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I have, as your Chairman has announced, recently moved from
what I have often called the dry-land part of the Department of
the Interior, into a much more varied assignment as the Chief
Lieutenant of the Cabinet officer responsible for the entire
Department.

Naturally, I haven't been unaware that there was in the
Department a Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, or a United States
Geological Survey. But as I have grappled with the problems of
Indian and Territorial Administration, with Public Land Administra-
tion, and with Parks and Recreation and a Railroad in Alaska, I
have not been as fully aware as I might have been of relationships
and comparisons which are capable of being made when these other
programs are related to the conservation movement generally.

So I hope you will forgive me as I try to adjust my thinking
to include the harvesting of the products of the ocean with the
harvest of crops on the lands in the context of conservation
consciousness.

I think it particularly appropriate to start with this
particular group -- you as canners see quite clearly that the
food from the sea, particularly the coastal sea, and the food
from the land must be produced with a consciousness of conserva-
tion principles, if supplies are to be maintained, and if we are
to meet the demands of a population which will double in a
period of time shorter than the age of most of us here.

Today I want to take a few minutes to talk about the American
conservation movement in this transitional period.

In my dryland phase, I came to know Wesley Powell, John Muir,
Gifford Pinchot, and Harold Ickes as the intellectual giants of
the conservation movement. I am sure that when the history is
written about efforts to achieve conservation of resources of the
sea, heading the list will be found a man who shares the platform
with me today, the Honorable E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, Senator from
Alaska. He has devoted his life to this and continues to lead the
effort.

In my dryland phase, my laundry list of the resources which
are essential to the continued growth and prosperity of our modern
society emphasized petroleum and coal, metalliferous minerals and
timber, potable water and animal forage. Now I must add many pro-
ducts of the sea. Citing known supplies, rates of use and needed
reserves, to a large extent, misses the point of the national
resource picture. The critical resources of one generation tend
to be outrun by technology, so that the following generation faces
a whole new pattern of resource issues.
I can make the point by citing only two examples, and the history of each are well known, making it unnecessary to give details. One is the uranium boom and the other is the present vastly expanded demand for silver after a long period of decline.

I do not choose to consume our valuable time with either historical review or statistical evaluation of our present resource situation. I would rather talk about the methods of public policy formulation. I think you might find it profitable to examine for a few minutes into the ways that resource conservation issues are posed in this complicated decade.

For this purpose, let me state a fairly simple thesis -- one that may seem grossly over-simplified until you have pondered it awhile. I am persuaded that national conservation emphasis, now and for the future, must be concentrated on certain basic, fundamental subjects: land to live on and potable water for survival. Whether development and wise use of the seas and their resources should be included is the new idea I'm adjusting to.

Our land economists point out that the process of urbanization alone -- for housing, commercial, and industrial development -- is consuming the countryside of this Nation at the rate of one million acres per year. This has obvious implications for the long-range future -- the prospect of simply running out of living space. But we needn't look that far ahead to see its impact.
There is already ample evidence that real estate values -- raw land values -- have increased more than any other commodity since the end of World War II.

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

It is only recently that we have come to the realization that the supply was finite.

Science and technology only stretch the limits of resources from the land necessary to man's existence. Chemical fertilizers multiply our food and fiber potentials. Energy can be captured from the fundamental atom, and soon from the sun itself. Technology cannot make the earth itself bigger. The supply of land is a closed vessel.

The adjacent seas, I now see, offer great possibilities for expansion of our activities. We are rapidly becoming vitally interested in the world ocean--all seas. Instead of thinking only or first of our defense interest in the sea, our vision must include the great opportunities for increasing commerce, for producing fresh water, for utilizing energy from the sea, or for
utilizing the resources within the sea of minerals and food.

Our science and technology are progressing to a point where we can look forward to farming the shallow expanses of the seas, producing more shellfish and inshore varieties of valuable species of market fish.

These developing uses of adjacent seas, coupled with the multiple-use concept of the land, offer possibilities for expansion of our conservation horizons.

It is gratifying that conservation, as an attitude or pattern of thinking, has become an umbrella spacious enough for all -- those who enjoy our lands and parks in a recreation sense, as well as those who derive their sustenance from it, whether from the timber, the forage, the minerals, or the resources of the sea.

But although multiple use and a consciousness of conservation, represent sound public policy and good sense, as concepts they do not eliminate the necessity for making hard choices. As competition for land use increases, the feasibility of multiple uses is reduced. The hard choices become more and more frequent--and more and more difficult.

When we turn from the national land base to the question of fresh water, the situation is not much different. The fastest growing areas of the United States are to be found on either side
of the lower Colorado River-South-Central Arizona and southern California. Neither of these areas is self-sufficient in water resources. Both have looked to the Colorado as the key to their growth for nearly sixty years. For thirty years, they resorted to both litigation and legislation to assure adequate water for agriculture and for municipal uses.

Through the whole history of the Boulder Canyon legislation and judicial consideration of the issues in Arizona v. California, it was taken as fact that the lower Colorado would furnish 7.5 million acre feet of water to the southwest annually. Now we are reasonably certain that this not so. After almost three generations of controversy, finally resolved by the Supreme Court in 1963, we face the unpleasant prospect of having to allocate a net shortage. Unless, that is, our conservation statesmanship is bold enough and imaginative enough to save water now being wasted and augment supplies from other sources.

These, you say, are relatively simple decisions to make. It takes only application of basic economic and engineering principles to determine whether and how much we can afford to do. True, except that this view ignores the simple fact that the very issues at stake will undoubtedly constitute one of the principal political battlegrounds of our generation and the next. And the resulting contest will be heavily colored by the slogans and epithets of past conservation crusades.
Even experienced and sophisticated veterans of public resource management react in a conditioned way to verbal stimuli which are a part of our political tradition. Take the word "exploit" in reference to economic development needs. This is ordinarily a bad word in the conservation lexicon -- not for any etymological or philological reason, for words are neutral. But this one exudes the colorful symbolism of our political environment. "Exploit" means "spoil"; "conserve" means "save."

In this context, one doesn't even need to write down the moral propositions that create the differences. Generations of holy crusade have produced the glandular reaction -- "exploiter," evil; "conservationist," virtuous.

This Pavlovian reference illustrates how deeply conservation issues have cut into national thinking.

Some will say: "Isn't this good? Shouldn't people react righteously without having to ponder? Let's not equivocate with evil!" This begs the question, for it assumes that the labels and catch phrases, the campaign slogans, have been correctly assigned; that there is some divine guidance, some intuitive gift, that permits ready identification of an infidel or heathen cause. For the purist, there are no gradations of virtue -- no compromises between ideal and reality.

Recently, an experienced and seemingly sophisticated government
servant said to me, "Why doesn't the Department create a special board for the sole purpose of identifying the public interest?"

A good question. Yet in the four years I've been in the Department, I can't recall anyone of the innumerable controversies where each side of the issue wasn't framed plausibly in terms of the public interest. I've known no decision made by Secretary Udall which hasn't been made in the public interest. Yet the controversies have been deep and vigorous, and many have reverberated in the halls of Congress or the columns of the press long after they were made. In all of them both sides of the controversy are stated in terms of the public interest, and in most of them both sides are in the public interest, in greater or lesser degree. But choices have to be made and the job of making choices cannot be delegated by the Secretary to a board.

Conservation issues are public issues. Success in the task of conservation requires mastery of the workings of politics, both internal and external. I have found that the word "external" includes, in a special way, international politics. Conservation presents elemental conflicts of values.

If the politics of conservation are to be worthy, if it is to be recognized that resource managers must communicate to the public and to the legislatures a sense of ethical urgency rooted in a felt philosophy, then history must be studied, our society comprehended, our governmental system mastered.
It helps to recognize that these are the current manifestations of a long tradition. Resource issues have been political issues since the earliest days of the Republic. Jefferson and Hamilton's ideological struggle had as one of its ingredients the policies which should govern in settling western lands. In the last decade, Al Sarena held center stage while the pressure for more open space, better recreation facilities, more and purer water piled up. This accumulation is our political inheritance, the unfinished agenda of our generation.

The techniques of achieving political goals for conservation were never more effectively exhibited than they were at the hands of the first Roosevelt and his Chief Lieutenant, Gifford Pinchot. Roosevelt made his name synonymous with conservation, as he met both the "interests" and their legislative spokesmen head-on.

By a pen's stroke, he set aside public lands for forest purposes while enrolled enactments of Congress prohibiting such executive action sat out the constitutional waiting period on his desk. Forestry, reclamation and wildlife protection became main functions of the Federal Government under his tutelage.

Teddy Roosevelt took the conservation movement out of the polite conversation of drawing rooms and off the platforms of the lecture circuit. An ideal, clothed with Victorian respectability, became an objective of public policy -- of government activity.
Conservation was made an object of political contest -- where it has been ever since, not only at the federal level but in the states as well.

Theodore Roosevelt's task in establishing the conservation deal ran across the grain of traditional thinking. He had to first establish waste as something close to immoral -- and then worked on the public conscience to see that it reacted accordingly. The substantive issues of his day were, however, relatively uncomplicated. Techniques of forest protection were direct, elementary and easily comprehended; power generation and transmission had potential for the future, but comparatively little current relevance; demands upon land and water resources were confined to single uses, uncomplicated by competing needs incompatible with each other.

Now our population has almost doubled and its mobility multiplied five -- or tenfold.

Hetch Hetchy was the ancestor of today's truism: that one man's conservation ideal can be another's desecration, that recriminations among allies under stress can draw as much blood as contests between ideological enemies.

Any number of parallel situations may be cited to demonstrate the increasing conflict between and among interests within the conservation family in its broad expense. The Steamboat Springs Project, dear to the hearts of the Reclamation Branch of the family, foundered upon the unavoidable consequence of flooding a part of
Dinosaur National Monument. The filling of Glen Canyon Reservoir is already under way, but the bitterness over failure to protect Rainbow Bridge against water intrusion will not be easily forgotten. Issues such as these find their outlet in the exercise of highly developed techniques of political pressure.

The issues upon which the conservation community finds itself divided will increase as demands for scarce land increases. The political dimension of conservation has expanded in ever-widening circles as our society and our technology have become increasingly complex. The simple "for" or "against" issue of 1900 now assumes overtones of the bureaucratic contest for policy supremacy. "Multiple use" becomes a slogan to block the preservation of critically needed recreation values, freedom to locate mineral claims argues against inclusion of a public domain tract in either a forest or a park. Parks supporters are accused of "locking up" resources because they regard public hunting incompatible with park objectives. The pluralism of modern life makes extremely complicated the simple faith which motivated Thoreau, Muir, Powell and the other prophets of the good life.

I have spent perhaps more time than I should on the general nature of modern conservation issues and the environmental context in which they must be defined. But I think it is more important that these concepts be understood than that we compile a catalog of specific problems and the programs designed to meet them.
Yet I do not wish to leave any impression that the problems are insurmountable -- or that they are not being attacked most vigorously. Neither is the case.

The 88th Congress has justly deserved the title of "Conservation Congress." In its short two-year span, more basic conservation laws were passed than in any comparable period -- even the Roosevelt years were less productive. In 1964 alone the following expressions of national policy were enacted into law:

-- A Land and Water Conservation Act sets aside certain federal revenues for a program of land acquisition and assistance to the states in meeting our burgeoning outdoor recreation demands.

-- A Public Land Law Review Commission was created to study and recommend a comprehensive overhaul of the laws and policies governing the management and disposal of the public domain.

-- The Wilderness Act established a system of primitive areas to be preserved for future enjoyment and study, but with appropriate recognition of the need to develop certain resources, principally minerals, within such areas.

-- Fourteen new units were added to the National Park System, including Fire Island National Seashore and Canyonlands National Park.

-- Appropriations were made to start construction on a giant intertie of power systems in the far west, designed to balance
the power resources, public and private of a region spreading from Canada to the Lower Colorado.

-- A Water Resources Research Act provides authority for an expanded and coordinated program of water research, with emphasis on federal-state cooperation and use of land-grant college facilities.

-- "New Starts" were authorized for federal reclamation projects in Utah, Idaho, Colorado, Wyoming and Washington State.

... and last, but not least, for those of you engaged in the fishing industry, several very important pieces of legislation were passed which strengthened the research programs of the individual states and give promise of upgrading at long last the domestic commercial fishing fleet.

Now all of you are experienced enough in the ways of government to know that this kind of legislative production did not spring into being, full-blown, in the course of one year. Most of it is the culmination of long deliberation and hard bargaining going back over a two-four-or eight-year period. It represents, however, a high-water mark in executive-legislative cooperation, because federal land and water policies are uniquely within the congressional prerogative.

If, as I predict, these conservation questions are to be central public issues in this and the next decades, then we can
profitably spend our time considering how public issues are resolved in this country.

The ultimate arbiter is the consensus of the people, but this consensus is acceptable to those adversely affected only as the interested groups like your association and others are satisfied that the processes for resolution of disputes are fair and equitable and in accordance with our constitutional system.

So we must keep in mind that it is to the Congress, as our representative form of government, that land managers -- resource managers -- must look for the articulation of the rules. This is the philosophy behind the Public Land Law Review Commission. Only rules derived in legal fashion will be fully honored as decisions inevitably become harder and harder.

Perhaps your interest -- perhaps you in the business world who are seemingly remote from some of these issues will see that your role is central, too. Perhaps those of you whose crop is from the sea might see these issues as still a decade or two away. But history as I read it does illuminate. I hope you will agree.

** ** ** ** **