ADDRESS

BY

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

STEWART L. UDALL

AT

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON CONSERVATION

WEST AUDITORIUM

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MAY 24, 1962

Man's stewardship began on this continent in the tenancy of a pastoral people. Our forebears lived hard and simple lives. They subjugated the forests, built their own homes, and drew sustenence from the fields, orchards and livestock they tended. Their power to alter the land was the power of the horse and the strength of bare hands. This primitive period gradually ended, however, when invention made it possible for men to organize the wholesale harvesting and marketing of their resources.

From the outset Americans were obsessed with the idea that nature's bounty was superabundant, that

our land was a storehouse so rich that the land husbandry experience of other continents and other peoples could be ignored with impunity. Governments, or so the national attitude went, should dispense, and not protect, natural resources, and the view was widely held that any enterpriser who harvested resources was part of the forward march of progress no matter how profligate or rapacious his activities might be in terms of the long haul. The result was that for nearly a century we waged a ruthless attack on the resources of this continent. We conducted a single-minded raid on wildlife and timber and grass and even on the soil itself -- before we awoke to the

fact that we were squandering the birthright of our children.

The conservation movement had its true beginnings in the apprehensions of a few sensitive men who saw the burned forests, silt-choked streams and disappearing wildlife, and spoke out against the mismanagement of our national estate. The names of these farsighted men form an honor roll of greatness, for George Perkins Marsh, John Wesley Powell, Bernard Fernow, Carl Schurz, and John Muir and the rest were land prophets whose protests and proposals began the creation of a new American conscience, and led to the resource reform movement

that had gathered considerable strength by the turn of the century.

It was a young President, Theodore Roosevelt, who crystallized ~~this~~ the conservation movement -- and gave it a name. Under his leadership we began to check unbridled exploitation, and to take stock of our estate. Roosevelt boldly asserted the people's interest in resource management, and his vigorous attacks on the wasters slowed the pace of plunder. He was a great educator (and taught us once and for all that conservation begins with education) but he also put the first foresters and water engineers in the field to work on systematic programs of

protection, renewal and development, and he moved rapidly to reserve for all of the people the remaining land suitable for forests, parks and refuges for wildlife.

There has been a perceptible ebb and flow in the federal conservation effort since 1900. Nearly every Administration has achieved ~~worthwhile new goals, or~~ started some new programs, but there has been a period of a few years during each generation when events and the right men have combined to propel us forward on new paths. The second of these periods came when the Great Depression and the Dust Bowl served unmistable notice on the American people that we were headed towards resource

bankruptcy unless we set out in an orderly way to repair the damage of the past. The main programs of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first term were conservation programs that constituted a massive effort to rescue and reclaim and develop the land. Out of this grave domestic crisis came action programs that have changed the face of our country -- and have given us yet today a series of alphabetic symbols -- TVA, CCC, SCS, REA, AAA -- which have rich meaning for all of our people.

We would do well, I think this morning, to reflect for a moment on the significant conservation decisions of the last hundred years, and their effect

on our national life. Let me quickly enumerate some of the decisive turning points in our land history -- policies achieved for the most part through the leadership of public men and by your determined predecessors in the conservation movement:

THE HOMESTEAD ACT OF 1862 -- which has become the classic American contribution to land reform;

THE YELLOWSTONE PARK ACT OF 1872 -- which was the beginning of the idea that the most superb of our scenic lands should become parks for all of the people;

THE FOREST RESERVATION ACT OF 1891 -- which enabled Harrison, Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt to establish our national forest reserves;

THE RECLAMATION ACT OF 1902 -- which meant that water would be conserved and its benefits widely shared in the arid regions of the West;

THE ANTIQUITIES ACT OF 1906 -- which gave Presidents the power to establish national monuments;

THE WEEKS ACT OF 1911 -- which established the system of national forests in eastern United States;

THE MINERAL LEASING ACT OF 1920 -- which

set up an orderly plan for the development of our mineral wealth;

THE SOIL CONSERVATION ACT OF 1935 -- which started a nationwide program of soil and moisture conservation; and

THE TAYLOR GRAZING ACT OF 1935 -- which closed the public domain and put our grasslands under sound management.

But resource laws have little worth unless capital is invested in development and sound programs of renewal and management are instituted. We acted on this front also, and our public stewards have made our husbandry a model for the world. What

would the face of America look like today; what would be the status of our natural resources bank account were it not for the dedicated work of the men of the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Corps of Engineers, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the other Federal and State conservation agencies?

However, if the forester and reclamation engineer were the apt symbols of the national effort during Theodore Roosevelt's time, and the TVA planner and the CCC tree planter typified the New Deal, the swift ascendancy of technology has made the bulldozer,

the rocket and the laboratory scientist symbolize our hope -- and our problems -- in the 1960's.

But conservationists cannot operate on the momentum of the past. Resources are caught up in the cycle of dynamic change, and we must devise new programs and make a bold forward thrust to meet the demands of tomorrow. The quiet conservation crisis of the 1960's has resulted neither from folly nor ignorance, but from our very success as a Nation -- it touches our total environment, affects all of our resources, and is heightened by the demands of our burgeoning cities, thriving industry and expanding population. It is the conviction of this

Administration that a new effort of Rooseveltian proportions must be made if we are to secure an adequate resource base for the future, and plan the use of our land resources so that material progress and the creation of a life-giving environment will go hand in hand.

A new effort is needed because we must now concern ourselves with the whole range of resources: with energy and metals, forests and forage; soils and water; wildlife and fish. But we are also concerned with all these things in combination, for together they make up the natural world - the outdoor America that is such a vital part of our national heritage.

It is President Kennedy's view that the land depends upon us as much as we depend on the land, and his thinking is reflected in the fact that his budgets have strengthened all of our existing conservation programs. In his special conservation message to the Congress in March the President re-defined conservation for the 1960's, and this definition should serve as one of the key themes of this conference.

"Conservation", the President said, "can be defined as the wise use of our natural environment; it is, in the final analysis, the highest form of national thrift -- the prevention of waste and

despoilment while preserving, improving and renewing the quality and usefulness of all our resources."

We need a whole army of resource specialists -- scientists, engineers and planners -- but we must also strengthen the capacity of all those in positions of leadership to think broadly, plan wisely, and act vigorously. The piecemeal approach of the past to resource problems will not suffice in the 1960's -- this is the central lesson we must all learn. The goals and purposes of President Kennedy's conservation program give us a clear concept of the dimensions and complexity

of our problems. Let me summarize some of them:

Exploit science to "create" new resources and enlarge the use of existing resources;

Give new vigor to traditional programs;

Unlock the resources of the sea;

Reserve for their high human uses the remnants of the American wilderness;

Establish a land conservation fund to ensure the acquisition of key conservation lands;

Wage an all-out attack on water and air pollution;

Help cities save open space and plan their growth;

Grow adequate timber supplies for future needs;

Save the remaining shorelines for public use;

Learn to husband fresh water, and seek the means of extracting it from the sea;

Plan now the water development of all river basins;

Preserve a viable habitat for waterfowl and wildlife;

Mount a ~~vigorous~~ broad campaign -- with invigorated state and local participation -- to enlarge the opportunities for outdoor recreation;

Earmark military reservation lands as an ultimate conservation reserve for federal, state and local governments;

Establish a Youth Conservation Corps to work in the vineyard on most of these problems, and above all

Share our conservation know-how and conservation ethic with men everywhere.

This program, as the President fully realizes, calls for a new level of performance by our people, new leadership at all levels of government -- and additional sacrifices by our citizens.

Some of the President's proposals have already become law: AND the last session of the Congress enacted a strong water pollution control act, passed an

open space program for cities, greatly expanded the saline water research program, made the great outer beach of Cape Cod a national seashore, and enacted the wetlands bill to preserve our waterfowl.

If the 87th Congress achieves the goals we anticipate, (and may I say that the American people are most fortunate in having a superb team of conservation leaders in the Congress) it will write a record of conservation accomplishments second to none. It is too much to hope that all of these far-reaching bills will be enacted, but if all of us give timely help there is good reason to believe that before Congress adjourns we will have a strong

Wilderness Bill, a Youth Conservation Corps, a Land Conservation Fund, a Farm Bill with new conservation provisions, grants to the states for outdoor recreation planning, a federal-state shoreline acquisition bill, an expansion of the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge, and two additional National Seashores.

However, even if this Congress reaches this high level of performance, there will yet be much unfinished business. The President has stressed in all of his messages on natural resources that we must think ahead and plan for tomorrow in order to do an adequate job as stewards of our national heritage.

Let me in the remaining portion of my formal remarks discuss with you some of the problems and opportunities which we in my Department see before us in the 1960's -- and on beyond. Other unfinished business!

I think we can all agree, as a starter, that wise planning is the one indispensable ingredient. The recent work of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the Kerr Committee on Water Resources, the Department of Agriculture's Timber Resources Review, and the Paley Commission, has certainly taught us that broad-gauged inquiries are needed before long-range

federal and state action programs can be formulated.

We have also demonstrated that action can follow quickly upon the heels of planning. A month after the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended the creation of a new Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the President endorsed this proposal in a message to Congress. After one more month, this new Bureau was established and is now a going concern.

I think it is also plain to all of us that scientific and social research must be the bedrock of all our planning and action programs. Our investment in conservation research now will

determine the environment in which our children will live in times to come, and the growth potential of the economy they inherit. The leaders of private industry are wisely making huge investments in research, but the responsibility for basic conservation research must fall heavily on government; first because governments must consider a longer time span than individuals; and second, because governments can best take account of the uncertainties of the future -- uncertainties in the rate of population growth, unforeseen changes in the national needs and the unpredictable demands of defense.

Our efforts in conservation research have these purposes:

To increase the knowledge on which planning and action must be based;

To find the highest and best uses of known resources;

To discover new resources.

Research as a basis for planning and action is nowhere better illustrated than in the problems of water resources. We do not yet have adequate knowledge to be able to predict the effects of upstream developments in a river basin on downstream water regulation and use; nor do we understand the long-term effects of flood control

measures on the natural regime of streams and flood plains, or the behavior of ground water reservoirs.

To find the highest and best uses of known resources, we need better ways to combine the tools of economic projection and physical research. In the case of iron ore, for example, the technological effort necessary to permit utilization of lower grade ore through beneficiation has come too late.

A present and pressing example lies in the abundant living resources of the ocean. Our own national needs for animal protein are adequately met by our livestock and fishing industries, but

elsewhere more than half the Earth's population suffers from a grave deficiency of animal protein. I am convinced that this deficiency can be overcome through the development of means of extracting and packaging fish protein in a form that can be distributed and marketed inexpensively in the inland areas of Asia, Africa, and South America. Such an exciting conservation development would bring health and new hope to more than a billion people throughout the world.

Nor should we forget that education is the key, both to the techniques and the ethic of conservation. We must produce more young people

with the skills needed for resource development, broad knowledge of the social, economic and technical factors that play upon each other in this field, and the idealism and farsightedness that will give them a deep concern for the future.

The American conservation movement has always been an optimistic endeavor -- concerned with a future in which it saw great hope. Unbridled optimism can lead us astray, however, and it is necessary for us to reflect soberly upon some of the hard facts with which we are confronted in this decade.

The world population explosion is a fact. We here are not basically responsible for root solutions to that issue -- morals and science and education must provide those answers. But we do have the obligation to measure the resource implications of this phenomenon. We ignore them at our peril. Only if we provide the data can the

other disciplines formulate the social and public policies needed to cope with the problem. Failing in this, we face an austere rationing of even those things which have been traditionally free in America -- its waters, wilderness and space. The tragic alternative is a primitive struggle for control of dwindling resources.

We need also to be realistic about the nature of our association in the conservation community. Each of us has some paramount interest in the natural environment we are committed to protect. Yet ours is an age of inevitable

competition for resources. An increased population enjoying a higher standard of living will intensify the inherent conflict among the various conservation values which have been traditionally regarded as mutually consistent parts of a unified movement. Controversy between, for example, park enthusiasts and hydroelectric power advocates, dam builders and salmon fishermen, industrial needs and scenic values etc -- all of these will become more frequent and more divisive unless we ~~construct and~~ adhere to a higher order of conservation statesmanship.

Insistence upon a purist, "all or nothing" position on complex issues can only dilute our

influence. The resulting inaction will mean lost opportunities in a period of "last chances." To avoid ultimate failure of all our efforts we must face up to our differences and reconcile them for mutual gain.

In another area, we have tended to be excessively defensive about the basic values that motivate us. It is fallacy, in my view, to attempt a justification of conservation solely in short-run economic terms. Conservation of every resource cannot produce the same margin of profit as concentrated exploitation. Attempts to demonstrate the contrary do a disservice to our integrity and weaken our position. Conservation does not mean

economic loss, but not all national forests would stand the test of a cost-benefit ratio and a secluded glade will not produce income or taxes on a par with high-rise apartments or a filling station. It is time for the American people to assume the burdens of maturity. Social values must be equated with economic values; the overriding need of men for an environment that will renew the human spirit and sustain unborn generations requires some sacrifice of short-term profits. "To thine own self be true" is a wise admonition with broad implications for all Americans today.

Until recent decades, our investment in

future resources has been drawn from accumulated natural capital. Not only have the national forests and parks been carved out of the unreserved public domain, but private railroads, family homesteads, even sites for thriving communities, came from the same reservoir. It is time to reverse the flow of investment. The affluence which grew out of the land must now provide the means for repairing and sustaining it.

The incentive for private investment in the protection of private resources is inherent in our economic system; even these incentives must be reexamined and strengthened. But it is our public

budgets that demand constructive, imaginative attention at this critical time of our national life. Both public confidence and wise husbandry demand that public investment show the same careful planning as we would exercise in private affairs. We must assess our conservation needs, establish priorities and make wise choices as to the tasks to be undertaken first. Above all, however, we bear the responsibility for convincing the nation that our resource budget can no longer remain unbalanced at the expense of fiscal expediency, that the resource base must get its fair share of reinvested national output.

In establishing goals and fixing priorities, both public and private, primary attention must be focused on the glaring evidence of our gross neglect. The scars of past abuse are apparent in many areas of the American land. Restoration has been too long delayed, productivity has been permanently impaired. One such symbol of our national disgrace exists in my own department. More than a decade ago, one of my predecessors pointed to the shocking depletion of the Federal range. Failure to repair that damage and to restore vegetation now finds us with more than 50% of the public domain grazing

lands incapable of contributing their necessary part of the nation's well-being. Strip mining has similarly wasted untold acres of private lands in the populous East and Mid West. Small forests and woodlots constitute an untapped resource for our cellulose needs of the future. We have lacked either the capacity or the daring to appraise some of our social and legal institutions which militate against conservation, such as the inseparability of surface ownership from mineral resources under the mining laws.

We must not be dismayed by these multitudinous demands. Success will come through

the strong leadership of dedicated public men and women. And public efforts are being augmented and supported by conscientious management of enlightened private ownership and by the voluntary efforts of individuals and groups, and privately financed research. One of the heartening developments of the past eighteen months has been the number of bold, well-conceived and realistically financed state CONSERVATION programs put into motion by Governor Brown in California, Governor Rockefeller in New York, Governors Meyner and Hughes in New Jersey, Governor Nelson in Wisconsin, Governor Lawrence in Pennsylvania, and others, whose progress is only

beginning. These programs, in concert with efforts of the political subdivisions and stimulated by the Federal assistance now in contemplation, carry much of the burden of making up the accumulated resource deficit. The success of Nature Conservancy projects under Mellon Foundation sponsorship and such local organizations as the Philadelphia Conservationists and the Friends of the Glen in Yellow Springs, Ohio, demonstrate that public enthusiasm can still carry forward essential work that might otherwise be overlooked.

X X X X X