According to the program, my subject is Resource Policies for the Future. Before discussing the subject, I would like to tell you a little bit about the Department of the Interior. Brookings did a monumental study of the Department 15 years ago, but I can hardly assume that its unpublished manuscript has been made available to you. My own specified responsibilities within the Department are not quite as broad as complete treatment of the title of my talk would indicate, and you are on notice that I do not speak as an authority in all areas. Furthermore, I find from an examination of the roster that no more than one or two of you are likely to have had first-hand experience with the Department.

The Department of the Interior is virtually impossible to capsulize. Its range of activities is vast, for one thing -- for another, if a person has an opinion at all about the Department, it is likely to be a vigorous one.

People who "feel" about Indians, feel deeply, and how we administer our trust responsibilities for the Indians for many influential opinion-molding groups, is the touchstone of an entire Administration's humanitarianism. If your concern is over the national parks and historic places of the United States, and our natural heritage generally, or if you are interested in wildlife and outdoor experiences, you are likely to find yourself in one of a very wide spectrum of "public-interest" organizations quite unbashful in expressing views about management of these resources -- the Wilderness Society, the National Parks Association, Audubon Society, Garden Club, Sierra Club, Izaak Walton League, etc., etc. These groups know who the Secretary of the Interior is; he may be a patron saint one day and a villain the next, and sometimes both at the same time.

If you live in the West, the Department has economic immediacy. In my own State of Idaho, the big businesses are timber and lumber, livestock and mining -- and all of these find their sustenance on lands owned by all the people, managed by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

In the Lake States, Interior means commercial fisheries; in the dryland west, reclamation, power generation and distribution; in the Caribbean and the Pacific, territorial administration; in Alaska, among other things, the operation of a mainline 477 mile railroad.

In the halls of universities and among the interested segments of the business community, our Geological Survey is a respected authority on hydrology, geology generally, and on conservation. Our Saline Water conversion program,
and coal and other research programs, emphasize governmental mobilization of science to public tasks.

To many of you, the free association-word for Interior is oil. The President has vested the Secretary with broad policy responsibilities in this area. Among the matters currently getting attention is the oil-shale potential, so much of these reserves being in public ownership and Interior control. Also, Interior administers the government monopoly on helium.

I'd like also to give you my assessment, in a few hastily assembled words, of what I consider to be the broad accomplishments of the present Administration.

Secretary Udall has made this a national Department. By the force of his personality, intellect, and vigor, he has bootstrapped a prosaic department into a role of real leadership in making America conservation-conscious. He has made the whole country aware of our programs, so long identified only with the West. National park and recreation concepts have been broadened, until Congress, we are confident, will soon enact a Land and Water Conservation Fund Bill. This will be landmark conservation legislation, and set national policy for acquisition of recreation and open-space lands for the crowded future.

A new and enlightened policy for development of Indian resources has escaped general public attention, but it accounts for an era of good feeling with the Indian people.

In the water area, the Department is wrestling with a Pacific Southwest Water Plan. Success in his efforts will crown the Secretary as a statesman in the highest connotations of the term.

There are individual troublesome exceptions, but I believe that most dispassionate observers would say that the relationships of this Department with the private sector of the economy using public lands are the best they've been in a generation. We think of the users as conservationists, too -- conservationists whose cooperation is requisite if we are to have really good management of the timber, forage, and mineral resources.

In the Department, I generally supervise six bureaus -- Land Management, Indians, Parks, Outdoor Recreation, Territories, and the Alaska Railroad.

The attitude toward resource policy of Stewart Udall and Stuart Chase furnishes a beginning comparison. These two "Stewarts", less than a generation apart, symbolize a revolution in attitudes about natural resources. In Mr. Udall's recent book, The Quiet Crisis, he chronicles America's conservation philosophy, knitting together the story of our developing conscience toward the resource heritage into which we were so accidentally born. I think the Secretary's book is remarkable for the contrast it presents when matched against the conservation literature of a generation or two past.
All of us recall the Malthusian prophecies of those who saw the end of our oil and coal reserves, the bankruptcy of our metalliferous mineral estate, the denuding of the forests and impoverishment of the nation. Yet in 1964 what is perhaps the most thoughtful conservation publication in a quarter-century eschews panic over the materials for abundance and states the cause of wise husbandry in idealistic terms: duty to the landed heritage, preservation of spiritual values and concern for human personality in a mechanistic environment.

Does this mean that we have solved our resource problems, despite the drain of two wars and a sky-rocketing gross national production? Were the prophets of scarcity irresponsible criers of doom? Or is Secretary Udall merely wrong in his emphasis? I think that none of these assessments is the right one.

The fact is that the technology, to which Secretary Udall looks with hope in his last chapter, has already changed the ground-rules and the assumptions of resource management. It isn't only that science and invention have given us new materials for old ones -- thereby stretching the frontiers of our resource base. Of equal or even greater importance is the fact that technology has given us the capability to locate and extract resource supplies hardly dreamed of a generation or two ago. Stuart Chase's concern over a finite oil supply in 1936 didn't take into account the tapping of reserves ten miles or more at sea.

And science has come to our aid in still another way. We can at last begin really to inventory our resource estate. Modern techniques of data accumulation, storage and manipulation put it within our power to act with knowledge of the consequences of action to a degree that manpower limitations would not permit even a decade ago. It is possible now to plot the future of a whole river basin by constructing a mathematical model. The heroes of Secretary Udall's book -- the Thoreaus, John Muirs, Pinchots and Major Powells -- are romantic figures of a romantic past. But the resource policies of a nation of 300 million are as likely to be influenced by the electron microscope and the computer as by the crusading spirit of a few men.

Yet science is neutral. The computer cannot make moral judgments. Human value judgments -- ethical concepts, if you will -- are still an essential ingredient of the mix. Science can tell us how many people can be jammed into a square mile without suffocating. But only the spirit of man can decide whether such a life is to be tolerated, whether the human soul can survive the optimum mathematical possibility.

Science has added new dimensions to our thinking about resources, but in the last analysis there is one factor in the resource picture that cannot be modified by technology. I refer to the finiteness of our land surface and the demands placed upon it by an exploding population. I submit that the resource policy issues of this and the next generation are going to be concentrated on this point.
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 40,000 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, flights 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 of land was finite. Its inelasticity showed most plainly when returning veterans found that even a veteran's preference for homesteading opportunity had become largely worthless.

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.

My part of the Department of the Interior also 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.

Conservation, as an attitude or pattern of thinking, is an umbrella big enough to accommodate both groups, the enjoyment or recreation conservationists, and the consumptive conservationists, the ones who extract minerals, harvest trees, graze livestock.

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, as a management concept and as substantive legislation.

Multiple use would stretch available land in the same way that a skyscraper or a high-rise apartment stretches it.
Wildlife habitat and grazing can be coextensive with the area managed for forest products; wilderness can match wildlife areas and grazing, but delimit commercial logging.

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.

And 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, but it does not find new land, nor does it insure against future restrictions based upon changed circumstances. We still have the concept of finiteness.

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 west of the 100th meridian. The pressures of the future will be on those 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?

The House of Representatives recently passed by the wide margin of 339 to 29 Congressman Aspinall's bill, H. R. 8070, which would establish a Public Land Law Review Commission, to go into this question. This I suggest to you is one of the most important bills now being given legislative consideration, for the Commission it would establish would get into the very heart of the policy considerations having to do with the management of the lands still owned by the United States of America. The purpose of the bill is clearly stated in it: It is to study the statutes, review the policies and practices of the Federal agencies, compile data on demands for the public lands, present and future, and to recommend legislation to the Congress.
The measure at the House hearings received virtually unanimous support from the broadest possible spectrum of the public interested in the public lands, whether commercially, as with the timber, forage, and mining industries, or non-commercially, as with the wildlife organizations and recreationists, and public interest and governmental units, State, county and local.

The proper forum for the resolution of the basic policy issues central to these problems is the Congress of the United States, not the technicians or land managers. 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, given the conflicts which will persist.

For conservation as a political issue will not drop out of the field as other problems of modern life demand our attention. Science and technology can change and multiply and stretch the limits of such resources as food and fiber and energy sources. But eventually we get back to the fundamental elements of land and water. Living space for twice our present population will demonstrate the inelasticity of the land surface. Water problems, both qualitative and quantitative, must be attacked promptly and with every scrap of our imagination -- for wars have been fought and civilizations have died for its lack. We face a century of intense competition for these elemental resources. Government must inevitably enter as the arbiter. Conservation issues may therefore become the dominant ones in public affairs, therefore in politics, in our own generation.

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 fiber 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 phrases I have just quoted are from a chapter of the same book with which I opened this discussion. 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." This we think is the dominant resource policy issue which Americans must face, not on some day in a distant future but now, because the hard choices we make today will determine what happens to the American landscape beginning tomorrow.
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