

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 19

SEPTEMBER 11, 1967, TO SEPTEMBER 20, 1967

(PAGES 24929 TO 26292)

less than 2 years Nimitz had converted a naval junkpile into the world's most powerful fleet.

The first major sea engagement which Nimitz commanded was the battle of the Coral Sea on May 8, 1942. Although tactically the United States was defeated, Nimitz could claim a strategic victory, for he had forced the Japanese to divert their thrust from Australia to the American base at Midway.

Most historians and politicians including President Roosevelt, considered the Battle of Midway, fought June 4-6, 1942, the greatest success of the war in 1942, and one of our greatest victories in World War II. Nimitz' foresight led him to base his tactics on intercepted Japanese codes indicating Midway as a major target. Washington strategists interpreted these messages as diversionary decoys. However, Nimitz concluded that the messages were authentic. The result was an overwhelming naval victory for the United States and the turning point of the war in the Pacific. The Battle of Midway halted the Japanese threat to Hawaii, the Panama Canal, and the United States and prevented the isolation and occupation of Australia. Thereafter Japan could only fight a defensive war.

Another outstanding accomplishment of Nimitz was his ingenious device of floating naval bases to follow the fleet ships. With these efficient stations providing fuel, supplies, and repairs, American ships could remain away from their ports for extended periods, thereby deceiving the enemy.

Nimitz carefully avoided publicity, always remaining in the background, never exercising his power unjustly, and allowing all credit to be given to his subordinates. Even in his speech on board the U.S.S. *Missouri*, after signing the Japanese surrender, he praised the other branches of the Armed Forces and our allies as well as his own men as instrumental in the victory.

In 1944, Nimitz was promoted to the newly created rank of admiral of the fleet, and from 1945 to 1947 was Chief of Naval Operations in Washington. He later served the University of California as a regent and worked with the United Nations and President Truman in an advisory capacity.

When Fleet Admiral Nimitz, winner of five Distinguished Service Medal Awards, died last year, he was buried according to his modest request—near the Pacific Ocean, side by side with other sailors and soldiers who had served with him, and without the ceremony of a state funeral.

But modesty cannot hide the valor of this great American, and it will not. In Fredericksburg, birthplace of Admiral Nimitz, a group of civic-minded individuals have come together to form a museum honoring him. The Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz Museum occupies the old Nimitz Hotel, long-operated by the admiral's family, located on Fredericksburg's main avenue, very near the center of the downtown shopping area. The building itself is a tribute to the admiral. Nearly a century old, it is built in the shape of a ship. It will house relics of the life of Adm. Chester

W. Nimitz—a life dedicated to serving and protecting his Nation.

I have asked that the flag flown over the U.S. Capitol on September 2, date of the 22d anniversary of the signing of Japan's surrender, in which Nimitz played such a central role, be made available to that museum as an added tribute, and a fitting one, I believe, to a man who did so much for the United States.

NEGROES AND JEWS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, from time to time, I have invited the attention of the Senate to the excellent articles presented in the Progressive magazine, published by the extremely able Morris Rubin, of Madison, Wis.

The current issue contains many provocative and informative articles.

In an editorial entitled "Negroes and Jews," the Progressive rejects the notion that the Negro community has become anti-Semitic. The magazine contends that the violent outburst of the SNCC hate mongers is not an accurate reflection of Negro sentiment.

The eminent Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], in an article entitled "New Tools for Social Progress," describes his plan for a domestic social program over the years to come. I believe the Nation would profit by reading it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW TOOLS FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS

(By Senator WALTER F. MONDALE)

Early this year, the National Committee Against Segregation in Housing charged that for the past three decades, good intentions notwithstanding, various Federal programs had fostered racial segregation and consequently trapped Negroes in slum ghettos.

Their specific criticisms attacked a broad range of programs and policies, among them urban renewal, transportation, and public housing. Some of the programs the Committee cited sought to improve American society generally; others, such as public housing, aimed at improving the condition of the poor. Of urban renewal, the Committee charged that the programs "have consistently violated the rights of Negro Americans and other minorities by forcing their continuous upheaval and relocation in racially segregated areas to accommodate local community prejudices."

Because the main target of the criticism was the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD Secretary Robert C. Weaver prepared an eight-page response which said, generally, that the Department was doing the best it could under current laws but stronger legislation was needed.

There the matter rests, and as a United States Senator who has voted for some of the programs, or supported others enacted before I came to the Senate, I am perplexed and troubled.

As the situation now stands, there is no prospect for an accurate and public accounting of the extent of racial segregation in the United States that would enable us to determine whether government programs are cures or contributors to the perpetuation of this social cancer.

The lack of verifiable, public information exists in a number of broad areas: physical health and mental illness, the quality of edu-

cation, the effect upon society of a gradually deteriorating natural environment.

Unhappily, we have had a whole summer of unprecedented violence in our cities that revealed glaringly the shocking lack of knowledge of the nature and extent of the social ills that plague our rich nation. The proliferation of ad hoc committees at the national, state, and local levels to determine the causes of rioting in the urban ghettos is ample evidence of the need for an on-going, permanent coordination of these social indicators. In these cases violence serves as a measure of the lack of jobs, poor health care, inferior educational opportunity, de facto segregation, and the multitude of other burdens that grind upon the poor and those discriminated against by the majority.

There certainly must be more peaceful ways than riot, and hopefully more precise methods, too, to measure our failures and document the considerable successes of governmental efforts to improve the quality of American life. Obviously, we need better indicators. For America to approach the future unequipped to evaluate and plan effectively is to invite chaos.

One of the social sciences, economics, has proven that by carefully measuring and watching various indicators such as retail sales, volume, amount of new investment, and levels of gross national product, we can take action to head off economic disaster. What do the social sciences have to offer in noneconomic areas of the human conditions? Very little of a solid or continuous nature. We now have no comparative system that will alert us to social disaster—a system of social indicators, widely broadcast, by which we could keep watch in a general way on the social processes in our nation and plan for society's orderly development.

Instead, we undertake ambitious and laudable programs, and watch in shocked amazement when the reaction is different from what we expected. Then we scramble to try to ascertain the facts, often with dubious success.

Take urban renewal, for example. For a decade, urban renewal has been held high as the salvation of our rotting cities, and damned as merely exporting the poor to new ghettos.

In my files are two magazine articles published within three months of each other in 1965. One of these, a critical article, cites a 1961 report that sixty per cent of the displaced poor were relocated in new slums while high-income families occupied the handsome new glass and steel towers. The other article, on the optimistic side, reported a 1964 finding that only eight per cent of displaced slum families remained afterward in substandard housing. The three-year time difference between the studies could account for at least some of the disparity—perhaps all. But in any case there are no clear, current, public, well-announced figures available to refute or support either claim. The two articles punctuate our ignorance about the real effects of one of the most ambitious and promising Federal programs. We know we are building new buildings, but what are we doing to people?

The absence of adequate, publicly announced indicators can also veil our successes and encourage mistaken exploitation of surface indications of failure, whether it be the testing of new educational techniques, methods of fighting crime, or the administration of welfare funds. As *The Progressive* noted in its June issue, White House aide Joseph Califano had performed the distinct service of coordinating welfare data revealing that only 50,000 of the 7.3 million persons receiving welfare throughout the nation are actually capable of being trained to hold jobs. This data, pulled together for the first time, effectively refutes the conservative bugaboo that, as *The Progressive* put it, "Americans on pub-

llc welfare rolls are lazy bums leeching on society. . . ."

What I am suggesting is that as our present programs continue in their sometimes uncertain way, we must undertake to devise statistical and analytical methods to help us find out what we have done and what we ought to be doing. To say that our societal programs may be imperfect and sometimes miss the mark is not to say, of course, that we should halt all attempts toward social betterment. But perhaps we can find ways to get more done at less cost and with less waste motion.

Beyond the establishment of social measures, there should be persistent and perceptible and continuing high level analysis of our social processes, their problems and possibilities, such as is provided for the President by the Council of Economic Advisers in the economic field.

Man's oldest method of self-education is trial and error, but it is also the least efficient. Try we must, but there are ways of reducing the margin of error.

Incessant trial and error and the absence of accurate measurement sap public confidence in otherwise highly desirable programs, and this perhaps is the core of disagreement about many programs designed to improve the public welfare: programs encompassing health, education, transportation. How do we measure success in terms that reflect impact on individuals? By amount of money spent? This may be a measure of effort, but not of effect.

To be sure, there are many surveys and abundant statistics. There are thousands of statisticians at work in Washington alone, and thousands more working for public and private agencies across the nation. And despite the fact that we do collect mountains of statistics, as the 1,000-plus pages of the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* attest, there remain frightening gaps in information essential for accurate evaluation. Much of the statistical information we now collect is incoherent; that is, it bears no readily apparent relationship to other data which, taken all together, would allow reasonable conclusions.

In other instances, the information is available from widely different agencies, but few people know where to get it. A social scientist doing some post-Watts research told me recently that all the statistical indicators warning of the impending explosion were available before the outbreak. Unfortunately, there was no one to gather and analyze them and no agency existing with the prestige and attention-getting devices to warn the public and government officials.

It would be an oversimplification, of course, to imply that social indicators can magically reveal the "truth" in every case in which an effect is disputed, or alert us to every impending crisis. But it cannot be denied that a system of statistical indicators, measured regularly and watched constantly, and not the least important, available for easy public examination, can yield invaluable guidance for future action. Such a system might make it possible to avoid the risk of dangerous sociological backlash.

The riots in Watts have been partially blamed on the frustrations that arose because of the transportation success of the Los Angeles freeway system. When public transportation withered as automobile travel became more and more convenient, the impoverished Watts residents without cars were effectively isolated from job opportunities and from state and local facilities where they could receive aid.

Columnist Joseph Kraft blames unfortunate consequences like this on our "innocence." Kraft laments that "Lack of regular information fosters an innocence and irresponsibility that is positively terrifying. City after city launches urban renewal drives only to discover—belatedly and with surprise—

that poor people are being driven from their homes. County after county launches drives for new industry only to learn—also belatedly and with surprise—that it is polluting the atmosphere. State after state pushes highway projects, only to realize—with astonishment—that the result is impossible congestion in city streets."

This may be "innocence." It is also appalling ignorance.

We were once just as ignorant of the consequences of economic policy. We used to thrash around making decisions on the basis of untested theories and inadequate information, assuming that cyclical waves of boom and bust were inevitable.

But with the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 establishing the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the Council fostered the refinement of the abundant economic statistics into a reasonably accurate measurement of the nation's economic health. These indicators provide the basis for analysis and planning that have been remarkably effective.

The valuable lessons learned over the past two decades regarding economic indicators suggests that if we had more and better data on social conditions, and if these could be molded into a coherent system of social indicators comparable to their economic counterparts, we would be able to do a far better job of decision-making regarding social programs.

The tantalizing prospect of social measurement was suggested by Gunnar Myrdal in his *American Dilemma*, written in 1944. He wrote, "We should . . . have liked to present in our study a general index, year by year or at least decade by decade, as a quantitative expression of the movement of the entire system we are studying: the status of the Negro in America."

In 1962, the Behavioral Science subpanel of the President's Science Advisory Committee acknowledged the benefits of systematic gathering of economic data, and commented: "We call attention to the great advance over the past generation in the quantity and quality of our information about the economy and the effective use that is now made of such information in formulating and administering national economic policy. Similar benefits would flow from a corresponding advance in the quantity and quality of information about non-economic aspects of behavior."

Another appeal for a social accounting appears in "Technology and the American Economy," the report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, submitted last year. In its chapter on "Improving Public Decision Making," the Commission declared:

"The American commitment is not only to raise the standard of living, but to improve the quality of life. But we have too few yardsticks to tell us how we are doing. A system of social accounts would seek to set up 'performance budgets' in various areas to serve as such yardsticks. A series of community health indexes would tell us how well we are meeting the needs of our people in regard to adequate medical care. A national 'housing budget' would reflect our standing in regard to the goal of a 'decent home for every American family.'"

A system of social auditing or accounting would serve five purposes:

It would sharpen our quantitative knowledge of social needs.

It would allow us to measure more precisely our progress toward our social objectives.

It would help us to evaluate efforts at all levels of government.

It would help us determine priorities among competing social programs.

It would encourage the development and assessment of alternative courses without waiting until some one solution had belatedly been proved a failure.

I have introduced legislation in the Senate

designed to accomplish these aims. The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act (S. 843) is an attempt to elevate social evaluation to as influential a position as is now occupied by economic measurement.

Modeled after the Employment Act of 1946, the legislation contains four key sections:

One—It establishes full social opportunity for all Americans as a national goal.

Two—It establishes a three-member President's Council of Social Advisers and charges them with devising a system of social indicators, and with appraising governmental programs and advising the President on domestic social policy.

Three—It requires the President to submit an annual Social Report, comparable to the Economic Report, disclosing the indicators for public examination, and giving them wide exposure.

Four—It establishes a Joint Congressional Committee on the Social Report, which could hold hearings and subject the President's Social Report to critical analysis.

When the nation's population was widely dispersed on farms and small hamlets, the rate of social change was slow. Much of the social adjustment to sickness, unemployment, disability, old age, broken homes, poverty, and crime was handled within the local community. In 1890, half of our people lived on farms and many of the rest in small towns. Today, something like five per cent of our people live on farms and practically all population increase is taking place in the large metropolitan areas. With people so concentrated, social change can be rapid, the sense of responsibility for one's neighbors is diminished, and the impact of a catastrophe is so overwhelmingly large that no neighborhood—however well-intentioned—can possibly cope with it.

Urban concentration has made necessary large technological projects in transportation, water, sewage and waste disposal, as well as housing construction and renewal. The pace of technological adaptation of man to his environment has certainly increased.

At the same time, we have—if anything—impaired our ability to identify and deal with the inescapable social dislocations that accompany new urban technology. The burgeoning growth of social programs at Federal, regional, state, county, and municipal levels has already created a cats-cradle of inter-governmental authorities. Partial data of varying quality are pouring out to confuse us. Large projects employing "systems" techniques are taking into account social impacts related to their own construction, but cannot hope to coordinate with similar social impact analysis of other projects.

Clearly, in the collection, management, and evaluation of sociological data, the qualitative evidence points without exception to our large and growing deficiency. William Gorham, Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said last year, that "When it comes to planning for the efficient allocation of national resources against competing social needs, the United States is an underdeveloped country. We have neither a planning board examining possible futures nor a central statistical agency gathering the data necessary to evaluate possible ways of getting there."

Gorham's chief, HEW Secretary John W. Gardner, has given this grim appraisal of past practice: "We have a great and honored tradition of stumbling into the future. In management of the present, our nation is—as nations go—fairly rational, systematic, and orderly. But when it comes to movement into the future, we are heedless and impulsive. We leap before we look. We act first and think later. We back into next year's problems studying the solutions to last year's problems. This has been true as long as I can remember."

Two reasons are sometimes advanced for our past unwillingness to take the necessary steps to prevent future chaos. Long range social planning is supposed to be expensive, and to be restrictive of freedom. It can be both; I suggest that it need be neither.

Long ago, John Dewey pointed out the essential distinction between planning in a dictatorship and planning in a democracy. Dictatorial planning sets fixed time goals over long periods and rigidly programs actions to achieve them. Democratic societies must plan continuously, modifying programs and even objectives flexibly as circumstances change. Technology and the planning for its use become our servants, not our masters.

In a seminar late in June this year and formal hearings on "The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" during July, forty-two witnesses were heard. They came from a wide array of posts in government, the academic world, and public and private efforts to deal with social change. They were unanimous in endorsing the principle on which this legislation is founded—the need for better information and coordinated efforts to improve the social health of the nation. Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research which conducted the hearings, said at the close of the session, "It is perfectly clear that this Act, with refinements, should become law."

Today our country is confronted with an issue that may be as dangerous to national stability as was the Civil War. As we attempt to face that issue we know too little about the causes of ghetto upheaval and the forces at play in the current crisis.

We would know more now if we had been working at it harder in the past. That is what the "Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" is all about. It could provide expert knowledge at the highest level of visibility. It could give the social state of the nation the kind of analysis it must have. Perhaps it could present alternatives to violence for the President, the Congress, and the American public to consider.

Unless we provide government with new modern tools we are likely to waste more and more of our resources in crash programs without knowing what will result, a process both wasteful and dangerous.

NEGROES AND JEWS

The Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee's attack on Israel and Zionism last month revived heated discussion of the recurring charges of anti-Semitism among American Negroes. Most Negro leaders joined Jewish spokesmen in emphasizing that the SNCC was not reflecting Negro sentiment—only a small, far-out minority.

This latter view is confirmed in a recent University of California study of alleged anti-Semitism and other Negro attitudes. The study reports some cool facts on the matter and may succeed in bringing about a better understanding of the subject.

Sociology Professor Gary T. Marx, of the Survey Research Center at Berkeley, supervised Negro-conducted interviews of a scientifically selected sample of more than a thousand Negroes in New York, Atlanta, Chicago, and Birmingham. Marx reported that, to the degree that Negroes distinguished between Jewish and non-Jewish whites, they favored Jews and were less anti-Semitic than were whites.

Harry Lee Moon, Negro editor of *The Crisis*, monthly publication of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, wrote in a recent issue that anti-Semitism "among Negroes is a minority phenomenon unrepresentative of the total community."

In fact, wrote Moon, "Negroes have been constantly urged . . . to emulate the Jews . . . No other people . . . have been so con-

sistently regarded by Negroes as a worthy example."

Benjamin R. Epstein, national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, said in a comment on the Marx study:

"The Jewish community would be well advised to focus its attention on the main sources of American anti-Semitism and to drop preoccupation with Negro anti-Semitism, which only serves to divert energies from the civil rights struggle."

A VICTORY FOR PAUL HALL

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in recent weeks it has become evident that soon we may see the advent of a new era for the American merchant marine.

It looks as though we are approaching the day when Congress and the Nation will be presented with a workable maritime program that will bring an end to years of stalling and frustration, and that will set us on the road to revitalizing our aging merchant fleet.

When the new maritime program does appear, much of the credit for its creation can be given to Paul Hall, president of the Seafarers International Union and of the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO.

Mr. Hall has been a courageous and tireless fighter for domestic shipbuilding. As one of the strongest voices in the American labor movement, he has used his vast influence wisely and skillfully on behalf of the overall good of the maritime industry.

Helen Delich Bentley, the distinguished maritime reporter for the Baltimore Sun, recently published a profile of Paul Hall. I ask unanimous consent that this praiseworthy article be printed in the RECORD.

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

AROUND THE WATERFRONT: NO-BUILD-ABROAD VICTORY IS HALL'S

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON.—As words have been written and hot ones exchanged in recent months over what the new maritime policy of the United States should be, the man constantly named as the "Number 1" force leading the opposition to the Administration's program has been Paul Hall, a smooth-talking ex-sailor and president of the Seafarers International Union of North America (AFL-CIO).

He is also president of the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL-CIO and is often described as the probable successor to George Meany as head of the House of Labor.

More than that, when President Johnson recently was reviewing the maritime program, Hall was the only person referred to by name when Mr. Johnson said he didn't want to engage in a fight on the matter. Last year, the President publicly acknowledged at a White House dinner that among the tribulations borne by the position of Chief Executive is a defeat such as he had recently incurred at the hands of Hall on Capitol Hill.

NOW RIDING HIGH

Right now Hall is riding high because the concessions made by the Administration regarding a maritime program have come his way or as Hall prefers to put it, "the way for the good of the over-all industry—my whole fight has been in behalf of a strong, healthy industry which will be good for all of us."

Paradoxically, Hall reached the conclusion through this long haranguing that his support in the labor movement had to come from almost every segment of the trade

union movement other than the maritime unions.

In fact most of the maritime unions criticized him and even denounced him for prolonging the institution of a program by being such a determined "holdout." Now secretly they are glad about the results although not one will say so publicly.

One of the principal points snagged onto for criticism was that he has opened up the membership in the Maritime Trades Department to everyone outside maritime labor, that he has permitted railway clerks and doll makers, carpenters and electricians to join.

"Yes, we have," the 53-year-old tow-headed onetime fireman admits flatly. "We have because they have a role in whether there is an American merchant marine or not. There is a definite interdependency on exports and imports; certainly railroads are tied closely in the transportation picture with ships.

"Although the maritime unions are composed of the best-hearted persons in the world, we don't have the capacity to stay together on issues.

FINDS INABILITY TO UNITE

"There seems to be an inability among all of us to unite and stick solidly together on one issue regardless of the period of time it takes to put it over.

"Therefore, I reached the conclusion that we needed other sources of strength, sources which were constant and on which we could depend at all times. Maybe it's easier to work with them because there is no conflict of jurisdiction at any time. Too many of them are more accustomed to cooperating and sticking to an issue."

Also he points out that if all of the seamen and all of the longshoremen were lumped together, they would not make up one half as many union members as the membership of the State and Municipal Employees Union, which is part of the six-million-member M.T.D.

OTHER POPULOUS COMPONENTS

All the seagoing and shoreside maritime personnel would not make up 25 per cent of the Carpenters Union or 40 per cent of the Retail Clerks Union—"just single unions."

Hall is a fiend on details and on carefully working out plots. Any time the S.I.U. or M.T.D. is responsible for an affair, he emphasizes to his men in charge that the minutest of details must be thoroughly checked out because they can make or break the function.

When he moves into a campaign—be it to help a favorite win a political election or to fight on Capitol Hill on any issue—he lays out strategy beforehand. He is always the general. He is always the one who may hold his army back because his inner senses warn him the timing is not quite right.

ADMIRATION OF DISSENTERS

It is because of these traits and an extremely sharp mind—one with which many persons disagree but which they nevertheless admire—that he is described as one of the most politically astute leaders in the entire labor movement.

Over the years, he has had his sailors help in the picket lines of State and Municipal Employees, of the American Newspaper Guild, of the Carpenters, the Butchers, the Bakers, the Garment Workers.

You name them and you can bet that the white caps which mark the S.I.U. members appeared in strength on the picket lines.

ALL AFL-CIO CONVENTIONS

Hall himself has made it a point to participate in the State conventions of all A.F.L.-C.I.O. groups as well as international conventions, more of which are calling upon him in their programs because of his oratory along the lines they want to hear.

He has never hesitated publicly to criticize

referred to agencies that could provide services needed to increase their employability; about 61,000 unemployed and underemployed persons in 19 cities and two rural areas were slated to receive whatever job assistance they require under the concentrated employment program.

In the past 3 years alone, we have made landmark advances toward providing full opportunity for every citizen. For example: Between 1½ and 2 million people are in school, training on jobs because of these newly developed programs. Otherwise, they would be out of school and out of work; the number of long-term or "hard-core" jobless—persons out of work 15 weeks or longer—has been cut by more than half—from 929,000 in August 1964 to 441,000 in August 1967.

These strategic programs hold long-term promise not only for the once-forgotten disadvantaged who are now able to lift themselves, but for the Nation as a whole which benefits from their new skills.

This promise is evident in the fact that three out of four trainees who complete their classroom work under MDTA move on to regular employment and nearly nine out of 10 who complete on-the-job training become gainfully employed. Under this vital program, workers once handicapped by lack of skill are now living and working in self-respect as machine operators, clerk-typists, combination welders, nurse's aides, automobile mechanics, automobile body repairmen, practical nurses, and trained salespeople. Others face the future with bright career hopes in several hundred other occupations.

It is most heartening news that the Federal Government is beginning to get back through taxes what it pays for training.

President Johnson has said, for example:

The average trainee in on-the-job training programs developed by the Labor Department is returning the total cost of his training to the Treasury in less than two years. There will continue to be dividends for many years to come.

The fact is that an average on-the-job trainee repays the Federal Government over half of its investment in him in his first year of training. By the time the second year of training is over, the Government has been repaid in full.

The promise of these programs is also evident in the cases of great numbers of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees—in urban as well as rural areas—who have prepared for permanent careers by serving as aides in schools and libraries, parks and hospitals, cafeterias, and museums. These young people are building for their own future as they help improve their communities.

Individual cases, not statistics, best tell the success stories being written under these programs every day in cities and towns across the Nation.

In St. Albans, Vt., a father of four lost his job as a member of a labor gang with a railroad company because of a reduction in force. Unskilled, he was jobless for nearly a year before enrolling in a

cook's course under MDTA. But after 19 weeks of training, he was rehired by that same railroad company—as a cook with a starting wage of \$3 an hour.

In Jacksonville, Fla., a 17-year-old 11th grade dropout could not find a job anywhere. A member of a family that had been on welfare for three generations, she wanted to get off welfare at any cost. She joined the Neighborhood Youth Corps and was placed as a nurse's aid at a home for the aged. Because of bad health, she had to quit after 6 months. But she returned to the NYC and would not give up. She finished high school at night last June and the hospital rewarded her efforts by hiring her as a full-time nurse's aid. She is now being groomed by the hospital for a scholarship to study to be a registered nurse.

Down in Louisiana, a 25-year-old Negro woman, abandoned by her husband and supporting four small children on welfare, could not even get a job as a domestic in her small town because of a surplus of labor. But she enrolled in an MDTA secretarial course and is now a secretary in New Orleans. On receiving her first check, she beamed:

This is the first time I've ever seen my name on a paycheck. It's so beautiful I'd like to frame it. Now I'm a taxpayer.

There are literally hundreds of thousands of similar stories unfolding across the country. Graduates of these training and educational programs are now better equipped to enter the world of work.

It is obvious that maximum preparation is the key to getting ahead today—and every citizen should have full opportunity to make as much sense out of his life as possible.

Certainly, the mistakes, oversights, and general apathy of more than a century will not be righted by pat or short-cut solutions. We must continue to strengthen those programs that prepare the disadvantaged to make their way alone.

Makeshift jobs are not the answer. The rapid advance of modern technology is leading to fundamental changes in the occupational structure. These changes will spell an increasingly grim employment outlook for the ill-prepared worker over the long run.

Consequently, education and training are essential if a person is to have prospects for the jobs of the future. Over the next 10 years, for instance, the fastest growing occupations will be in the professional, technical, and kindred categories. While total employment is expected to grow about a quarter between 1964 and 1975, it is anticipated that the number of white-collar jobs will increase by nearly a third and blue-collar jobs by a fifth. So by 1975, it is expected that white-collar jobs may constitute nearly half of all employed workers, compared with slightly more than two-fifths in 1964.

Unemployment will continue, then, to fall most heavily on the least educated and least prepared for work. Young workers with less than 8 years of schooling, for example, will have seven times the jobless rate of college graduates and, tragically, laborers, the least

skilled group, are seven times more likely to be out of work than professional workers.

The urgency for maximum preparation is emphasized by the probability that American workers may face numerous job changes during a career. A 20-year-old man today, for instance, could be expected to change jobs six or seven times during his worklife expectancy of 43 years. This speaks loudly for a background that will enable a person to adapt to the training and retraining necessary to permit a change of jobs.

Being thrown out of work because your employer closes shop is tough enough when you're young—

Said one man who learned the hard way—

But, when you're over 50, it's murder. No employer would ever consider hiring me at my age.

President Johnson captured the essence of what must be done in his March 14, 1967, message to the Congress on urban and rural poverty:

Let it be said that in our time, we pursued a strategy against poverty so that each man had a chance to be himself.

Let it be said that in our time, we offered him the means to become a free man—for his sake, and for our own.

Shortcut solutions to the complex employment problems in our changing society are not the answer. Rather, the answer lies in providing each citizen with the opportunity to prepare himself for existing jobs—meaningful and rewarding jobs. Makeshift work will not solve the problems of the unskilled man or woman. It only forestalls his or her day of reckoning. Every American needs full opportunity, not public doles.

I urge every Member of the 90th Congress to support the strengthening of those programs that are helping so many fellow citizens break the shackles of poverty. Nothing less will do.

NEW TOOLS FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act of 1967, S. 843.

This historic proposal, authored by the junior Senator from Minnesota, and coauthored by 10 other Senators, including myself, is aimed at establishing order among often competing and overlapping governmental programs in the social field.

The Subcommittee on Government Research, of which I am chairman, recently completed 5 days of hearings and a day-long seminar on this legislation. The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act has won wide support from social scientists, Federal governmental agencies involved in social programs, civil rights leaders, social workers, and officials at all levels of government.

In the September issue of the Progressive magazine, there appears an article by Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, explaining in cogent, convincing terms the need for this act.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, "New Tools for Social Progress," by Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, of Minnesota, be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW TOOLS FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS

(By Senator WALTER F. MONDALE)

Early this year, the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing charged that for the past three decades, good intentions notwithstanding, various Federal programs had fostered racial segregation and consequently trapped Negroes in slum ghettos.

Their specific criticisms attacked a broad range of programs and policies, among them urban renewal, transportation, and public housing. Some of the programs the Committee cited sought to improve American society generally; others, such as public housing, aimed at improving the condition of the poor. Of urban renewal, the Committee charged that the programs "have consistently violated the rights of Negro Americans and other minorities by forcing their continuous upheaval and relocation in racially segregated areas to accommodate local community prejudices."

Because the main target of the criticism was the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD Secretary Robert C. Weaver prepared an eight-page response which said, generally, that the Department was doing the best it could under current laws but stronger legislation was needed.

There the matter rests, and as a United States Senator who has voted for some of the programs, or supported others enacted before I came to the Senate, I am perplexed and troubled.

As the situation now stands, there is no prospect for an accurate and public accounting of the extent of racial segregation in the United States that would enable us to determine whether government programs are cures or contributors to the perpetuation of this social cancer.

The lack of verifiable, public information exists in a number of broad areas: physical health and mental illness, the quality of education, the effect upon society of a gradually deteriorating natural environment.

Unhappily, we have had a whole summer of unprecedented violence in our cities that revealed glaringly the shocking lack of knowledge of the nature and extent of the social ills that plague our rich nation. The proliferation of ad hoc committees at the national, state, and local levels to determine the causes of rioting in the urban ghettos is ample evidence of the need for an on-going, permanent coordination of these social indicators. In these cases violence serves as a measure of the lack of jobs, poor health care, inferior educational opportunity, de facto segregation, and the multitude of other burdens that grind upon the poor and those discriminated against by the majority.

There certainly must be more peaceful ways than riot, and hopefully more precise methods, too, to measure our failures and document the considerable successes of governmental efforts to improve the quality of American life. Obviously, we need better indicators. For America to approach the future unequipped to evaluate and plan effectively is to invite chaos.

One of the social sciences, economics, has proven that by carefully measuring and watching various indicators such as retail sales volume, amount of new investment, and levels of gross national product, we can take action to head off economic disaster. What do the social sciences have to offer in non-economic areas of the human condition? Very little of a solid or continuous nature. We now have no comparative system that will alert

us to social disaster—a system of social indicators, widely broadcast, by which we could keep watch in a general way on the social processes in our nation and plan of society's orderly development.

Instead, we undertake ambitious and laudable programs, and watch in shocked amazement when the reaction is different from what we expected. Then we scramble to try to ascertain the facts, often with dubious success.

Take urban renewal, for example. For a decade, urban renewal has been held high as the salvation of our rotting cities, and damned as merely exporting the poor to new ghettos.

In my files are two magazine articles published within three months of each other in 1965. One of these, a critical article, cites a 1961 report that sixty per cent of the displaced poor were relocated in new slums while high-income families occupied the handsome new glass and steel towers. The other article, on the optimistic side, reported a 1964 finding that only eight per cent of displaced slum families remained afterward in substandard housing. The three-year time difference between the studies could account for at least some of the disparity—perhaps all. But in any case there are no clear, current, public, well-announced figures available to refute or support either claim. The two articles punctuate our ignorance about the real effects of one of the most ambitious and promising Federal programs. We know we are building new buildings, but what are we doing to people?

The absence of adequate, publicly-announced indicators can also veil our successes and encourage mistaken exploitation of surface indications of failure, whether it be the testing of new educational techniques, methods of fighting crime, or the administration of welfare funds. As *The Progressive* noted in its June issue, White House aide Joseph Callano had performed the distinct service of coordinating welfare data revealing that only 50,000 of the 7.3 million persons receiving welfare throughout the nation are actually capable of being trained to hold jobs. This data, pulled together for the first time, effectively refutes the conservative bugaboo that, as *The Progressive* put it, "Americans on public welfare rolls are lazy bums leeching on society..."

What I am suggesting is that as our present programs continue in their sometimes uncertain way, we must undertake to devise statistical and analytical methods to help us find out what we have done and what we ought to be doing. To say that our social programs may be imperfect and sometimes miss the mark is not to say, of course, that we should halt all attempts toward social betterment. But perhaps we can find ways to get more done at less cost and with less waste motion.

Beyond the establishment of social measures, there should be persistent and perceptive and continuing high level analysis of our social processes, their problems and possibilities, such as is provided for the President by the Council of Economic Advisers in the economic field.

Man's oldest method of self-education is trial and error, but it is also the least efficient. Try we must, but there are ways of reducing the margin of error.

Incessant trial and error and the absence of accurate measurement sap public confidence in otherwise highly desirable programs, and this perhaps is the core of disagreement about many programs designed to improve the public welfare: programs encompassing health, education, transportation. How do we measure success in terms that reflect impact on individuals? By amount of money spent? This may be a measure of effort, but not of effect.

To be sure, there are many surveys and abundant statistics. There are thousands of

statisticians at work in Washington alone, and thousands more working for public and private agencies across the nation. And despite the fact that we do collect mountains of statistics, as the 1,000-plus pages of the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* attest, there remain frightening gaps in information essential for accurate evaluation. Much of the statistical information we now collect is incoherent; that is, it bears no readily apparent relationship to other data which, taken all together, would allow reasonable conclusions.

In other instances, the information is available from widely different agencies, but few people know where to get it. A social scientist doing some post-Watts research told me recently that all the statistical indicators warning of the impending explosion were available before the outbreak. Unfortunately, there was no one to gather and analyze them and no agency existing with the prestige and attention-getting devices to warn the public and government officials.

It would be an oversimplification, of course, to imply that social indicators can magically reveal the "truth" in every case in which an effect is disputed, or alert us to every impending crisis. But it cannot be denied that a system of statistical indicators, measured regularly and watched constantly, and not the least important, available for easy public examination, can yield invaluable guidance for future action. Such a system might make it possible to avoid the risk of dangerous sociological backlash.

The riots in Watts have been partially blamed on the frustrations that arose because of the transportation success of the Los Angeles freeway system. When public transportation withered as automobile travel became more and more convenient, the impoverished Watts residents without cars were effectively isolated from job opportunities and from state and local facilities where they could receive aid.

Columnist Joseph Kraft blames unfortunate consequences like this on our "innocence." Kraft laments that "Lack of regular information fosters an innocence and irresponsibility that is positively terrifying. City after city launches urban renewal drives only to discover—belatedly and with surprise—that poor people are being driven from their homes. County after county launches drives for new industry only to learn—also belatedly and with surprise—that it is polluting the atmosphere. State after state pushes highway projects, only to realize—with astonishment—that the result is impossible congestion in city streets."

This may be "innocence." It is also appalling ignorance.

We were once just as ignorant of the consequences of economic policy. We used to trash around making decisions on the basis of untested theories and inadequate information, assuming that cyclical waves of boom and bust were inevitable.

But with the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 establishing the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the Council fostered the refinement of the abundant economic statistics into a reasonably accurate measurement of the nation's economic health. These indicators provide the basis for analysis and planning that have been remarkably effective.

The valuable lessons learned over the past two decades regarding economic indicators suggests that if we had more and better data on social conditions, and if these could be molded into a coherent system of social indicators comparable to their economic counterparts, we would be able to do a far better job of decision-making regarding social programs.

The tantalizing prospect of social measurement was suggested by Gunnar Myrdal in his *American Dilemma*, written in 1944. He wrote, "We should . . . have liked to present in our study a general index, year by year or

at least decade by decade, as a quantitative expression of the movement of the entire system we are studying: the status of the Negro in America."

In 1962, the Behavioral Science subpanel of the President's Science Advisory Committee acknowledged the benefits of systematic gathering of economic data, and commented: "We call attention to the great advance over the past generation in the quantity and quality of our information about the economy and the effective use that is now made of such information in formulating and administering national economic policy. Similar benefits would flow from a corresponding advance in the quantity and quality of information about non-economic aspects of behavior."

Another appeal for a social accounting appears in "Technology and the American Economy," the report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, submitted last year. In its chapter on "Improving Public Decision Making," the Commission declared:

"The American commitment is not only to raise the standard of living, but to improve the quality of life. But we have too few yardsticks to tell us how we are doing. A system of social accounts would seek to set up 'performance budgets' in various areas to serve as such yardsticks. A series of community health indexes would tell us how well we are meeting the needs of our people in regard to adequate medical care. A national 'housing budget' would reflect our standing in regard to the goal of a 'decent home for every American family.'"

A system of social auditing or accounting would serve five purposes:

It would sharpen our quantitative knowledge of social needs.

It would allow us to measure more precisely our progress toward our social objectives.

It would help us to evaluate efforts at all levels of government.

It would help us determine priorities among competing social programs.

It would encourage the development and assessment of alternative courses without waiting until some one solution had belatedly been proved a failure.

I have introduced legislation in the Senate designed to accomplish these aims. The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act (S. 843) is an attempt to elevate social evaluation to as influential a position as is now occupied by economic measurement.

Modeled after the Employment Act of 1946, the legislation contains four key sections:

One—It establishes full social opportunity for all Americans as a national goal.

Two—It establishes a three-member President's Council of Social Advisers and charges them with devising a system of social indicators, and with appraising governmental programs and advising the President on domestic social policy.

Three—It requires the President to submit an annual Social Report, comparable to the Economic Report, disclosing the indicators for public examination, and giving them wide exposure.

Four—It establishes a Joint Congressional Committee on the Social Report, which could hold hearings and subject the President's Social Report to critical analysis.

When the nation's population was widely dispersed on farms and small hamlets, the rate of social change was slow. Much of the social adjustment to sickness, unemployment, disability, old age, broken homes, poverty, and crime was handled within the local community. In 1890, half of our people lived on farms and many of the rest in small towns. Today, something like five per cent of our people live on farms and practically all population increase is taking place in the large metropolitan areas. With people so concentrated, social change can be rapid, the

sense of responsibility for one's neighbors is diminished, and the impact of a catastrophe is so overwhelmingly large that no neighborhood—however well-intentioned—can possibly cope with it.

Urban concentration has made necessary large technological projects in transportation, water, sewage and waste disposal, as well as housing construction and renewal. The pace of technological adaptation of man to his environment has certainly increased.

At the same time, we have—if anything—impaired our ability to identify and deal with the inescapable social dislocations that accompany new urban technology. The burgeoning growth of social programs at Federal, regional, state, county and municipal levels has already created a cats-cradle of inter-governmental authorities. Partial data of varying quality are pouring out to confuse us. Large projects employing "systems" techniques are taking into account social impacts related to their own construction, but cannot hope to coordinate with similar social impact analysis of other projects.

Clearly, in the collection, management, and evaluation of sociological data, the qualitative evidence points without exception to our large and growing deficiency. William Gorham, Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, said last year that, "When it comes to planning for the efficient allocation of national resources against competing social needs, the United States is an underdeveloped country. We have neither a planning board examining possible futures nor a central statistical agency gathering the data necessary to evaluate possible ways of getting there."

Gorham's chief, HEW Secretary John W. Gardner, has given this glum appraisal of past practice: "We have a great and honored tradition of stumbling into the future. In management of the present, our nation is—as nations go—fairly rational, systematic, and orderly. But when it comes to movement into the future, we are heedless and impulsive. We leap before we look. We act first and think later. We back into next year's problems studying the solutions to last year's problems. This has been true as long as I can remember."

Two reasons are sometimes advanced for our past unwillingness to take the necessary steps to prevent future chaos. Long range social planning is supposed to be expensive, and to be restrictive of freedom. It can be both; I suggest that it need be neither.

Long ago, John Dewey pointed out the essential distinction between planning in a dictatorship and planning in a democracy. Dictatorial planning sets fixed time goals over long periods and rigidly programs actions to achieve them. Democratic societies must plan continuously, modifying programs and even objectives flexibly as circumstances change. Technology and the planning for its use become our servants, not our masters.

In a seminar late in June this year and formal hearings on "The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" during July, forty-two witnesses were heard. They came from a wide array of posts in government, the academic world, and public and private efforts to deal with social change. They were unanimous in endorsing the principle on which this legislation is founded—the need for better information and coordinated efforts to improve the social health of the nation. Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Research which conducted the hearings, said at the close of the session, "It is perfectly clear that this Act, with refinements, should become law."

Today our country is confronted with an issue that may be as dangerous to national stability as was the Civil War. As we at-

tempt to face that issue we know too little about the causes of ghetto upheaval and the forces at play in the current crisis.

We would know more now if we had been working at it harder in the past. That is what the "Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act" is all about. It could provide expert knowledge at the highest level of visibility. It could give the social state of the nation the kind of analysis it must have. Perhaps it could present alternatives to violence for the President, the Congress, and the American public to consider.

Unless we provide government with new modern tools we are likely to waste more and more of our resources in crash programs without knowing what will result, a process both wasteful and dangerous.

CONFERENCE OF WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, earlier this summer, from July 11 through July 14 the Conference of World Peace Through Law was held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. James B. Brennan, U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin was present at the Conference, in his role as an observer for U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark.

The presence of distinguished citizens of nations throughout the world made a great impact on the Conference and its work.

Recently, Mr. Brennan sent a report to the Attorney General containing his reactions and impression of the Conference's work.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Brennan's report be printed in the RECORD, so that the Senate can benefit by Mr. Brennan's observations.

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

U.S. ATTORNEY,

Milwaukee, Wis., August 18, 1967.

HON. RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL: Thank you for granting me the observer's role at the World Peace through Law Conference in Geneva July 11 through 14. I enjoyed being part of the conference and was honored to be one of your information gatherers.

The fledgling World Peace Through Law organization, age four, met at Geneva, Switzerland. Over one hundred countries were represented. The opening sessions of the conference were held at the Palais Des Nations. The Palais was constructed to house the old League of Nations a half a century ago. The work sessions of the conference were held at the Hotel Intercontinental in Geneva.

The opening statements, 14 of them, made the case for world peace through law. One of the most arresting speakers was the Honorable René Cassin of France, who is the president of the European Court of Human Rights. This octogenarian who presided at the cornerstone-laying ceremony for the Palais Des Nations 50 years ago has been in the fight for peace through law since then. His effort indicated his enthusiasm and drive has not been contained. He told us that in spite of the setbacks to the concept of resolving international disputes by law instead of war, he felt that the League and its successor, United Nations, have made great strides.

The Swiss speakers recalled their unique position in the world of peace with a 150 year record going for them.