I am aware this morning that our host city, Tucson, in addition to being a lovely place blessed with more sunshine than other areas of the country, is also the home of my boss, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. You had expected, and he had hoped also, that he would be in this place on your program. I feel the burden of these circumstances.

First I must confess that I cannot give his speech; mine must be more limited in scope for my responsibilities are narrower. Neither can I hope to match the platform presence of a man who could get himself elected four times to the Congress from this District.

Your theme, "As Others See Us," invites me, graciously, to talk about our mutual concern with management of lands which belong to all the people of the United States, but which are committed by Congress to the stewardship of various Interior Department bureaus—Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Reclamation—and of various other Federal agencies—Defense, Forest Service, etc. These are "public" lands. In the West, public lands nurture much of the fish and wildlife, the propagation and harvest of which is your concern.

Congress has seen fit to withdraw some public land for purposes which preclude it to your programs—for example, National Parks, and some Atomic Energy Commission and military withdrawals. Other withdrawals have aided wildlife objectives—wildlife refuges have been created by Congress, and in some cases by executive or administrative action.

Today, I will fuzz the Federal land managing agencies' bureaucratic lines and will lump together the differing kinds of State Commissions represented here, so that when I say we, I will be referring to the Federal side; you will mean the States or other non-Federal public bodies.

In the context of how it looks from this side of the table, Federal-State misunderstandings have occurred, and friction has developed. Sometimes the disputes have been direct, as for example on the question of whether a particular proposed national park area ought to be managed, from the fish and wildlife standpoint, by the States or by the Park Service; or what control methods ought to be applied to bring elk stocking down to range carrying capacity.
At other times, we (in the most frequent situation the BLM) stand in the middle as a sort of referee between conflicting contentions on the non-Federal side as to best land utilization. Your plans for land use in a given area might be in conflict with livestock operators, for example.

As I said, some of these disputes are direct and clear-cut, but mostly they tend more to be peripheral—argumentative, oblique, anticipatory, preventive, or fearful. That is because they are symptomatic of the heightened consciousness and sense of unease both sides feel of the finiteness and perceptible limit of our land area. The "frontier" which was a part of the American dream as we were growing up, is not so much a dream now as a memory. Its disappearance spells a different life for us and we are suspicious of it. The desert which both repelled and attracted us by its seeming endlessness can now be encompassed whole by our eye from the common-place jet airplane, and as we see both sides from 35,000 feet, it doesn't look so big.

Some of us have visited or studied the intensively managed, private hunting and fishing preserves in Europe. We want to postpone the day when we must come to that as long as we can, but we read every day the statistics of our population growth, and see the evidence of the sprawl of our cities over the once pastoral green space surrounding, and we can't shut it out.

The literature of our youth used the expansive words—boundless, inexhaustible, endless, numberless, unlimited—to describe our prairies, forests, flight of birds, runs of fish, herds of buffalo. The land which was beyond the Blue Ridge was the jump off for the land beyond the Cumberland Gap, up the Missouri, beyond the Rockies, and finally the arid desert itself.

At the end of a couple of diverting World Wars, however, came the realization that the supply was finite. Its inelasticity showed most plainly when returning veterans found that even a veteran's preference for homesteading opportunity had become largely worthless.

Science and technology can stretch the limits of resources from the land necessary to man's existence. Chemical fertilizers have multiplied our food and fiber potentials. Energy can be captured from the fundamental atom, and soon from the sun itself; potable water can be derived from the bountiful oceans. Someday it may transport some of us off to more spacious planets, but technology cannot tamper with the land dimensions of this one. The supply is a closed vessel.

As land managers, our realization of the finiteness of our land base has been hastened in recent years by the geometric acceleration of demand for outdoor recreation. By definition, outdoor recreation requires land and water areas. Some types are modest in their requirements; others, such as wilderness opportunities, involve big areas.

Before that, however, worry about limited land reserves was muted, but the concern was there and although accommodation has not been too difficult, the Government has had to step in to referee range wars, enacting the Taylor Grazing
Act; miners have fought over claims; and the homesteaders and the livestockmen have had their disagreements. But by and large, the Forest Reservations, the National Parks, the wildlife refuges, and even the military withdrawals seemed not unduly to encroach upon the continued use of the public land both by the "enjoyment conservationists and the consumptive conservationists."

My part of the Department of the Interior deals with those who, under the law, are entitled to utilize the public lands for such basic survival needs as cellulose, protein, and minerals and fossil fuels—timber, livestock, and mining. We also are concerned with recreation, generally in the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and specifically in the administration of the national parks.

Conservation, as an attitude or pattern of thinking, is an umbrella big enough to accommodate both groups, and thus the use of these terms—enjoyment or recreation conservationists, and consumptive conservationists—simply as a descriptive convenience.

The intellectuals among the land managers and conservation minded land users, seeing the handwriting on the wall, long ago began to look for ways and means to provide the equivalent of elasticity in the inelastic land area. One answer was multiple use, both as a management concept, and as substantive legislation.

Multiple use would stretch available land in the same way that a skyscraper or a highrise apartment stretches it. In a given area, say a national forest of a million acres, you have a multiple of that million acres as your management is for both forest products and watershed protection, wildlife habitat and grazing, mining and camping, and even wilderness.

If you visualize each use as a level or story of our highrise apartment analogy, you can imagine that some of the floors would be coextensive, while others would be of lesser size. And you can picture encroachments which would block the base areas and all floors above it, while others would affect less than all of them. Wildlife habitat and grazing could well be coextensive with the area managed for forest products; wilderness might match wildlife areas and grazing, but delimit commercial logging; camp sites might be available only for their recreation use.

In public lands not in forest reservations, the same analogy might be drawn. Lands within grazing districts are used in common with wildlife, and hunting is permitted under State regulations; but private owners of surrounding lands often control egress and ingress, blocking the public use of the area.

Multiple use is good public policy. It is good sense. But it doesn't wipe out the necessity for making hard choices. As competition for land use increases, moreover, the feasibility of multiple uses will be reduced, rather than increased. The hard choices will become more and more frequent—and more and more difficult.
Neither multiple use nor any other formula can really expand the land base. It does not furnish an answer where decision must be made for or against a contemplated use which precludes all others. As a concept multiple use urges accommodation, and as legislation it may regularize functions which might otherwise not be considered appropriate management objectives (such as recreation on BLM lands), but it does not find new land, nor does it insure against future restrictions based upon changed circumstances. We still have the finiteness of land; multi-level structures become inadequate, too, and even have to be torn down to make way for higher uses.

The physical frontier of our national youth has disappeared. But westward migration has not. Why? At least one explanation lies in the fact that open space still exists in the West. Much of that open space is public land. Of the 170 million or so acres left in the public domain, exclusive of Alaska, 95% are located in the eleven contiguous States represented here. The pressures of the future will be on your States and, in large part, on the lands under my present administrative control.

What is our national policy with respect to those lands? Are we committed to retain them in public ownership? If there is a choice as between retention or disposal, whose choice is it?

By a careful selection of alleged authorities, I can give you as many answers to these questions as you want. Reputable students of public land policy, for example, are practically unanimous in saying that The Taylor Grazing Act revolutionized national philosophy. Clawson, Robbins and Stegner all tell us so. But the statute books suggest otherwise. The mining law of 1872 is intact as to hard rock mineral patents; Congress has not repealed the venerable Homestead Act, the desert land acts, the Pittman Act, the Small Tract Act or any of their many off-shoots. True, the Taylor Act provides a buffer in the form of authority to classify lands. But can this be carried to the arbitrary extreme of classifying all or most public lands as non-disposable? Can we repeal the disposal laws through this administrative loophole?

Clearly not. But how far in that direction may we go? That is the first of the hard choices. If I had the answer, I would gladly give it to you. Lacking it, I will only suggest that if you desire certainty on this point then you had better be giving serious thought to the kind of reforms in our public land laws that will be adequate to meet the coming pressures. In so doing, I need not remind you that such reforms will have to meet the test of political viability, especially in the States you represent.

Acceptability of proposed reforms of the public land laws to the States where most of the public lands lie, the Western States, is politically axiomatic. At one time it could have been said that these States would have been concerned exclusively with the interests of the consumptive conservationists—with emphasis on the adjective.
That this is no longer true is perhaps best emphasized by the strength of your organization. Clearly you are on the "enjoyment conservation" or "recreation conservation" side. Not that your interests are always opposed to those of the consumptive conservationists; more likely they are generally harmonious. You see no diminution of hunting opportunities by the process of logging. When it comes to mining, you don't have strong feelings until streams become polluted by certain types of activities or when the surface is left disturbed. Your boards or commissions include consumptive conservationists and certainly the rank and file of the hunters and fishermen of the Western States come from the basic industries which support the economy of these States.

Nevertheless, your activities do require land--large quantities--and where the land base is so largely in Federal ownership, you are not only interested in how the Federal Government manages it but also whether the Federal Government plans to keep it and on what terms and conditions and subject to what restrictions it makes dispositions of it.

Over and over again I have emphasized the theme that the proper forum for the resolution of the basic policy issues central to these problems is the Congress of the United States. The Congress as a representative body in a free government is the only source of decisions which will be finally acceptable to all of us.

Consideration of these public questions by interested groups and the public generally throughout the United States and in the decision making processes of public agencies is freshened by a revitalized national consciousness of conservation as a concept. When choices must be made which preclude uses requested or desired by one group or another, they are now being made in an atmosphere of concern for the future, a concern for "quality".

This means the application of values which are not necessarily or primarily measurable in dollars; values which rise above both immediate concern for profits and long-term doctrinal commitment to private or public ownership or management; values instead which emphasize our history and our heritage, and which acknowledge our need "to march with a stride that conforms to the cadences of the earth itself," to borrow a felicitous phrase from Secretary Udall. Obviously we have to be concerned with our supply of food and fibre but there is now also a "search for balance and order, a quest for a new sense of values, a striving for a land consciousness that has meaning for the future."

The quoted phrases are from a chapter of an as yet unpublished book by the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Udall epitomizes and personifies the national concern for quality in our land management decisions. He leads this Administration in a concern for green landscapes, "for cleanliness and freshness in what nature can and will produce if we perform the innumerable acts of stewardship that are our responsibility."
"The signature we affix on the land will be largely determined by the land consciousness which we evolve. We need a conservation concept that will give full play to the finest and highest human impulses, will make visible our love for the land, and declare our respect for the rights of the unborn."

This leadership is beginning to dominate land management and it is catching hold in the halls of Congress. The Leopold report on wildlife management in the parks is an historic document, the influence of which will be felt for years to come. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill now pending in the Congress which is a grant-in-aid bill to encourage States to plan, acquire and develop recreation areas is a bold and imaginative act of conservation statesmanship. The basic ideas that the States must occupy the key role in developing a well balanced national recreation program, that a substantial acreage of land ought to be acquired by public agencies, to make it possible to meet future recreational needs--and that acquisition should be financed with as little impact as possible on the Federal budget, and that the recreationists should pay a reasonable portion of these costs--these represent the determination of the Secretary and the Administration to avoid becoming a casualty in the war over the way our private land supply shall be managed and used.

I think you can see that from our side of the table, the Federal side, we are as concerned as you with the growing imbalance between demands for land use and the land available for it. The challenge to conservationists, and I mean all the conservationists, without descriptive adjectives, is very great. It will take the best thinking of all of us.
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