



Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation
5th Floor, Hunt Library
Carnegie Mellon University
4909 Frew Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
Telephone: 412-268-2434
Email: huntinst@andrew.cmu.edu
Web site: www.huntbotanical.org

The Hunt Institute is committed to making its collections accessible for research. We are pleased to offer this digitized item.

Usage guidelines

We have provided this low-resolution, digitized version for research purposes. To inquire about publishing any images from this item, please contact the Institute.

Statement on harmful and offensive content

The Hunt Institute Archives contains hundreds of thousands of pages of historical content, writing and images, created by thousands of individuals connected to the botanical sciences. Due to the wide range of time and social context in which these materials were created, some of the collections contain material that reflect outdated, biased, offensive and possibly violent views, opinions and actions. The Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation does not endorse the views expressed in these materials, which are inconsistent with our dedication to creating an inclusive, accessible and anti-discriminatory research environment. Archival records are historical documents, and the Hunt Institute keeps such records unaltered to maintain their integrity and to foster accountability for the actions and views of the collections' creators.

Many of the historical collections in the Hunt Institute Archives contain personal correspondence, notes, recollections and opinions, which may contain language, ideas or stereotypes that are offensive or harmful to others. These collections are maintained as records of the individuals involved and do not reflect the views or values of the Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation or those of Carnegie Mellon University.

About the Institute

The Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation, a research division of Carnegie Mellon University, specializes in the history of botany and all aspects of plant science and serves the international scientific community through research and documentation. To this end, the Institute acquires and maintains authoritative collections of books, plant images, manuscripts, portraits and data files, and provides publications and other modes of information service. The Institute meets the reference needs of botanists, biologists, historians, conservationists, librarians, bibliographers and the public at large, especially those concerned with any aspect of the North American flora.

Hunt Institute was dedicated in 1961 as the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library, an international center for bibliographical research and service in the interests of botany and horticulture, as well as a center for the study of all aspects of the history of the plant sciences. By 1971 the Library's activities had so diversified that the name was changed to Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation. Growth in collections and research projects led to the establishment of four programmatic departments: Archives, Art, Bibliography and the Library.

Hausen

AMERICA'S CHAOTIC SOCIETY - TO WHERE?

SPEECH GIVEN BEFORE THE METROPOLITAN HOUSING AND PLANNING COUNCIL

December 4, 1970

by
Dr. Philip M. Hauser

My object is to provide a framework that I think leads to a better understanding of the chaos with which the world and our own society are afflicted at the present time--chaos, in my judgment, which will grow a good deal worse before it gets any better. Let me provide perspective by reminding you to begin with that man, or some close kissing cousin, has been on this earth for perhaps as long as four million years. In the course of his occupation of this planet, man, as the only complex culture-building animal on the globe, has generated four developments which have profoundly affected his attitudes, his values, his institutions and his behaviorisms. These developments may be termed the population explosion, the population implosion, the population displosion, and the accelerating tempo of technological change. Now most everybody understands what is meant by the population explosion. It refers to the remarkable acceleration of the rate of world population growth - particularly during the three centuries of the modern era. By the population implosion I refer to the increasing concentration of peoples on relatively small portions of the earth's surface, a phenomenon better known as urbanization. And by the population displosion I refer to the increasing heterogeneity of peoples who share not only the same geographic locale, but increasingly the same life space, social, economic and political activities. I refer to

the dispoision specifically in its post World War II context, swept by what Adlai Stevenson II popularized as "the revolution of rising expectations." With rising expectations diverse peoples throughout the globe are no longer willing to settle for second place, or do without freedom and independence if they have not yet achieved them. I also refer to the situation in which, in specific areas, diverse peoples - including minority peoples - insist that they have equality of opportunity in an egalitarian society.

Now these three population developments are interrelated - the population explosion has fed the implosion; both have fed the dispoision. It is unnecessary to say anything about technological change to any American audience, I think, other than to point out that technological change has generally preceeded social change, and that technological change has been both antecedent and consequent to the other developments.

All of these developments have in common some rather interesting characteristics. First, their recency - I start out with a four million year perspective and point out that the population explosion, world wide, is but three centuries old. The population explosion, incidentally, can be summarized very quickly by pointing out that it took the predominant portion of these four million years to generate a world population of one billion persons. This was not achieved until about 1850. It took only eighty years to add a second billion. World population was two billion by 1930. It took only thirty years to add a third billion. The population of the world was three billion in 1960. And at the present rate of growth, about 2% per annum, we would add a fourth billion by 1974 - in

only fourteen years from 1960. I think that it is a reasonably safe bet, short of the catastrophic, that we will have seven billion people on this globe by the year 2,000, which is only thirty years away - a little more than one human generation.

Now the population implosion is considerably more recent than the explosion. In 1800, (and it is only since the 19th century that you can say the world has experienced the population implosion), only about 2.4% of the world's population was urban. It is now closer to thirty percent. By the century's end, with present trends, it could be 48% - almost half of the population of the world.

The displosion is more difficult to quantify, but certainly in terms of space, time and cost considerations, diverse peoples are in closer interaction than ever before, and with, I think, quite visible deleterious consequences.

Now let me state my basic thesis at this point. My thesis is that man, as the only culture-building animal on the globe, has through the developments I have indicated, created a 20th Century demographic and technological world. He is still trying to learn how to live in it - and thus far not too successfully. This 20th Century demographic and technological world has precipitated unprecedented problems --environmental, physical, personal and social, economic, political and governmental. These problems are going to get exacerbated rather than resolved for at least during the remainder of this Century. The reason, among other things, is because we are attempting to deal with these 20th Century problems with 19th and 18th Century ideologies, value systems, forms of government and procedures.

Now let me proceed to try to document that assertion. On a world-wide basis certainly the basic problems generated by the population explosion are manifest in concern now about degradation of the environment, about the relationship between population and food supply and, I think most significant of all, about the excessive growth of the developing regions in Asia, Latin America and Africa --growth which is very definitely obstructing their efforts to achieve higher levels of living. In respect to environmental problems let me say they are serious even though perhaps much of what is now being said about the relation between population and environment is nonsense and sheer hucksterism. This concerns me because I think some of the public zeal being generated by "the angry ecologists" may turn into public apathy when their extreme overstatements boomerang and their false predictions do not come to pass. In my judgment the situation is bad enough without the hysterical reactions of zealots including Paul Ehrlich.

Second, on the food problem, though much has been said on this subject, it is a grave mistake to say that there will be tens of millions of people starving during the 70's or 80's. It may be confusing to some to realize that the same people who made such predictions are now also saying that they will not come to pass. The explanation for this apparent contradiction is very simple. If the writer published before 1966, the outlook was gloomy; and if he published since 1967 he has changed his mind because the outlook changed. The difference in outlook was, of course, the result of the green revolution. But just as it is a grave mistake to anticipate that there will be millions of people soon starving to death, it

is equally erroneous to say that mankind has now solved the food problem. If the green revolution continues to realize its promise, at the best we may have gained two, three, perhaps four decades during which efforts to dampen population growth rates might produce a situation in which the world could keep up with food production.

Third, I think the gravest part of the international outlook lies in what in my judgment will inevitably be the failure of two-thirds of mankind - it will be three-fourths by the end of the Century with present growth rates - to achieve their national aspirations for higher levels of living. In consequence, we can anticipate between now and the end of the Century greater, not lesser, social unrest; more, not fewer, political instabilities; and graver, not milder, threats to world peace. Out of that international outlook, despite the fact the world is now spending something in the neighborhood of 190 billion dollars a year for the military, I think the prospect is that we will see increased, not diminished, expenditures for armaments. No matter how isolationist we may try to become this will require bigger, not smaller government in Washington, and higher, not lower, taxes for the American people.

Simply to call attention to the consequences of the population explosion on a world-wide basis, let me point out that it is easy to document the assertion that mankind has not yet learned how to live with diversity. By diversity I am referring to people sharing the same locale varying by culture, by language, by religion, by value systems, by ethnicity, by race. Mankind has not yet learned how to live with diversity on an egalitarian basis. This is what accounts for the kind of conflict now manifest between

Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland; between the Hindus and Moslems in India and Pakistan; among the diverse linguistic groups of Hindus within India; among the tribes in Africa; between Israel and Arab in the near East; between Malays and Chinese in Malaysia; and between white and black in the Union of South Africa, in Rhodesia and in the United States. In fact, may I say the revolt of the blacks in this country may be regarded as our local manifestation of the revolution of rising expectations which has swept the whole world and has not by-swept American blacks.

Let me focus now on these population developments within the U.S.

First, the population explosion: When our first census was taken in 1790, there were fewer than four million people in the United States. By our last census, we had about 205 million as of April 1, 1970. If you look ahead to the end of the Century, we are likely to add from 75 to 95 million. In my own judgment we will more than likely have the higher number and, short of the catastrophic, a nation of about 300 millions by the year 2,000, a little more than one human generation from now.

That is the population explosion so far as the numbers go. What is it going to do in terms of problems generated? May I say at this juncture that the increment will by no means threaten survival itself, as is true in most of the developing regions of the world. There is little question, however, that it will very seriously threaten the quality of life in this nation. It will constitute a threat to the quality of life in that it is almost certain to exacerbate many of our present problems and especially the urban crisis with which I will deal separately. In other words, this nation in terms of the explosion and despite a reduced birth rate between

1957 and 1968, must be prepared to accommodate within the next thirty years an increment which is large enough to be the eighth greatest nation in the world today. Some may interpret this as economic opportunity, but it will be opportunity with terrific costs.

The population implosion: When our first census was taken in 1790, 95% of the American people lived in rural places. The way we define rural is farms or places having fewer than 2500 persons. We do not have the results of the urban-rural distribution yet from the 19th census. With the 18th census in 1960, our nation had become 70% urban and 63% metropolitan - 63% of our people lived in cities of 50 thousand or more in the counties in which those cities were located.

Now I want to mention something that to my mind is of the utmost significance and I think understood by very few people. This nation did not become an urban or metropolitan nation in the sense that more than half our people lived in urban or metropolitan areas until as recently as 1920. The 1920 census reported 51% of the American people living in urban places and it is this year now coming to a close, 1970, that marks the completion of this nation's first half century as an urban nation. Now fifty years is a very small period of time in the life of a nation, and it is less than one life time. In fact, most adults in the nation, not to mention the predominant proportion of our senators and congressmen, were born into an agrarian America and have yet to learn how to live in the Metropolitanized America. Just in terms of this temporal perspective, small wonder there is an urban crisis. We are still trying to learn how to live in the world we have created. Whatever the increment of population may be between now

and the end of the century in this country, 75 million to 95 million, it is virtual certainty that all of it will be absorbed by urban areas; and that perhaps as large a proportion as 80% will be absorbed by metropolitan areas. It is even possible that more than the total increment may become urban, because in the intercensal decade between '50 and '60, (we do not have the results yet for '60 to '70), the increase in the urban population of the United States exceeded the increase in the total population of the United States. That is, the rural population actually decreased during the decade between '60 and '70. It was over thirty million in 1910. We could still lose half of our rural farm population and decrease farm production by no more than about 5%, and decrease acreage under cultivation.

On the population displosion, let me summarize that quickly by reminding you that everybody in this country came from somewhere else. The British anthropologist Leakey only a week or two ago indicated he had some findings that showed people first came here about eighty thousand years ago, which set the time table much farther back than it previously had been. To get a little more recent, let me point out that in 1900, little more than half of the American people, only 51%, were native white of native parentage - the other 49% were either foreign born, second generation immigrants, (children of foreign born, or mixed parentage) blacks or members of other races. As recently as 1960 - and that is the most recent information we have had on this subject pending the publication of the 1970 census results - almost a third of the American people - 30% - were still either foreign born, second generation immigrants, blacks or members of other races. This of course is one of the most polyglot nations on the face of the globe. We have had in our history considerable evidence

of frictions in the process of what was called Americanization of our foreign born ethnic groups. However, certainly in the post war world, the major manifestations of problems arising from the population dispersion are those that have related to our blacks and increasingly now to our other minority groups.

Let me take a moment, therefore, to give you a quick overview of the demography of the blacks in this nation. When our first census was taken in 1790, there were about 800 thousand blacks in the United States - somewhat fewer than there were in the City of Chicago as reported in the 1960 census. But they made up a fifth of the population of the country - a full 20%. They remained about 20% until about 1810. With the cessation of the slave traffic, white immigration continued. Although black birth rates were higher than white, their death rates were so much higher than white that they continued to be a dwindling proportion of the total population until about 1930 when they fell below 10%. Between '30 and '40 their growth rate was about the same as the white, and since '40 has been considerably greater than the white by reason of unprecedented speed in urbanization and decreasing death rates.

Up to 1910, 89% of all our blacks were still in the South. That concentration had diminished only two to three percentage points from the proportion reported in the 1860 census - the last census before the Civil War. Consider this, an even more significant fact: As recently as 1910, 73% of all our blacks were rural, concentrated largely in the rural slum South. By reason of the upheavals of World Wars I and II, great migratory streams of blacks came from the South to the North and, during World War II,

appreciable numbers went for the first time to the West Coast.

The blacks were transformed from 73% rural in 1910 to 73% urban by 1960. This is probably the most dramatic transformation of a people's way of life in less than one life time - 50 years - than ever has occurred in human history. What kind of preparation had they for this terrific transformation? Let me remind you that as recently as 1960, 78% of all adult blacks, those 25 years of age and over, had not completed high school. Moreover, 23% had not completed fifth grade - they were functionally illiterate: They could not read a metropolitan newspaper with ease. This was their share of the American heritage and a pretty good indication of their preparation for this tremendous transformation in the course of less than one life time. Thus, the problems of our population dispoision are now most manifest, as the blacks try to find their way into the mainstream of American life--urbanism and metropolitanism as a way of life. It is ironic, by the way, to talk about the blacks being "newcomers" to the mainstream of American life because they have been here three and a half centuries. The average black has been an American a lot longer than the average white person in this nation. What may be even more ironic is that the newest "newcomers" to the mainstream of American civilization are the chaps that were here to greet the first white man and the first black man - the American Indian. The process of aculturization, incidentally, to complete this lesson in irony, is evident if we now refer to the aculturization of the blacks - not to say the American Indians, or our other minority groups - as Americanization.

Now what are the kinds of problems that these developments have

generated? On the physical side we have air and water pollution; problems with respect to the circulation of goods and persons -- air and surface congestion; the slum; the whole problem of urban design with which this Board struggles.

Let us turn to personal and social problems, which include, delinquency, crime, drug addiction and alcoholism; the revolt of youth characterized at one extreme by youth who cannot cope and seek forms of escapism, the hippy, and at the other extreme, youth who cannot cope and become frenetic activists, seeking confrontation, and using bombs presumably to accelerate social change. Add to this the revolt of the blacks, and increasingly the revolt of other minority groups.

Let me indicate a sinister sort of portent of the revolt of our minorities. As you know, there are about two or three white poor for every one black poor, even though over 40% of the blacks are poor, and only 10% of the whites are poor as officially defined. But it has occurred to me with some premonition of fear, that the revolt of the blacks could have the same relationship to the revolt of the poor in general that the fission bomb bears to the fusion bomb. The poor constitute enough people to make up a nation the size of the Philippines or Turkey. One bomb could well set off the other. There are many other problems precipitated by the developments I have described including economic and governmental problems. I do not have time to deal with them, but part of my thesis is "these as well as the problems I have elaborated are going to grow worse before they grow any better" because we are attempting to deal with them with 18th and 19th Century ideologies, value systems, forms, and structures of government and procedures.

Professor William F. Ogburn introduced the concept "cultural lag" into the literature. He perceived that in social change some things lag behind others. Let me give you some concrete examples of cultural lag. One, a kind of an interesting physical one is the gun. Now the constitution, of course, guarantees citizens the right to bear arms. Actually, if you read the constitutional convention debates this dealt with the right of the states to have militia - but I think it is fair to say it has been interpreted to mean that every man has a right to have a gun. In 1790, it made considerable sense for people to have a right to have guns. It was an important way to get a good part of ones food supply. It was an important way to protect the family in a frontier society against beasts - some of whom were human of every complexion. It was also an important way, if you remember your American history, of increasing realty holdings - if Indians got into the way. I would argue you can make a pretty good case for everybody having a gun in 1790. But, for this to be a constitutional right in the last third of the 20th Century in urbanized and metropolitan U.S.A. is an excellent example of cultural lag. This is why, in this nation last year we killed thirteen thousand people with guns whereas among comparable populations in Europe or Asia, the number of people killed by guns is to be measured in tens, not thousands. Let us consider another example of cultural lag as a result of the rapidity with which we became urbanized. As recently as 1960 there were 39 states in the United States in which the urban population constituted a majority of the people, but there was not a single State in the Union in which the urban population

controlled the state legislature. Now in these days when it is popular to talk about civil disobedience, may I respectfully suggest that the American people have never experienced so injurious a form of civil disobedience as the civil disobedience of the state legislatures of the United States which willfully defied their own state constitutions and the Federal Constitution with respect to apportionment. Why is the Federal Government in such things as urban renewal, public housing, expressways and highways, civil rights, transportation, education? There are the naive or the unscrupulous who say that it is because the federal government has usurped state's rights. I think a more accurate reading of the situation - it is because rural-dominated legislatures have so callously ignored urban problems as to force the predominant majority of the American people - 70% in 1960, perhaps closer to 75% today - to turn to the Federal Government for the resolution of their problems. It is not that the Federal Government usurps State's rights, it is that State Legislatures have been committing suicide, have made themselves the fifth wheel of American Government. In my judgment, it matters little what the State Governments do from this point forward in terms of basic problems which confront America. This is why I think another fine example of cultural lag is the present administration's program of the so-called "new federalism." The new federalism fortunately is not going to amount to anything because the kind of money being talked about is minor and would not make much difference anyway. But the new federalism as I see it is a fine example of a razor-sharp 19th Century mind trying to provide increased resources through state governments which for the first seventy years of this century have demonstrated they could not be less interested in urban problems,

do not have the expertise or competence to deal with them, are much more subject to pressures of special interest groups and are much more corrupt. Now that is the new federalism in a nutshell. Let me give you some other examples of outmoded ideologies and value systems:

"That government is best which governs least."

"Each person pursues his own interest as if guided by Adam Smith's invisible hands."

"Let the buyer beware."

"Taxes are something government takes away from people and should be kept at a minimum."

Consider the first two, "That government is best which governs least", "Each person pursues his own interest as if guided by Adam Smith's invisible hand". You know these precepts made pretty good sense in 1790 - 95% of the American people lived on farms. What was there for government to do? If you took care of your own family you were doing essentially all that was necessary, not only for their economic welfare but for the economic welfare of the United States. But to utter such nonsense in this last third of the 20th Century is a fine example of cultural lag - of razor sharp 19th Century minds repeating shibboleths that are utterly irrelevant, unrelated to the world in which we live. Can you imagine the United States today without a Social Security System, without a Pure Food and Drug Administration, without a Federal Communications Commission, without a Security and Exchange Commission, without a Civil Aeronautics Authority, and so on down the line?

We also keep repeating the nonsense "Caveat Emptor", let the buyer

beware. I was in a debate with the conservative columnist, Kilpatrick, whose column appears in about one hundred newspapers including the Chicago Daily News. Within the past year, before the American Home Economic Association, Kilpatrick said, "let the buyer beware" should still govern the market in the United States. Let me interpret his position to you. This means to me that every woman in this country, has the right to bear one, two, maybe three deformed babies and then, when she discovers this is the result of Thalidamide, she can punish the producer by refusing to buy any more of it. Or this means to me that every housewife had better learn how to use a slide rule and take it with her to the supermarket so she can ascertain that if she buys the large size economy package it will cost her more per ounce than if she buys the smaller size package.

"Taxes are something the government takes away from people and should be kept to a minimum." While this certainly guides the administration and the Congress as I understand it, this is quite in conflict with the idea that taxes are what the people pay for the performance of services which only government can provide, and some of which may determine the difference between whether we have or do not have a viable society. If we cannot afford to pay taxes to perform those services which make sure that U. S. remains a viable society, we may have the satisfaction of going down the drain of history along with the Roman Empire saying, "Well we kept our taxes low."

The welfare system to my mind is one of the best recent examples of cultural lag. President Nixon, on the Family Assistance Plan, went

out of his way to point out that it was not a program down the road toward a welfare society because it provided, in keeping with principles of rugged individualism, the opportunity for man to work. He did not quite say it accurately - for it contains punitive provisions to require people to work. But this painful effort to indicate that the welfare society is a pejorative concept in an interdependent and as vulnerable a society as we possess is again one reason why I think Nixon has one of the most razor sharp 19th Century minds in contemporary America.

Another example of cultural lag - racism. There never was a homogeneous pre-urban, pre-industrial group that was not characterized by what the anthropologist and sociologist call ethnocentrism. That is the tendency of every people to judge others by themselves. The Chinese regarded themselves as human beings and the class word they used for non-Chinese is the same class word they used for animals. In ancient Greece there were only Greeks and "barbarians." The Hebrews were God's "chosen people." I love to tell white audiences the Eskimo's explanation of the whiteman who is obviously the product of an Eskimo girl that got lost in a blinding blizzard and a wolf which raped her.

Now ethnocentrism in a world before the population explosion, imperialism, and displacement did no particular harm. But in a world characterized by urbanism and metropolitanism as a way of life, it works much mischief. It becomes racism and all the problems racism generates. A final example of cultural lag is evident in our form of local government which we inherited from 18th Century England. Central cities in metro-

politan areas in this nation, are not equipped to deal with their problems. They have neither the authority nor sources of revenue to deal with them.

In conclusion, let me repeat, we have created a 20th Century demographic and technological world and we are still trying to learn how to live in it. We have not yet achieved much success. What remains of at least the rest of the Century, assuming we remain a viable society, is greater not lesser chaos.

And so I close, taking advantage of this captive audience with something that will make the most conservative and reactionary of you agree with at least something that I have said. I will close with the story about the little old lady in tennis shoes who came up after a speaker finished, "You know, sir, that was an excellent talk." She was trying to compliment him. "Utterly superfulous." To which the speaker responded, "Well in that case I will see to it that it is published posthumously." To which the little old lady said - and this gives you conservatives or reactionaries a chance to agree with me - "Oh, please do and make it quick."