

reduce all the unnecessary travel and travail that, in Wilfred Owen's words, result 'from the inconvenience of having things located in the wrong places.' More compact forms of urban settlement and growth would be far more conservative of both energy and environment and far more conducive to the 'good life' that we so ardently seek...

"In general, all of these changes that I have suggested would reduce our demands upon our resources and our environment while, in many respects, improving the quality of our life...

"For, the energy and environmental ills that afflict us, along with a great many other aggravations that seem so inseparable a part of modern life, are in large measure the result, not simply of how much and how fast we grow, but of how we grow, of the character and composition and quality of growth.

"We can and should seize upon the energy crisis as a good excuse and a great opportunity for making some very fundamental changes that we ought to be making anyway for other reasons...

"Our first priority — in any national strategy that seeks to get at the roots of our energy crisis — must be to move gradually toward a deep and enduring reduction in the growth rate of energy demand. We need, at the same time, to move carefully and cautiously in the extraction and use of our current fossil fuel supplies, making certain that we apply the most effective and advanced techniques available for keeping environmental damage to the barest minimum. We need, finally, to undertake an intensive R&D effort to develop economically and technologically feasible ways of living off of our energy income rather than our energy capital, off of our renewable rather than our nonrenewable energy supplies, off of the sun, wind, tides and geothermal heat rather than off our finite and rapidly falling reserves of fossil fuel.

"If we are to come to grips with the issues that I have touched upon — with what might be call the problems of growth — we are going to have to make some rather far-reaching changes...

"To begin with, we are going to have to find new kinds of political leaders — leaders who understand that the fundamental issues before us are not always the isolated and immediate ones, but the interrelated and the long-range ones. Leaders who understand that, in an age of growing scarcities, the ancient and honored practice of promising more of everything, of guaranteeing two chickens in every pot and two cars in every garage, is neither relevant nor responsible; leaders, in short, who understand that less is often better."

**Katharine Graham:
To Tell or Not To Tell**

Mrs. Katharine Graham was chairman of the board of The Washington Post Company when she addressed The Economic Club of Chicago on February 10, 1976, on the press and its responsibilities.



"Difficult judgments can be required when our First Amendment obligation, the obligation to inform, collides with other basic interests and values that are served, or at least arguably served, by secrecy...

"Let me start by posing two large questions that are asked repeatedly and with a growing air of concern, not only by critics of the press but also by many journalists. The first is what are the responsibilities of the press for the consequences of what we print...?"

"The second question is whether the present way of dealing with these conflicts is so unreliable that a better system should be devised to reconcile the interest and values that collide, and to discipline the press or push us to discipline ourselves..."

"Let me summarize the major arguments for some

degree of secrecy in government, especially national security affairs.

“First, it is argued, that some information must be kept secret because its publication would expose individuals to danger or gravely weaken the nation’s defenses...

“Second, it is argued that many other operations, especially in the diplomatic realm, are acutely sensitive and benefit from secrecy...

“Third, it is argued that within the government, confidentiality in a broader sense serves the national interest by promoting candid internal debate and sound policy-making...

“Fourth, it is argued with increasing heat that the press handles sensitive matters irresponsibly by overplaying stories based on leaks and creating the false impression that everything secret is sensational or scandalous.

“Finally, the claim is made that these considerations of danger and diplomacy and deliberation are so sensitive, in themselves, that only those in government can make rational decisions about what should be disclosed...

“Most of these are substantial arguments, and we do consider them seriously in deciding what to do with the secret materials that come into our hands...

“Yet, a key element in our concept of responsibility is that we should not leave these judgments wholly to the government. Secrecy, as it exists in Washington, is simply too indiscriminate and too easily abused.

“To start with, the penchant for classifying documents has gone beyond all reasonable bounds. We learned during the Pentagon Papers case that secrecy stamps had been put on newspaper clippings, not to mention material that had appeared in books and in speeches by public officials...

“Second, officials habitually leak classified mate-

rial to serve a variety of purposes—to send a signal overseas, to test congressional reaction to a policy, to shoot down an opponent or undermine a competing agency.

“What should the press do in such situations...?”

“In short, we do have a predilection to publish; that is, after all, our business. But we do recognize other obligations, too. We do not fancy ourselves to be official spokesmen or promotional tools of government. But neither do we see ourselves as reckless code-breakers and spoilers whose citizenship stops at the newsroom door...

“(T)here is (also) a strong argument for confidentiality in some areas of banking. The arguments are remarkably similar to those in the national security field...

“First, some information is private, and disclosing it would violate individuals’ rights.

“Second, finance is a risky business. If allowed to operate in confidence, bankers enjoy more flexibility in dealing with situations that involve some risk...

“Third, it is asserted that the whole system of regulating financial institutions depends on candor, which in turn depends on confidentiality...

“Finally, it is argued that all these matters are so delicate, and the information involved so technical, that many reporters and the public won’t understand it, much less evaluate it fairly and accurately.

“There is no question that our financial system requires a large investment of public confidence and trust. But I would argue that our critics’ contentions go against their own conclusions in one crucial respect: the very sensitivity and fatefulness of their processes and decisions suggests that this is an area the public should know more about — not less.

“One of the perils of excessive secrecy, after all, is that it can lull the public into optimism which is unwarranted. The real erosion of confidence comes when a major breakdown catches the public by surprise, and it turns out that warning signals have been blinking for some time, but were suppressed by good manners, habits of discretion, and hopes that the problem could be contained...”

“In Washington there is growing pressure, from the intelligence community and elsewhere, for some kind of Official Secrets Act to prevent the press from publishing secrets if the government objects — or for a law imposing heavy penalties on those who leak sensitive material to the press.

“In my view, these approaches have many defects and few benefits at all. For one thing, no law would stop those who act irresponsibly now...”

“Second, the controls being discussed would hobble the responsible press, by inhibiting our efforts to give context and perspective to the news we print.

“Third, any such law is bound to be applied selectively and arbitrarily, because of two unavoidable areas of discretion: first, who decides what is secret, and second, who decides whether to prosecute when something has been leaked...”

“To give the government that much authority is dangerous to democracy. It virtually insures that most of the conflicts between secrecy and openness will be resolved one way: in favor of greater official control over the content and even the topics of public debate. And it could make the press more like a bulletin board for official pronouncements, rather than an energetic, independent force...”

“So I come back to the need for responsibility, and judgment, and tolerance of tension in those areas where the genuinely tough problems cannot be resolved... Our system depends on the free flow of information and ideas, and on respect for certain basic rights; but it also relies on faith, the quite

extraordinary faith that ordinary people can act responsibly and bear the strains of freedom and complexity...”

“So instead of seeking flat and absolute answers to the kinds of problems I have discussed tonight, what we should be trying to foster is respect for one another’s good faith, knowledge of one another’s conception of where duty lies, and understanding of the real worlds in which we try to do our best.”

Joseph A. Califano, Jr.:
The Biggest Bureaucracy

Joseph A. Califano, Jr. was Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare when he addressed The Economic Club of Chicago on April 20, 1978, on the challenges of big government.



“No department of government faces greater management challenges than the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. And no department must perform better than HEW. Our programs, which are often not widely popular, touch the lives of this nation’s most vulnerable citizens: the elderly and the poor, the blind and the disabled, the minorities who suffer discrimination, the children who need compensatory education. If we are to earn the respect of the American taxpayer, we must demonstrate that sensitive social policy can be joined with strong, effective management.

“Tonight, to illustrate the potholes and minefields on the road to manageability, I want to discuss with you one of the many problems that I face as secretary of the largest department in the federal government: the growing crisis in the Social Security Disability Insurance program. This program, the cost of which has jumped by more than 500 percent in just over 10 years, today requires a thorough-