

shil FYI + comments File
REMARKS OF SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE

American Orthopsychiatric Association
Chicago, Illinois March 23, 1968

THE GOVERNMENT AND FULL SOCIAL OPPORTUNITY

Thank you, Dr. Bower.

I want you to know how much the American Orthopsychiatric Association contributed to the fight for fair housing in the Senate.

Shortly after Dr. Bower stopped at my office to pick up some biographical material, I discovered that he probably had gotten the wrong sheet of paper. One of my more enthusiastic -- and more optimistic -- staff members was in the process of bringing the biography data up to date and had included a sentence in there about my efforts in bringing about Senate passage of open housing. I was pretty sure that was the information sheet Dr. Bower had picked up. This was a week or so before the vote, while we were still pretty uncertain whether we were going to make it.

Well, that was a real predicament. What could I do?

I could call Dr. Bower and tell him that he might have to take out that sentence. But that might lead him to make some judgment about my own mental health.

I could fire the staff member and hope that Dr. Bower would be discreet and sympathetic if fair housing didn't make it. But that seemed an unnecessary loss of badly-needed talent on my part and a demand on Dr. Bower's restraint that I couldn't expect a man with any sense of humor at all to live up to.

So I took the only other alternative available. I told the Civil Rights Senators that I was going to be personally embarrassed before the American Orthopsychiatric Association and possibly suspected of having some illness of the ego if we didn't get that bill passed. I didn't even have to explain to them what the American Orthopsychiatric Association was. Just the name was enough. We went out and passed fair housing because I wouldn't have dared show up here today otherwise.

So I've been waiting to find out whether Dr. Bower had the biography with that premature statement in it, and I've been waiting to see how he would handle it if he did. But more important, I've been waiting to tell you about your psychological contribution to the fight for fair housing and human decency in the Congress.

This incident is a good example of the way in which things are interconnected in this world, and that's basically what I want to talk to you about. A number of things are going on in this country that make an overpowering case for the creation of some structure in the government that can deal on a continuous basis with questions concerning the interrelationships of the social health of this nation.

As many of you know, I'm deeply involved with legislation that is intended to do just that. The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act which would create a Council of Social Advisers to the President, an annual Social Report to the Nation, and a

Joint Social Committee of the Congress.

I really see that bill as a way to deal with interconnections:

--Between the mental health of the nation and the opportunities we provide for a decent life for our people;

--Between dramatic technological advances such fields as science and medicine -- and mental health -- and the social, ethical and moral questions they raise;

--Between our astonishing capacity to prosper and grow economically and our equally astonishing capacity to ignore the effects of this growth on the quality of life in the nation -- for those who prosper with the nation as well as those who are left behind;

--Between the steps we take in the hope of improving life for the prosperous majority in places like Chicago and the hidden social costs to those who are shoved out of the way by these steps;

--Between the conditions described in the unhappy report of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and our strength of character as a humane people dedicated to the pursuit of happiness.

Let me illustrate these relationships briefly and suggest the value I think there is in structure like the Council of Social Advisers which is proposed in the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act. And please keep in mind that I'm speaking

to you today as a member of Congress and a politician, and not as a scientist of any sort.

My concern is the practical problem of reaching out to fulfill the ideals of America -- as Tom Wicker of the New York Times put it in a striking statement about the general malaise of America in the 1960's:

"From reality man reaches toward promise, fails, and in an agony of failure finds his greatness by reaching again."

First of all, there is a relationship between the mental health of people and the opportunities they have for a decent life.

I don't want to participate here in trying to define mental health -- I understand you people are having some difficulty with that yourselves on a continuing basis. But I think it is fairly clear that mental health has something to do with a response to the environment in which an individual exists.

I simply want to suggest that we load the dice against stability and happiness--

When we tolerate education that is not worthy of the name for some of our people

When we tolerate insensitive law enforcement and inadequate public services for those who are powerless to help themselves

When we tolerate the strategy of the ghetto -- even a "golden ghetto "

When through acceptance of segregation, we tolerate the blunt and simple rejection of one human being by another without any justification but superior power.

I don't want to suggest that there is no mental health problem among the affluent participants in our economy and society. I'm sure you know much more of what there is to know about these relative situations than I do. But certainly there is reason to doubt the old adage that deprivation is ennobling -- at least this kind of deprivation for these people, in this environment and this society.

So it is just not possible for people who are concerned with mental health to avoid questions of social welfare and national social policy. The people in this organization, the contents of this convention program, the invitation to me to come here -- all of these are adequate evidence of the interest you have in this relationship.

Yet there is no public national forum for the discussion of these relationships. There is no public national structure which deals on a day-to-day basis with these questions and suggests national policy concerning them. There is no public national effort to analyze our failures and help us reach again toward promise.

Second, there is a relationship public policy and between the dramatic technical advances we are making in such fields as science and medicine -- including mental health.

We have just finished the fourth day of hearings on a Senate joint resolution to establish a Commission on Health Science and Technology. Senator Fred Harris and I introduced this resolution in January, and there has been a great deal of public interest in it.

This Commission is deliberately proposed to study the public policy issues that might be involved in our rapidly developing health technology -- to examine the ethical, legal, moral, and social issues, for example, that may be related to such developments as organ transplants, the possibilities of genetic intervention, and behavior control.

If we discover no more issues than the one that has dramatically emerged so far, we will have ample evidence of the need for such a study. I believe we have uncovered a shocking absence of public understanding of the work that is being done and the lives that can be saved and improved if adequate financial support is given to basic and applied research in this technology.

Part of the reason for this information gap is surely the lack of interest -- or even the unwillingness -- of our scientists and technicians to make their public case while they seek public funds. Dr. Arthur Kornberg, whose work with DNA is one of our great accomplishments in this society, told the Subcommittee on Government Research that he frankly begrudged the time away from his laboratory to participate in the discussions before the Congress. This is a problem which must be overcome, for public

funds are going to become increasingly scarcer without public discussion. And we need more money, not less, for this kind of effort.

But part of the problem is surely the absence of a convenient, on-going, public national structure which can deal with such matters of public policy. In order to get this discussion, we had to propose a special commission. That should not be necessary. In a society which is desperately trying to match its technology and its sense of humanity, there must be a continuous public forum for this discussion. We need help if we are to reach for the American promise.

Third, we are a nation with astonishing poverty in the midst of astonishing prosperity, and both of them affect the quality of our individual lives and the national well-being.

This is a nation of reckless wealth. We have rampant prosperity and rampant pollution. We flee the central city on super highways that are prison walls for those who remain behind. Our foods are thoroughly enriched and lavishly packaged -- and completely unavailable to millions of our citizens. We develop programs to alleviate poverty and misery and create the permanent poverty and misery of dependence instead of the independence we should be seeking.

John W. Gardner, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has characterized our perennial short-sightedness:

"We have a great and honored tradition of stumbling into the future. . . we are heedless and impulsive. . . . We back into

next year's problems studying the solutions to last year's problems."

And so our houses are bigger and our lakes are dirtier and our seashores are less available and we have super highways where we once had parks. And a substantial proportion of American citizens have become what Gunnar Myrdal calls an American under-class -- completely separated from the mainstream of American life.

As Whitney Young of the National Urban League said at hearings last summer on the Full Opportunity Act:

"We need a clear and precise picture of how well we are doing in our efforts to provide a decent life and full opportunity for all Americans, and we do not have one."

More than that, we have no public institution where we can talk regularly about what we are doing to ourselves, no public national forum on the social effects of our economic development, no arrangement for drawing public national attention to the nature of the changes that are taking place in the quality of American life.

Fourth, when we do look to the future, we plan programs which are realistic only for those who are already in the mainstream -- our programs are aimed at the middle-class majority and those who are almost poor.

Our urban renewal programs have created luxury apartments and further narrowed the boundaries of life for the truly poor

by callously pushing them from slums they know to slums they do not know.

Our housing programs are aimed at taking the least economic risks and are therefore less available to those whose need is greatest.

Our health centers and public services may require the poor to use transportation that is not available or too expensive. And the wait for help can be so long that a day may be lost from what little work is available.

Our transportation efforts emphasize superhighways and not public transportation.

Of course there is work being done on projects to help the really poor. But we are too often unable or unwilling to think in terms of the real needs of those we are trying to help.

The poor have no institution to tell us how it is. They are voiceless except in the private and potentially destructive ways that some of their would-be leaders work. And the nation is officially deaf, for there is no structure at the highest levels to hear their case.

Fifth, there is a relationship between the unhappy news of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and the quality of our national character.

Senator Harris and I were co-authors of the resolution which led to the creation of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. It has now told us of a cancer of white racism at the source of our national sickness. It tells us of

the danger of a truly divided society.

It tells us much that we already know, but it places what we know in the context of thoroughly documented, frightening facts about our society. These are facts that contradict our dedication to the pursuit of happiness. These are facts that demonstrate the national agony that Tom Wicker described.

This report says two things about us, I believe.

It says we have not paid attention to what is happening to us.

It says what is happening to us is a direct contradiction of the ideals of our society.

We had to create a special nation commission to tell us this. The story might have been different if we had always had a continuing study of the relationship between the facts of our national social health and the ideals of our national social philosophy.

But there was no national debate on the future of our cities because there was no public national institution to gather the information, analyze it, and confront the national conscience with our neglect and lack of responsibility.

And now we are paying the heavy price of our ignorance and insensitivity.

I don't want to suggest for a moment that the legislation I have proposed would offer easy solutions for the variety of problems which I have very sketchily raised this morning. But

we would know more now about our possibilities and our problems if we had worked at it more systematically on a national basis.

That is what the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act is all about, I believe. It could provide a national public forum for informed discussion of the social state of the nation. It could provide expert information and analysis at the highest level of visibility. Information, analysis, and recommendations could flow to the President and Congress from a level above the provinciality and vested interests of individual agencies. It could help us mount a social effort that is sophisticated enough to remain consistent with our national promises.

The legislation itself is fairly simple. It is modeled after the Full Employment Act of 1946 which established the Council of Economic Advisers, the annual Economic Report to the Nation, and the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress. This structure has done much to raise the level of discussion among the public and members of Congress concerning the economic progress of the nation. It has made its contribution to the unprecedented prosperity which we are now enjoying. Unfortunately, however, it has not been sensitive to the social implications of that prosperity.

The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act would declare full social opportunity as a national goal.

It would establish a President's Council of Social Advisers and charge them with devising a system of social indicators, appraising government social programs, and advising the President on domestic social policy.

It would require the President to submit an annual Social Report, disclosing the indicators for public examination and giving them wide exposure.

It would establish a Joint Congressional Committee on the Social Report, which could hold hearings and subject the President's social report to critical analysis and public discussion.

A great deal of the discussion at the hearings on this legislation and within the academic community has centered on the degree of sophistication of social indicators, problems of quantification of social data, problems of the analogy with the Council of Economic Advisers, and the difficulty of separating social and economic considerations.

I do not want to discount the importance of these questions, but I do want to emphasize the real and present possibilities of such a structure in terms of the relationships I have outlined this morning. The questions of sophistication, quantification, and categorization can be worked out, I believe. What is really critical is the establishment of the structure:

First, we may not be terribly sophisticated yet in the social sciences, but we know much more than we are using. The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act would provide a mechanism

to use what we now know at the level where that would be most effective.

Second, we simply cannot tolerate the absence of a national public forum on the social effort of our society. We must have a way of reaching the national conscience on a regular, institutional basis. This structure could create a vital public social dialogue at the highest levels of government.

Third, we could look forward to new communication between the public policy makers and those who know the most about the causes and effects of our social phenomena -- even if they do not know everything there is to be known about them.

Fourth, when danger threatens, the signals could be raised immediately at a point where national action could be stimulated and still be effective. We might be preventing disasters instead of trying to pick up the pieces afterward. That approach should appeal to people who work in mental health.

Fifth, I cannot imagine any more worthwhile undertaking than the involvement of the best American minds in the most humane American efforts. This structure could make it possible for America to stumble less and help more, to suffer the agony of failure less often and reach with greater hope toward the American promise for all our people.

At the close of his testimony on the Full Opportunity Act last summer, even as the riots were continuing, Whitney Young told the Subcommittee on Government Research:

"It is right down to liberate or exterminate the Negro in this country. The appeal is that the Negro has said to America in a thousand ways over 400 years that we believe in America, and now it seems to me that the time has come to say to the American Negro that "I believe in you." That is our simple appeal."

It just seems to me that this eloquent statement says something about our national mental health. We've got to find a place where we can really talk about it.

Draft Muskie Speech

THE FUTURE OF OUR CHOICE

There is an understandable tendency in politics -- especially in Presidential campaigns -- to look backwards ... at the record of the candidate and his party. That is a good tradition ... and we Democrats are proud of the record we've built. We run on it gladly. We're especially proud of Hubert Humphrey ... and the extraordinary personal record he has compiled during 20 years of unexcelled public service.

But looking backward isn't good enough in 1968. We must also look toward the future.

More importantly, we must demand in 1968 that those men who seek the Presidency and the Vice Presidency address themselves to the future.

I believe that no question is more important in 1968 than this: MR. CANDIDATE, WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE FUTURE?

And I think every American has a responsibility to ask those who seek his support this year to answer that question directly ... without side-stepping, and without slick but empty slogans.

The future is, after all, where we must live these next four years. If life tomorrow is to be tolerable, we had better do some very serious thinking about what we want the shape of the future to be. And we had better seek some specific answers

from those whose public offices will have a powerful impact on the future.

The fact is, of course, that we know nothing about the future for certain. That's why, I suppose, it isn't discussed much in political campaigns. Unfortunately, that's also why we struggle from crisis to crisis year after year.

All we do know for sure is that it's ours ... that it belongs to this generation of Americans and not to any other. And we know, too, that it hasn't happened yet. And because it hasn't happened yet there remains a chance, however slim, that we may still have the future of our choice.

If you really want the future of your own choosing -- if you really want this country to move in a new direction during these next few years, I think it's imperative that the choice you make in November be made at least in part on the way in which the candidates this year answer when you say -- Mr. Candidate, What do you think about the future?

Do you fear it? Or do you welcome it? Does tomorrow's uncertainty frighten you? Or do you accept the challenge of uncertainty and change gladly?

Do you welcome the opportunity to grapple with the unknown future? Or do you frankly prefer the certainty of the past?

Mr. Candidate -- do you offer me a future predetermined by old attitudes and old answers or one built to the specifications of those of us who must live in the as-yet unshaped future?

I'm prepared to answer that question for the Democratic ticket here and now. Mr. Humphrey and I welcome the future ... and we welcome change and we believe in the capacity of reasonable, intelligent men to harness change to accomplish the goals they have chosen. We believe that the future can be better than the past. And we believe it is possible for the future to free men from the shackles of past mistakes and old answers.

Now there's a good deal of speculation these days about how we ought to spend the so-called "Peace Dividend". -- the money which is unspent when the war in Vietnam stops. That is one specific question which should be answered by the Presidential candidates this year -- because the eventual use to which those funds are put by the next Administration will have a great impact on America's future.

Vice President Humphrey recognizes the tremendous importance of this question. He recently charged a task force composed of six of the nation's most widely-respected economists with developing an answer to the question of how much money will be available to the next President after the war ends. The best

estimate of our best economists now is that, during his second term in office, the next President ~~as~~ould have nearly \$20 billion to allocate for new purposes.

With that kind of a projection available, I think every voter should be asking the candidates how they propose to use these resources? Do they intend to apply them to the problems of pollution, housing, hunger, transportation, education, health and all the others that threaten to end our civilization ... Or is their intention to ignore the problems of the cities, where 80% of our people live, and to use those billions to give the rich another tax-break? Do they propose to use those billions to revive urban life in America by helping our cities and states meet pressing public demands for services? Or do they intend to follow the unimaginative and dangerous road of cutting taxes, giving those with means more, and those with none still less?

Mr. Nixon has already said that taxes are too high now ... that he would terminate the tax surcharge now in effect. Can there be any doubt about his intention regarding the "Peace Dividend"?

Hubert Humphrey, on the other hand, has made it perfectly clear that the resources now being used to protect the freedom

of others would, in his Administration, be turned to securing freedom for those millions of Americans progress has by-passed -- the poor, the hungry, the uneducated, the old, and the ill.

Hubert Humphrey realizes that neither the world nor America can continue indefinitely along a path that widens the perilous gap between rich and poor.

Americans are a compassionate people. That is why we are in Vietnam. And that is also why the talent and resources now utilized elsewhere should be used during the next Administration to bring hope and security, health and opportunity to those of our countrymen who now have no real opportunity, no real security, and -- worst of all -- no real hope.

While we can't know what the future holds, we can safely predict on the basis of past experience and present difficulties what major problems we are likely to have to cope with in the near future. The Peace Dividend Question is but one of several we should be addressing to our candidates this year.

One that I have worked hard to answer as Chairman of the Senate Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee is how we propose to make our system of federalism function in the future. There are some hard facts that must be faced when we talk about the present shape of Federalism in America. Growth of incredible

proportions is the common trait of all governmental levels in recent years. The next President, I believe, simply must find a way to convert this helter-skelter growth into a creative partnership ~~with~~ goals understood, responsibilities placed, authorities provided and fiscal resources available for each member of the Federal system to function effectlyely in its own sphere.

Some of the awesome facts about federalism today are these: Between 1948 and 1966, Federal indebtedness rose by 26.8%. But during the same period, State and local debt leaped by a phenomenal 472.7%! Actually -- for the governmental level which both Nixon and Wallace want to convert into the new action center ~~of~~ government -- the States -- the rapid growth of indebtedness is even more frightening -- between 1948 and 1966 it averaged 704.2%!!! Another fact about contemporary federalism involves the proliferation of Federal grant-in-aid programs. Federal aid amounted to \$1.8 billion in 1948. It may exceed \$18 billion for the current fiscal year. Moreover, the categories of grant programs reached the 379 mark in January of 1967 -- that means that 197 new Federal grant-in-aid programs were created during 1964-66. Simply stated, the question this picture presents to those seeking your support in this election is this: Mr. Candidate,

how do you propose to make such a system function in the future?

I believe I have some answers to that question. Federal programs of aid to State and local government continue to grow in number and complexity, with serious overlapping, duplication, and conflict of purpose. What is needed, I think, is an overhaul of the Federal aid system -- with reduction in the number of separate programs through elimination of those that have accomplished their purpose and consolidation, wherever possible, of those with identical or closely related purposes, and new arrangements for their efficient administration. I also believe that the Executive Office of the President will have to be strengthened if we are to have any hope at all of making some sense out of the Federal aid miasma in the future. Ways must be found to coordinate the activities of the departments and agencies in support of national goals and in keeping with consistent overall policy. If existing machinery does not allow such coordination, I would recommend -- as I have in the Senate -- the creation of a new structure -- a National Intergovernmental Affairs Council -- to achieve coordination in Federal-aid efforts and improved communication between the Federal, State and local governments regarding the availability of Federal assistance and the terms on which it may be obtained.

So asking a candidate his views about the future is, I think,

extremely important. The way he responds can tell you much about the future where you will live. It can tell you, for example, whether lawlessness and civil strife bred by social injustice will continue because ancient wrongs remain. And his response can tell you whether we are really at the end of an era or merely trying to keep that era alive for a few more years.

Asking a candidate about his idea of the future can also tell you something about his personal attitude toward the single most important fact the next President will face ... the fact of endless, relentless change. How does your candidate view change? Hubert Humphrey and I welcome it. Because change can be, we believe, for the better if wise men use it properly. And to harness the power of change to build a brighter tomorrow this nation desperately needs leaders with flexible attitudes about the future.

This nation needs leaders who recognize, for example, that the old ways of making decisions about which problems government will try to resolve ... and how it will approach them ... and just not adequate any more. This nation needs leaders prepared to use the technology change has given us to control change itself. It has been proposed, for example, that the President be given the aid of a Council of Social Advisers to advise him on lingering social problems and to suggest the best means of ending them. That sort of advisory unit would be composed of

some of the country's best scholars ... armed with the latest techniques for getting at the country's social problems and for choosing the best means of coping with them.

And it would have a variety of advantages. It could, for example, coordinate existing information about such diverse social problems as the control of highway deaths and pre-school education. Compilation of all we now know on such efforts would almost certainly accentuate knowledge gaps and stimulate the development of the knowledge we are now lacking. Beyond that, such a Council could, by drawing together governmental personnel and interested citizens at every level, serve to provide the feedback which is, I believe, absolutely essential if we are serious when we talk about building either a Federal system capable of functioning in the future or a participatory democracy. And, finally, the reports developed by such a Council would almost certainly stir helpful debate in the halls of Congress and throughout the country about the meaning of this or that social problem and the value of alternative social policies. I believe that only such a debate can result in the formulation of national goals and spending priorities which we must have in the future.

The next President may find such a tool helpful and, indeed, indispensable in making sound judgments about how to deal with America's domestic problems. He will certainly need to possess an attitude which views the Federal Government not as a fixed pattern of agencies and programs and budgets ... but as a

flexible framework for political problem-solving which can be adjusted to meet new problems and new needs in new ways.

This may well be the most critical thing you need to know about your candidate's view of the future -- what does he propose to do about the obvious disaffection of the young, the poor and even many citizens in neither of those groups from the established institutions of our society -- government, the church, the college and so forth. How does he propose to make those structures meaningful channels for human action and energy once again?

I don't believe it can be done by asserting the inviolability of the existing structure. I don't believe it can be done by insisting that the disaffected of our age are merely the malcontents of every age -- that those who dissent today would dissent in some manner whenever they happened to be living. I am personally convinced that the technological and social change which has swept the entire industrialized world in recent years has caused the instinctive fearfulness of all organizations -- of all institutions -- to insulate themselves from reality.

I believe many of our institutions have simply sought, mistakenly, to conserve themselves by ignoring change. Long ago, the great conservative philosopher Edmund Burke observed that "a state without some means of change is without the means of its (own) conservation." The same maxim applies to the institu-

tions of today and tomorrow. The plain fact is that ways must be found in the future to help established institutions maintain an openness to social change and a flexibility which permits continuous self-renewal. I believe, further, that our next President can help the colleges, the churches, and the institutions of government accomplish that historic feat IF he is a man personally committed to self-renewal rather than fear of change.

Does your candidate for President have that kind of attitude? Or does he approach the future with eyes fixed firmly on the past? Is he talking about old answers and maybe even old problems while violence stalks the land and children starve and old men wait for death in squalor and sickness and despair?

I believe you need an honest answer to that question before you can vote in this election. I don't believe that you should place your faith in a man who seeks the Presidency but is unwilling to tell you where or how he'll lead America. I believe you should press the candidates seeking your support this year for an answer -- Mr. Candidate, what do you think about the future?



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org