REMARKS OF UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JOHN A. CARVER, JR., BEFORE THE
56th ANNUAL SESSION OF THE PACIFIC LOGGING CONGRESS, PORTLAND, OREGON,
NOVEMBER 8, 1965

Four weeks ago, I keynoted another industry's opening session, that of the
American Mining Congress. The Pacific Logging Congress has different kinds of
problems, but with a few changes I could open the same way. To the Mining
Congress, I began by pointing out that the Department of the Interior touched
the economic lives of most everyone there—in some cases frontally, and in
others indirectly, but always significantly.

At one end of the spectrum in your case, of course, is the direct relationship
of seller and buyer. Many of you buy government timber from the Interior
Department.

Owing to the particular nature of most Interior Department land holdings, the
Department of the Interior is a neighboring landowner to even more of you than
buy from us. As neighbors, you find yourselves with the usual "neighborly"
problems—boundaries, rights of way, fire protection and other silvicultural
matters, and public access.

The landowning and land managing functions of both the public and private sectors
of the forest business have a special stake in the burgeoning functions of
outdoor recreation. As forest owners or forest users, you have more than the
usual citizen's concern about the Federal activities in the parks and recreation
field, and particularly in any Federal program which may remove timber from the
market. Concern about such questions paradoxically is not diminished by
distance from the area supposedly threatened.

There are many other relationships. They may not be as numerous or quite as
vital as those with the Forest Service in the direct forestry and logging
activities, but to us at least they seem to be more troublesome, particularly
in the recreation-related fields. Here, you sense that forces are at work that
are not local or regional, but national.

I am aware that the theme of your conference emphasizes changing demands for
wood and related new concepts and developments and logging methods, and better
utilization. To this theme, perhaps I can repeat another section of my
Mining Congress keynote. There has been a shift in the nature of our national
attitude toward the minerals industry and the wood industry.

And I suppose it would be accurate to observe to you, as I did to your colleagues
in the Mining business, that the grade of our reserves is declining, and that
this decline is offset by corresponding improvements in technology and the
acquisition of new knowledge.
And where not so many years ago, our policies rested on fear of exhaustion and shortages, right now the dislocations seem to be in the direction of oversupply.

Of more concern to us is a trend which has come to the forefront in the past few weeks. I detect a deterioration in the climate of confidence which I have thought had become fairly well established between the private side and the public side of the wood business.

It was three years ago now, on October 30, 1962, that we sat together—Federal, State and private interests—to work on resolutions of the mutually distressing problem of the Columbus Day windstorm. Cooperation and mutual understanding marked the effort; we demonstrated that we could work together.

At a recent national session of the Society of American Foresters, in Detroit, the timber operators, particularly those in the Northwest, evidenced that they felt somewhat put upon, to state it mildly.

Quoting from the October 29, 1965, Lewiston Tribune:

Exponents of multiple use of forest lands are being "out-communicated, often misrepresented and villified" by those seeking additional wilderness areas and national parks, George H. Rauch of Lewiston, Potlatch Forests, Inc., vice president in charge of lands and logging, said here Thursday.

The term "conservation" too often is being confused with preservation, he told the North Idaho Chamber of Commerce.

...Rauch said he was well aware of the rapidly-expanding "people pressures" to acquire, to zone for open spaces, to beautify, to develop for recreation, hunting, fishing, water management and to preserve forested lands.

"There is room for much disagreement as to how best to achieve our broad conservation goals," he said. "There is great need to debate the conservation alternatives on their merits.

"The core issue of how much and what kind of land the national and local interests can afford to have withdrawn for special uses is a valid issue and not easy to solve, but there is no room at all for false charges and villification or for 'goodguy, bad guy' conservation melodramas," he said.
The theme of your conference emphasizes utilization, which is a great interest of mine. For the past five years my responsibilities in the Department of the Interior have been related to the stewardship responsibilities given by the Congress to the Department of the Interior in the field, among others, of the public lands.

In the light of what I've said, I would like to discuss not public land policies, but rather its politics. The politics, of course, is of the small "p" variety.

I have many times said that in my opinion making the social decisions to meet the demands of 300 to 400 million people (our population within the lives of many of you in this room) for living space, food and fiber and all of the other resource requirements of a now unimaginable technology is important. Conservation and resources promise to become in our time the most critical domestic political issue.

Success in the tasks of conservation requires mastery of the workings of politics, both internal and external, because elemental conflicts of values are involved.

How these issues are posed, how they are to be resolved is my subject tonight.

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 two basic, fundamental subjects: land to live on and potable water for survival. All other resource problems can, in the long haul, be met and overcome through wise use of science, more effective utilization of known reserves and greater knowledge of world supplies.

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. This is most evident in metropolitan areas, but its effect is being felt even in relatively stable rural communities. We have seen numerous instances where semi-arid public domain lands were a drug on the market at $5 or $10 an acre in 1945. Now there is avid competition to acquire the same lands at prices ranging from $100 to much over $500 an acre.

I think one accomplishment of the last five years is to have moved away from the reactive or simplistic consideration of resources issues. It is easy to manipulate public attitudes by the device of setting up the straw man, whether that straw man is another country's policy (what they want we oppose and vice versa) or another person or group (if the lumber of cattle or mining people are for it,
we are against it, if the Sierra Club or the Wilderness Society supports
a certain proposal it must be bad per se); or a slogan (Al Sarena and Teapot
Dome stir the adrenals). I think this is no longer quite so. Now the issues
are mixed, and old alliances are disturbed.

For example, take the intertie agreements, by which Federal, private, and
municipally owned generating and distributing systems agreed on arrangements
mutually beneficial to each.

President Johnson hailed the accomplishment of that agreement with the words":. ..
if we turn away from division, if we just ignore dissension and distrust, there
is no limit to our achievements . .." And he hailed the significance of the
interties in terms neither governmental nor physical, but as a monument to
cooperation.

If slogans still dominated, if reactive rather than positive thinking were the
pattern, such accomplishments would not be possible.

Two things must be comprehended in considering the politics of resource
management. One is that pluralism is the dominant feature of our society.
This pluralism, as the demand for coordination and cooperation has increased,
has not so far slowed the march of improvements in services to the American
people.

The second is that the nature of the technological revolution must be under-
stood, and communicated to the people, lest it destroy our freedoms.

In simple terms, we must remember that our concern must not be only with the
materialist results of technological advance--which contribute to both our
comfort and our discomfort--but with the methods by which we arrive at rational
judgments as citizens of a democratically organized society.

It is a political task to see that the decision-making power doesn't pass to
any particular elite group--whether it be the aesthetic elite, the technical
elite, or the industrial or business elite.

We must constantly and consciously work to see that the political system which
must manage all these forces remains responsive and responsible--that elected
officials have a real, not a shadow role, in the process; that the nature of
resource issues is accurately and understandably stated to the public, that
local and regional governmental units are not ignored or downgraded.

How this is to be done is not so easy to state.

One approach which holds much promise is the investigation in depth of the
effectiveness of public land policies by the Public Land Law Review Commission
Under the chairmanship of Wayne Aspinall, the Commission is structured to accommodate the complexity of the subject and interests in it, and it will operate in public. The Commission members know that the public rarely speaks with one voice and that it is critically important that all segments of interested, responsible and informed opinion be heard.

Its staff director, Milton Pearl, told the American Forest Products Industries, Inc., meeting in Washington a week ago that the Congress has determined that the public land laws now in effect may be inadequate to meet the current and future needs of the American people, and has enunciated the policy that "Public lands of the United States shall be retained and managed or disposed of all in a manner to provide maximum benefit for the general public."

"With the possibility that additional areas of the public domain may be set aside for protection of their recreation potential, we must consider the merit and effectiveness of procedures by which national parks and national monuments are established and managed," Mr. Pearl said.

National forests, and all the policies and practices applying to national forests, are included in the scope of the study. In a word, a forum exists for consideration of the general or overall nature of the problems you are concerned with, additional to the legislative forum guaranteed for any given project.

The Interior Department supports strongly the approach and work of the Commission. I am on its Advisory Council as our Department's Liaison Officer. The President of AFPI, Mr. Bernard Orell, is on it. The concept of the Commission is to get all interests represented, and the wood industry is well represented by Mr. Orell and others.

Most importantly, the Commission is legislatively dominated; thirteen of its nineteen members are from Congress.

I have no desire to lull you, or to interfere with the industry's approach to this problem.

I simply do not think that there ought to be a pitched battle between the land managing agencies and the land users in these complicated times. There are all kinds of pressures competing for the use of scarce land; recreation is one. But roads, reservoirs, utility rights of way, urban expansion, and industrial uses also enter in.

It isn't a situation for doctrinaire positions. We should be willing to sit down together and discuss these matters without harshness or bitterness. I've felt that for the last five years we've been able to do just that. I hope we can continue to do so.