

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 3

FEBRUARY 8, 1968, TO FEBRUARY 22, 1968

(PAGES 2603 TO 3952)

corde will carry about half that number at a speed of about 1,500 miles an hour.

### POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last session I introduced a bill calling for the creation of a Council of Social Advisers. The aim of the council would be to provide the Nation as a whole, and policymakers in particular, with a better notion as to where we are socially in order that we be able to make more rational decisions about where we ought to be heading.

Bertram M. Gross, director of the national planning studies program at Syracuse University, spoke at the seminar-hearings which were conducted on this bill. His concern was and is with helping public policymakers deal with the increasing complexities that confront them. At a recent policy conference of the Conservative Party in Canada, he again discussed the "intelligence gap," and the great difficulty policymakers have in finding out what the "status quo" really is.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Gross' address titled "Political Accountability in a World of Confusing Change" as an indication that the subject of social accounting is being seriously considered by Canadian Conservatives as well as by public officials of both persuasions in the United States.

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

#### POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY IN A WORLD OF CONFUSING CHANGE

(Special address by Bertram M. Gross,<sup>1</sup> at the Progressive-Conservative Policy Advisory Conference, Montmorency, Quebec, August 10, 1967)

Mr. Chairman (I was about to say "Fellow Conservatives" but I must restrain myself), it's very exciting to visit the colossus of the North and to see that political leaders here are also conducting a cautious flirtation with eggheads. Down below the border where I come from we also have a Conservative Party. They're called Republicans. And the Democrats have a saying, "The Republicans are really a grand old party—the only trouble with them is, they should stay out of politics". Now from what I've learned after being here two hours, you have not been following that admonition and neither shall I. I came here to talk politics, to talk on an academic plane about the politics of power, the winning of power and the use of power constructively in this world of baffling change.

Now in this century any government in power in any political system must make some form of accounting regularly to the people. But there is no international law requiring honesty or even completeness in political accounting. The older forms of accountability are found in budget messages, annual reports, political conventions, political campaigning and the like.

In the last third of this century new forms of accountability are being initiated. National plans, plan evaluation, annual economic and social reports, systems analysis and program budgeting (spin-offs in part from the new weaponry of defence and offence) are leading to unprecedented new

ways of harnessing our data processing potentials to the needs of people to know and politicians to inform or misinform.

In the United States, for example, work has already been started on the first of a new series of annual social reports of the President.

Long-range preparations are being made to convert our historic, antiquated State of the Union Message into an up-to-date, professionally grounded, popularly understandable review of the changing state of the nation. And a few farsighted Mayors and Governors are beginning to plan for annual reports on the state of the city, the state of the metropolis and (this sounds better in French, I am sure) the state of the State. I give credit to a fellow New Yorker, another Conservative, Nelson Rockefeller, for that last phrase.

In developing our reporting to the people and in the professional assistance which political leaders are demanding on the provision of reliable system state information, we find something called a "credibility gap." I am sure you don't have anything like that here, but below the border it is said that political leaders who know what's happening, don't tell the public. That's the credibility gap. Yet there's also an intelligence gap. The intelligence gap occurs when people don't withhold information that they have because they don't have the information in the first place; they have too little to withhold. This we have found in doing the professional work for the first Social report of the President of the United States; this we have found is our predicament below the border.

Our first great Republican leader had a phrase which is often quoted, and I'll try to embellish it a little bit. He said "You can fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time." Let me add that political leaders have proved their capacity to fool themselves most of the time. I might say in passing this is a very important function of government—fooling one's self. It provides that element of stability without which confusing change could not be tolerated.

Now in the rest of my remarks it may look as though I'm telling you something. That's a rhetorical form designed to ease the pain of the additional confusions, Mr. Chairman, that I shall bring to this session. I'm speaking in the spirit of the great American movie producer, Sam Goldwyn, who is reputed to have said, "For your information, let me ask you a question." I am going to do him one or two better and, instead of telling you things, I'm going to ask three questions.

The first should not, of course, be addressed to the Liberal Party or any other party. It's strictly *your* kind of question. It is, "What is the status quo?" Conservatives, I'm told, at least where I come from, are supposed to be for it. I haven't met one yet who knows what it is but he's for it anyway. The second question is, "How do political leaders react to change?" and the third is, "What *should* be the status quo?" and if I remembered my Latin better it would be "the status quo erabit" instead of "est". I must warn you I will use certain strange words in English not Latin, as I proceed, such as "mega-expectancy" and "circular mosaic" and "idealistics." That's the way that "technopols" such as myself talk about the problem of getting and using political (for-give the expression) power.

#### WHERE ARE WE?

What is the status quo?

That's the question that Rip Van Winkle asked on waking up after a long nap in the Catskills. When he went to sleep we were a British colony. When he woke up he heard about George Washington, who has then the

President of the United States. There had been a change in the system. And many of us today should really confess that our name is probably Van Winkle because we've dug ourselves into so many esoteric specialized caves, polished up the intricacies of so many old issues of a previous century or the beginning of this, that we've lost track of where we really are today and are not quite aware that there has been a system change. This applies to what I might vaguely refer to as the West, or North America as part of the West.

The most obvious aspect of system change can be described in terms of science and technology. I will not bore you by going through the tremendous "advances"—I use that word tentatively—in the techniques of information processing the movement of people and things through space and many other things. Let me merely say in passing that if there is one thing which is inconstant and continuously varying, it is the direction, rate and nature of scientific and technological change. We can send machines around to photograph the back side of the moon but we can't develop a transportation plant that integrates air and ground transportation in New York City, or any other city of America or of the North American continent. Also, if we talk too much about science and technology we lose track of many more important social changes that really are at the heart of the systemic revolution, the shift from advanced industrialism to the first stages of the emerging post-industrial society. I will mention a few of these very quickly.

First, we are becoming a service society. We don't need so many people any more to produce goods. Manufacturing is beginning to fade off in terms of employment in the same way that agricultural employment with increased agricultural productivity has always faded off with the industrial revolution. Second, we have gone beyond the stage of large scale organizations, of big business, big government, big labour. By now, the growth of integrated social action has transcended the boundaries of formal organizations. So, if we now look at the social reality of our post-industrial world, it is found in the macro-system, in the organizational complex, in the family of organizations that constitute the banking system or subsidized agriculture or civil air transport or the defence-space complex or any other of the huge systems that are often made up of combinations of government, private groups and universities and technical laboratories. Third, the talk about the white collar class taking over, with the decline of blue collar workers, is outrageously out of date. It is not white-collarism that has come to the fore but professionalism, professionalism that has extended to every form of activity; and extended professionalism and specialization that goes far beyond the concept of the professions as composed of the doctors, lawyers, engineers and teachers. Every science, every sub-science, every sub-profession, has its new meritocracy, ladder, channels of advancement, forms of barriers to advancement until certain proficiencies are proved.

This extended professionalism has meant a multi-linguistic development which guarantees that at any faculty meeting the members of an Economics Department or a Mathematics Department or a Sociology Department cannot understand each other any more—if they're any good. When you really *get there* in terms of specialization, the divisions multiply at such a rate that serious communication in the specialized jargons upon which scientific progress depends is made almost impossible. Fourth, despite the statistical lies that have been made readily available in our country at least, on divorce and family breakdown and things like that, we have seen an extension of family life unprecedented in history, characterized not only by

<sup>1</sup> Professor of Political Science, Maxwell School, Syracuse University; Director, National Planning Studies Program.

early marriages but by longer life expectancies which mean that for the first time, men and women live together in nuclear family units for truly long periods after children leave home.

While this is a fantastic social phenomenon, it is rooted upon a major shift of investment from the business sphere to the household. The National Bureau of Economic Research in America, which helped invent the GNP as a statistical series (with some help from Marshall), has come to the conclusion that we must now talk about the "factory in the home." In the United States at least, for every five dollars of business investment every year there are seven dollars of hard-goods investment in the house, that's apart from the investment of family funds outside the house. What I'm saying about the role of the family, I might say, does not at all comport with popular impressions that all you have is family breakdown in the modern world.

Fifth, the geographical spread of employment, population and human activity, the new pattern of urban settlement throughout the world, has obsoleted to an important degree the concept of the metropolitan area. And in the most dynamic, powerful and influential portions of the world we now have the metropolitan family or the aggregate of metropolitan areas which constitute, in that horrible Greek word, the megalopolis. We are now in a world situation where the largest bulk of the political influence, culture, science and administration of the world is concentrated in a dozen megalopolitan areas.

I wish I could put on a screen here the insulting map which Barbara Ward published in the Economist only three weeks ago. She shows the outlines of a "nor-meg" that's the northeastern megalopolis in the United States from Washington up to Boston, and then she has a little spur here and she calls this the "Canadian extension."

The growth of the megalopolitan world is merely one aspect, however, of the emergence for the first time in world history of a truly world society, a world society of increasingly inter-dependent organizations and inter-dependent nations. A world society not of good neighbours (and I cannot recollect ever living in a neighbourhood of them) but a world of neighbours and increasingly closer neighbours. This is a world society in which the bi-polar simplifications of the immediate post-war II world, of the divisions of the world into something called "here-and-there", East and West and a third force in between has utterly dissolved, leaving all sorts of people hanging on to old shibboleths, among them some of the funniest being the people who are still trying to believe in themselves as a third force.

Now these social changes have given rise to a whole host of new expectations. We hear about the revolution of rising expectations in the under-developed world. This is nonsense. Anybody who has travelled in the under-developed world finds that the expectors there are the small handful of elites that were educated in the west, and their big complaint is the apathy, the low level of expectations of their people. The real revolution in terms of expectations is in those countries that are moving into post-industrialism. And there we find that people expect not only longer life, which they're getting, but greater activity expectancy. Not merely vegetation after the age of 60 but a new job, a new career after 65 and even after 70. Not only greater earning expectancy but greater learning expectancy as new opportunities are provided for education, re-tooling and re-thinking at all stages in life.

This is consistent with the new concept in post-industrialism of education as a continuing part of life. It even gets to the point where they expect professors, full professors, to learn. Of course, the spinster rate has gone down tremendously. That, of course,

means that greater marriage expectancy is the birthright of every young girl and every infant boy. This marriage expectancy is rising very quickly, but, as I stated a little while ago, this also means a great expectancy of moving into the new phenomenon (not known in the past), of the post-child family. "God bless" the kids, now that they're gone, let's enjoy life. Let's even find an architect who can design a house for a couple who, in the "P.O." period, can learn how to live together without having to rely on children to resolve their conflicts for them. The democratic revolution of the early twentieth century of course led the people to expect more participation in decision-making, but now the last of our mega-expectancies is the urge to enjoy, to participate in beauty. And this in a sense is the deepest meaning behind the phrase which Lyndon Johnson has been using, the effort to orient the United States toward the quality of life rather than merely the quantity of goods and services. These mega-expectancies, in turn, are continuously churned up by the now ideology of post-industrialism.

One of my colleagues, Daniel Bell, wrote a book proclaiming—this is the title—"The End of Ideology"—but as the inventor of the phrase has been very active in bringing into the new ideology of post-industrialism which I will call R.- and D.-ology: Research and Development-ology. Its principle, which is a restatement of the conviction of Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson and the other successful rebels against the British, of the basic principle that any problem can be solved briefly, given enough investment of high quality R and D hours and appropriate provision, not only for research and development but for testing and evaluation. This R.- and D.-ology spreads from hard goods systems to soft systems in social science and it is part of our conviction that, by God, there's no problem we can't solve if we put our best brains to it. . . .

This in turn, of course, leads to expectancies for solutions to new problems that people cannot solve. And I might say in this connection, if you are searching for solutions, my own observation in this context is that *solutions create problems, good solutions create big problems, and excellent solutions create fantastic problems.* And in this kind of a world of galloping, uneven change with people moving off in all directions (even women wanting political posts) I heard a psychiatrist say a few days ago, "What is the world coming to? First they wanted to own property, then they wanted to vote, then they wanted jobs, now they want to enjoy sex. Where are we going?" All those things were not accepted at the beginning of the century. It's in this sense that I try to see the various things that are happening. But really I cannot so I appropriate from my Canadian colleague, (who wrote his splendid book on "The Vertical Mosaic") and I talk instead about the circular or revolving mosaic, a kaleidoscopic revolving world in which it's difficult to get your bearings, in which the centre may not hold and things may fall apart.

#### HOW DO POLITICAL LEADERS REACT TO CHANGE?

The issue here is not simply that political leaders bury their heads in the sand, or, carefully place both ears to the ground at the same time, in trying to sense what is going on. That is not the main problem. The main problem is that in the face of change, political leaders react. *That is what makes so many of them reactionaries.*

It would be a very dangerous thing to live in a world or country where all political leaders tried to lead. You need stability in a system. You cannot afford too many people who know what the *status quo* is. But we need some political leaders who try to lead. I am much more sanguine than the Canadian commentator who sees a decline in the

proportion of politicians who are really political animals. Now, I am just wondering how he counted the politicians; whether he knew one when he saw one. When I look for politicians, the first place I look is at the bureaucracy. Next I ask, "Where's the fellow who can understand campus politics?" In the world of the political animal we may be seeing a strange mutation. I mean a real mutation, not what happens in California when Class B actor becomes a Class B governor. I mean the kind of situation you have (and I can prove my objectivity by referring only to Republicans) when you have in office people like Rockefeller and Lindsay in my state, Percy in Illinois and Hatfield from Oregon, all of whom are men who could not only review a book without a ghost writer, but, if given enough time, could write a fair one. But these are also men who, having this intellectual capacity, are also capable of organizing strong, varied, widely dispersed "ghost stables." This means that as part of the new mutancy in political conservative leadership, they have fond out that it is not enough to steal ideas from third parties. Of course, we don't have any third parties around in the United States that you can really steal an idea from. The last person to do that was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who annihilated the socialist party by appropriating all their ideas. Norman Thomas gave up and decided there was no use running for office any more. The Communist Party was thoroughly subverted by the reform ideas the New Deal took from the Socialists.

I am not familiar with the Canadian scene. I do not know how much further you have to go in stealing either the ideas or the idealogues from your minor parties. But the essence of the new political mutation which brings forth people capable of leading a little is the ability to work with the intellectuals of the country. Our Republicans are very good at that. They have been working with the intellectuals for a long time. They only have one rule: park your brains in the vestibule before you come into the parlour. The trouble in working with intellectuals is that they are bound to bring into your party deliberations and ideas which will lead to international party conflict.

As a university professor, I am more skeptical of professors than any non-academic could possibly be. In fact, I would even coin a phrase that Confucius should have written—"Don't trust a braintrust till it is tested," and it takes time to test "technipol" brains. Yet to grapple with the new facts of life, with the new dynamics of the real status quo, means that internal conflict must be faced, must be kept in its place, but must be welcomed within a party.

#### WHAT SHOULD THE STATUS QUO BECOME?

Above all, the price of political leadership, in a world of utterly baffling change, is to take the tremendously difficult risk of setting forth ideals for the future *status quo*—for the evolving future state of your nation.

In this connection, I would like to tell you the name of a game and start it. The name is "Idealistics." This is a special version of the easier game which is called "Futuribles," invented and led off by my esteemed colleague, Bertrand de Jouvenel in Paris. Conjecturing about the future is "futuribles." Idealistics is conjecturing about that future towards which you are willing to risk your political face and life. In this connection, by the way, I might step back a moment and say that a very good test of the political leader of the future is whether or not he tries to save face or issues. I have come to think that the man who tries to save his face doesn't have one worth saving. You can only cope with confusing change by learning, and the kind of information processing machine that man is can learn only through some version of trial and error. The

recognition of error is rather difficult. Idealistics is a special game of error, of taking a flyer on the future to portray the kinds of system states that really meet deep-felt needs of your people, or even futures that may meet needs that they are not at all aware of, and may not thank you for when you talk about them.

The first rule of idealistics is that you are out of the game if you start by mentioning anything which is straight, hard-goods technology. That is too easy. Let us not think of a future in which I can get back to New York City or to Syracuse in a half an hour; I am perfectly willing to take a longer period of time. I would suggest for reflection, with your fingers crossed, such idealistics as the following:

1. *A United Nations with financial resources of its own.* A very capable group of international lawyers has done a service to political leaders of all countries by developing a step-by-step program of international treaties and declarations, whereby the non-national two-thirds of the world (because after all the nation-states claim only the one-third of the earth's surface) would be fully internationalized. They have developed a specific program whereby the United Nations could, in keeping with the highest concepts of international law and order, take claim to the mineral and fishing resources of the high seas, and through leasing rights and provisions, develop in the course of the next decade, sufficient resources to guarantee its own sustenance and activities. The Antarctic, I am told, is a tremendous source of wealth. It happens to be one of the few areas of the world in which the Russians and the United States are cooperating on a scientific venture of unprecedented proportions in an unprecedented manner. That is a land area. The arctic circle is a sea area and could only be claimed, by our historical concepts of international law, by an international body. Perhaps Canada has some special role to play in the future of the Arctic regions.

2. *Creative regionalism.* As part of idealistics, creative regionalism is a form of social organization designed to utterly baffle and confuse anybody who tries to explain things in terms of simple hierarchy—that is, distinctions between, above and below, and who is boss and who is subordinate. In a world of declining hierarchy, I believe that our forms of living together throughout the world must call for vast new experiments in both federalism and regionalism. In a period of relative stagnation in the United States of ideas to back up President Johnson's slogan of "creative federalism" perhaps we might turn to the north for examples of how to do better in creative regionalism.

3. *Organization individualists.* In the world of the macro-system, of the large-scale complex of interrelated, intersecting organizations, I think we should aim to bid goodbye to what William White called the "organization man" and begin to talk about the "organization individualist." He is the person who sees a challenge to his creativity and his innovational capacities in the resources and in the confusions that are unrivaled in large scale complex macro-systems. The government's systems advisers, civil servants and civil service reformers have a great contribution to make to the promotion of organizational individualism.

4. *Female power.* At a time when the term "black power" is uppermost in the minds of many people in the United States, I would like to turn attention away from our oppressed minority to talk about the subservient majority, and use the term "female power." I am very serious on this. I think a mark of maturity in the post-industrial world will be when more opportunities in all walks of life are opened up for women. I'm including the opportunity not only to be a

man in a man's world, but to be a woman in a world of men and women, an opportunity to be recognized for working in child care and housework. I must say I find nothing more fantastically humiliating than the question, which pervades a lot of questionnaires and census questions in our countries: "Are you a housewife or do you work?"

A Dutch psychoanalyst has written a book called "The Male Myth" in which he suggests the the problems that men face, and that young men face in adjusting to the modern world, can never be solved until greater opportunities are provided for women to develop free from our heritage of myth and taboo as to what is expected from a girl, what is expected from a wife, what is expected from a woman. And I have no hesitation whatsoever in predicting that before 1984, in less than twenty years, the recognition of female power, the untapped, the unleashed potentialities of women to be creative in their own way, the recognition of this potential in our society will be the acid test in the success of any major political party in the post-industrial world.

We, in the United States, have been rapidly progressing backward in this subject. The figures on jobs for women and married women completely gloss over the nature of the jobs and the salaries and the career opportunities provided. In fact, at a time when forward-looking people throughout the world know that part-time jobs are the only feasible things to add (and it's really moonlighting) to the work of the housewife, we still in our economic analysis of the labour force, regard part-time employment as something which indicates a weakness in the labour market and economic structure. We are still not directly oriented in any of our bureaucracies, whether municipal government, or state government, or universities, or hospitals, or schools, to the obvious mathematical fact that three part-time women may often do more work than two full-time ones.

5. A fifth idealistic proposition that I would offer for your attention is disguised under the technical term "interface." Interface is what the engineers talk about when they concern themselves with communication between many levels of two cooperating systems. Instead of layering you can have an interface at many levels, so that people can talk to each other freely. The interface which we must work on, because it cannot come automatically, is the interface between people in different roles in life, in different sciences and professions who cannot speak with each other. Then there is that tremendously difficult interface between "professionals" and those people who have not yet entered the professional ladder of modern meritocracy.

Here is an increasingly important role for the politician. He must find a common language. He must be able to communicate the wisdom of the *avant garde* scientist who depends on increasingly specialized jargon: *he must communicate this in some way to his electorate.* You talk in simplistic terms here about bilingualism. There is a bilingual problem, yes; but again without knowing enough about Canada, I know that in the United States we have a *multi-lingual problem in English.* We have to develop multi-linguistic skills in English. I could have presented my lecture thus far in terms that only three persons in the room would have understood; maybe I would not have understood it myself. We need training in multi-lingual skills and perhaps if you must face up to talking various versions of French as well as various versions of English. I suppose this is a good training ground for the more difficult problem of living in the multi-linguistic, hyperspecialized, hyperprofessional merit of this post-industrial society.

#### WHAT SHOULD PEOPLE BE TOLD?

And so, having reflected in public on the questions of where are we, and how do political leaders react and where should we go, I come back to the question of political accountability. This can be formulated in a question also: What should the people be told?

Now, I believe Canadians probably are in the delightful position of standing between two myths, both of them rather ridiculous. The British myth is embodied in the Official Secrets Act is, "Don't tell anybody anything." It is a gentlemen's world and gentlemen know. They don't have to be told, and they don't tell.

The American myth, which is just as silly, is the myth of the goldfish bowl, "Open agreements openly arrived at and tell the people everything." Well, we are not going to go very far in politics if you say you are going to tell it all. Who would listen?

But underlying both of these outdated attitudes, of course, is the gnawing question "Do we know enough to tell? What is our capacity to deal with the intelligence gap?" I must say that in our task force operations on the first Social Report of the President in the United States, we have all learned very great humility. The intelligentsia, to the extent that it is represented in these operations in Washington seems to be the very first to confess that they lack intelligence—intelligence in the information-gathering sense.

I am tempted to conclude my remarks on the problem of accounting to the people in a situation where you may not be sure what has happened (let alone what should happen) by quoting a marvellous story by Sir Geoffrey Vickers in a radio talk over B.B.C. called "The End of Free Fall." This is the story of the man who jumped off the Empire State Building, and after he got to the twentieth floor said, "I'm doing alright so far." Sir Geoffrey commented upon this saying: "So far, so good, but maybe its time to think about building a parachute into the system." My particular kind of parachute—the one I am helping design at this moment and have been bringing to your attention—is the development of some form of national, regional, and state systems accounting which will help us know the *status quo*, the state at which we have been, and help give us a better idea as to where we might and should be going.

#### FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, this month's bulletin of the American Society of Newspaper Editors contains an article entitled "FOI Cleanup Hitters With Good Followthrough," written by Representative DONALD RUMSFELD.

Representative RUMSFELD is a knowledgeable and articulate spokesman in the freedom of information field. I believe his article should be read by all Senators. The American Society of Newspaper Editors is to be commended for its continuous interest in obtaining a truly effective freedom of information law.

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

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

FOL CLEANUP HITTERS WITH GOOD FOLLOW-THROUGH

(By DONALD RUMSFELD, Member of Congress, 13th District, Illinois)

When the new Federal Public Records Law (5 U.S.C. 552) became effective on July 4, 1967, some Freedom of Information advocates hailed it as the long-sought panacea