

Speech by:
Daniel J. Evans to
National Adult Education Conference
Portland, Oregon
October 27, 1978

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT
FOR EDUCATION/ENERGY/ENVIRONMENT

As a beginner in education, particularly in higher education, I was distressed about the opportunity to speak to you until I realized that I had passed my first year in higher education. I am no longer a freshman but rather a sophomore, and everyone knows that sophomores have reached the eiptome of knowledge, urbanity and wisdom, and thus I will have no difficulty in plunging ahead.

Responsibility of Government after all depends first on people. With no people, obviously no need for organized government. More than that it depends on those people's needs and abilities, or willingness to support government. Our current condition is a puzzling one indeed.

Let us begin with the ability or willingness to support organized government. Howard Jarvis, for 25 years, attempted to get signatures and approval by the voters of California of a whole series of issues which related to taxation. The fact that he succeeded this year is not so much a tribute to his own skills or even his persistence, but rather that times finally caught up with some of his issues. It also relates, quite frankly, to incredible insensitivity in California state government. Any government which allows a \$7 billion surplus to develop without either spending it, giving it back to the people, or lowering taxation, invites change. California is too big a part of this nation for Proposition 13 to be viewed as a local aberration. It is a reflection of a national reaction to current concerns over inflation, an uncertain economy, and distress at the loss of American economic power in the international market. I don't believe for one minute that the reactions through Proposition 13 and a growing series of similar

proposals in other states, really measures only a so-called tax revolt. It is broader than that in at least two major respects. People aren't only questioning how much money is being spent in the public sector. They are also questioning the value of the services received. There is increasing question in their minds that the proliferation of services and the growth of government at all levels, is really producing for them good value from the increasing tax burden they carry. An important factor in current frustration is the abhorance of excessive regulations created by public bodies. The staggering list of rules and regulations at all levels of government, and their increasing complexity are matched by the penchant of most administrators to write rules and regulations in a turgid English never taught in any school. Regulation may well be the most important of a modern 3R's of Regulation, Revenue and Reform.

If that reflects the willingness of people, how about their needs? We are going to face a time in the next few years where there will be increasing confrontation between the willingness of people to support institutions and programs, and their needs. The struggle will become increasingly intense and will pit one citizen group against another. Tuition tax credits for middle income Americans will compete with the desire for increased police and fire services. Business tax reductions will compete with the need for better mental health care and further investment in corrections. This list is endless. In virtually every state of this nation, as legislators gather next January, and even in the Congress returning next January, the orientation will not be to decide what the needs are and then measure whether current revenues can take care of those needs or whether further revenues are needed. Rather, we are in a time when the first decision will be how much money is available under current taxation. The number one issue will be whether we can retreat from that current level through tax reduction. What is left over will be competed for by all the services needed at every level of government. That is why the confrontation will be increasingly intense.

Decisions on tax and service levels are being made regularly by legislative bodies, generally with inadequate information. More important and less understood by most of us is how population dynamics change the focus of public as well as private investment. The measurement of both needs and abilities depends on people and, more importantly, their distribution in the population. For instance, the working ages -- people between 21 and 65 generally provide most of the taxes, and the young, those under 21 and the elderly, those over 65, generally use the bulk of our taxes. The young use education and juvenile institutions and about half of our welfare through aid for dependent children. Corrections are basically aimed at the juvenile or the young adult. Nursing homes and hospitals, pensions and welfare are aimed primarily at the elderly. In the attached chart, Figure I reflects the situation in the State of Washington, but it differs only in degree in other states of the nation. Essentially the same changes will occur throughout the country during the course of the next dozen years. This chart is aimed at showing the distribution of the ages in our population and the change in the percentage age components from 1978 to 1990. The dotted line across the middle of the chart represents the average increase in Washington state's population expected in the next 12 years, 23 percent.

Let us examine the independent elements of that population. Too often legislators and observers of the political scene and frankly, even some of those who have private management responsibilities look only at that over-all population. It's much more important to look at the separate elements of that population. You can readily see that the young in our population, those between 0 and 5 years of age, will increase by almost 50 percent. Those at high school graduation levels, between 15 and 20 and in the early 20's, will decrease by as much as 13 percent. The soaring wave in the center, our World War II babies grown up, represents the most dramatic element of our population. The 80 percent increase in population of those between 35 and 45, is followed by an equally dramatic drop in those between

55 and 65 who will shrink as a percentage of the total population, and also shrink in actual numbers. Finally, those over 65 will have a greater than average growth rate. Why such a difference? Those items at the top really point out why.

Starting from the right, the earliest times, the elderly of the next dozen years will be reflective of the war babies born after World War I. From reading of history, almost every war in which we have been able to keep population statistics, going clear back to the middle ages, has been followed by an extremely rapid increase in birth rate and in numbers of births. This phenomenon appears to be a natural effort to replenish population lost during a way, and that happened after World War I. During the next dozen years we will have to deal with those people as retired citizens. The Depression babies of 1925 to '35, reflected a drastically dropping birth rate in those years. The huge peak in the center represents the World War II baby boom of 1945 to 1955 who now will be the bulk of our working population. The dip in the teenagers of today and tomorrow comes with the advent of the Pill and the declining birthrate of the last decade. Finally, the rise in the numbers of youngsters which is already taking place is the beginning of a new population wave reflecting the babies' of World War II babies. The next generation, even at very low birth rates, will continue to grow in numbers simply because there are so many people in what demographers rather inelegantly call the fertile years. If this graph were to be advanced to 1995 or to the year 2000, it would simply move toward the right and as it moves in that direction, you would see a rising line coming onto the chart and ultimately a larger wave of population than that created by World War II babies. There are new youngsters coming along and we had better understand charts like this simply because the make-up of our population is going to be the driver of both public and private decision-making in the next decade. There will be more elderly with their obvious needs. There will be a new generation of young students. There will

There will be a drastic slump in the number of high school graduates with its obvious implications on higher education. There will be a vast number of new families and new homes and the new goods required to serve that huge group in the center who will be approaching the peak of their earning years. There will be fewer in the normal leadership age bracket. The real question over the next decade is what is going to happen in terms of our national and local leadership. Our leadership will either be younger or it will be older and it is unclear yet as to which direction we will move. Large numbers of citizens will be in their most productive workforce years. Crime, mental health, education, and all of the myriad public and private services will have changing responsibilities and priorities. It's impossible in the short time today to deal with government's role in all aspects of this imposing title except to be brief.

Energy for new industry to serve the population and the new homes for these vast numbers of new families simply cannot be produced by government fiat. Encouragement and leadership in establishing a new conservation ethic is an important part of meeting our energy needs during the remainder of this century. That new conservation ethic ultimately becomes an important challenge for education at all levels. Our environment today, both human and natural, is under attack by the growth needs of our society. Government may regulate both our human and natural environments, but individuals must preserve the environment. So both a conservation ethic and an environmental ethic are important for our next generation. It is exceedingly important that education play a leadership role in building that ethic.

Finally, let me turn to education's dramatic new role in the 1980's. We have had the troublesome response of the 1970's. You probably felt, as I have, the increasing demand of legislators, parents, administrators, for skill tests. They all cry out for some way to measure progress of students and voice unhappiness over apparently lower test scores, especially in mathematics and in writing and reading. I believe part of that feeling is fallacious. We are suffering the success of

of education over the last generation. Not too many years ago youngsters, who today are being tested and who are part of a lowering of test scores, weren't even in school. A high percentage of those who didn't do well in school dropped out and of course it was easier to test higher with a group of more select students who remained in school. But we can't excuse the current problems, especially in reading, entirely by that example. My concern is not that legislators, administrators and parents are asking for more accountability, because that is important. My concern is that the penchant for that testing at various levels in education may well lead to a response to "teach to the tests" because that is going to be how you are measured and teaching to the test may well result in a distortion, rather than a shaping of our educational system. I'm concerned even about current directions in higher education--the drive toward job and career training. The danger is in achieving a well-trained but uneducated society. In fact, I even went back to the dictionary to try to distinguish between that concept of training and of education, which I think is a major issue today.

Training: to teach or to exercise someone in an art, profession, trade or occupation; direct in obtaining a skill or give instruction to.

Education: to develop as a person by fostering to varying degrees the growth or expansion of knowledge, wisdom, desirable quantities of mind or character; physical health or general competence, especially by a course of formal study or instruction; provide or assist in providing with knowledge or wisdom, moral balance or good physical condition, especially by means of a formal education.

Quite a difference between just training and education. The wisdom of our ages, the transmission device for much of our art, our culture, our literature, our music and our history in a major sense, reside in our educational institutions. It is important for educational leaders to speak out and speak out forcefully for this

concept of education lest we be consigned eventually to a task simply as job trainers.

Let me then turn, finally, to government and education and the responsibilities of government in education. We have seen a generation now of centralization in welfare, in transportation, in environmental controls, in much of our current domestic life. Education is one major element which still remains fundamentally regional or local in character. My term as Governor coincided almost exactly with the explosive growth in categorical programs which began with the Great Society Congress in 1965. Those categorical programs grew so fast that by the early 1970's, when the National Governors' Conference asked the Federal government to present a list of categorical programs, no one at the national level could respond. They simply didn't know how many programs of what kind and what character were then available, especially those which had relationship to the states and local communities. As we moved toward more and more categorical and narrow programs, each one created its own management and was responsible for the large growth in bureaucracy at the federal level and to a certain degree, at state and local levels. A new nationally organized interest group almost invariably formed to respond to an individual categorical program. Congressional staff became enamored of a special program which gave luster to the Congressman who thought it up and, especially if that Congressman was honored with a national organization medal or plaque of some kind. The managers, the interest groups, and the staffers, none of them elected to public office or responsible to the taxpayers of today, fight to keep the programs intact, even though the population dynamics I have just described may dictate major change in direction and major change in priority. Leakage in many of these programs is large and unnecessary. No wonder people react violently to their current tax burdens. A recent annual evaluation report of the Office of Education lists 92 separate programs, all within the Office of Education, which are currently under evaluation. Each one of them has its own managers, auditors, surveyors,

analysts, planners, lobbyists, ad infinitum. I have a feeling that there may be some in the audience, bristling a little, who may even be part of that list I just mentioned. Lest I be too negative, let me talk briefly about a solution, or at least what I believe to be a badly needed new direction. Alexis de Tocqueville, in his Democracy in America, proved to be a prescient observer of the American scene. He spoke in a number of places in his two volumes, about the difference between centralized government and centralized administration. He admired the United States as being a country which had developed centralized government and he also admired the United States as a country which had avoided centralized administration. He pointed out the vast difference between centralized government, where goals were set and basic policy created, and decentralized administration, where the carrying out of those goals occurred through diverse administrations of the then 13 states. Certainly, the Federal Government has a role beyond foreign affairs and national defense. A role is required in national goal setting for domestic purposes, in measurement of those goals and perhaps in an oversight function in the use of federal monies. I believe, also, that the federal government has a responsibility to trust other levels of government, to trust those citizens who are involved at all levels, attempting to do a job just as well and just as honestly, and I certainly think, just as competently as those who serve us in Washington, D.C. While the goals may be the same and while we may have national objectives to which we strive, the organization, tradition and needs and current status of our individual states and local communities vary immensely. Our nation, I hope, is unique because of our diversity and not our uniformity. The problems of Washington State are not the problems of Indiana, New York, Alabama or any other state.

I believe a new style of educational partnership must be created. National goals should be identified to insure that, as a nation, we achieve some fundamental educational goals. Education planning should be carried out basically at state

and local levels to reflect the individual problems and the different organization and traditions of states and local communities. A much broader and more unified grant process must be established to avoid the excessive dollar drain from fragmented categorical programs. We need a renaissance of state and local and citizen involvement in this procedure. It may be more difficult, but I am confident it will ultimately be more rewarding. Education, too often has been developed to meet the needs and the desires of educators and educational administrators, rather than developed to fit the needs of students, who, after all, represent our prime responsibility.

The 1950's represented a decade where we spent most of our national money on primary education to start the task of educating our World War II babies. The 1960's were devoted to the secondary schools and the 1970's to higher education. The 1980's will very likely be the decade of continuing and adult education and there should be no surprise in that. Referring back to the chart, that's where the population pressure will be. Those in mid-career who seek to change careers need education to succeed. Those who are in the work force and who failed at some point to get an adequate education need to complete that education. An increasing number of citizens want to go back to school for no other purpose than the joy of additional education. They, too, are adults. In many respects the next educational generation is your generation. It is apparent that your willingness to come, many of you from long distances, your involvement and your discussion, will assure that you will successfully respond to the educational challenge of the 1980's. I firmly believe the decade ahead will be a delightful challenge for adult educators.

% INCREASE by AGE COMPONENTS IN WASHINGTON STATE

1978 - 1990

