

UNITED WAY ANNUAL MEETING

February 3, 1983

RECEIVED

MAR 18 1983

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF STATE

REMARKS - Daniel J. Evans

It becomes increasingly difficult to sit and listen to an extended introduction even though it's always nice to hear.

I really do have to share with you a true story, one that I've told before. It certainly puts into perspective the value of all of those honorary degrees that are bestowed from time to time on public officials and others throughout this country. I was asked to give the graduation address at Whitworth College and accompanying the invitation was an announcement that I would receive an honorary Doctor of Laws degree. I went, gave the speech, received the degree, and emerged with the rest of academic procession to the lawn to talk to graduates, parents and friends attending that graduation ceremony. I ran across a high school classmate, a long time friend, and he just looked at me and said, "Governor, I can't understand it, I went to Whitworth College for four years and got a BS degree, and you BS'd for half an hour and got a Doctor's degree." And as far as being a statesman rather than a politician, I still would proudly hold on to the title politician rather than statesman. I look upon statesmen as those who have fulfilled their responsibility, many of whom have long since passed on, and I don't intend for either to happen very soon. I'm proud to be a politician and wish that others were proud of the term which in most dictionaries is described as "a student of the art and science of government."

Looking out in this audience I certainly see a good many old friends and a number of new faces. I still consider myself a Seattleite, born here and educated here. I guess I'm just on extended foreign service and someday I expect my wife and I and our family will once again return to this community.

You've had a long and successful history in Seattle of caring and of giving. The proud record of United Way and of other similar volunteer agencies in this community is well known throughout the country. Even during periods of recession which occasionally come to this beautiful northwest, this community continues to care for its people. But I'm not here today to spend very much time congratulating you on past successes, or to even urge you on to your current goal. What I'd like to do instead is to talk about people and tomorrow. On arriving at my place at the table I picked up this little blue folder which you have in front of you, entitled "Strategic Planning - Forecasting With a Clear Eye." If your committee can successfully do that, you have suddenly distilled the most valuable of all resources and can sell it widely.

It's difficult, if not impossible, to have a clear eye on tomorrow. It's at best dimly seen, and it's changed as a kaleidoscope by new events, new technologies, and as yet unmade discoveries.

I know from recent experience how difficult it is. I was given the responsibility as a member of the Pacific Northwest Power Planning Council to merely look twenty years ahead for this region, to forecast the electric power needs, and then to accurately predict what resources will be required to meet those needs. I know how difficult that is and it's even more difficult to try to predict with any accuracy, the human needs of our community.

Perhaps some of you have read a new book, John Naisbitt's "Megatrends." I commend it to you. It's a fascinating view of the future and not a very long book. A long evening would easily take you through it the first time, but I'll bet you'll come back and read it again and again. Because whether or not you believe his predictions, it's worth being challenged by an author and an observer who has quite a different view than most of the future. If I quote liberally from him today in my remarks, it's not only because I was fascinated by his book, but because over the years I have come to believe many of the same things about our future.

Today, we in this country, certainly in this community, are in a period of transition. Perhaps the world is in a period of transition. In the last several hundred years we have successfully emerged from an agricultural period where most of our resources were required to feed all of us, into an industrial period which has encompassed most of the last two centuries, and are now clearly embarking on a new era which isn't as yet easily defined. But we have clearly, in terms of our work force majority, progressed from farmer to laborer, and in the late 1970's clerk. By 1980 more of our people were engaged in clerical or informational type activities than those who worked in our industrial plants. And as we look ahead it is more than likely that the next major share of our population will be involved as technicians. Once in this nation it took 80% of the population to produce enough food for 100% of the population. It was tough grinding work from dawn till dusk. As late as 1900 one-third of our population was engaged in farming and today 3% of our people not only produce enough food for all of us, but a substantial surplus to help feed the rest of the world. In those farm years there was a strong emphasis on the family. Work was at home. The family stayed home. Our elders were cared for at home and there was only the beginning of the broader community-based social resources. As we moved into an industrial society we of course left home and worked in our factories. We built today's America and we showed the way to the rest of the world. The hours were still long and tough, but gradually more and more of today's amenities appeared. As we moved away from home to work we also began to build social structures to replace that family-oriented agricultural community. By the 1970's we clearly were in a new age. Maybe not so easily identified, however, because I suspect a good many leaders of today, both public and private, are not yet fully aware of the enormous changes taking place around us. In the 1970's, in spite of high unemployment, 20 million new jobs were created in this nation; only 5% of those jobs were in manufacturing. The other 95% of the net new jobs created were in information processing and in service type jobs. By 1979 the general classification of clerk surpassed laborer as the largest single segment of our work force.

Well, what comes next? NEWSWEEK magazine estimated that 50%-60% of today's manufacturing employment could readily be replaced by smart robots by the turn of the century. It appears that today's 40 hour week is increasingly unnecessary to produce the food and the machinery for this society. New high tech industries are springing up everywhere, and it's interesting to read of some of their organizational techniques which are as new as the

industries themselves. Several of the most successful and largest today insist on regular sabbaticals for their workers as a way of restoring and re-educating them during their work careers. Sabbaticals which were once reserved to the ivory tower and to higher education may well become common for almost all of us. We will face in future years shorter work hours, different work arrangements, shared work, all of which are beginning to appear with increasing frequency today. There is no more reason to believe that the current 40 hour week will remain static than it was for the 60 hour week or the 56, or the 50, or the 48, or 44 hour week to remain in the periods during which they were common. I suspect that in not too many years something as short as a 20 or 24 hour week could be prevalent. According to Naisbitt, today's big business, big labor, big television networks and big government are all akin to dinosaurs. Here's where I reserve my own judgment and merely quote Naisbitt, otherwise I would probably disenchant most in this house in the course of the next few minutes.

As he points out, in the last ten years of those new jobs created in this nation, virtually none were in the top Fortune 1,000 businesses of this nation. Some grew of course, some shrank. But overall, almost no growth. The new jobs were in new and smaller industries and businesses, most of them doing things that had not even been conceived a few years earlier. He points out, and I thoroughly agree, that whether you're talking about business or government, or even volunteer organizations, that strategic planning today is worthless unless a strategic vision of tomorrow precedes it. Big labor -- In the mid-1970's we reached the peak of unionization and a smaller share of our work force is unionized today than just a few years ago. And why? Because we are moving into a period where there will be new forms of management. Again, as Naisbitt points out, computers have become so powerful that there's no longer any need for the pyramidal or hierarchical form of management where each level required certain people reporting to the next level in order to keep track of what was going on and what personnel in various departments were doing. Computers today easily do all of that or could, and so new forms of management are being discovered. We look to Japan for some of their successes and find that shared management perhaps is one of them. We will create our own version of new management, new circles of responsibility, new ways of reporting to each other. It will negate some of the necessary unionization of the past because employees will gain a larger share of decision-making in those businesses.

Big TV -- By the turn of the century it is unlikely that our choice will merely be ABC, NBC or CBS. The rapid growth of cable and satellite will soon make hundreds of channels available to almost all of us. Two-way television is coming where we can respond to what is being transmitted and can literally vote from our homes on questions of interest. We will shortly tune in at will to weather or sports or education or the current goings on of the United States House of Representatives, or the meeting of the City Council, or of the State Legislature. And if that doesn't all put you to sleep you've got 120 more channels to keep you awake. The viewer's choice will soon make the necessity of sterilized network pap less necessary.

Big government -- There is good reason why there has been a renaissance in state government during the last 20 years. Why we talk today about new federalism, why there is a new vitality in city and community government, why community organizations themselves play a role in community or city development. Naisbitt suggests that fewer people vote nationally, perhaps because it doesn't make as much difference as it once did. That the real focus in the future may be increasingly on what happens in our communities and in our own states. We have become so big and so complex that a decentra-

lization rather than a centralization of authority is desirable. While I've quoted Naisbitt in challenging others, he also includes education in his gun sight. Today's education which does not really produce the kind of graduates needed. Graduates are needed who not only can compute and write, but who can think through difficult and complex problems. New education will be required. New teaching to prepare for a new era. The need today seems to be for technicians and we listen to the debates in the Legislature about the requirements for high tech industries and high tech education. I suspect, however, that we will find a real and growing need for a new kind of generalist and not specialist. A person who knows how to continue to learn, a person who can think through these complex problems, and for a person who understands the morality and the logic and the philosophy and the sociology related to these marvelous new machines. The machines themselves are important, but more important is the wisdom of those who put material into the machines and those who use the material which comes out of the machines.

Really, what does all of this have to do with United Way? We still have the unfortunate, the ill, the people who need the help of their neighbors and others. How do we fill the chasm which seemingly continues to grow between the needs in our communities, and the increasing inability or unwillingness of taxpayers to meet those needs through taxes. For some years now we have felt, and I believe wisely, that only a voluntary sector can fill that chasm. United Way as one major element has helped to do that job.

But now I think, we too need to take a new look at the shape of that voluntary sector. Naisbitt stated that he believed there were five trend setting states. Five states of the nation which over the last quarter of a century have often been the leaders in new trends in a wide variety of fields. He suggested that you could predict what would happen a few years later in the nation by what was then happening in those trend-setting states. Those states included: California as you might guess, Florida, and three others which are not so large: Connecticut, Colorado and Washington. And I sometimes wonder with the problems we have faced over the last few years, with our occasional reluctance to march with boldness, whether we could still be considered as a trend-setting state. Well, I think we can be and we ought to be, and perhaps the way in which we can show others is by aiming our voluntary sector at new needs. I would hope the United Way, for instance, recognizing that much of its resource goes to the aid of those who are ill, could also help to provide support so that we do not become ill. The wellness of our citizens precedes the illness of our citizens. To the degree that we can provide leadership to insure that our people stay well, we reduce the need to serve those who are ill. It's important in this new era to encourage the human touch to human services. We too often provide the service, send out the money, and mechanically go through the process of providing needed resources for those who are the recipients. In too many cases that response is sterile or stand-offish, and doesn't add the human touch which is so necessary.

And if this view of the future is correct, then high technology desperately needs, as Naisbitt calls it, "high touch"...the increasing interaction between people. Because computers don't feel, or love, or cry, or laugh, but they can help us provide more time. And when there is more time, people need to have more than just recreation for leisure activity. And I suggest that perhaps United Way and others, rather than just looking to the community to money which in turn can buy human services, should start mining time just like we mine money. We need not be selective or wonder about the giving ability of a person when we're talking about time, because each of us is blessed with exactly the same amount. Twenty-four hours a day are given equally to the

richest and poorest of us. And that miracle of time can fill the gap, I believe, between need and the ability to simply pay to meet those needs. You and I read daily, of people who are doing just that. Within the last three days I read of a man who was giving of his time to help a parapalegic to exercise, to swim, and in the process discovered a new friend, and spent more time than he originally allotted to that new friendship and a new relationship. I read of a young student who worked at night to support himself at school, but one night a week would end his work and journey to a nearby church where he spent the rest of the night helping bake bread for a church feeding program for the poor. And he reported in this article, not a feeling of desperate tiredness after 24 hours of continuous labor, but the joy and the warmth of what he had done for others.

I'm confident that the United Way will continue, not to just serve, but to help lead this community. And as your Strategic Planning Committee does its work, I hope that it will find new ways to use this increasing availability of time which is perhaps a bigger resource ahead of us than money, and combine both to show the way to a new era. Let us insure that Washington does continue to be a trend-setting state. Let us also insure that an emerging technical and computerized age be one in which caring for each other will continue to be of prime importance.