicial review); \textit{see also U.S. Const. art. IV, § 3, cl. 2 (delegating to Congress power to control all public lands).}} Finally, in the off chance that the court decides to review President Trump’s actions, it is possible that it could do so on a limited basis, not broadly defining presidential power under the Antiquities Act but, instead, crafting a narrow holding applicable only to the case before it.\footnote{143. See Rusnak, \textit{supra} note 8, at 681-82 n.56 (noting case in which court found in favor of challenger to Antiquities Act).} With revisions planned for ten additional national monuments and over 100 monuments yet to be reviewed, a limited holding would mean that conservationists, looking to protect these monuments, would have the heavy burden of filing similar lawsuits every time a monument comes up for review and revision.\footnote{144. See Zinke, \textit{supra} note 57, at 10-18 (listing ten additional monuments for review and revision); \textit{see also National Monuments At Risk: An Executive Order Jeopardizes Monumental Treasures, supra note 6 (highlighting allowing President to undermine monument designations sets dangerous precedent).}} With these considerations in mind, it becomes clear that the judiciary is not a viable option to resolving these ambiguities.\footnote{145. See Hartman, \textit{supra} note 7, at 163-69 (highlighting problems with judicial review).}
Accordingly, what is needed to resolve this hotly contested issue is for the legislature to act.\textsuperscript{146} The Constitution gives Congress the power to control all public land within the United States.\textsuperscript{147} It was according to this power that it created the Antiquities Act and delegated to the Executive the power to create national monuments.\textsuperscript{148} Now, as the Antiquities Act is under fire, it is Congress’s job to clarify what the boundaries of this delegated presidential authority are.\textsuperscript{149}

Although Congress previously attempted to make such changes to the Antiquities Act and to provide clarification, it was unsuccessful.\textsuperscript{150} The likely reason for this is that conservationists in the Legislature may have been hesitant to make such changes because the current construction fits their conservationist desires.\textsuperscript{151} These legislators, however, should keep in mind the considerations discussed above.\textsuperscript{152} If conservation is their main concern, it does not seem wise to leave such determinations up to the judiciary, when they could make such determinations themselves.\textsuperscript{153} The threat of irreparable harm posed to both current and future national monuments is too great to justify allowing its fate to be determined by a judiciary that has historically taken a hands-off approach to defining presidential powers under the Antiquities Act.\textsuperscript{154}

\textsuperscript{146.} See id. at 169 (discussing how failed legal challenges to Antiquities Act have lead opponents to seek change through legislative process).

\textsuperscript{147.} See U.S. CONST. art. IV, § 3, cl. 2 (granting Congress power to regulate all land within borders of United States).

\textsuperscript{148.} See Hartman, supra note 7, at 154 (stating that Congress granted President right to make national monuments).

\textsuperscript{149.} See Wyoming v. Franke, 58 F. Supp. 890, 896 (D. Wyo. 1945) (highlighting courts have held that it is Congress’s job to delineate powers created under Act).

\textsuperscript{150.} See Hartman, supra note 7, at 154, 169-75 (discussing Congress’s largely unsuccessful attempts to modify Act).

\textsuperscript{151.} See id. (stating bills to change Act have been introduced in Congress but have never been successful).

\textsuperscript{152.} For a discussion of the problems that arise when relying on judicial resolution of the Antiquities Act dispute, see supra notes 139-145 and accompanying text.


\textsuperscript{154.} See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (itemizing archaeological and historical artifacts that are now at risk after Bears Ears and Grand Staircase scale backs). President Trump’s proclamation confined monument protection only to those most celebrated features of the monuments. Id. For a discussion of the unwillingness of
Congressional action is both necessary and timely as allowing President Trump’s actions to stand would call the fate of many current and future national monuments into question.\(^{155}\) The broad discretion and deference afforded under the Antiquities Act has permitted Presidents to define for themselves the powers that Congress delegated to them.\(^{156}\) Numerous Presidents have tested and pushed the boundaries of this power and have found themselves largely unimpeded in doing so.\(^{157}\) As much of this testing the boundaries has been in favor of the creation of national monuments, conservationists have never raised an issue with a President doing so.\(^{158}\) President Trump’s Order 13792 and the Bears Ears and Grand Staircase scale backs, however, trouble conservationists who are now being faced with a President that is aggressively pushing the boundaries in the other direction.\(^{159}\)

Accordingly, Order 13792 serves as just one example of the threat posed to national monuments under the Act’s current vague construction and broadly defined presidential powers.\(^{160}\) If the Antiquities Act remains under its current construction, great deference will be afforded to current and future Presidents’ decisions and any current and future invasions on national monuments will likely go unimpeded.\(^{161}\) Even conservationist groups and concerned citizens will be left defenseless in protecting national monuments, as not only is it very difficult to challenge presidential actions under the Act but it is also difficult to gain access to information that is necessary to support any such challenge, as demon-

\(^{155}\) See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (warning permitting President to have power to review and revise monuments could have far reaching implications).

\(^{156}\) For a discussion of the deference afforded to presidential actions under Antiquities Act, see supra note 140 and accompanying text.

\(^{157}\) See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (discussing inability of court to review presidential designations).

\(^{158}\) For a discussion of prior challenges to designations under Antiquities Act, see supra notes 32-33 and accompanying text.

\(^{159}\) See Eilerpin, supra note 56 (quoting Secretary Zinke regarding public comments on review and revision). Secretary Zinke made it clear that he will ignore an overwhelming public response opposing changes to national monuments stating, “I don’t yield to public pressure. Sound public policy is not based on threats of lawsuit. It’s doing what’s right.” Id.

\(^{160}\) For a discussion of Order 13792 and President Trump’s Proclamation, see supra notes 47-76 and accompanying text.

\(^{161}\) For a discussion of the broad deference afforded to presidential designations under the Antiquities Act, see supra note 36 and accompanying text.
strated by current attempts to obtain information relied upon in Zinke’s designation reviews. 162

With these considerations in mind, conservationists in Congress should take any proposals for change to the Antiquities Act, like the previously discussed Bill 3990, under serious consideration. 163 While these proposals will likely not provide for the expansive powers to create national monuments that is enjoyed under the Antiquities Act’s current construction, they are starting points. 164 Conservationists in Congress must realize they can no longer afford to reject such proposals, but instead must compromise with their pro-development peers. 165 Although both sides of the dispute will likely have to make concessions, a solution that is mutually agreeable to both sides of the debate is preferable to leaving the task of defining the presidential powers under the Act to the Judiciary or Executive Branches. 166 Instead, conservationists in Congress should embrace their constitutionally mandated power to control all public lands and use this as a means to protect and control the fate of all national monuments. 167 If they do not, all national monuments will seemingly have lost their best chance at ensuring their survival. 168

162. See Compl. for Decl. and Injunctive Relief at 10-22, S. Utah Wilderness All. v. U.S. Dep’t of Interior, No. 1:17-cv-02314 (D.C.C. filed Nov. 2, 2017) (discussing failure to reply to FOIA requests). Complaint alleges that the FOIA records are essential to their advocacy and that failure to respond is actively impeding their ability to carry out their organizational missions. Id.

163. See Eilperin, supra note 56 (discussing concerns of conservationists regarding President Trump’s actions). Secretary Zinke stated that the Department of the Interior would be open to adopting a national monument designation policy similar to that laid out in Bill 3990. Id.

164. For a discussion of Bill 3990, see supra notes 93-99 and accompanying text.

165. See Eilperin, supra note 56 (discussing reaction of conservationist community to scale backs). Conservationists stated that with the scale backs at the Bears Ears and the Grand Staircase, the Trump administration has essentially waged war on America’s national monuments. Id. Secretary Zinke indicated that the administration may be looking to force Congress’s hand in amending the Antiquities Act, as he explicitly referenced Bill 3990 as a possible solution to what he considered presidential abuse of the Antiquities Act. Id.

166. For a discussion of limited authority of the judiciary to review presidential actions under the Antiquities Act, see supra notes 133-135.

167. For a discussion of congressional power to control public lands, see supra notes 110-111.

168. See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (highlighting expansive implications of President Trump’s actions).
VI. AS VAST AS THE BEARS EARS?: THE FATE OF AMERICA’S NATIONAL MONUMENTS PUT IN LIMBO

After President Trump announced his plan to review a number of national monument designations and implement scale backs of the Bears Ears and Grand Staircase, he was met with a significant amount of opposition.\footnote{169 For a discussion of public outcry against President Trump’s actions, see supra notes 66-76 and accompanying text.} To some, this kind of public outcry may seem somewhat disproportionate considering that President Trump’s Order 13792 called for the review of only twenty-seven of the 157 current national monuments.\footnote{170 See Exec. Order 13792: Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act, 82 Fed. Reg. 20429, 20429 (Apr. 26, 2017) (calling for review of all monument designations made since 1996).} Moreover, of those twenty-seven monuments placed under review, only two of the most expansive national monuments were actually scaled back or revised in anyway.\footnote{171 See Eilperin, supra note 56 (stating President Trump’s Proclamation downsized two massive national monuments).} When considered in this limited context, it may make one question the significance of Order 13792.\footnote{172 See Max Greenberg, Happy 110th anniversary to the Antiquities Act, protector of monuments for all, WILDERNESS SOC’Y (Jun. 6, 2016), https://wilderness.org/blog/happy-110th-anniversary-antiquities-act-protector-monuments-all (discussing public support for designation and protection of national monuments). Many Americans support the designation and protection of America’s national monuments. Id.} Are scaling back a few of the most expansive monuments, of the 157 current national monuments, really that big of a deal?

In response to that question, many conservationists would likely have a few questions of their own.\footnote{173 See Travis S. Andrews, ‘The President Stole Your Land’: Patagonia, REI blast Trump on national monument rollbacks, WASH. POST (Dec. 5, 2017), https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2017/12/05/the-president-stole-your-land-patagonia-rei-blast-trump-on-national-monument-rollbacks/?utm_term=.9ea8750fae4b (discussing uproar and warnings to public made by conservationists after Trump’s proclamation).} Do you want to have the opportunity to hike the expansive landscape of Grand Canyon?\footnote{174 See Monuments Protected under the Antiquities Act, supra note 19, at 1 (stating Grand Canyon was created under Antiquities Act and parts still remain protected under it).} Do you want generations of future Americans to be able to snorkel and explore the beauty of the Virgin Island coral reefs?\footnote{175 See id. at 7 (stating Buck Island Reef National Monument was created under Antiquities Act and parts still remain protected under it).} Do you want your kids and your grandkids to be able to view the pristine beauty of Alaska at Glacier Bay?\footnote{176 See id. at 5 (stating Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve was created under Antiquities Act and parts still remain protected under it).} Most Americans likely answer
"yes" to all of these questions. All of these invaluable American treasures were created and are currently protected under the Antiquities Act. If presidential designation powers continue to go unchecked, all of these national monuments and numerous others will remain at risk.

Unlike its predecessors, this most recent campaign to revise national monuments is not likely one that will fade into oblivion. Instead, Order 13792 and subsequent proclamations seemingly mark the beginning of what will be an aggressive invasion on America's national monuments. While the scale backs implemented at the Bears Ears and the Grand Staircase are seemingly limited in scope, if they remain unchecked, they stand for a much larger proposition that such presidential actions are permissible. Accordingly, it is likely that the scale backs will not stop here and that, instead, all 157 of America's national monuments could suffer a similar fate. Considering the irreparable harm such scale backs

177. See Greenberg, supra note 172 (stating ninety percent of voters favor presidential power to permanently protect some public lands); see also Conservation Groups File Lawsuit After President Trump Illegally Axed Dinosaur Treasure Grand-Staircase Escalante National Monument, supra note 153 (stating during Zinke review comment period over 2.7 million Americans voiced support for national monuments across country).

178. See Monuments Protected under the Antiquities Act, supra note 19, at 1, 5, 7 (listing Grand Canyon, Glacier Bay, and Buck Island Reef as national monuments protected under Antiquities Act).

179. See Eilperin, supra note 56 (stating Zinke reports called for revisions to national monuments in addition to Bears Ears and Grand Staircase); see also infra note 183 (highlighting sweeping implications of President Trump’s actions).

180. See Exec. Order 13792: Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act, 82 Fed. Reg. 20429, 20429 (Apr. 26, 2017) (calling for review of twenty-seven national monuments). Zinke’s review and recommendations were not limited to the Bears Ears and Grand Staircase. Id. Additionally, many conservationists believe that if President Trump’s review and revision of the Bears Ears and Grand Staircase are permitted, other national monuments will likely be subject to scale backs. See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (discussing conservationists’ reactions to Bears Ears and Grand Staircase scale backs). In fact, Rhea Suh, the President of the Natural Resources Defense Council, posed a question to President Trump: “What’s next, President Trump, the Grand Canyon?” Id.

181. For discussion of possible implications of President Trump’s action, see supra note 159 and accompanying text.

182. See Turkewitz, supra note 5 (discussing concerns of expansive impact of Bears Ears and Grand Staircase scale backs).

183. See id. (highlighting sweeping implications of President Trump’s actions). While a number of national monuments have, subsequently, been further protected pursuant to congressionally-created laws such as the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916, the monuments’ fates remain unclear. See generally Squillace, supra note 16 (noting many national monuments have been further protected by subsequent congressional action but not in their entirety). For example, while the Grand Canyon has been subsequently preserved by congressional action, parts of it remain at risk. See Hannah Nordhaus, What Trump’s Shrinking of National Mon-
could have on the American treasures encompassed within these national monuments, this is simply unacceptable. 184

Following President Trump’s proclamation, Patagonia, the popular outdoors brand, posted a message to shoppers visiting their website: “The President Stole Your Land.”185 While Patagonia’s message is seemingly dramatic, it makes an impact and draws the public’s attention to what is at stake.186 Whether Patagonia realizes it or not, they have the right idea.187 As discussed above, the Legislature, a branch driven largely by public opinion, is the branch that needs to act now to protect the fate of the national monuments.188 Accordingly, if you answered “yes” to any of the questions above, do those fighting to protect America’s national monuments a favor: reach out to your local congressman or congresswoman and tell them you want your land back.189
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