UNITED STATES

OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

population receiving 40 per cent of the income in Argentina, Brazil and Mexico. The bottom 40 per cent of the population received 10 to 14 per cent of total income in those countries.

Education: Enrollment of school-age children in primary schools increased by about 50 per cent between 1960 and 1967, or from 24 million to 36 million. But there were 27 million children not enrolled in primary schools in 1967—740,000 more than in 1960.

With an expansion by 1979 of primary education facilities sufficient to give all school-age children six years of schooling before their 15th birthday, the adult illiteracy rate would be reduced to about 37 per cent or some three-fifths of the 1964 rate, which was 62.1 per cent.

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY GEORGIA ASSEMBLY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Georgia General Assembly meeting in Atlanta be printed in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 181–470

A resolution expressing opposition to the Federal Communications Commission's proposal to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television; and for other purposes

Whereas, the Federal Communications Commission plans to ban all cigarette advertising on radio and television unless the United States Congress intervenes to prevent said Commission from carrying out said plan; and

Whereas, if carried out, this proposed ban on cigarette advertising would do violence to the principles of free enterprise which have been the source of the greatness of our country; and

Whereas, the tobacco industry has always been and still is of fundamental importance to the economy of the South; and

Whereas, the importance of the tobacco industry to our own State is demonstrated by the fact that Georgia growers produced an average of over 78 million dollars worth of tobacco per annum during the past three years; and

Whereas, the impact that tobacco has on the Georgia economy is further demonstrated by the fact that there are over 26,000 tobacco growers in this State, and many times that number of people depend on the tobacco industry, either directly or indirectly, for their livelihood; and

Whereas, at a time when further taxation of our citizens is being considered, it should be noted that over thirty-seven and one-half million dollars in cigarette and tobacco taxes was collected by the State of Georgia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968; and

Whereas, cigarette advertising is directed toward people who already smoke and amounts to competition among brands rather than an inducement to people to begin smoking; and

Whereas, while convincing evidence has been presented to show that cigarette smoking is harmful to health, the alleged impact of cigarette advertising on actual smoking is sheer speculation which has not been backed up by objective and factual information; and

Whereas, since no reasonable justification for banning cigarette advertising on radio and television has been demonstrated and such a ban could have far-reaching adverse effects on the economy of our county, the Federal Communication Commission's plan to implement such a ban should be abandoned.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia that the members of this body do hereby express their firm opposition to the proposal by the Federal Communications Commission to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television.

Be it further resolved that all members of the Georgia delegation to the United States Congress are hereby requested and urged to use their power and influence in prohibiting the implementation of the proposed ban of cigarette advertising on radio and television.

Be it further resolved that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed to transmit appropriate copies of this resolution to Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; Honorable Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture; Honorable Phil Campbell, Undersecretary of Agriculture; each member of the Georgia delegation to the United States Congress; the Federal Communications Commission; Honorable Lester Maddox, Governor of Georgia and Honorable Thomas T. Irvin, Georgia Commissioner of Agriculture.

In House, read and adopted March 3, 1969.
GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

In Senate, read and adopted March 17, 1969.

HAMILTON McWHORTER, Jr.
Secretary.

PARTICIPATION AND ALIENATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on several occasions in the past I have spoken about "Toward a Social Report" and its relation to the Full Opportunity Act of 1969—S. 5. Today I invite attention to the last chapter of that report: "Participation and Alienation." Some of the other chapters of this report have dealt with relatively more simple topics. This is one area where, at present, it is more intelligent to concentrate on the formulation of the proper questions than it is to seek answers to irrelevant questions. The seventh chapter of "Toward a Social Report" does precisely this.

This chapter attempts to pose questions which will enable us to judge not simply whether our institutions accomplish their tasks but, equally important, how they accomplish their tasks. Such questioning will "remind us of the range of considerations we should keep in mind when setting public policy, and encourage the collection of needed data in the future." In time, perhaps, we will be in a position to know how to reform our institutions so as make certain that they respect the rights of individuals; facilitate democratic participation; provide congenial group affiliations, and insure the survival and orderly development of our society.

The chapter asks questions in three major areas. We can all agree that our institutions should function in a manner which will not unduly infringe on our individual liberties. Accordingly, the first section of the chapter "asks questions about the degree of freedom and constraint in American life." The report suggests:

We need to develop survey data that can discern any major changes in the degree of tolerance and in the willingness to state unpopular points of view, as well as information about the legal enforcement of constitutional guarantees.

We can also agree that the protection of the individual liberties of only a selected few is not sufficient. It is necessary that every American's civil liberties are protected. Therefore, the second section of this chapter "raises questions about the extent to which the ideal of equality and justice is realized." Once again we are faced with the situation where those who are least educated and who have the least income often have the least chance to make their interests known. We must ask, How can the groups with the least organized power assert their interests against those with the most? This question urgently needs to be answered.

Finally, we can agree that even if people "enjoy freedom, and a just and equal political system" they can still lack a "sense of community." That is, they can still feel alienated: from their family, neighborhood, Nation, or any other social group. It is in this section where we come face to face with a problem which most Americans are deeply concerned about: the problem of a nation divided against itself. We desperately need to know how deep or serious "are the divisions in our society." It is only after we have such information that we will be able to act intelligently to eliminate the divisions which are not socially advantageous.

I wish to stress one other point which is highlighted in "Toward a Social Report." Social reporting in not a panacea. The difficult policy decisions we face will not be solved automatically by social reporting. As the report notes:

Social Reporting cannot make the hard choices the Nation must make any easier, but ultimately it can help to insure that they are not made in ignorance of the Nation's needs.

What social reporting can do is to keep us from continually "stumbling into the future."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the seventh chapter of "Toward a Social Report," entitled "Participation and Alienation," be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHAPTER VII. PARTICIPATION AND ALIENATION

WHAT DO WE NEED TO LEARN?

The preceding chapters neglect many of the Nation's major concerns. They have, for example, scarcely mentioned the divisions in our society which separate young and old, black and white, left and right. Yet these divisions trouble many Americans, and help explain the demonstrations at universities, the disorders in cities, and the manifestations of racist and extremist strength. The preceding chapters have similarly neglected the controversies about court decisions defining our individual liberties, demands for "democratic participation" in the organizational life of the society, and the concern some Americans have about the viability and stability of family life.

The most notable of the problems that have been neglected are those that concern the functioning of our social and political institutions. To the extent that these institutions have promoted health, deterred crime, and the like, their achievements belong in preceding chapters. But we also care about *how* we combine our efforts to achieve our goals, about our loyalty toward our institutions, about our attitudes toward each other, and about the implications of our social and

political institutions for the future of the Nation, However good our health or high our incomes, we would not be satisfied with institutions that failed to respect individual rights, allow democratic participation, provide congenial group affiliations, or insure the survival and orderly development of our society.

Unfortunately, it is concerns such as these that we know least about. It is more difficult to assess the extent to which our political and social institutions satisfy democratic values, or prevent alienation, than it is to assess the level of health, income, or crime.

Therefore, we can do little more than ask the right questions. Yet it is important that these questions be asked. If assessments of the state of the Nation take account only of those variables that are readily measurable, our social priorities and public policies will be distorted. It will not be possible to obtain the needed information in the future unless the questions are asked now.

Since the primary purpose of this report is to examine the condition of American society, the questions should pertain to the basic functions our social and political institutions perform, rather than to their structures or characteristics.

One purpose our institutions should surely serve is that of protecting our individual liberties—one of the first ideals of our Nation. Democratic processes are meaningless if citizens do not have a large measure of freedom, particularly freedom to dissent from the policy of the Government and the views of the majority. Thus the first section of this chapter asks questions about the degrees of "Freedom and Constraint" in American life.

In a modern democracy, individual liberty cannot be the privilege of a few: It must be available on an equal basis to every law-abiding citizen. A system in which some stand above the law, while others are denied its protection, is repugnant to the idea of justice. Equality before the law in turn implies that every citizen have access to public services on an equal basis according to law. The citizens must also be able to influence public policy, and in the aggregate influence it decisively, or they are not truly free. There must be meaningful voting, and the vote of each citizen must count equally. The second section of this chapter therefore raises questions about the extent to which the ideal of "Equality and Justice" is being realized.

A people may enjoy freedom, and a just and equal political system, yet lack any sense of community. Many may be alienated, not only from the Nation, but also from their families, neighborhoods, and other social groups. Some degree of alienation and disunity is acceptable in a society that values individual freedom, and the alienated may be creative and bring about reforms which benefit society as a whole. But if alienation becomes so pervasive that all sense of community is lost, the result can be disaster.

The degree of alienation also depends on the functioning of all the social groups in the society. A person may be alienated because of the failure of his family, the shortcomings of his neighborhood, the lack of a congenial club, or the policies of the National Government.

Thus the third section of this chapter, on "Community and Alienation," asks how strong are the bonds which maintain our relationships to social institutions, from the family to the National Government. Here we encounter what many Americans find the most worrisome questions of contemporary life: How serious are the divisions in our society? How can we bridge the generation gap that divides families and universities, and the racial and ideological differences that divide neighborhood and Nation?

QUESTIONS ABOUT FREEDOM AND CONSTRAINT

It is a sign of the profound value placed on freedom that many use this word to describe a great many of the things they want. Better education, more goods and services, and higher incomes give people the freedom to do things they could not have done before. But we are discussing freedom here in its most ancient and basic sense: those rights that allow an individual to use his time, talents, and resources in whatever way he pleases, so long as this does not interfere with the rights of others.

Freedom of expression

Democracy cannot be meaningful if those who disagree with the policy of the government have no opportunity to persuade their fellow citizens to vote it out of office. Thus freedom of expression, both for individuals and for groups, is absolutely indispensable to a democratic society.[1] We must therefore ask particularly about the freedom to express dissenting and unpopular views.

There can be little doubt that court decisions in the recent past have expanded the legal protection for free speech. Important as these legal developments have been, they are by no means the whole story. Freedom of expression can be restricted not only by government officials, but also by popular intolerance. However, the extent of such intolerance is not known.

There is some evidence that a majority of Americans on occasion have wanted to deny free speech to their fellow citizens, and that this disposition has been more prevalent among the rank and file than among community leaders. In the period of the Red scare of the early fifties, only 27 percent of Americans thought that an admitted Communist should be allowed to make a speech in their communities; but 51 percent of community leaders felt such a speech should be permitted. Among the general population,

only about 37 percent thought that a person who wanted to speak against religion should be allowed to speak in their communities. Again, community leaders were more tolerant; 64 percent of them believed such a speech should be allowed.[2]

There is a need for tolerance not only in national political forums, but also in daily life. How much tolerance of dissent is there in our schools, factories, and offices? We do not know, but some approximate answers could be obtained, as one study shows.

In this study, representative samples of persons in the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, and Mexico were asked about the extent to which they had as students felt free to discuss unfair treatment in school or disagree with the teacher, and whether they had participated in school debates on political and social issues. As tables 1 and 2 reveal, American respondents were more likely than those in any of the other countries surveyed to say that they had felt free to disagree with their teachers, discuss unfair treatment with them, and participate in school discussions and debates. Americans were also more likely to be consulted about job decisions and to protest job decisions than those in most of the countries surveyed.

The lack of information about the extent of our liberties may suggest that we are not as vigilant about the state of our freedom as we purport to be. Here we can do little more than pose the question of how well the Nation is protecting the individual rights its rhetoric emphasizes. But the question is itself important. If it is asked more often, we will in time be able to provide better answers.

TABLE 1.—FREEDOM TO DISCUSS UNFAIR TREATMENT IN SCHOOL OR TO DISAGREE WITH TEACHER, BY NATION

[In percent]

Percent who remember they felt—	United States	United Kingdom	Germany	Italy	Mexico
Free	45	35	34	29	40
Uneasy	23	18	24	19	16
Better not to talk to teacher	25	41	30	36	39
Don't know, don't remember, and other	8	6	12	16	5
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Total number	969	963	953	907	783

Source: Almond and Verba, "The Civic Culture," p. 332.

TABLE 2.—FREEDOM TO PARTICIPATE IN SCHOOL DISCUSSIONS AND DEBATES, BY NATION

[In percent]

Percent who remember they felt—	United States	United Kingdom	Germany	Italy	Mexico
Could and did participate	40	16	12	11	15
Could but did not participate	15	8	5	4	21
Could not participate	34	68	68	56	54
Don't know and other	11	8	15	29	10
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Total number	969	963	953	907	783

Source: Almond and Verba, "The Civic Culture," p. 333.

QUESTIONS ABOUT EQUALITY AND JUSTICE

Equal treatment is a cornerstone of our society. We believe in equality before the law: The judicial system must deal equally with the great and the small, or there is no justice. We believe in the right to equal access to public services: The administrative apparatus should treat all citizens in the same way, according to law. We believe in the one-man-one-vote ideal: The political system should give each citizen equal access to the electoral process so that no group can wield political power disproportionate to its numbers. These ideas of equality and justice are not only enshrined in our rhetoric; they are essential to the viability and integrity of our democratic processes. If those who oppose the existing leadership cannot depend on the protection of the courts, or equal access to public services, or voting power comparable to their numbers, democracy is threatened.

---

[1] If there is freedom of expression and organization, there is automatically a good deal of religious freedom as well.

[2] Samuel Stouffer, *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1954), pp. 26–44.

Justice in the courts

A democratic society must always ask whether everyone accused has a right to counsel and all of the other requisites of a fair trial; whether justice is so long delayed it is in effect denied; whether every citizen has equal access to publicly provided services.

The American system of justice with its ancient roots in the common law, its elaborate rights of appeal, and thoroughgoing system of judicial review, is properly a source of national pride. Yet there is evidence that some suffer rough and ready justice at the hands of the police; that some are tried without adequate counsel; that publicity and prejudice may sometimes prevent a jury from rendering justice. In some parts of the country, the punishment of those accused of rape has varied with their race and the race of their victims.

One reason why so little is known about the exact extent of such inequities in our system of justice is that virtually *any* such wrong is a matter of great seriousness. It can result in the impeachment of a judge, or the expulsion or loss of pay of a policeman. Because so much is at stake, it is extremely difficult to collect information on shortcomings as a matter of statistical routine. Yet, if we believe in justice, we are obliged to ask to whom it has been denied.

Access and redress in large organizations

A growing group of Americans, especially among the young and the black, are intensely concerned about the relationship between the individual and the large bureaucracies. They are concerned about the relationship between the citizen and the police force, the student and the university, the claimant and the insurance company, the welfare client and the public assistance office, the tenant and the housing authority, the employee and the hierarchy.

The concern about the relationship between the individual and the bureaucracy is coming from diverse segments of the political spectrum. Historically, those on the right have been most anxious about the evils of bureaucracy and most enthusiastic about decentralization. But recently, the "new left" seems on its way to putting democratic participation in large organizations, including some forms of decentralization, above the left's traditional advocacy of central planning and the nationalization of industry.

The problem is this: How can the individual citizen, especially the citizen who is lacking in education, influence, and self-confidence, get the services he should expect from large bureaucracies, or get redress from the wrongs they may commit against him? The person accused of a crime has recourse to an elaborate system of justice replete with features designed to protect those unjustly accused. But the citizen who cannot get the police protection he needs, or who suffers rude treatment from the police, may find that the courts are irrelevant, or so costly and cumbersome that they are of no use. The man who can't get a license to work, or get a public utility bill corrected, or have an insurance claim processed promptly, may not have the option of turning to the courts. He may know that "you can't fight city hall," or influence a large corporation.

It is always possible to complain, and complaints sometimes help. Yet all too often complaints get lost in a snarl of red tape. This is especially true for the person who lacks education, or experience with large organizations, or who lacks the stamina, resources, and gall needed to make a large issue out of what the bureaucracy may take to be a small matter.

Today, as never before in our history, people seem to be at the mercy of huge, impersonal bureaucracies. Even when large bureaucracies function efficiently, there still may be resistance and resentment. People want to be treated personally and humanely. They do not want to be only a cog in a machine. The courtesy of an explanation, or a sympathetic ear, may make all the difference.

The expansion of government services, both at Federal and local levels, has increased the multiplicity of offices and agencies with which the citizen must deal. Millions of Americans think of their government as distant and unresponsive, though paradoxically many seem to think the city government more remote than the Federal.

The decline of the political machine typical of the 19th century city may also be a factor. Corrupt as these machines were, they nonetheless were responsive to the needs of many of the immigrants from Europe, and helped assimilate them into American life. The mid-20th century immigrants to the city are mainly Negroes from rural areas of the South who have not been assimilated into the political structure nor had the personal relationships with the city government that the political machines afforded earlier immigrants.

The difficulty of the relationships between bureaucracies and Negroes is illustrated in table 3. Whereas 87 percent of the whites expect "equal treatment" by administrative officials, only 49 percent of the Negroes do. Negroes are also less likely to feel that administrative officials will pay attention to their point of view, less likely to expect equal treatment from the police, and less likely to think the Government or the Congress pays much attention to what people think.

and help individuals to deal with bureaucracies. Many things can be done. We must consider the merits of ombudsmen or independent investigators who can look into citizen complaints against administrative actions; neighborhood city halls that can bring local government closer to the people; neighborhood service centers that help people find their way to the right agency; consumer protection units; expanded legal aid for the poor; improvement in administrative law, so that the protection of the courts can be broadened; decentralization of police forces, schools, and other governmental functions; effective employee grievance procedures; councils of student representation in university communities, so that student reactions can effectively reach faculty and administration; and informal networks of communication that tell the administrator what his clients are thinking.

Large organizations are a fixture in today's world. How to keep them from colliding with the individual need for identity and participation is a complex problem. It will take a great deal of study to understand this problem, and probably a wide variety of policies to deal with it.

Political inequities

Universal suffrage, with one vote for each citizen, is one of the requisites of a system in which every individual, whatever his economic or social status, has an equal voice. As recent Supreme Court decisions about "reapportionment" suggest, there is in our constitutional and democratic ethic a concern that each group of citizens have the opportunity to play a role proportionate to its numbers.

Are any groups denied the role in the political system to which their numbers should entitle them?

In some Southern States, most Negroes have historically been denied the right to vote, and the proportion of Negroes registered in these States is still often a great deal smaller than the proportion of whites that are registered. Such inequities are an affront to democracy. Yet it is also significant that these differences in registration rates are steadily getting smaller, partly because of the Civil Rights Acts of recent years, and that in the Northern States Negro registration rates are not much different from those of whites.

There are also distinct differences in the proportion of the *total* population that is registered in the Nation's major cities. A study of 104 major cities showed that rates of voter registration were greater than 90 percent in some cities (such as Detroit, Seattle, and Minneapolis), and less than 70 percent in others (such as Baltimore, Newark, and New York). If literacy tests, methods of purging registration rolls, and inconvenient arrangements for registration are among the factors that account for these differences, they have distinct implications for the distribution of power among different socioeconomic groups.

There is also the question of the fairness of the apportionment of state legislatures and state congressional delegations, but again there is a clear trend toward more equal representation. Gerrymandering also appears to be declining, though this defies accurate measurement.

Insofar as the right to vote and apportionment are concerned, the situation is one of distinct, if not rapid, improvement.

Political power, however, involves more than the right to vote. It can require, among other things, money to finance campaigns, effective political organization, and lobbying or other pressure on the officeholder between elections. In many cases a group will have a major influence on public policy only if it is organized.

Although America has been called a nation of joiners, the fact remains that most Amer-

TABLE 3.—RESPONSIVENESS OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

	Total	White	Negro
Percent who expect equal treatment in administrative office [1]	83 (970)	87 (866)	49 (100)
Percent who expect equal treatment from the police [1]	85 (970)	88 (866)	60 (100)
Percent who expect administrative official to pay attention to their point of view [1]	48 (970)	50 (856)	30 (100)
Percent who expect police to pay attention to their point of view [1]	56 (970)	58 (866)	36 (100)
Percent who feel elections make the Government pay much or some attention [2]	89.2 (1,450)	90 (1,291)	83.8 (148)
Percent who feel most Congressmen pay much or some attention to what people think [2]	79.2 (1,450)	79.3 (1,291)	78.4 (148)

Note: Numbers in parentheses refer to the bases upon which percentages are calculated.

Source: Almond and Verba, "The Civic Culture," 1960.

[2] Source: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, Election Survey, 1964.

A study of the attitudes of Southern whites and Negroes, on what they would do about the problem of a dangerous school crossing, again shows the Negro's sense of uneasiness in dealing with officialdom. Though Negro responses indicated they would be about as likely to take action about a dangerous school crossing as whites, they were less likely to deal with the official directly, and more likely to speak to "influential" private persons. Whereas 49 percent of the whites would talk to the school officials, only 33 percent of the Negroes would. Though only 1 percent of the whites would talk to an influential private person, 8 percent of the Negroes would.

We need to consider a wide variety of new options that will improve participation

icans do not belong to any organization that represents them in the political system. Only one American in 25 reports membership in an explicitly political club or organization, and only 24 percent report belonging to any organization that they consider to be involved in political or governmental affairs. Only 57 percent report belonging to a voluntary association of any kind, including religious groups. A number of surveys indicate that less than 8 percent attend any political meetings or rallies.

Thus most Americans are without any organizational affiliations that would give them an organized voice in the governmental process.

The frequent lack of significant organized representation for major groups should not be surprising. When a large group of citizens has some common interest of purpose to seek in the political arena, the typical *individual* in that group often finds that it is *not* in his self-interest to contribute his money or time to an organization that attempts to further that common interest. He would get the benefits of any legislation that the organization succeeded in getting passed whether he contributed to that organization or not. And the typical individual in a large group could not by himself be decisive in determining whether or not the desired legislation would be passed. Thus he has little incentive to support an organization working in his political interest, and may very well not do so. The voluntary association seeking favorable legislation for a large group is in a position analogous to that of a government, in that it produces a service that cannot usually be sold in the market, yet it lacks the power to collect taxes, which governments (however popular their policies) require. Accordingly, we cannot assume that every large group of citizens will organize whenever its interests are threatened.

Industries with a small number of large firms will, because the resources are great and the number that need to be organized is small, usually be able to establish trade associations to further their political and other interests. Similarly, some professions, such as medicine, are well organized in part because each doctor can get professional advantages from joining his medical association. Labor unions can sometimes confer some similar benefits through grievance procedures and shop stewards, and often have the benefit of "union shop" provisions as well. Some farm organizations restrict the benefits of their cooperatives and mutual insurance companies to their members, thereby making it more advantageous for farmers to join.

Whereas some groups have the benefit of organization for reasons such as these, other groups, whose interests should have as much claim to attention, do not have these organizational advantages. This introduces an important inequality into our political system, which explains some of the unevenness in governmental attention to different problems.

This inequality particularly affects those with the least income and education. A survey by the National Opinion Research Center found that 52 percent of those with an income over $7,000 belonged to some voluntary association, but only 24 percent of those with an income under $2,000 did. Some 53 percent of the professionals, proprietors, managers, and officials belonged to voluntary associations, but only 32 percent of the skilled laborers, and 21 percent of the unskilled. Forty-two percent of farm owners, belonged to such organizations but only 13 percent of farm laborers.

Organizational inequities such as these help us understand the paradoxical strength of "special interests" in a democratic system formally designed to treat everyone alike.

How can the groups with the least or-

ganized power assert their interests against those with the most? Enlightened public officials can help. A government can set up an office of consumer affairs, or an agency for migrant workers, and so on. But, in the end, can the problem be solved unless we organize the weak, or weaken the strong?

QUESTIONS ABOUT COMMUNITY AND ALIENATION

The concern about social division and alienation in American society seems greater now than it has been for some time. The rising tempo of protest, especially among the young and the Negro, and the recent manifestations of right-wing discontent, have prompted some Americans to ask why the Nation faces these divisions now.

There are undoubtedly many reasons. The sharp differences about the war probably explain some of the division. Another factor is our growing affluence and new social legislation which lift the expectations of some people and, at the same time, arouse resentment and fear of change among others. A complete analysis of social cohesion would also have to consider, among other things, the ways children are brought up and educated, and the effectiveness of society's mechanisms for mediating and resolving disputes. It would also have to do justice to the positive functions of alienation and division, as sources of innovation and reform.

The alienation from the university, neighborhood, and family may well be of greater concern than the national political divisions. This alienation suggests one of the most fundamental causes of national division—the lack of satsifactory group relationships. People need a sense of belonging, a feeling of community, in some small social group. If such associations are lacking, they will feel alienated; they will have a tendency either to "cop out" of the central life of the society, or else try to reverse the direction of the society by extreme or even violent methods. The more numerous and stronger the social ties that bind an individual to the social order, the more likely he is to feel an attachment to the society, and work within existing rules to improve it.

We then need to ask questions about some of the principal social relationships in the society, and particularly the family, the neighborhood, and the voluntary association.

The effects of marital status

The need for social relationships may be seen in the association between marital status and health. Married people have distinctly lower death rates and lower rates of suicide, alcoholism, and mental illness than those who have never married or whose marriages have been disrupted by death or divorce.

With the important factors of age, race, and sex accounted for, differentials in death rates by marital status are very great. For every age, race, and sex, married persons have the lowest death rates. This cannot be explained by any difficulties those who are ill might have in getting or keeping a spouse, for the death rates for widowed persons, at all ages and for both sexes, exceed those of the married. Nor are the differences in suicide rates large enough to account for the differences in mortality rates.

Such statistical associations are particularly important here because they illustrate the pervasive and far-reaching consequences close social relationships can have. They add plausibility to the observations which suggest that alienation from society often reflects a lack of satisfactory relationships in small, primary groups, rather than solely global or national developments, and they show the need to inquire into the functioning of all types of social groups.

The condition of the family

The family has undergone profound changes in modern times. It was once the

basic unit of society—the source of cohesion and security, the unit of economic activity, the means of education and recreation. Today, many of the functions of the family are performed by other institutions, from the Social Security Administration to the school.

The change in the structure and role of the family has had two important consequences. First, young but unmarried adults have had less family affiliation in recent times than in earlier periods. For many Americans now between 18 and 22, the college or university is *in loco parentis*. For some others, a hippie community may play the role the extended family served in earlier periods. Neither the college nor the communities of drop-outs bring different generations together on the intimate terms the extended family once did, nor do they provide the same kind of emotional security and support.

The second consequence is that changes in the family as an institution are sometimes read as signs of the collapse of family life. Thus, increases in divorce rates suggest to some that the value put upon family life is declining, yet the proportion of the population that is married has been increasing.

Between 1940 and 1965 the proportion of the population, after age-adjustment, that is married increased by 7.5 percent, but the proportion divorced increased only 1.3 percent. Those with disrupted marriages tend to marry again, and fewer stay single. Longer life expectancy means that marriage partners have a longer life together, much of it without the obligations of young children. We need much better information on what such changes mean for our well-being and the strength of our institutions.

The Negro family has suffered adversities going back to the days of slavery. A large percentage of Negro children live in disrupted families. In 1965, about 38 percent of the Nation's Negro children did not live with both parents, whereas only 10 percent of white children were in that situation. About twice as many nonwhite children were living with their fathers only, four times as many with their mothers only, and five times as many with neither parent.

A substantial part of this difference is due to the greater rate of illegitimacy in the Negro population. In 1965, 1.2 percent of single white women had a child, but 9.8 percent, over eight times as large a proportion, of the nonwhite women did. This difference can, however, easily be misinterpreted because white couples are more likely to use contraceptive techniques, or to marry after the discovery of a premarital conception. Moreover, the illegitimacy rate among whites appears to be increasing, whereas that of nonwhites is, if anything, going down.

Still, Negroes are much less likely to belong to intact families than whites. This fact adds interest to the question of whether there is more alienation among the Negro population than the white.

Voluntary associations

There is some evidence that membership in voluntary associations reduces an individual's sense of powerlessness and alienation. One survey [3] attempted to measure the extent to which a sample group felt they had control over the events that affected them. The responses, especially those of manual workers, suggested that members of a labor organization consistently had lower "powerlessness" scores than those who did not belong to any organization. The results are given in table 4.

[3] From A. Neal and M. Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," *American Sociological Review* (1964), 29, 216–226.

TABLE 4.—MEAN SCORES ON POWERLESSNESS FOR UN-ORGANIZED AND ORGANIZED MANUAL WORKERS, WITH INCOME CONTROLLED (N EQUALS 244)

Income	Unorganized	Organized
Under $3,000	2.50 (14)	2.20 (5)
$3,000 to $4,999	3.20 (46)	2.81 (52)
$5,000 to $6,999	3.20 (25)	2.55 (75)
Over $7,000	3.00 (4)	2.65 (20)
Total (mean)	3.08 (89)	2.64 (153)
S.D.	1.5	1.8

Note: Scores on the powerlessness scale ranged from 0 to 7

Though the evidence is ambiguous, those with the most pronounced sense of powerlessness and alienation often seem to display an ambivalent attitude toward political participation. On the one hand, they are less likely to vote, keep track of political issues, and the like. On the other hand, there is also some evidence that they are disproportionately active in particular circumstances. Some studies have suggested, for example, that alienated and powerless voters are especially likely to be vigorous opponents of fluoridation and school bond issues.[4]

These results are consistent with a theory advanced by a number of sociologists: alienation usually leads to political apathy; yet alienated people become easily aroused in certain circumstances, such as when extremist and totalitarian forces are gaining strength. We need to continue seeking further evidence on this and other explanations.

The neighborhood

The immediate neighborhood, though not so important as a social unit as it once was, still has some significance. The slum neighborhood is of particular interest, since it generally has less organization and social structure. Slums have disproportionate numbers of people who suffer from social pathologies, and slum communities lack the internal structure to deal with these problems.

In fact, social problems—from family disruption to suicide—cluster in the slum. This does not necessarily mean that the problems could disappear if there were no slums. It is logically possible that people with problems gravitate to the slum.

However, there is evidence that suggests that personal and social pathologies are contagious, and that slums *generate* many problems which they have no way of controlling.

If the probability of falling victim to a social pathology is greatly increased if one is brought up in a slum, then the slum is more than a private problem. It is a public and social problem. Private action cannot be expected to cure the social contagions of the slum environment any more than it can deal adequately with contagious diseases. They demand organized action, and organization is what many slums above all lack.

The lack of organization and social structure in the Negro slum therefore appears to be a major problem, and probably one that is related to the recent civil disorders. Cohesion or solidarity would be a great asset for it would give Negroes collective strength both in making external demands (e.g., on city government, or employers), and in enforcing internal constraints (e.g., against delinquency and crime). Its relative absence leaves the individual Negro particularly vulnerable to the unrestrained predations of

---

[4] J. S. Coleman, *Community Conflict* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957); W. A. Eamson, "The Fluoridation Dialogue," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1961, 24, pp. 527–537; J. E. Horton and W. E. Thompson, "Powerlessness and Political Negativism," *American Journal of Sociology* 1962, pp. 485–493.

persons within his community or outside it. The examples of the solidarity of other ethnic groups, such as Jews and Chinese, indicate the tangible assets community solidarity provides: political power, aid to those in trouble, and lending arrangements for those establishing or expanding businesses.

Alienation

The net effect of an individual's praticipation can be partially revealed by surveys which seek to find out whether the individual feels he has control over his own destiny, an intelligible part to play in social life, and values he shares with others. According to such surveys the degree of alienation is substantially different for different groups.

Negroes are much more likely to feel powerless and alienated than whites. A comparison of white and Negro employed men in Los Angeles, for example, showed the following results:

[In percent]

	Negro choices (N=312)	White choices (N=390)
1a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it	58	77
1b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time	42	23
2a. By studying the world situation, one can greatly improve his political effectiveness	58	70
2b. Whether one likes it or not, chance plays an awfully large part in world events	42	30
3a. Wars between countries seem inevitable despite the efforts of men to prevent them	69	66
3b. Wars between countries can be avoided	31	34

Studies have also indicated that the difference in the sense of powerlessness between Negroes and whites is not explained solely by differences in education. When a sample of whites and Negroes were asked to react to the statement that "There is not much I can do about most of the important problems that we face today," the proportions responding affirmatively, at different educational levels, were as follows:

Negroes:	Percent
Less than 12 years education	73
12 years or more	60
Whites:	
Less than 12 years education	57
12 years or more	34

Most other minorities also show a high degree of powerlessness, though the Jewish minority appears to be an exception.

Some surveys have suggested that Negroes in integrated areas, or with relatively integrated life styles, tend to feel less powerlessness than Negroes in highly segregated circumstances. The willingness to use violence, by contrast, appears to be greater among Negroes with a high degree of powerlessness, at least according to one survey of the Watts area of Los Angeles.

Among white Americans, alienation is apparently less likely to show up as a feeling of powerlessness and more likely to show up as a conviction that socially disapproved means must be used to attain objectives. Alienation in this sense is greatest among those with lower socioeconomic status. Those who are the most alienated, moreover, tend to have considerable prejudice against members of minority groups.

Alienation accordingly appears to play a role both in the discontents of the black minority, especially those who feel violent means are necessary, and also among those in the white population who show most prejudice against minority groups. Its importance among disaffected young people is not in dispute.

Conclusion

A sense of community, which would do a great deal to lessen alienation, is only one of our social and political objectives. We also cherish individual freedom and equality which too much cohesion in our social groups can sometimes restrict. Some alienation may also be related to intellectual and artistic creativity, and thus socially desirable. Moreover, it often strengthens the forces of reform, and enables the society to change with the times.

Thus a sense of community is not the only good. But, as the present divisions in our society reveal, it is very much worth asking whether we have as much as we need.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN SPECIES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have joined the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) in cosponsoring S. 335, a bill to prohibit the importation of species which are in danger of extinction and to protect certain species in the United States.

Mr. President, this is a good piece of proposed legislation. We in Alaska know and value the beauty and pleasure that are derived from our wild animals, and anything the Federal Government can do to help to preserve this priceless natural heritage is for the better.

I hope that S. 335 can be passed quickly; every day of delay will mean further loss to the world's dwindling irreplaceable supply of wild creatures.

RELOCATION FROM KANSAS CITY NOT JUSTIFIED

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for some time rumors have been circulating that the administration was considering reorganization in several of the most important departments, with a possible relocation of regional offices. We had heard reports that this relocation would involve moving the regional offices of the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity from Kansas City, with a consequent transfer of hundreds, if not thousands, of career employees from that community, all for the commendable objective of improved service.

The possibility of transferring these offices from Kansas City has been advanced several times in the past, but was always tabled after careful study revealed the superb transportation and communication facilities at Kansas City, as well as its central location for the majority of the people to be served.

Only yesterday, the Kansas City Star, in a story by Mr. Joe Lastelic of the Washington bureau of that newspaper, gave what appeared to be a more authoritative report than we had previously been able to obtain from the administration about this possible relocation.

Immediately, Senator EAGLETON, Representatives BOLLING, HULL, RANDALL, and I joined in a telegram to the President asking that before any such change is made, the civic and business leaders of Greater Kansas City, representing both Missouri and Kansas, be given an opportunity to present the facts as to what