

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 12

MAY 27, 1968, TO JUNE 6, 1968

(PAGES 15011 TO 16380)

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

"The children, as you can see, are very well behaved," he was saying. "Although the school is now on fire, the boys who put the torch to it did not really seem angry. They were just carried away by the excitement. That car you see being overturned belongs to a fourth-grade teacher who is known for her strictness. It's the children's way of seeking redress of grievances. I think we must all agree that this younger generation has definite ideas and isn't afraid to express them."

Hours later, after negotiations between the pupil leaders and the teachers, it was decided that henceforth any teacher who raised his voice would have to stay after school, that any teacher who passed out a bad mark would be brought to the attention of the local civil liberties league, and that any teacher who gave a test would automatically have his certificate revoked.

When I finally arrived home, I told my wife all that had happened at Pine Crest Elementary School. She could see I was depressed. "Never mind," she said, "It's at least nice to know that our children are really getting ready for college."

EDWIN A. ROBERTS, JR.

THE FULL OPPORTUNITY AND SOCIAL ACCOUNTING ACT

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act, introduced in the Senate last year by Senator MONDALE of Minnesota is a highly meritorious proposal. This legislation provides for the creation of a Council of Social Advisors to the President, comparable to the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It would also require the President to submit an annual social report to the Congress. The measure would also create a joint committee in Congress to scrutinize the President's social report.

There is little doubt that the domestic crisis confronting our Nation today requires new imaginative approaches and programs in order to resolve this problem. While the search for the solutions should be nationwide, Senator MONDALE's proposal will give direction to the many efforts initiated by sociologists, historians, criminologists, psychologists, and other scholars and public figures. As my eminent colleague so wisely points out:

At present, our social goals are vague and ill defined. The legislative requirement that the Administration deliver a public social accounting should sharpen the Administration's goals and social planning. This could promote setting long range goals in, for example, education, health care, and the fight against environmental pollution, and encourage definite periodic progress toward their achievement.

Reporting on the "Social State of the Union" is a good idea. I believe that upon reading an excellently written article, published in the June 1968 issue of *Trans-action*, the Senate will come to the same conclusion. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

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

REPORTING ON THE SOCIAL STATE OF THE UNION
(By Senator WALTER F. MONDALE)

America's social goals were well stated by the writers of the Constitution: to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote

the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity." But in 1968 we see little domestic tranquility; we see little justice for a substantial number of citizens; and for millions—poorly educated, ill-housed, or otherwise deprived—the blessings of liberty are a cruel jest.

The search for solutions to this modern dilemma leads those of us in government to turn to social research. There is increasing legislative hunger for social-science counsel. Senator Abraham Ribicoff, in major hearings on the urban crisis, called no fewer than 12 social scientists to testify. In order to improve the federal government's social-science research capability, Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma has reintroduced legislation to establish a national foundation for the social sciences. He seeks to draw the social sciences from the shadow of the National Science Foundation, thus giving them independent status and increased stature.

In government departments, a new kind of administrator is emerging. For example, Daniel P. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor, is "one of a new breed of public servants, the social-scientist-politicos, who combine in their backgrounds both social-science training and full-time involvement in political activity." (See "Black Families and the White House," Lee Rainwater and William L. Yancey, *Trans-action* July/August 1966.) Another new political animal in federal departments and agencies is the systems-approach expert, who—by means of cost-effectiveness analysis and other tools—seeks to help decision-makers understand all relevant alternatives and key interactions among them by calculating costs, risks, and potential results associated with each course of action. An example of this new breed is William Gorham, formerly of the Pentagon and the RAND Corporation, and Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who has been appointed head of the Urban Institute, a government-supported independent research center.

The development of these new types of scientist-politicians suggests a governmental institution—an arm of the executive—that can combine a knowledge of sociology, science, history, social psychology, criminology, and social economics. These new specialists can place their knowledge in a governmental context, and bring a systems approach to bear on broad social programs.

Early last year I introduced in the Senate the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act, which was cosponsored by Senators Clark, Hart, Harris, Inouye, Kennedy of Massachusetts, McCarthy, McGee, Muskie, Nelson, and Proxmire, who is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. This legislation would draw the social scientists into the inner councils of the Administration; it would foster the use of the systems approach for an overview of the broad range of domestic social programs; and it would establish a system of social accounting to keep a constant check on our domestic social status. Furthermore, it would require a public report of this social audit.

In its statement of policy, the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act reaffirms that "it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the federal government, consistent with the primary responsibilities of the state and local government and the private sector, to promote and encourage such conditions as will give every American the opportunity to live in decency and dignity, and to provide a clear and precise picture of whether such conditions are promoted and encouraged in such areas as health, education and training, rehabilitation, housing, vocational opportunities, the arts and humanities, and special assistance for the deprived, the abandoned, and the criminal."

To accomplish this, the legislation would: Declare social accounting a national goal; Establish the President's Council of So-

cial Advisers, comparable in the social sphere to the Council of Economic Advisers in the economic area;

Require the President to submit an annual Social Report to Congress, the social counterpart to his Economic Report; and

Create a joint committee of Congress to examine the substance of the Social Report.

In his Social Report, the President is to detail "the overall progress and effectiveness of federal efforts" toward implementing the policy of the act; review state, local, and private efforts to this end; and present "current and foreseeable needs, programs, and policies and recommendations for legislation."

The three-member Council of Social Advisers, supported by a staff of experts in the social sciences and in those natural sciences concerned with man and his environment, would be empowered to "gather timely and authoritative information and statistical data" and analyze and interpret them. The Council would also appraise the various programs and activities of the federal government and develop priorities for the programs, recommending to the President the most efficient and effective way to allocate federal resources.

The model for this act is the Employment Act of 1946, which has had an indisputably favorable effect on the nation's economy. This economic progress—owing in large part to highly refined economic analysis and indicators—is a powerful argument for using social analysis and measurement.

The Council of Economic Advisers recommends measures to maintain a stable, prosperous, and expanding economy. It operates on four assumptions:

That welfare (the ultimate objective) is dependent upon the level and health of national economic activity;

That economic factors can be quantified;

That action by government can cause specific changes in the national economic conditions; and

That from analysis of economic data it is feasible to recommend specific action to achieve national economic health.

To do its job, the C.E.A. had to develop a system of economic criteria to measure the present and prospective conditions of the economy. It had to increase the expertise and the rigor of the economics discipline in order to reduce the margin of error in economic measurement. It had to develop tools of economic analysis, calling upon the entire community of economists for contributions. It had to proceed with caution so as to command the respect and acceptance of decision-makers. Finally, its recommendations and findings had to be action-oriented.

The same process is now appropriate and necessary in the social endeavors of the federal government. But we should mislead no one: This new job will be far more difficult. There should be no false hopes for instant success. For the most part, economic indicators are hard, cash-register data, and in most indices the dollar is available as a uniform measuring unit. Understandably, it is far easier to count the cash in working-man's pocket than to measure the quality of his health or education.

A true attempt to apply non-economic measures to the quality of life in America could have a revolutionary impact on government. It might be the first time that government looked at the individual to see what government programs do to and for him—in other words, to discover the effect, rather than merely to measure the effort, of government programs. For example, we know how many people take advantage of Medicare, but there are no public reports on the quality of this care. The same is true of education, criminal rehabilitation, and much of the poverty effort (although the publication of studies on the effect of Head Start has been a laudable beginning).

At present, our social goals are vague and

ill defined. The legislative requirement that the Administration deliver a public social accounting should sharpen the Administration's goals and social planning. This could promote setting long-range goals in, for example, education, health care, and the fight against environmental pollution, and encourage definite periodic progress toward their achievement.

Some argue that this system of progress reports will curb innovation and experimentation. But I think we have little to fear if we use fresh, imaginative ideas. And in fact, the lack of adequate indicators can actually conceal the success of government innovations. Critics of the Job Corps, for example, attack the cost per corpsman, while the Corps' effect on the corpsman's life and potential is ignored.

Some see a danger of the indicators' being manipulated for political ends, or the goals deliberately being set so low that accomplishment will appear spectacular. Of course, our political system is, at every level, vulnerable on this score. But there are checks built into the legislation. It provides for a Joint Congressional Committee empowered to probe deeply into the substance of the Social Report—to examine and criticize the declared goals, to question the philosophy behind the various programs, and to test the adequacy of the indicators. For a demonstration of how effective this legislative tool can be, we need only refer to the transcript of the 1967 hearings of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report chaired by Senator William Proxmire.

There are also other legislative checks on the Administration. The General Accounting Office has won a strong reputation for its auditing of Administration expenditures. Senator Abraham Ribicoff has proposed that this operation be expanded by adding an Office of Legislative Evaluation charged with "evaluating the results of the social and economic programs [Congress] has enacted." The Full Opportunity Act proposes to give the Administration new evaluative and analytical equipment. Certainly Congress should be given comparable legislative tools.

The Administration, with the program-planning-budgeting system directed by the Bureau of the Budget, is already taking limited steps toward improving program evaluation and determining program priorities. And William Gorham, in his work in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has been coordinating a panel working on a "social state of the nation report." No one can guarantee, however, that it will be a permanent institution of government.

SEARCH FOR A CONSTITUENCY

As a matter of practical politics, the passage of legislation requires a constituency. Since most laws grow out of a need that has immediacy and relevance for a sizable part of the population, most proposed legislation has a constituency highly motivated to promote its passage. But where is the constituency of legislation that looks to the future—legislation that will have profound impact, yet is currently difficult to understand and in constant danger of being misinterpreted?

To build such a constituency, we must look to the social scientists themselves. And there are other allies as well. At all levels of government social-welfare organizations and officials are concerned about the effectiveness of programs ranging from welfare to education, from city planning to health care.

The initial job in building a constituency is to bring the legislation to the attention of those for whom it has inherent interest. I have sent letters to 500 social scientists inviting their comment. Furthermore, editorials in media ranging from the *Minneapolis Star* and *Milwaukee Journal* to specialized newsletters have brought encouraging response.

The second step is persuasion, which in

this case means education. Few people in policy-making positions are aware of the concept of social accounting—largely because literature on the subject is confined mostly to the academic journals.

The congressional committee is a useful educational device, particularly as an efficient information conduit to the policy-makers. The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act has been referred to the Government Operations Committee, which has sent it to Senator Harris's Subcommittee on Governmental Research. In the summer of 1967 that subcommittee held a unique one-day seminar to explore the ramifications of the proposal. Both that session, and the hearings the subcommittee held later, elicited highly illuminating views from social scientists, present and former government officials, businessmen, and journalists. Above all, the discussions buttressed the need for an institutionalized and on-going review of the state of our nation's social health, at the highest level of government as well as on the community and state levels. In great part the hearings produced more questions than answers, and exposed our ignorance rather than a wealth of information about social processes. But our country is now demanding the answers, and it is essential that we begin asking the right questions.

While the Full Opportunity Act will have a vigorous impact upon government, I believe it will have no less impact on the social sciences. There is every reason to believe that the social sciences—like economics since 1946—will be greatly stimulated by enactment of the legislation. Such legislation may prod many social scientists into devoting increased attention to social problems that have specific relevancy to government. Instead of concentrating solely on research and comment, they will become active participants in policymaking.

Are social scientists up to the task? While most who have written me believe that they are, some are less confident. One social scientist of long experience warned, "The behavioral sciences, in my judgment, are in no real position at this point to give any hard data on social problems or conditions." He added, "There are many promises and pretensions; however, when it comes to delivery, what is usually forthcoming are more requests for further research. . . ."

If social scientists have not developed the necessary sophistication to fully participate in policy determination, then they *must*—and very soon. For government at all levels is going to ask them for advice and value judgments. This responsibility is going to be thrust upon them, and I don't think they are going to refuse it.

I am encouraged by the reports sent to me by social scientists who are involved in both the planning and the evaluation phrases of future-looking projects. The work of organizations such as Resources for the Future and the Russell Sage Foundation is well known. And, of course, virtually every major university has a center or institute doing extremely ambitious research on social problems. Others, such as the Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge at the University of Michigan, are devoting their activity to ways of using scientific skills in the social as well as in the natural sciences. The book *Social Indicators* (M.I.T. Press, 1966), edited by Raymond Bauer, shows how researchers can frame the important questions and meet the basic requirements for social accounting.

All this suggests that some social scientists want to become activists—to convert their role from that of observer to that of participant.

THE COMMUNICATION GAP

Today, because much valuable information disappears into the academic journals, many policy-makers remain unaware of its existence. A Council of Social Advisers could

probably correct this problem by providing a funnel through which the findings of social-science research would be directed to government.

Of course, government policy-makers shouldn't expect a full range of sophisticated social indicators to be developed overnight, nor should they expect evaluation and analysis that bear the stamp of certainty rather than theory. Scientific progress doesn't work this way. If I read the history of the Council of Economic Advisers correctly, it took that group many years, and experimentation by several Council chairmen, to evolve a satisfactory role in economic analysis and policy recommendation. This will be even more necessary when we are dealing with elusive social values.

Now, a word of warning: There is a history of mistrust on the part of some members of Congress toward the social sciences. This attitude is based partly on unfamiliarity, partly on poor communications between scientists and policy-makers, and partly on the fact that many Congressmen regard themselves as successful practitioners of applied social science—because they have won elections. Institutionalized channels of communication will help break down this mistrust.

Also important is the fact that policy-makers are wary of the political backlash contained in the findings of the social scientists. One dramatic example was the response of policy-makers to the Moynihan Report on the Negro family.

Finally, there are still a substantial number of people who see behavioral-science study as a trend toward the society of Orwell's 1984. They are wary of invasion of privacy in social research, and fear that data banks will make the individual increasingly vulnerable. These are legitimate concerns, often deeply felt by the social scientists themselves. These concerns demand vigilance. There must be guarantees against misuse of some of the most valuable equipment in social-science research.

But despite these difficulties, it is time to establish an alliance between policy-makers and social scientists. The alliance promises better lives and more individual opportunity through a more orderly approach to the future.

Of this need, former Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary John W. Gardner has said: "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 by studying the solutions to last year's problems."

Bertrand de Jouvenel has written that the 20th century now has the opportunity to devise "a long-term strategy for well-being." As I read the Preamble to the Constitution, it seems to me that this was precisely the goal of the 18th century Constitutional Convention. Today, a vigorous program—backed by the collective political wisdom of the Congress and the technical expertise of the social scientists—finally offers us hope of achieving that goal.

"NEW DIRECTIONS FOR URBAN AMERICA" BY REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, much of the social and political attention in America is directed toward the urban crisis. We are faced with a multitude of unsolved human problems, crime and civil disorder, a declining urban environment, and inadequately equipped urban governments.