

U.S. Congress
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 12

JUNE 12, 1967, TO JUNE 20, 1967

(PAGES 15309 TO 16558)

A NEW ORIENTATION IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this month the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science published the first of a two-volume series entitled "Social Goals and Indicators for American Society." Special editor of the series is Bertram M. Gross, professor of political science and director of the National Planning Studies Program of Syracuse University. He is also well known as a former Executive Secretary of the Council of Economic Advisers.

This volume of the Annals relates to a subject that will be considered in depth this coming Monday at a seminar sponsored by the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations. The seminar, which will be held in room 3302, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m., will consider legislation entitled "The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act of 1967," S. 843. A distinguished panel of social scientists, educators, and experts in social fields will participate.

The legislation provides for the creation of a President's Council of Social Advisers comparable to the Council of Economic Advisers, provides for a Social Report by the President, declares social accounting a national goal, and establishes a joint congressional committee with oversight responsibility regarding the Social Report.

In an introduction to the Annals, Professor Gross has described the history of, need for, and potential of social accounting. Because it is especially pertinent to the seminar Monday, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the introduction was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW ORIENTATION IN AMERICAN GOVERNMENT

(By Bertram M. Gross and Michael Springer¹)

ABSTRACT: The variety of approaches and subjects in this volume reflects the informa-

¹ Michael Marien, graduate research assistant at Syracuse University, has helped in preparing this article. The assistance of the Stern Family Fund is acknowledged for having helped the special editor in producing these two volumes and also for having facilitated the convening of special exploration-and-review sessions on many of the articles. Acknowledgement must also be made of the ideas, encouragement and stimulus provided by the participants in these sessions: Albert D. Biderman, Bureau of Social Science Research; Alfred Blumstein, Institute for Defense Analyses; Michel Chevalier, University of Pennsylvania; Albert Cohen, University of Connecticut; John Dixon, Basic Systems, Xerox Corp.; Julius C. C. Edelstein, C.U.N.Y.; William Ehling, Syracuse University; Nathan Goldman, Syracuse University; Robert W. Gregg, Syracuse University; William G. Grigsby, University of Pennsylvania; Jack B. Haskins, Syracuse University; Michael Harrington, League for Industrial Democracy; Moyomo Ise, Crusade for Opportunity, Syracuse; Joe Kappel, Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare; Gerald J. Karaska, Syracuse University; Andrew Kopkind, *New Republic*; Peter Lejins, University of Maryland; William F. Lipman, Federal Office, California Legislature; Michael Marien, Syracuse University; S. M. Miller, N.Y.U. (on leave to Ford Founda-

tion explosion in social indicators. Current expansion of social indicator activity has been given impetus by: (1) the growing awareness of the contributions and limitations of economic information; (2) the implementation of the Planning-Programming-Budgeting System within the federal government; and (3) specific proposals for increased utilization of social information, such as the Technology Commission's call for social accounting, annual Social Reports of the President, and a "Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act." Normative concerns require that our "data system" remain unsystematic, with promotion of both multiple sources and dissonance. Furthermore, the development and use of social information should not be thought of solely in executive agency terms—there is a creative role for Congress in this area.

(NOTE.—Bertram M. Gross, Syracuse, New York, is Professor of Political Science and Director, National Planning Studies Program, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University. He has been Fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (1961-1962); Executive Secretary of the President's Council of Economic Advisers; Member of Arlington County Planning Commission and Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission; and First Chairman of the National Capital Regional Planning Council in the United States. He is the author of *The State of the Nation: Social Systems Accounting* (1966); *The Managing of Organizations* (1964); and *The Legislative Struggle* (1953). Michael Springer, Syracuse, New York, is Graduate Assistant, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.)

"... Upon this gifted age, in its dark hour
Rains from the sky a meteoric shower
Of facts . . . they lie unquestioned, uncombined,

Wisdom enough to leach of us of our ill
Is daily spun, but there exists no loom
To weave it into fabric."

—EDNA ST. VINCENT MILLAY.*

In the middle third of the twentieth century, the United States made historic advances in developing regular, well-ordered, and increasingly reliable economic data. These advances were of some help to private and public decision-making in meeting the challenges of the Great Depression and World War II. They have been of increasingly greater help, it is widely acknowledged, since 1946.

As Americans enter the last third of the century, a subtle but profoundly significant shift is beginning to take place in the informational premises of decision-making throughout the country: *more explicit attention to transeconomic goals and data.* This shift is associated—both as cause and effect—with a rapidly emerging proliferation of publicly and privately produced social in-

tion); Howard E. Mitchell, University of Pennsylvania; Robert B. Mitchell, University of Pennsylvania; G. Holmes Perkins, University of Pennsylvania; Ivar Peterson, *New York Times*; Douglas W. Rae, Syracuse University; John Rider, Syracuse University; Pamela Roby, N.Y.U.; Bruce M. Russett, Yale University; Seymour Sachs, Syracuse University; Marshall H. Segall, Syracuse University; Thorsten Sellin, University of Pennsylvania; Eleanor B. Sheldon, Russell Sage Foundation; William H. T. Smith, Chief of Police, Syracuse, N.Y.; Stanton Wheeler, Russell Sage Foundation; Oliver P. Williams, University of Pennsylvania; Preston Wilcox, Columbia University; Marvin E. Wolfgang, University of Pennsylvania; and Roland E. Wolsley, Syracuse University.

*Collected Sonnets of Edna St. Vincent Millay (New York; Washington Square Press, 1959).

dicators. This "meteoric shower"—as illustrated by the following articles and the companion volume of THE ANNALS to be published in September 1967—may well prove to be one of the most important, complicated and challenging aspects of the modern "information explosion."

While the social indicator explosion raises many new problems for the structure of American government, the relations between private and public agencies, and the place of the individual in an increasingly organized society, this article will focus on some more prosaic issues which must be understood before one can begin to face these larger questions. This article will attempt to introduce these issues by dealing with the variety of approaches in this volume, some key points in the social indicator information explosion, and our unsystematic national data system.

In so doing, we shall touch upon various legislative proposals bearing upon these subjects, particularly the "Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" (S. 843) proposed by Senator Walter F. Mondale and ten other senators.²

"New Goals for Social Indicators," the introductory article for the forthcoming September 1967 volume of THE ANNALS will deal directly with the even more complex issue of the relationship between indicators and goals in terms of the profound normative questions involved in the selection of indicators; their underpinnings in concepts, theories and values; the need for both qualitative and quantitative information; and the possible consequences of this new orientation in American government. In the same issue Amital Etzioni will analyze the dangers in valid social measurements, and Raymond A. Bauer the problems involved in the use of more and better information by individuals, organizations, and governments.

A VARIETY OF APPROACHES

In these two volumes of THE ANNALS (May and September 1967) a varied group of scholars, government officials, and journalists explore what is—or what they think should be—going on in a wide variety of specialized fields. One of our purposes, apart from probing these areas, is to illuminate the variety of different approaches to social indicators and goals.

The ten articles in this volume, for example, have been written by three sociologists (Duncan, Glaser, and Williams), three political scientists (Gross, Moynihan, and Scammon), two journalists (Fontaine and Gottehrer), one law professor (Konvitz), and one economist (Fisher). While only one now serves full-time in government, four have held high government positions involving the use of data in policy-making. Most of the others have been frequently consulted by different national and local agencies. Some have emphasized conceptual underpinnings, some concrete and discernible trends, some the analysis of interrelations. A few have concentrated on goals and qualitative judgments, less on quantifiable facts. The article on civil liberties (by Konvitz) deals directly with the philosophy of values. The article on New York City (by Gottehrer) deals frankly—and politically—with the political aspects of urban indicators.

In two articles on the urban environment, Moynihan and Gottehrer open up a world of diverse approaches. Moynihan more systematically and Gottehrer more impressionistically address themselves to the problem

² Senators Clark (Pa.), Hart (Mich.), Harris (Ind.), Inouye (Hawaii), Kennedy (Mass.), McCarthy (Minn.), McGee (Wyo.), Muskie (Maine), Nelson (Wis.), and Proxmire (Wis.). Senator Proxmire, it may be noted, is Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress.

of getting behind "aggregatics."³ They both realize that in such a vast and heterogeneous country, a soundly compiled national indicator may have as much meaning as would a Weather Bureau report on today's average national weather. They are both aware that some data on a city as a whole conceal great disparities. Meaningful urban indicators, they show, must be "disaggregated" to differentiate between different people, families, organizations, and areas in a metropolis. Neither is overly impressed by distinctions between "economic" and "transeconomic."

They make it clear that anyone dealing seriously with urban indicators must address himself to the local components of almost all forms of available data. Barry Gottehrer, assistant to the mayor of the largest city in the United States, makes a major proposal for "State of the City" reports that are to go well beyond the usual statements about city departments and report on the "quality of life" in urban areas. His article is followed by Moynihan's which cuts across an array of social data to outline a starting point for such reports.

In the September 1967 volume, with more articles placing the major emphasis on goals, this diversity will become still greater. Thus, S. M. Miller's article on "Poverty and inequality" will take the position that a minimum approach by government in any society with significant inequalities must provide for rising minimum levels not only of income, wealth and basic services, but also of self-respect and opportunities for social mobility and participation in many forms of decision-making.

Indicator suggestions

Area	U.S. Government statistical series		Other
	New data	Better use of existing data	
Individual and group values		Compilation of non-Government attitude surveys...	Research on: (1) Intensity of commitment to particular values and beliefs; (2) relation between apparent reduction of ethnocentrism and growth or more intellectual evaluations; (3) extent of concern over leisure; (4) extent of loss of belongingness, loss of norms, uprootedness, etc.; and (5) relationship between overt acts and expressed values.
Civil liberties	Continued utilization of Presidential and congressional commissions to explore the most pressing problems in the area of civil liberties.		Research on: (1) Effectiveness of fair housing, employment, and education acts; (2) the exercise of academic freedom; and (3) the effects of pornography. Development of tools to evaluate such complex questions as the relationship between non-violent demonstrations and respect for law. More research by such institutions as Columbia's Center for Research and Education in American Liberties.
Electoral participation	Bureau of Census: Biyearly estimates by States of numbers of citizens of voting age eligible under State law to vote.	More detail in statistical abstract on Negro voter registration. Compilation of State and local registration and voting statistics.	Research on: (1) Factors affecting turnout and registration; (2) characteristics of those who run for office; and (3) influence of turnout on parties and local government.
The mass media	Federal Communications Commission to publish national and local time series on the proportion of advertising and news time by the networks and broadcasters, the size of listening audiences and the types of programs.		Professional appraisals of extent of depth reporting systems and editorial professionalism. Research into the effect of mass media on values and behavior, where people get information, and functions of newspapers.
Discrimination against Negroes	Bureau of Census and other agencies: Separate orientals from "nonwhite" category. Statistics of intermarriage. Publication of Equal Opportunity Commission data on Negro employment by sectors of industry and by job category.	Bureau of Census and other agencies: Publication of key indicators on conditions of Negroes (i.e., employment, income, housing, education, voter registration, etc.) School segregation status for all regions (not just the South). More extensive groupings of data by cohorts.	More extensive analysis of existing data. Repeated standardized field observation studies of Negro communities and problem areas (for race relations).
Crime and delinquency	Survey to determine whether offenses are reported to police and, if so, with what consequences. Surveys of corporations, government agencies, etc., to determine extent of white-collar crime. Surveys of women to determine incidence of rape.	Periodic reports on separate categories of crime to include through analysis of data. Revision of FBI Uniform Crime Reports to include: (1) Comparison of police and survey data on particular offenses and (2) adequate assessment of crime rates for similar offenders who received diverse judicial and correctional treatment.	Assessment of alternative crime control measures, including their unintended consequences, such as other kinds of crimes.
The natural environment	Data on physical characteristics and contaminants in streams, estuaries, lakes, air above metropolitan areas, solid wastes, etc. Estimates of costs and benefits (social as well as economic) and other measures to achieve specified standards of quality.	Combining of existing series relating to water and air conditions; placing them on a common basis of concepts, definitions, and methods of measurement. Further efforts to standardize underlying assumptions and procedures for estimating costs and benefits associated with environmental projects and programs.	Development of statistical information on environmental quality for more effective pollution-abatement programs.
Urban conditions	More detailed information on intercity migration... Employment data that can be disaggregated to areas within a city. Information on location of jobs within the standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA). Segregation data for private as well as public schools. Local components of other indicator suggestions.	Census data further organized according to political jurisdictions. Taeuber indexes for every SMSA in the country. Urban area data books for the nontechnical reader. Further efforts to indicate the limitations and inaccuracies of existing data.	Research on: (1) Participation in all aspects of community life; (2) use of cultural facilities; (3) changing social and economic structure of low income areas; (4) effects of urban density; and (5) patterns of educational quality within SMSA's. More extensive support of in situ studies of urban neighborhoods. Local components of other indicator suggestions.

Thus, attention is directed to aspects of "spiritual poverty" as well as to neglected aspects of economic living standards.

These differences are reflected in the kinds of new information implicitly and explicitly called for by each author. We have freely adapted their proposals and added a number of our own in the table "Indicator Suggestions." (This table will be continued in the September issue.) In the area of United States government statistical series,

there are proposals both for new data and for better use of existing data. The "Other" column includes proposals for the studies needed to provide both better interpretation of available data and the conceptual framework for more effective data collection and interpretation. These proposals more than reflect the authors' ideas for improved social indicators. They also reflect the types of demands that are now being made upon both public and private data gathering agencies.

The nature of these demands and the types of substantive information within the following articles are rooted both in personal and disciplinary backgrounds and in the characteristics of the subject matter. They suggest the difficulties involved within any one of the specific areas dealt with: civil liberties, elections, mass media, discrimination, crime and the natural and urban environment (in this volume), or poverty, em-

ployment, education, physical and mental health, art, television, and the broader aspects of democratic participation (in the September 1967 volume). The subjects covered by both volumes will present only a partial view of the rich variety of available social indicators. No attempt will be made to identify—let alone analyze—the myriad interrelationships between these subjects. While the reader will be given an opportunity to learn about a number of trees, we shall not help him see the forest. A purpose of these volumes is to indicate the scope and limitations of some available social indicators. Implicit in this effort, also, is a demonstration of the futility of simple-minded holistic views of social life. This may reflect the probability that the growth of science and self-awareness can lead to confusion and ambiguity as well as surety.

This paradox of a poverty of perspective in the midst of a growing abundance of data

³ "Aggregatics," a form of mental acrobatics in which nonspatial, macroguesstimates are juggled in the air without reaching the ground in any territorial entity smaller than the nation itself." Quoted from Bertram M. Gross, "The City of Man: A Social System Reckoning," in *Man's Environment: Next 50 Years* (Bloomington, Ind.: University of Indiana Press, 1967).

pointed unmistakably toward an enlarged role for transeconomic information, particularly information bearing on the "quality of life."

The Technology Commission's call for social accounting

In January 1966, major support for new ways of dealing with social information came from the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. Despite disagreements on other subjects, the Commission was unanimous in stating that our ability to measure social change has lagged behind our ability to measure strictly economic change.⁹

The Commission called for some system of social accounts to assess the utilization of human resources in four areas:

1. The measurement of social costs and net returns of innovation.

2. The measurement of social ills (for example, crime and family disruption).

3. The creation of "performance budgets" in areas of defined social needs (for example, housing, education, and welfare).

4. Indicators of economic opportunity and social mobility.

Action along these lines, it was stated, could help put economic accounting into a broader framework.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Department's transdepartmental mission

In March 1966, President Johnson formally assigned the following mission to John Gardner, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW):

"Through the program entrusted to its care, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare exercises continuing concern for the social well-being of all our people. Already, as I have indicated in this message, it has become possible to set ambitious goals for the future. . . .

"To improve our ability to chart our progress, I have asked the Secretary to establish within his office the resources to develop the necessary social statistics and indicators to supplement those prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Council of Economic Advisers. With these yardsticks, we can better measure the distance we have come and plan for the way ahead."¹⁰

HEW was given this transdepartmental mission for several reasons. Under the effective leadership of its present Secretary, John Gardner, the department has been able to develop a broad base of political support and respect within government and the academic community. This has allowed HEW to assume a job that not only could have significant effects on every department in the federal establishment, but also requires the wholehearted cooperation of a good number of "free intellectuals" from in and out of government. Furthermore, since Secretary Arthur Fleming under the Eisenhower Administration, HEW had taken the lead in organizing available social data and developing new programs of data collection. Under the active sponsorship of Wilbur J. Cohen, now Undersecretary, the HEW's Office of Program Analysis continuously improved its monthly *HEW Indicators* (with charts and tables modeled on the Council of Economic Advisers' *Economic Indicators*) and its annual supplement, *HEW Trends*.¹¹ To the surprise of HEW, a White House review of the situation showed no comparable transoceanic work by any other de-

partment. Moreover, even within its own area, the Department's key officials, with many new, enormous programs to administer, were deeply dissatisfied with the statistical status quo. They wanted the better information required for effective handling of their new managerial burdens.

Within HEW, major responsibility for the new mission was assigned to William Gorham, Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination. An economist and "systems analyst" from the Rand Corporation and Secretary McNamara's office in the Department of Defense, Mr. Gorham is also in charge of the new PPBS activity in HEW. He has organized a Social Indicators Panel composed of about two dozen scholars and experts from universities and other non-governmental research institutions and has asked Daniel Bell to serve with him as the Panel's cochairman.

Under the guidance of Gorham and Bell, the experts on the panel have been encouraged to consult widely with their colleagues and to seek help from the best minds available. They have worked in collaboration with an ever widening panel of data experts from many other government agencies. This activity has proceeded in an open and non-secretive manner, with increasing coverage in the press.

The possible Social Reports of the President

By early 1967 it became widely known that work was under way to prepare professional materials that could be used in proposing a first Social Report of the President. The rationale for developing such a proposal was expressed in a working memorandum by the two cochairmen as follows:

"No society in history has, as yet, made a coherent and unified effort to assess those elements in the society which facilitate and which bar each individual from realizing to the fullest extent possible his talents and abilities, in order to allow him to find a job, or establish a career commensurate with his talents, to live a full and healthy life equal to his biological potential, to establish the conditions for an adequate standard of living which allows him to live in a civilized fashion, and which provides a physical and social environment which enhances his sense of life. We believe that these are aims implicit in the American purpose. We believe that the means of realizing these are possible. If it is agreed that this is an appropriate and adequate focus, the function of the Social Report would be to provide a continuing assessment of our abilities to realize these aims."

At this present stage of social science development, deficiencies in both data and theory impose serious constraints. First, the analysts must "make do" with existing data. Second, they must also get along without the kind of "overview framework" provided for economic information by national economic accounting. The first difficulty is eased by the assumption that the social reports themselves would promote action to fill the most critical "social data gaps." As for the second difficulty, some fear that this is inherent in the nature of the information explosion in social indicators. Others hope that with the resulting loss of perspective there will be increasing interest in serious efforts to develop operating models for systematizing social data. The senior author of this paper has already made some preliminary suggestions along these lines in *The State of the Nation: Social Systems Accounting*, and plans to continue this discussion in his Introduction to the September 1967 volume of *THE ANNALS*.

An awareness of these constraints on the part of external observers has even led to calls for quicker action. Thus, the columnist Joseph Kraft summarized a discussion of the subject as follows:

"To be sure, an annual social report is not going to end congested streets, air pollutions,

and the shortchanging of the consumer interest. But it can create a climate of continuous self-correction; a barrier against irrevocable mistakes, not to say disasters, such as the loss of a Negro generation. And that, it seems to me, is perhaps the most important domestic business now before the Nation."¹²

In February 1967, Senator Walter G. Mondale (Minn.) and his group of ten other senators called for a legislative structure for annual social reporting by the President, professional assistance, and congressional participation. Their proposed "Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" (S. 843) parallels in many ways the Employment Act of 1946. Its major sections provide for:

(1) an annual Social Report of the President to be transmitted by March 20 of each year,

(2) a Council of Social Advisers to assist in preparing the report and working on the underlying studies and data, and

(3) a Joint Committee on the Social Report (composed of eight Senators and eight Representatives) to review the Social Report and transmit its findings thereon to the Congress by June 1 of each year.

The sponsors have arranged for the bill to be referred first to the Committee on Government Operations and then to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Public hearings will presumably be held before subcommittees of each.

OUR UNSYSTEMATIC NATIONAL DATA SYSTEM

"The Johnson Administration," the *Wall Street Journal* has reported, "is considering a major centralization of its sprawling statistical empire—hopefully without giving it a 'police-state' image."¹³

The idea of national "data centers" (or, if one may use a popular but misleading metaphor, "data banks") has developed as a natural result of the increasing need for "administrative statistics," the rising capacity of each generation of electronic computers to store, process, retrieve and deliver such data, and the mounting aspirations of computer designers, producers, and users. The social indicator explosion has contributed to interest in this idea.

In the short compass of this chapter, we can merely identify a few of the "data system" issues made more acute by the social indicator explosion. We cannot directly discuss the broader problems of "information management," the so-called "credibility gap," or the "dossier problem" (which might become more acute when there are more life-cycle and longitudinal studies along the lines suggested by Otis Dudley Duncan and Daniel Glaser in their articles in this issue.)¹⁴ Our remarks will be limited to suggesting three normative principles for dealing with three basic questions:

Who should collect social indicators?

What should be done about conflicting data and interpretation?

What should be the role of the Congress?

THE PRINCIPLE OF MULTIPLE SOURCES

Even the strongest proponents of a national data center recognize the need for some types of decentralized collection, analysis, and dissemination of data. Thus, within the federal government, we have recently seen the creation in HEW of a National Center for

¹² *Washington Post*, January 4, 1967.

¹³ Article by Richard F. Janssen, *Wall Street Journal*, November 11, 1966. The possible difference between image and reality was not mentioned.

¹⁴ At the Russell Sage Foundation, Stanton Wheeler is exploring this problem by examining a series of case studies. The subject is also being studied by the Budget Bureau's panel on a national data center, although without the participation of lawyers such as Milton Konvitz who have specialized on civil liberty problems.

⁹ *Report of National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

¹⁰ President Lyndon B. Johnson, *Message to the Congress on Domestic Health and Education*, March 1, 1966.

¹¹ *HEW Indicators* (monthly) has been recently discontinued. This may result in an expansion of *HEW Trends*.

Education Statistics and the National Health Survey. There is widespread support for a national bureau of criminological research, as proposed by Daniel Glaser in his article in this issue. The National Science Foundation is developing new sources of information on the volume and type of scientific activities. New government programs often involve specialized agencies in the collection of the social data required under their legislation—as with the Negro employment data collected by the new Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. True, the Bureau of the Census provides remarkably expert facilities for conducting surveys for other agencies or processing the information they collect. But the impact of the Bureau's work has been less to replace decentralized data collection than to provide the central services needed to facilitate it. The next few years will see the growth of perhaps dozens of specialized data centers run or financed by the federal government—mostly in areas beyond the traditional boundaries of economics.

This proliferation of data calls for the Census Bureau to increase its efforts in developing more useful compendia of "processed" data such as the *Statistical Abstract* and the *Historical Statistics of the United States*. Given the scope of presently available information, these documents could easily include separate sections on civil liberties and discrimination against Negroes. In the near future they could include a section on the arts and greatly expanded sections on health, crime, and other areas about which more reliable information is being developed. Furthermore, the Bureau should seriously consider producing more special-purpose compendia of easily understood summaries of information, such as the urban area data books suggested by Daniel P. Moynihan in his article in this issue. Such efforts will make information available to a vast number of citizens—some of whom may very well be congressmen, government officials, and political activists—who do not have the machines, money, or skills to make meaningful numbers from computer tapes.

Both the Census Bureau and other federal agencies must probably limit themselves to the collection and analysis of what Daniel P. Moynihan labels "pan-political" data. This notion refers to the simple fact that no piece of information is apolitical, but that the type of information collected by federal agencies has been and will in the future be designed to service the widest possible spectrum of political interests. This, of course, places certain constraints upon the statistical services within the federal government, and there are certain questions they cannot examine. For this and a number of other reasons, the "multiple source" principle extends beyond the federal government to at least four other areas: local and state governments; public action associations; private research institutions; and the press. Cities, regional planning agencies, and state governments are collecting social data that is far more sophisticated than is possible on a nationwide basis. In so doing, of course, they usually start off with Census data and other federally provided information. Chambers of Commerce and other business organizations are increasingly engaged in surveys bearing on the widening interests of business enterprise. It may be presumed that their example will be followed by labor unions, Community Chests, and other civic action groups on the brink of entering the twentieth century.

One of the most strategic of all roles is played by private research institutions, whether or not university-based. In the 1920's, the National Bureau of Economic Research patiently laid the basis for the national income work taken over by the Department of Commerce in the 1930's. Maintaining the initiative, it then mobilized the intellectual resources needed to guide the continuous improvement and extension of this work by

government. Although there is (as yet) no comparable institution in the field of social indicators, there are many research institutions with rapidly expanding capacities and scope. Some specialize in sample surveys on almost any conceivable subject. Some concentrate on specific subject-matter areas. A few of the smaller foundations—particularly the Twentieth Century Fund and the Russell Sage Foundation—have conducted path-breaking studies involving the collection and analysis of social data.

It seems both likely and desirable that the present multiplicity of sources will become still "more multiple." Technically, specialization demands it. The dynamics of both political action and scientific research suggest that more and better production of social indicators by the federal government (like public expenditures in the Keynesian model) might have a "multiplier effect" on nonfederal collection, analysis, and interpretation.

The principle of "systemic dissonance"

There is a delightful (albeit somewhat terrifying) ambiguity behind pending proposals for a national data center. Among advanced students of "information theory," this should be no cause for surprise. Information engineers may be relied upon, in their recurring bursts of artistic enthusiasm, to contribute to misinformation about their work. "Their skill in the precise language of mathematics has not been matched by an ability to cope with the greater ambiguities of the word-language in which mathematics is embedded."¹⁵

One view of a national data system is rooted in the "informational retrieval" problem. From this point of view, we face an information crisis that may be defined as "the overproduction of information relative to the capacity for the storage, analysis, and distribution to point of need."¹⁶ Under a glutted "market place of ideas," to use the phrase of Oliver Wendell Holmes, information cannot flow freely, an immobility probably far more serious than constraints on the mobility of capital and labor. The exploitation of advancing technology for storing, processing, and distributing information opens up new potentials for "assembling scientific and technical information and disseminating it to those who need it, whenever and wherever they need it." The more naive model-builders think these potentials can be developed through formal structure modeled

¹⁵ Bertram M. Gross, "Information Theorists," *The Managing of Organizations* (New York: Free Press, 1964), Vol. 1, pp. 210-213. Reference is here made to Bar Hillel's "An Examination of Information Theory," *Philosophy of Science* (1955): "We see again and again that, in spite of the official disavowal of the interpretation of 'information' as 'what is conveyed by a signal sequence,' 'amount of information,' officially meant to be a measure of the rarity of the kinds of transmissions of signal sequences, acquires also and sometimes predominantly, the connotation of a measure . . . of the kinds of facts . . . designated by these signal sequences" (p. 94). Shannon and Weaver themselves contribute to this ambiguity by stating that their use of the word "communication" involves "not only written and oral speech, but also music, the pictorial arts, the theatre, ballet, and in fact all human behavior" (Claude Shannon and Warren Weaver, *The Mathematical Theory of Communication* [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949], p. 95). Norbert Wiener has done his share by equating the engineer's kind of "information" with meaning (*The Human Use of Human Beings* [Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1950], p. 7-8).

¹⁶ Bertram M. Gross, "Operation Basic: The Retrieval of Wasted Knowledge," *The Journal of Communications* (June 1962), pp. 67-83.

in accordance with the hierarchical pyramids of Weberian or so-called "classical" organization theory. More realistic organizers think in terms of a two-directional "grid" or network of interconnected organizations. Here the emphasis must be placed on the creation of both (1) a multiplicity of decentralized stations and (2) facilities for the rapid intercommunication of information at a level of sophistication that recognizes data differences.

Another view emphasizes co-ordination through standardized definitions and strongly enforced priorities. If limited to certain kinds of standardized economic data, this could unquestionably lead to cheaper and quicker services. It might also lead to two critical data pathologies: "hardening of the categories," and the monopolization of information.

In the field of transeconomic indicators, the co-ordination approach is particularly dangerous. While more standardization is needed in statistical series, there is an equally serious need for sustained and sophisticated challenge of standardized definitions and methods of interpretation. A splendid example is the constructive criticism that Daniel Glaser and Albert D. Biderman¹⁷ have been leveling for years against the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Crime Index. Although sociologists regard the index as a statistical monstrosity, we should bear in mind that the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover has merely been carefully following the best advice obtainable from the sociologists of a now-defunct era. Is there not a danger that—with large federal grants and contracts "guiding" the work of dispersed data centers and research institutions—this experience may be repeated on a larger scale?

It has been pointed out that "official data will always be too 'official,' reflecting the bias of collection agencies or the institutional rigidities of major interpreters. The categories themselves will never be automatically adjusted."¹⁸ Hardening of the categories is hardly curable without continual challenges and debates that might lead to recurring reconstruction of categories.¹⁹ Within the federal government, both the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Census Bureau have often been sensitive to these debates. Other agencies with a political stake in outmoded concepts and inaccurate statistics turn a deaf ear to all calls for innovation.

Here the media of communication could play strategic roles. As Fountaine points out in his article in this issue, radio, the press, and magazines have a long way to go in communicating significant information. Indeed, their record in keeping up with the advances in the social sciences will have to improve considerably before achieving mediocrity. But there is also the role of *challenge and exposé*—as played by the long line of "muckrakers" and crusading journalists. These free-wheeling challengers may bring to public attention official data that has been suppressed. They may find flaws or inconsistencies in officially released data. At times, they even collect information on their own and prepare the way for the official data of the next generation. Insofar as the mass media are concerned, these roles are played by only the small handful of first-class newspapers in the country: the *Washington Post*,

¹⁷ See section entitled "A Case Example: Crime Rates," in his "Social Indicators and Goals," Bauer (ed.), *Social Indicators*, op. cit., pp. 111-129.

¹⁸ "The State of the Nation," in Bauer (ed.), op. cit., p. 260.

¹⁹ The National Bureau of Economic Research is presently preparing major extensions of national income accounting. It will be of considerable interest to see how quickly their proposals are introduced into the "official" accounts.

the *New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and perhaps four or five others. Fortunately, a healthy yeast is provided by small circulation publications. Most of these—like the *New Republic*, the *Nation*, *Ramparts*, the *Reporter*, the *I. F. Stone Weekly*, and *Dissent*—are on the "Left." Fortunately, with the emergence of a know-something "Right," some slow progress is being made along these lines by William Buckley's *National Review*.

With the increasing utilization of social indicators in the political process, hardening of the categories could have a profound impact on public policy. We now must begin to ask whether, as we develop better information retrieval facilities, they should not ease the flow of *dissonant*—as well as coordinated—information and whether, if major parts of our national data system (such as the census, for example) are to be made more systematic, to tolerate, preserve, or perhaps even promote the dissonance of those who challenge the relevance, accuracy, or credibility of official data. Should we not recognize an important role for "systemic dissonance?"

With the increasing utilization of sophisticated information in the policy-making process, the old aphorism "knowledge is power" has a particularly contemporary ring. With government playing a greater role in the production of this information, there is an obvious danger of government monopolization of information. This could manifest itself in two ways: (1) narrow specification of information produced and (2) tight control of access to it. We suspect that many city planning and urban renewal agencies often sit on data lest "progress" be impaired by those who would learn they must suffer "short-run" hardships. While much of this condition is the result of bread-and-butter political expediency, it often stems from a misguided determination that the maintenance of ignorance is a beneficial form of social control.

A more subtle and possibly more significant problem is that much of our information is being produced for and by a few groups in our society. In this regard Andrew Kopkind, an informed but skeptical observer of the growth and utilization of specialized information within government has warned:

"There is no general agreement on 'human values.' But the people who frame the questions about society and plan the future can easily, and unconsciously, inject their own values into the answers they receive. . . . The danger is that government and corporate elites will monopolize the business of question-asking, and so manipulate the attitudes of the society they are pretending to serve as disinterested technicians."²⁰

In a similar vein, conservatives may argue, with a certain amount of justification, that most empirical data generated by contemporary social science has been motivated by and supports a liberal critique of American society.

There are no simple solutions to these problems, which will become more acute as social indicators are further introduced into the political process. It is hoped that our discussion of multiple sources and "systemic dissonance" will suggest some possible solutions. The success of these solutions will in large measure be determined by whether Congress assumes a creative and critical role in the future development of social indicators.

THE PRINCIPLE OF LEGISLATIVE RESPONSIBILITY

The Founding Fathers of the United States, true children of the Enlightenment, clearly recognized the informational functions of government. In Article 1, Section 2, they provided for a decennial census (the first ever called for by a national constitu-

tion). In Article II, Section 3, they recognized the importance of making information available to Congress instead of having it carefully guarded by executive officials: "The President shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union." In the Bill of Rights they provided safeguards for the freedom of speech and the press, as well as personal privacy. But their greatest contribution was the "systemic dissonance" built into its provisions for the separate authority of the Congress, the President, the Supreme Court, and the states.

This is not the place to review the circumstances under which this "separation of powers" may lead to deadlock and breakdown or those under which it may lead to unified and concerted action, nor is there space to discuss the role of the Supreme Court (touched upon in Professor Konvitz' article in this issue) or that of the states and localities (briefly referred to above) with respect to social data.

But since the provision of more and better social indicators is usually discussed by technicians whose natural orientation is toward the agencies in the executive branch of government, we find it essential to conclude this discussion with a few words on the responsibility of the Congress.

This responsibility takes two forms: (1) the airing of new ideas (including those that may be "born before their time"); and (2) the criticism of, and debate on, executive information and proposals. The former is essential to bring hidden issues into the open and rescue creative ideas that may get knifed in the dark. The latter provides opportunities for almost any organized group in the country, no matter how weak, to have its views expressed indirectly in committee hearings or represented by some members of Congress.

We would be less than frank if we did not concede that the great majority of technicians concerned with the development of social indicators are rarely aware of the constructive role played by Congress in laying the groundwork for major innovations in public policy. Similarly, in the development of the Employment Act of 1946, many of the most ardent proponents of full (or maximum) employment thought almost exclusively in executive agency terms. Some of them regarded the Act's provisions for a Joint Economic Committee of Congress as merely a sop to congressional critics.

Twenty-one years after the Act's passage, the Joint Economic Committee has, in the words of one observer, become "the *nom de plume* of the world's largest class in economics, in which astute and overworked Congressmen and Senators take turns in being pupils and instructors to most of the Nation's economists."²¹ It has investigated data gaps and challenged one-sided or defective executive interpretations. In the sphere of economic data, the Joint Economic Committee has probably been the most significant source of healthy and invigorating "systemic dissonance."

At present, various members of Congress have offered a wealth of important proposals bearing upon our knowledge of social conditions, problems, and change. Among these are measures to set up a National Social Science Foundation (proposed by Senator Harris of Oklahoma), for contracts with non-governmental agencies for the application of "systems analysis" to social problems (proposed by Senator Nelson of Wisconsin), to provide for a mid-decade census (proposed by Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut), and to set up an "office of legislative evaluation" in the General Accounting Office (proposed by Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut). The first three of these, let it be noted, provide for executive activities alone, and the fourth

for activities by a so-called "autonomous agency" to help the legislature.

Like the Employment Act of 1948, the "Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" sponsored by Senator Mondale and his group deals directly with both the executive and legislative branches. Obviously, if there is to be an annual Social Report of the President, the President will need sustained, professional work of a transdepartmental nature and on a full-time basis. The legislative proposal for a Council of Social Advisers focuses attention on this organizational problem. But it would be unfortunate if this proposal should detract attention from the equally significant idea of a Joint Committee on the Social Report.

As indicated at the beginning of this chapter, it is possible that the President may soon initiate a series of annual Social Reports to Congress. This could be done without new legislative authority. But what will happen to such reports? Will they receive serious and sustained attention and review in Congress? Outside of Congress, will they be accepted as more authoritative than they could possibly be?

At this point let us be perfectly clear that the analogy with economic indicators and goals should not be carried too far. In the noneconomic aspects of social measurement and social policy—as well demonstrated by the articles in this volume and its companion volume of September 1967—we have lagged far behind the progress made in measuring economic change and ordering economic information. With broader social measures, the complexities are still greater and the dangers of oversimplification still more threatening. Here, even more than in the economic field, we need legislative responsibility in encouraging a variety of approaches, promoting multiple sources, and nourishing "systemic dissonance." Thus far, the only proposal in this important area is that of Senator Mondale and his ten colleagues (including the Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee) for a Joint Congressional Committee on the Social Report. If this is to be the "*nom de plume*" for the world's largest classroom in social information and social policy, its teachers and students—be they social scientists or legislators—must be willing to face intellectual and moral problems of monumental dimensions.

CUBA: THE CRISIS AT OUR BACK DOOR

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the United States is facing a real and increasingly bloody crisis in Southeast Asia, and obliquely, an equally danger-fraught political crisis in the U.N. We also, as evidenced by recent press dispatches, have a near-future political or military crisis at our back door.

Today's press stories tell of action by the Council of the Organization of American States in indicting Cuba for landing an invasion force in Venezuela last May 8.

Venezuela's OAS Ambassador Pedro Perez Montesinos called the Cuban action "a real menace and serious danger" to Latin American nations, which echoes a timely warning issued June 16 by syndicated columnist Carl T. Rowan.

After extensive research which is the basis for a number of columns on the crisis off our shores, Mr. Rowan asserted that—

There is a growing feeling in diplomatic circles that another great power clash over Cuba lies not too far down the road.

²⁰ "The Future-Planners," *New Republic*, February 25, 1967.

²¹ Stanley Lebergott, *Men Without Work* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1965), p. 174.