

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

FREEDOM IS NOT ENOUGH:
THE MOYNIHAN REPORT AND AMERICA'S STRUGGLE OVER BLACK FAMILY LIFE,
FROM LBJ TO OBAMA

Washington, D.C.
Thursday, June 10, 2010

PARTICIPANTS:

Featured Speaker:

JAMES T. PATTERSON
Ford Foundation Professor of History Emeritus, Brown University

Featured Panelists:

E.J. DIONNE, JR.
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies

CLARENCE PAGE
Columnist, *The Chicago Tribune*

ROSS DOUTHAT
Columnist, *The New York Times*

* * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. DIONNE: First of all, Professor James Patterson has written the best book on what I think is one of the most important arguments we've had in American politics about the Moynihan Report and African-American and low-income families and the relationship between, if you will, family values and social justice.

Secondly, I'm honored because I am, as some of you know, a fan of Senator Moynihan's and I have probably in my lifetime flip-flopped on a lot of issues, but there's one -- I can honestly say this is an issue I have not flip-flopped on. I was assigned, when I was in college, which, unfortunately, is a long time ago, to write a critique of a *New York Times* editorial and I ended up siding with Moynihan and the Moynihan Report in that. And I have held the same view for a long time that it's very, very important for advocates of equality and equal rights to care about the state of our families.

And third, it's a great honor to have Dr. Jim Patterson, the Ford Foundation Professor of History Emeritus at Brown University with us today. He asked me not to go long, so I won't. He's a graduate of Williams College. He got his master's and Ph.D. at Harvard. He wrote a wonderful book which is -- he kindly found -- it had gone out of print and I asked him for it recently and he found it for me, and it has a lot of relevance to this moment. He wrote in his first book, I think it was your Ph.D. thesis, is that correct? Or grew out of it -- was called *Congressional Conservatism and the New Deal*, and it makes for fascinating reading now both for the ways in which our moment is similar and for the ways in which it's different. We may have you back to talk about that some day.

He is also the author of *The New Deal in the States: Federalism in Transition*, a great book, *Mr. Republican: A Biography of Robert A. Taft*, and I'm not going to list all his books, but *America in the 20th Century: A History, America's Struggle Against*

Poverty, 1900 to 1980, and he wrote a book about cancer and the history of our relationship with it, and a very, very important book that I suspect a lot of people in this room know about, *Grand Expectations: The United States 1945 to 1974*.

I just want to close this introduction by reading the last two paragraphs of Professor Patterson's book because I think they make very clear why this subject is still very much alive.

"As the tortuous trail of the Moynihan Report has shown, a lot of misunderstandings and misrepresentations, most of them rooted in abiding racial antagonisms, also hamper efforts to talk forthrightly and productively about black family problems. These misunderstandings and distortions continue to impede the search for effective public policies.

"Still, the efforts of well-intentioned policymakers combined with those of parents and community leaders, must continue. If and when these efforts secure substantial political support, Lyndon Johnson's "Springtime Dream" at Howard University, as scripted for him long ago by Moynihan, might become possible. Large numbers of Americans might recognize that freedom is not enough and agree that black Americans should be able to enjoy not just equality as a right and a theory, but equality as a fact and a result."

I give you Dr. Jim Patterson. (Applause)

DR. PATTERSON: Can everybody hear me all right? I always have to lean down at these podia, and I will -- I'm supposed to talk for about 20 minutes and I'll probably keep it to under 40. It's very hard to summarize a book that you spent several years writing, and even though it's a slim and inexpensive book --

MR. DIONNE: For sale in the back.

DR. PATTERSON: Yeah, you were supposed to mention that. I'm very indebted to E.J. Dionne, who has not only been instrumental and the key person in getting

me here today, but also wrote a blurb on the back of the book, which I understand that whenever he writes such a blurb it makes it into an instant bestseller. So, I'm very pleased about that.

Thank you all for coming. I am often mistaken at checkout counters and so forth for another James Patterson and you probably know him. He's a very, very -- the biggest selling author in the world, and if I were he, I wouldn't be here.

I want to do four things today. I want to give you some sense of who I am and why I undertook this book, *Freedom is Not Enough: The Moynihan Report and America's Struggle Over Black Family Life from LBJ to Obama*, which, as you can tell from the subtitle -- because titles never tell you anything about a book -- is really about the struggles over black family life; what, if anything, is wrong with it; what should be done to improve it; why and why not. My book covers not only the Moynihan Report of 1965 -- more on this in a minute -- but also struggles since then to talk frankly and forthrightly, as the passage that E.J. just mentioned said, about black problems.

I first want to talk about why I undertook the book, then I want to tell you some things, most of which this knowledgeable audience already know, about what the Moynihan report was, what it tried to do, and what it wasn't.

Thirdly, I want to talk about what happened to it, both good and bad, why did this happen to it, and so what, mainly in 1965 after it came out, but also, to some extent, since.

And finally, although I am distinctly not a policy person as some of you may be at Brookings or visiting Brookings, I'll try to give you some ideas of what I think might be possible to improve a situation which I think is catastrophic.

Okay, why did I do the book? E.J. has saved me some time here by describing a little bit about my intellectual odyssey. I used to do straight political history as

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

my book on Congress in the '30s indicates and my biography of Robert Taft, but like a lot of historians in the '60s -- I was born in 1935, so I was already teaching in the '60s -- I was moved by the Civil Rights Movement. And as any of you know, stories are always deeply influenced by the events of the times in which they live, which is another way of saying that anybody who maintains that historians are totally objective don't know anything about history writing.

So at any rate, this forced me to turn and try to learn something about black history and the history of race relations, about which I knew very little and about which I had taught very little up until the mid- and late '60s. And that's when I first came upon the Moynihan Report of 1965, and also about something that many of you may also know, that Moynihan worked as one of Nixon's top domestic advisors from 1969 to 1970 and was instrumental, among others, in formulating the so-called Family Assistance Plan, or FAP as it was called, which if passed -- and it did pass the House, but never got through the Senate -- would have established a guaranteed income program for all kinds of impoverished Americans and working class Americans. It was a very far-reaching program, probably the most far-reaching to get that far in all of American history, but it did not make it through in the end.

Anyway, I came across Moynihan in these regards. I wrote this book about poverty that E.J. Dionne mentioned and actually had had some later updating so the book is now called *America's Struggle Against Poverty in the 20th Century*. My books seem to have struggle in the titles all the time. In the course of doing that book, of course, I had to learn something about poverty -- black, white, rural, urban, and so forth. And later on I wrote a book on the *Brown v. Board of Education* case, which was imaginatively titled, *Brown v. Board of Education*. The publisher thought they should know what it was about.

At any rate, so then I turned with my interest in poverty and my interest in

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

race relations, and finally my interest in family issues got me into this. And what do I mean by "my interest in family issues?" Well, I became aware, as no doubt you did, of the absolutely staggering changes in the structure and the nature of American families over the past 40 or 50 years -- 45 years since the Moynihan Report was written in early 1965.

Just to give you a couple of statistics. In Moynihan's report which was published -- it was written in early '65 -- he had data for what was then called illegitimacy. I know this is a hard word to use now, but it was common then. We now use out of wedlock pregnancy or non-marital birthing or whatever, but then it was called illegitimacy and people talked about illegitimacy rates and ratios, which are different things. But the proportion of black births in 1963, which was the latest data he had in 1965, the proportion of these which were born out of wedlock in 1963 was 23.6. The proportion of white babies born out of wedlock at that time was roughly 3. There was a multiple of 8: 3 and 23.6.

Today, and indeed since the mid-'90s, that proportion among blacks, non-Hispanic blacks, in the United States has hovered around 70 percent. The most recent figure I've seen is 72.3 percent of births to blacks today, black babies, are out of wedlock. The proportion of first births to blacks is over 80 percent. The proportion in many inner cities is 90 percent. There is, of course, a substantial black middle class. Were it not for that middle class -- because this is a class as well as a race issue -- these figures would be probably in the 80s or the 90s.

So, it's gone from 23.6 in 1963 -- it was already 28 percent, by the way, at the end of 1965. Moynihan didn't have that data; it had raised 5 percent in 2 years. By 1970, it was 38 percent; and by the '80s, it was in the 50 percents; and by the '90s, up into the 70s. So, this is an enormous growth in the proportion of births that were out of wedlock.

Now, Moynihan was not moralistic about this, I'm not moralistic about it. What it means, of course, is that very large numbers of children are growing up in female-

headed families, more than half of which live in poverty. So, it's not a slam. It's not a statement that single mothers can't raise children. Some do a good job, but it's tough, and particularly if you're poor, and this is what Moynihan was well aware of. His father was an alcoholic, left him -- he was living in New York City -- when he was 10. He never saw his father again, who somehow managed to remarry even though he was a Catholic, don't ask me how. And Moynihan and his two siblings and his mother had a real hard time. They moved in some various cold water flats. He sold newspapers in Times Square. He knew something about these problems, though, of course, he never lived in Harlem and he did not know a whole lot of black people, although he did go to Benjamin Franklin High School in East Harlem for his last two years of high school. So, he knew what the situation was and later on he got interested in it and wrote this report.

I should have said, by the way, that the percentage of white, non-Hispanic births that is out of wedlock today is around 28 percent, so that's risen from 3 to 28 between 1963 and 2008, 2009, whereas the black goes from 23.6 to over 70. In other words, the white percentage has risen at a considerably faster rate. But that's, of course, a statistical thing since you start at such a low level, any considerable increase is going to result in a very rapid rate of increase. This means that today 41 percent of births in the United States are born out of wedlock.

One of my few reviews so far has said that there's too many statistics in my book. You get the idea? But they do give you an idea of what the situation is. So, that's why I wrote this book because of my interest in poverty, my interest in race relations, and living through a period in which American family structures have just gone off the charts.

Now, I should add something that many of you already know and that Moynihan became aware of especially and demographers know, that particularly by the '70s and '80s and today, this phenomenon of rapid increases in the proportion of births out of

marriage is a phenomenon of virtually all industrialized nations, the one exception being Japan, so I might say all Western industrialized nations. There are a number of nations, for instance, which have a higher percentage of births that are out of wedlock today, for instance in Sweden and various other places, and many that are right in the range of the 41 percent I just mentioned. However, no nation comes close to the simply African American rate in this country, which, as I said, is over 70. So, that's why I got into it.

Now, what was the Moynihan Report? In 1961, Moynihan joined the Kennedy Administration as an assistant to the Secretary of Labor, who was Arthur Goldberg. By 1965, Goldberg had left because Johnson had named him to the Supreme Court and then kicked him into the UN ambassadorship, and Moynihan had become an Assistant Secretary of Labor and head within that office of the so-called Office of Public Policy and Research, which gave him a lot of freedom to study individual problems.

His boss, the Secretary of Labor who replaced Goldberg, was W. Willard Wirtz, whom you probably realize died very recently and lived here in Washington. I interviewed him for my book. Moynihan had a lot of freedom and he sat down, having decided in late 1964 that he really wanted to write a report on the black family, and in the space of three months between January and March, with the assistance of a few staffers and with a lot of reading into the history of the black family as written by people like W.E.B. Dubois, E. Franklin Frazier, Gunnar Myrdal, and a whole range of other people, plus dealing with contemporary activists and writers like Kenneth Clark, whose book *Dark Ghetto* came out in early '65 just as he was writing this and it was about Harlem, and he wrote -- the report was titled, "The Negro Family: The Case for National Action."

As you know, in those times black people were ordinarily described as Negroes just as out of wedlock pregnancy was described as illegitimacy. So, this was a normal terminology, "The Negro Family: The Case for National Action." He finished it in

March 1965 and he had the Labor Department print up from his typescript 100 copies of it, 99 of which were placed in a safe and the other 1 was circulated. The idea was that this report would go only -- I think there were more than one after a while -- it would go only to top officials in the Johnson Administration for which he was then working because Kennedy, of course, had been assassinated in early '65, and the goal was to understand the problems of the lower class black family. He was very clear in making distinctions between lower class black families and upper class black families. And if the term "lower class" offends you and you'd rather have the word "low income," the fact is that many of these families didn't have any income, so lower class, I think, is a better way of describing and that's the way he did it.

So, it's a study of lower class, largely urban, central city, black family structure, historically and up to the present day. It was 78 pages long -- is 78 pages long; 53 of those were the report and the other pages were notes and appendices. There were a whole lot of charts and graphs and tables and boldfaces and capital letters and so forth in the course of this report. It reads easily. It's very well written. There are no mistakes in it. The numbers are good. And it's a remarkable achievement, although that shouldn't surprise us, because we know now from Moynihan's later career, he later on worked for Nixon, Nixon then named him ambassador to India, believe it or not, and Gerald Ford named him as the UN Ambassador. And then he ran for the Senate and had 24 years, four terms, and was replaced by Hillary Clinton in 2001.

But this was an in-house document. It was aimed at top officials in the government. It was diagnostic, not prescriptive. That is to say it gave a lot of statistics to show what was happening. The subtitle was "A Case for National Action," but it was a very short final chapter. It had no specifics in it.

I rather admired Moynihan for this and you in public policy might as well.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

Then and later, he always thought that social science -- he was not a trained social scientist. He had a Ph.D. from the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and he wrote a thesis which was never published on the International Labor Organization. If you showed him a chi-square or correlation coefficient, he would, you know, what's this? This wasn't what he did. But he was very shrewd about -- he was very widely read in philosophy and history and political philosophy and had a good prose style and could bang out things on a typewriter and with very few changes get them published in mass circulation magazines and places like this.

It was a liberal document. Moynihan was a Democrat. He was a great admirer of his fellow Catholic John F. Kennedy, and a loyal supporter, up until that time, of Lyndon Johnson. He had phrases in it about what he called the racist virus in the American bloodstream. And he talked about three centuries of unimaginable mistreatment that had befallen black Americans throughout a history which included his description of slavery and the problems of black families under slavery where marriage was prohibited and men had no control over their wives or over their children, and mothers also often had no control over their children being sold out from them. So the black family was really shattered in many cases by slavery, although there's arguments to the contrary on this which I won't have time to get into today.

The report, therefore, was cool, it was diagnostic, it was unrelenting, it was grim. He talked a lot about what he called the matriarchal family structure, which he was at some pains to say it wasn't any worse than a patriarchal one, but the problem was that we lived in a patriarchal society and the black family system to the extent that it was matriarchal was, therefore, out of sync with the culture. He talked about what he called startling increases in welfare dependency and he showed that these were going up in the early '60s even as, thanks to the good economic situation in the early '60s, black unemployment,

which was three times that of whites, was going down. This was what was called a scissors effect, as you see these trend lines going in opposite directions. He said something other than unemployment is causing increases in welfare dependency, which he took to be a sign of the inability of families to make it on their own.

And he closed by a long chapter, or the penultimate chapter prior to the little one, called "A Case for National Action," by describing this whole situation as a tangle of pathology. Famous phrase. Now, actually, he took this phrase from Kenneth Clark, who was a well-known black psychologist. You may know him also as the man who did the doll studies which resulted in the Supreme Court's -- helped to move particularly Chief Justice Warren in the *Brown v. Board of Education* case, which was a unanimous decision in 1954 and Clark's *Dark Ghetto* written in early '65 had chapter titles about pathology.

Martin Luther King, at the same time, spoke of many black families as being fragile, deprived, and often psychopathic. Whitney Young wrote a book, *To Be Equal*, and was the head of the Urban League in 1964 when he wrote this book, had said the same thing.

Moynihan, however, was a white messenger -- I'll come to that -- and so he was not saying anything that really knowledgeable people didn't know about all of these things, all of his statistics were good, but they were grim, they were unrelenting. And they were not followed by, okay, here's what we should do about it, because he wanted people within the government quietly to talk this out and not come up with some half-baked ideas which wouldn't get through.

Well, that's what the Moynihan Report was. Now, what happened to it? The first thing was good. The first thing was the word ultimately got to Johnson and he asked Moynihan to collaborate with Richard Goodman, the chief speechwriter for the administration, and write a speech for the Howard University commencement here in

Washington, which Johnson then gave on June 2nd, almost 45 years to the day I'm standing here, 1965. This was the famous speech that Johnson referred to as his greatest civil rights speech. Moynihan later said it was his last civil rights speech. Both things are true. I'm just going to read a little bit from it because it's where the title of my book, *Freedom is Not Enough*, comes from.

Johnson started off -- and this is a speech that Moynihan really wrote. I've been in the archives and think that he was the main speechwriter even though if Richard Goodwin were here he would claim he wrote it by himself. He pointed Johnson -- by Moynihan -- Johnson asked him to write this speech because he'd heard about the report. We don't know if he'd actually read it, but presumably he agreed with much of it, and he pointed to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act, which was then going through Congress and which Johnson would sign two months later on August 6th.

And he said, "These are good. They have provided freedom for black people, freedom from segregation, freedom from voting discrimination, but they do not provide freedoms "for." You needed positive freedoms, you needed social equality in addition to civic or legal freedom."

And he said, "Freedom is not enough," that was then being conveyed. "You do not wipe away the scars of centuries by saying now you are free to go where you want, do as you desire, and choose the leaders you please. You do not take a person, who for years has been hobbled by chains" -- famous metaphor here, "hobbled by chains" -- "and liberate him," as in the Civil Rights Act, "bring him up to the starting line of a race and then say, 'You are free to compete with the others,' and still justly believe that you have been completely fair."

I actually was on the Diane Rehm Show this morning and she played that

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

speech back. I had never heard it. It's really quite moving. Johnson spoke very slowly and very effectively. It was not just the crowd of graduates at Howard, 5,000 or so people were there.

So, he says, "It's not just enough to open the gates for opportunity. All our citizens must have the ability to walk through the gates," another key phrase. "This is the next and more profound stage of the battle for civil rights. We seek not just freedom, but opportunity, not just legal equity, but human ability, not just equality as a right and a theory, but equality as a fact and a result."

And Johnson then went on to say that nothing was more important than dealing with the problems of the black family because as Moynihan, who had absorbed a good deal of Catholic social doctrine about the importance of the family and because of his own experience, believed, as I do, that it starts there. And if you don't have a good family situation, your kids are going to grow up and have a whole lot of problems in addition to the poverty which that usually leads to.

So, this was the good part of it. The report got to Johnson, Johnson makes a famous speech. He says we're going to have a White House conference to discuss this issue and we're going to come up with something, and this is the next stage of civil rights. Johnson, in fact, was trying to seize control of the Civil Rights Movement which at that time was becoming frayed. The commitment of many black leaders to nonviolence and to interracial cooperation was being tested as by the Mississippi Freedom Party problems in 1964 and other things, and Johnson wanted to -- being Johnson, he wanted to control this himself. And so this was part a move to make sure the President was in command of a movement which, like a lot of movements, was moving to the left and becoming more radical. So, this was the good side.

Three things, however, really change, and I'll be real quick with this. The

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

first was escalation in Vietnam. Three days after he gave the talk at Howard he got a message from Westmoreland, we've got to escalate. For the next six weeks pretty much all he does instead of working on developing this White House conference for civil rights. He's closeted with his advisors and July 28th he announces the escalation that many had been predicting. This leads to, over time and to some extent in 1965, to cracks in his until then seemingly unassailable liberal coalition.

Do you all remember what a year 1965 was? That's my next book; it's going to be on 1965, so I'll tell you. This was the year in which Johnson, having swept to a record victory over Goldwater, gets passed not only a Voting Rights Bill, but Medicare, Medicaid, National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities, immigration reform, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which was the keystone to his already existing war on poverty, increases in spending for the war on poverty, the legislation establishing HUD -- Housing and Urban Development -- cabinet position, and on and on and on. He seemed invincible. He begins the escalation; the cracks appear in the coalition.

The second thing was the Watts Riot, of the three, the most important. This broke out on August 11th, 5 days after he signed the Voting Rights Act; lasted for 5 days and nights; 34 people were killed, all but 5 of them black. The National Guard had to be called in, it went on day and night, it was on television, and it dramatically changed the image that many American white people had of civil rights protestors. These were not the Christ-like, long-suffering, abused, segregated Southerners that had been at the center of the movement, most recently in the Selma March of that year. These were angry young black people prone to violence, looting, and burning. People started to say, hey, wait just a minute here. What's going on?

It also had a real effect upon Johnson. He was absolutely blown away by

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

this riot. He was down at his ranch. He kept saying, "How could they do this to me? I've given them all these things. Could FDR do any better?" FDR was his idol. No, he couldn't. How is this? And it was a long time before he could even bring himself to act on the issue to send in troops. And the other thing was it turned the leadership of the more militant groups into civil rights organizations, notably CORE and SNCC, more rapidly away from the interracialism that they were moving away from already and more rapidly away from a commitment to nonviolence. And the civil rights leaders are rushing, in effect, to catch up with the riots in Watts and are increasingly militant, increasingly demanding, and unhappy with the fact that Johnson, having promised a White House conference isn't really doing anything. Instead he's escalating the war in Vietnam.

The third thing that happens is the report is leaked. Did I tell you that it didn't have his name on it? It was just called "The Negro Family: The Case for National Action," and the bottom of it said: Published by the Labor Department, the Research and Planning Division of the Labor Department. His name wasn't on it. And it was not known as the Moynihan Report; it was titled "The Negro Family: A Case for National Action."

Leaks start coming out. Who leaked it? Maybe Moynihan, maybe not, no one knows. Some of the leaks were accurate, some were inaccurate, but by late August it was known as the Moynihan Report and Moynihan, of course, became a household name.

Now, what was the reaction to it? It was very negative from the people who mattered, that is to say, the militant civil rights leadership, black as well as white, because what they saw in this report was an unrelentingly cool and diagnostic savaging of their family situation, which they didn't want to hear about even if some of them thought it might be true. In fact, some of the people who denounced Moynihan for this report in the next few months were people like James Farmer, for instance, head of CORE, who had earlier spoken out about problems with the black family, as had Martin Luther King as I mentioned.

King, by the way, was not one that savaged the report. He kept quiet about it for the most part. Farmer, nonetheless, in December writes this, "We are sick unto death," in a critique of the Moynihan report, "sick unto death of being analyzed, mesmerized, bought, sold, and slobbered over while the same evils that are the ingredients of our oppression go untouched."

So, you get this escalating anger about the leaks to the Moynihan Report, which, by the way, as of September, is available as now reprinted by the Government Printing Office and sold -- you'll be interested in this -- for 45 cents. However, (inaudible) to ask for it.

So, most people never actually read the Moynihan Report. They read about it in *Newsweek*, which was one of the first to break, and various other places, in a famous column by Evans and Novak which appeared in August.

Johnson, concentrating on Vietnam, obsessed with it, preoccupied, angry at Moynihan anyway because Moynihan had supported Bobby Kennedy for a race in New York City for senator in 1964, basically washed his hands of it. Having given the speech at Howard, he focuses on foreign relations and he decides he's not going to go ahead with any of these things that he talked about. He has to go ahead with the White House conference because he said he did, but he downgrades it to a planning conference in late '65 and nothing comes of it. And the full-dress one, which took place at the Sheridan Park -- the first one took place at the Hilton -- accomplished absolutely nothing.

Moynihan later wrote that this was a moment lost. We can maybe talk about this. If something had been done about the Moynihan Report in 1965 or in a year or two, if all these other things hadn't happened -- even historians like to play with what-if -- would the situation today be any better? Or would it be different in ways from what it is today? Moynihan thought this was a moment lost and it was certainly the moment when the

report was deep-sixed and for the next 20 years at least, almost no liberal person like Moynihan, white person, dared to come out and say what Moynihan had said, lest he be tarred with the same brush as he was. This was a really difficult time for Moynihan and his family, too, because he was regarded as a racist by many people and he was regarded as having blamed the victim. And one of his major tormentors, a guy named William Ryan, he was a white guy, ultimately wrote a book with that name, *Blaming the Victim*, and it was originally an article which appeared in late 1965.

Starting in the '80s, because the numbers were so horrendous, you begin to get some black people and some white people speaking out. *The Cosby Show* was influential in this regard, showing what black people -- that they're not all like this. A sociologist, William Julius Wilson wrote a book, *The Truly Disadvantaged*, in which he praised the Moynihan Report and Moynihan, in fact, blurbed it. They were friends. Orlando Patterson -- I've interviewed all these people -- was also another person, a brilliant sociologist, also at Harvard, who from the beginning was a supporter of Moynihan; Benjamin Hooks, the head of the NAACP at that time; Glenn Lowry who's now a colleague of mine at the Economics Department at Brown, who was then a self-styled black conservative, he is no longer. There were some voices, black voices speaking out, defending the Moynihan Report and saying it wasn't racist and this a real problem and blacks should acknowledge and do something about it, but it was still a risky thing to do.

And now more recently, hence my subtitle, Bill Cosby has come out, made a famous speech here at Constitution Hall on the 50th anniversary of *Brown v. Board* in 2004. He wrote a book later on with Alvin Poussaint, a civil rights worker, called *Come On, People*. Obama, in his *Audacity of Hope* in 2006, before anybody ever heard of him, take a look at the book. There's a couple of passages in there in which he praises Moynihan and says he got it right and we should do something. And he's said things along those lines,

also, as you know, in Chicago during his campaign in 2008 and at the 100th anniversary of the NAACP last year. But he hasn't had the time and there have been so many other concerns, so he really hasn't acted on it and he hasn't specified exactly what he would do except better education.

Meanwhile, of course, while there's no dialogue about this to speak of, no serious discussion of the report, no serious discussion of the problem, the statistics are getting worse and worse and worse as I've suggested earlier.

Now, finally and last, I'll be really quick because I'm not a policy person, what should we do now?

Well, since writing my book I've read a number of good books, including one by Amy Wax, *Race, Wrongs, and Remedies: Group Justice in the 20th Century.*" Amy Wax, which, had I read it before, would have changed my conclusion somewhat, and it's, I think, a very, very excellent book which goes through a whole range of policies which have been suggested or, in various ways, tried to deal with these problems of family life and these statistics that I mention, and shows how flawed and how unworkable they all are.

You see, what we're dealing with here is not just a problem of unemployment, as problematic as that is, as we know today, we're dealing with a Western-wide, advanced nations decline of marriage, so that vastly larger numbers of people feel no stigma and no difficulty in having children out of wedlock, of cohabiting, of divorcing, of broken families. And the situation is particularly grim in the statistics, as I mentioned, about out of wedlock pregnancy and the feminization of poverty, which is a major source of the growing inequality of our culture over the past 30 years, just that, just the fact of these fatherless families.

So, where I come down on this is if there's any hope it would be to really engage in vastly intrusive interventions into the lives and educations and families of very,

very young preschool children, because you cannot stop people from having children, you cannot stop people from divorcing. These are things government can't really do. Sex education really hasn't done it, the Pill hasn't done it. Something like 50 percent of all pregnancies in this country are unwanted. I mean, I could go on with a lot of statistics. And so I don't have it -- unfortunately, it's not a book with a hopeful answer. It's not a book that says if we had listened to Moynihan, who had all the answers, we wouldn't be here today. I wish it were, but Moynihan, as I say, did not have the answers in 1965. He wanted to study them, and the report was squelched and no study was made. And the thing got worse and worse and worse, and here we are today in this very discouraging situation.

I mention at the end of my book things such as KIP, the Knowledge is Power program, the Harlem Children's Zone, and, of course, there's an immense amount of local effort on the part of people. You can see it in any city like this, in black neighborhoods where there are centers for this or that, and efforts to do this and that, but it's not turning the situation around.

And so I leave you on that pessimistic note. Thank you. (Applause)

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very, very much. One of the reasons I very much wanted to have this discussion here at Brookings is that a book on this subject might also be called "The Tragedy of Social Policy," because when you go back and look at what Moynihan was trying to do, many of the things he was out to do were things that progressives actually want to do. He was particularly interested in -- although employment was not the only issue, Moynihan was a passionate believer in full employment. And there were -- I think that the opportunity we lost that Professor Patterson referred to, in those couple years after the passage of the Civil Rights Bills, is enormous.

We are very blessed today to have two very distinguished journalists, my colleagues, to respond to Professor Patterson. I have to say, when you set up events, one

of the most wonderful things is when people eagerly want the opportunity to do this, they eagerly and kindly say, yes, I will do that. And I want to thank Clarence Page and Ross Douthat for doing that.

Clarence is a 1989 Pulitzer Prize winner for commentary -- not the magazine. He is a syndicated columnist with the Tribune Media Services, a member of the Chicago Tribune's editorial board, he is, as many of you know, a regular contributor of essays to the *NewsHour*. He's been on every television show known to humankind except I haven't seen you on the Food Channel, but I may have missed it.

MR. PAGE: I'm working on it.

MR. DIONNE: Yes. McLaughlin, Chris Matthews, *Countdown*, *Nightline*, BET's lead story. One of my favorite facts about Clarence is he began as a reporter when he was 17 years old. He won awards -- award for community service for an investigative series called "The Black Tax." I'd love to know what that was about, but one of my favorites is that when he was a reporter and assistant city editor for the *Chicago Tribune*, he participated in another Pulitzer Prize winning activity: its 1972 task force series on vote fraud. And, of course, some of us think that covering vote fraud in Chicago would be like covering the weather, so it's really quite a wonderful thing.

He worked for the *Middletown Journal*, the *Cincinnati Enquirer*. He's got a slew of honorary degrees. He is married, has a son, and lives in the suburbs of Washington.

Ross Douthat, for those of us who are older, is impossibly young. That's only because we're jealous of you for being so young. He is -- he joined the *New York Times* as an op-ed columnist in April 2009. He was the senior editor at *The Atlantic*, a blogger for theatlantic.com. He is already the author of two books, *Privilege: Harvard and the Education of the Ruling Class*. It always made me hope that Ross was some kind of Marxist when, in fact, he's a conservative, and co-author of what I think is a very important

book with Reihan Salam, *Grand New Party: How Republicans Can Win the Working Class and Save the American Dream*. He is a film critic for *National Review*, a native of New Haven, and he now lives in Washington.

I invite Clarence and Ross up. Clarence, you can reply first, Ross afterward. I'm going to ask a couple of questions and then open it up to the audience. Thank you.

MR. PAGE: And thank you, E.J. There's no question as to why we would say yes, not only because you're so lovable, but also because we admire and respect Daniel Patrick Moynihan and this debate that he started lo those many years ago.

I'm delighted to hear you're working on a book on 1965, Professor Patterson. Have you read *The Class of '65*?

DR. PATTERSON: I have.

MR. PAGE: Good. Good. That was a book -- for the sake of you young people -- a book done, what, about 20 years ago now it's been, about the class of '65, which I happen to belong to. And for those of you fellow boomers out there, you can appreciate what a year that was, not only the events that you mentioned, but also Malcolm X was assassinated at that time, the immigration bill, which was way underreported considering the consequences of what has come about since then, which is a subject for another seminar here, actually. But I was also at that time; I had just become Negro and was on my way to black. (Laughter)

So, as you talk about Negro in America, et cetera, I started out colored, and my very first -- those of you who have read my book, now long past paperback into out of print, but heading towards resurrection, hope --

MR. DIONNE: It's a cool title. It's a great title.

MR. PAGE: *Showing My Color: Impolite Essays on Race and Identity*, way

ahead of my time, but back in my yout, as we say in Chicago, in my youth, when I was about seven years old visiting what my family calls "the old country" and you all know as Alabama, I had my first encounter with segregation. I was in a 5-and-10 cent store -- and by the way, 45 cents was good money in those days, by the way, professor. I mean, I could go -- I reminisce about you could go see a first run movie for 25 cents back in my home town. But anyway, I was in a 5-and-10 cent store, I had turned to my parents and said, I need to go get a drink of water, and before they could say anything I disappeared into the racks. And a couple minutes later my mother says to dad, you better go find him, and dad found me at these two water fountains, one marked white and one marked colored. And there I was at the colored fountain turning the water on and off very disappointed that it was clear. It was like back up in Ohio.

So, that was the first day I heard the word. I asked my dad, why they got two water fountains? That was the first day I heard about segregation.

Now, I fast forward to 1969, when I was coming -- you talk about militant voices responding to Moynihan, I always chuckle at the word "militant" because that was a term of art in the media in those days for any person of color, and by the way, we are now "of color." I mean, I've gone from colored person to being a person of color. Who says we haven't made progress?

In any case -- I passed right through African American.

DR. PATTERSON: It's very confusing for us, you know?

MR. PAGE: I know, but that's the whole point. That's the whole point. If you can't own what you call yourself, what can you own? So, whenever things start getting, you know, dull, or thinking I'm making progress, we change what we call ourselves just to keep white folks on their toes.

In any case, I was, at that time, I was coming out of journalism school.

You've got to remember -- I'm trying to put Moynihan in context now as to why black folks reacted the way they did, because if anything was rare in the media it was people of color, until an Affirmative Action program called urban riots. Watts. *LA Times* didn't have any black reporters until Watts. Where did they find a black reporter? In the classified ad department. They said, hey, can you write? Yeah, would I be here if I couldn't? Hey, we got an idea. They sent him across town with a dime for what was called a pay phone, for you young people -- before cells -- a pay phone. They said, go over there, take some notes, and call us in. And so they had a black reporter from that day on.

Years later they made a made-for-TV movie out of him. My newspaper didn't have any reporters yet in the newsroom. We had one in the Gary, Indiana, bureau because the editor at that time -- true story -- felt like, well, if we're going to have one we better start him out in Gary before we bring him in the main newsroom. Anyway, four years later, they want to hire another one -- three years later, they hired Joe Boyce, who was a former Chicago cop, good family man, now they're looking at scouring the campuses and they found me. And you've got to understand, I had a lot more hair in those days, muttonchops sideburns, John Lennon glasses, dashiki, peace medallion, ankh chain, bellbottom jeans, combat boots, Vietnam jungle boots, propensity to salute people like this -- not exactly *Tribune* corporate style.

One of the aids to the editor said, I've got an idea, let's go ask Joe -- Joe Boyce, the former Chicago cop, now in the newsroom. So, the gray suits came down, they found Joe, said, hey, Joe, we interviewed this fellow, Clarence Page from Ohio U. Did you happen to talk to him? Say, yeah, I met him. They said, well, we were wondering about giving him an offer, but we think he might be a little militant for the *Tribune*. Joe, former Chicago cop -- this is, what, like a year after the summer of '68, right before the Days of Rage with Bill Ayers, et cetera, et cetera -- says, well, you know, it might do this newsroom

some good to have a few militants around here.

So, they gave me a job offer the next day, and I'm happy to say, I went down to Brooks Brothers to buy a suit and meet them halfway.

This was the context that Moynihan came along saying it's all because of your grandpappy and grandmammy that got you in your condition. You can see why this was greeted with the mixed reaction with which it was greeted. But I'm a fan of Moynihan. I think that he did raise points, obviously, and Professor Patterson has written an excellent book, a book -- I think we need to revive this dialogue in a healthy way. It has not been healthy, and that's what I want to talk about.

Let me say first of all, Moynihan wrote a case not so much for action as for a national study that could lead to action. His quest for remedies continues long after his death. We have, unfortunately, gotten mired in what my friend E.J. in a previous book would have called "a false debate," a false debate about whether or not families are a good thing. I mean, this is ridiculous. Of course families are a good thing. That's not the issue. The real issue is poverty; the real issue is saving our children. How do we do that? Well, Moynihan saw through the lens of the family, and, understandably, I think Professor Patterson's on to something when he talks about Moynihan's own background: his catholic upbringing, his own personal experience, being raised by a single mom after age 10. That's just my personal theory.

I had the good fortune of crossing paths with Senator/Professor/Ambassador Moynihan before he died, Renaissance man that he was. I was in awe of the man from college just because he was -- the force of his intellect crossed party lines. The notion that he was a fascist, racist right winger, et cetera, was ridiculous. His ideas lead to so many important what we now call neo-conservative reforms, like the Earned Income Tax Credit and other ideas. He was advocating years ago for a negative

income tax. He was advocating for so many ideas.

Well, Teddy Kennedy -- you know, Nixon's health plan -- well, I won't go way off the track on that, but let me say that back in 2000, I'll never forget it, it was 2001, the day of the Inauguration, I was over at the Reagan Building at the Wilson Institute for a presentation our colleague George Will was giving. Moynihan was in the audience there and we got to talking and we walked out and he toured me around through that building over there and chortled as he explained how he always wanted to help the Wilson Center to have a home and the Newt Gingrich's Republicans were in charge over at Capitol Hill. How can I get funding for this? I know: I'll name it after Ronald Reagan. So, another legacy to the man's genius.

In any case, I was rather in awe, trying to conceal my awe, because he was being so nice showing me around. And we were talking and we got to talking about a new speech he was working on in regard to marriage rates in Europe and the West, particularly Scandinavia. And the numbers he was telling me were really quite surprising at the time because there's all this talk about black marriage rates and here in some parts of Scandinavia out of wedlock birth rates were over 50 percent and yet they weren't living in poverty. Why? Because they had very strong social safety nets.

So, what is the connection? Moynihan himself was at the time almost befuddled. He'd just gotten back from India. He was telling me at length about men in Calcutta living in dire, deep poverty, but who were sacrificing, begging, borrowing, filching -- long-term borrowing -- to get a dowry together so their daughters could get married. And he said, here is this deep commitment of these people living in such poverty, but they go out of their way to be able to afford marriage for their kids. While Scandinavia, marriage, well, you know, we'll get around to it. This was something he was really -- I'm reminded by David Brooks had a column yesterday about the big shaggy, which is that area of human behavior

that isn't easily explained by our conventional methods. This was where Moynihan was really digging down deep trying to figure this out and why this was happening. And I felt so doubly sad when he was taken from us because I think he was on the verge of getting at some really eye-opening research in this area.

But it shocks my own old-fashioned social conservatism, Baptist-based, moral sensibilities, but if we really want to be honest about the importance of marriage, we need to ask not only why some parents are not bothering with marriage, but also why so many other parents do. My own son who provides me with endless amounts of column material, a few years ago when he was in high school, he was in the back seat while mom and dad were in the front, on one of those rare occasions when kids actually talk to their parents, they have no choice, and he mentioned something about how he didn't see why he should ever have to get married. I almost stopped the car, you know, and this gave me an opportunity to score points with my wife by lecturing to our son about the importance of marriage and how -- and he said, well, why? It's just symbolic, blah, blah, blah. And I said, yeah, it's symbolic, but you know, kid, you've never been in love before. When you're in love with somebody, somebody who you know you're in love because you want to be with this person all the time, you want to be with them the rest of your life, then you want every kind of chain or attachment or whatever bond that you can build, whether it's symbolic or not. Oh, I was so proud of myself.

Did I have any impact on the kid? I don't know, but I said, I'll tell you one thing, have girlfriends, whatever else, but don't you ever have a baby unless you really want to spend the rest of your life with that person because that's what it's all about. I was just really proud. But I don't know if it did any good. If it did -- if I did know, then I could bottle this and we could just distribute it to everybody, couldn't we?

How much of a difference does marriage make? I've been thinking about it

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

ever since. What convincing argument can I give to people who don't think it's that important? What social supports work to help children not only in spite of unmarried parents, but at the expense of marriage itself? This is what a good friend of mine from Finland, she's got four siblings. She told me all four of them are married but her, which is an endless issue at family reunions -- oh, I'm sorry, I said that wrong -- all four of them have children but her. Only one of them is married, but it doesn't matter as far as they're concerned. They're raising the children as good kind of traditional families, they just don't happen to be married.

This is something that's been brought up by some social scientists here in the U.S. about what do we do with those folks who are living in role of spouse, living in -- you know, doing the role of parents, but they aren't legally married.

And, you know, like Moynihan, I'm good at raising questions, I don't have all the answers. But how might our government incentives turn that around? You had a good call on Diane Rehm's show this morning about the policy that would kick out nonnuclear families from public housing or take them off of public assistance if you had a man living in the household, a father living in the household. That was not allowed. This is the sort of thing -- that's public policy that works against marriage. We can certainly do something about that.

Moynihan was only beginning to probe those questions. I think exalting the role of traditional families as a predictor of socioeconomic success may overestimate its impact as a cause and underestimate other factors of which traditional families or out of wedlock births are an effect, a consequence, not a cause of socioeconomic success.

I would submit it's not even clear that the breakdown of the family is the central problem or whether it's just one of a constellation of other problems that poverty creates and makes into a problem. After all, black out of wedlock births skyrocketed during

the same period that the black poverty rate dropped by half to about 25 percent from a 1965 rate of more than 50 percent. Lower income people have more children out of wedlock. This is known around the world. And there's no question single moms overall predict poverty, but they don't always predict poverty. So do the lack of jobs, so do the lack of marriageable men, as William Julius Wilson put it so well. And this is what I run into all the time with my conservative friends, colleagues, critics, and e-mail writers. Okay, black folks need to get married, where are you going to find the daddies?

Ross' wonderful newspaper a few days ago, Sam Roberts had a piece, the headline, "Black Women See Fewer Black Men at the Altar." It talks about black women, some of them marrying outside their race, some of them not marrying at all, there just aren't enough black men around, which is another -- excuse me, marriageable black men. I've known William Julius Wilson since his days at the University of Chicago before he had decided to do Harvard a favor and go over there, and this has been something that he has been dealing with. And he took some of the heat off Moynihan in 1977 with his book, *The Declining Significance of Race*, because -- '77 or '78 -- because he -- it was also politically incorrect to say that race wasn't the center of the black universe.

Those days are changing and they need to. What can be done? Handier sex education and contraception is one interesting area to look into. There's evidence that black teen pregnancy declined in the 1990s because of multiple reasons. The Guttmacher Institute, respected by both sides of the abortion debate, hasn't concluded exactly why except they said everything seems to have had an impact; in other words, fear of AIDS; the popularity of Depo-Provera, especially among black teenage girls; fear of STDs in general; something of a -- well, also sex education, both sex education with abstinence education or without it. It all seems to have had a positive impact. More study needs to be done.

I think we also may need a social revolution. Bill Cosby did a great step

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

forward in that area of getting people to talk about it. The black pundit class was not unified in its support, shall we say, to put it mildly, but people on the street -- I've been following Cosby for several years now and have talked to him several times and been to some of his shout outs, whatever he calls them, they're kind of like teach-ins, and folks out of neighborhoods, communities, churches, et cetera, they come out and respond very positively.

I'm encouraged by Beyonce and her song, "All the Single Ladies" because the refrain of this song is, "if you want to put a ring on it," you know, that has an impact, ladies and gentlemen. Those of us who have seen over the years, if you really want to have social change, music is both a measure of social change; it also helps to push social change forward. One song ain't going do it, but I'm always happy there's still kind of positive messages coming out in terms of the value of marriage.

LBJ and Moynihan argued for the provisions of jobs, jobs programs, vocational training, educational programs for the black community. I could see it, Scandinavia. One Clayborne Carson, a Dr. King scholar, once said that black Americans are funny. We have the home morality of Southern conservatives, but we vote like Swedish social democrats. And this is true. If we did have those kind of safety net programs would we be like the Swedes, would we be like Scandinavians? Would we still have a high out of wedlock birthrate? I suspect it's possible, but maybe we would at least have better households, more stable households, for our kids to be raised in.

Finally, KIP Academy, Harlem's Children Zone, I cannot say anything but positive things about that. We need more of it. The only problem is replicating it -- it's not a problem it's a challenge. Replicate. Harlem Children's Zone, they start before the kids are born. As soon as they hear that you are pregnant, they'll be at your doorstep and the community adopts the kid and they find the daddy if they need to, or usually the daddy's still

around at that point and there's some interest in being a good dad, and Harlem Children's Zone provides them with the support to stay together, the counseling of marriage, household, child rearing, et cetera. It is a wonderful idea and people of both parties love it.

Where's the action? That's the question. Barack Obama loved it during the campaign, Bill Clinton loved it, George W. Bush loves the Harlem Children's Zone. It's a terrific program. But, you know, what really disturbs me is that Moynihan's report has become an excuse for national inaction. It has become something that's thrown up in my face or other people's face when we talk about some kind of real government role. Big government is the enemy now and there's this sense that government can't do anything good. But I believe, and polls back this up, that the American people like government that works, that they think works. That's why Social Security is the third rail issue, Medicare, Medicaid. Most of Medicaid goes to pay for the parents of the middle class in nursing homes. This is the side of the issue you won't hear at the Tea Party rallies. And I think that in that sense Moynihan has opened up a very positive issue for debate and discussion and, as the old saying goes, when white America gets a cold, black America gets pneumonia. If we can deal with these problems in the low-income African-American community it will raise the status of everybody else.

And thank you very much for your patience. (Applause)

MR. DIONNE: I want to thank Clarence for many reasons, but two in particular. One is I'll be able to go home and tell my kids that I organized the first Brookings event ever where Beyonce was mentioned.

MR. PAGE: There you go.

MR. DIONNE: And he also gave me a great idea. I want to form an organization, a political organization, of people with the home behavior of social conservatives who vote like Swedish social democrats. There are millions of us. So, thank

you.

Ross, welcome.

MR. DOUTHAT: Well, thank you, E.J. Thanks to Brookings so much for having me. Thanks to the other panelists. I have no personal Daniel Patrick Moynihan stories, so I thought I'd get up here and attempt to imitate Beyonce's dance from the music video, and if E.J. will join me, I think we can --

MR. DIONNE: No, that I couldn't tell my kids about. (Laughter)

MR. DOUTHAT: That you couldn't tell your kids. Fair enough, the next panel, we'll do some training.

I think this book has been published -- and it's a wonderful book and Professor Patterson is to be congratulated on it -- but I think it's been published at a very interesting moment, which is really a moment that's probably lasted a decade or so, but a kind of hinge moment in how we talk about the problems that Daniel Patrick Moynihan first identified. And I think the hinge moment was suggested by the professor's remark that what we're talking about when we talk about the tangle of pathology that Moynihan looked at is less a crisis of the black family and more a crisis of the family. And I think part of the tragedy that's woven into this story is the extent to which the crisis of the family became entangled in America's endless debate about race relations and it became, you know, the kind of polarization that the book discusses where to talk about these family issues was to be perceived, for understandable reasons, as blaming the victim, as attacking the poor, and so on, is a reflection of the fact that the crisis of marriage, the crisis of the family began in the black community and began in a place where the conversation is always laced and interwoven with the legacy of slavery and the legacy of segregation.

But I think if we look at the situation in America today, it's clear that this is a case where black America was a kind of canary in the coal mine for the rest of society. And

I think the statistics the professor brought up, I think the most startling statistic -- and it's not startling if you follow the debates, but it certainly would have been startling in the 1960s -- is the statistics surrounding out of wedlock birth rates in the Hispanic community. Because there you have a portion of the American population that has all of the endless debates about, you know, is it the legacy of slavery? Is it the impact of slavery on the black family? You know, is it the emasculation of black men in the 1840s and 1850s South? And so on. That whole debate applies not at all to the experience of Hispanic Americans. And yet we've reached a point in the United States where 50 percent of Hispanic births are out of wedlock, and it's not at the same levels that it is in black America, but it's rising to meet them. And, in fact, I believe that over the past 10 or 15 years, if you look at out of wedlock birth rates in the black community, what you see is actually the out of wedlock birth rate, the raw numbers of out of wedlock births as a proportion of the population, has -- I'm going to mangle the statistic a little -- but it's actually dropped. And the reason the out of wedlock birthrate remains so high overall in the black community is that married black men and women are having fewer children. It's no longer that unmarried black couples are having more.

So, I think we've reached a point where the problems that Moynihan identified in African-American life have at least plateaued, if not started to diminish slightly. But what we're seeing among Hispanics and then among working class and poor whites, is exactly the same trend just 10, 15 years behind where -- or 25 to 30 years behind where the black family was.

So, starting from that premise, from the crisis of the family, the crisis of family structure in the United States and indeed in the Western world in general, I'm just going to talk very quickly about -- well, I had sort of framed this as what we won't do about it, what we can do about it, and what we won't do about it, but should.

So, I'll start with what we won't do about it. And what we won't do about it

is what, I think, Daniel Patrick Moynihan would have had us do, which is essentially spend more government money directly overall on direct anti-poverty programs aimed at poor and working class families. And we won't do it for reasons that Professor Patterson brings up in the book, reasons that are familiar to all of you having to do with the budgetary crunch facing not only the United States, but every Western nation, and, frankly, the overall crisis of the Western welfare state. And, you know, within that ongoing crisis there is room, I think, for on the margins more spending here, less spending there, and so on, and there's room for shifting money around in certain ways and in certain places. But overall, I think the idea of a large-scale expansion of government spending a large-scale direct anti-poverty campaign really died with the financial crisis. And it's true that, you know, there are ways that we can raise taxes. There are all kinds of ways that we can raise taxes. But even if we raise taxes in all the ways that E.J., in all his infinite wisdom, might have us raise them, we would be raising them in order to pay for the programs that already exist, not to fund new programs. So, that's one reason we won't do it.

The other reason we won't do it is that, you know, many of the things that -- I think liberals tend to regard this mid-1960s moment as a lost opportunity, and in certain ways it was. It was a lost opportunity for American public spending on anti-poverty programs to rise to Scandinavian levels, but it wasn't a lost opportunity in the sense that an awful lot of money was spent and an awful lot of programs were created. And I think that there is a strong sense, and, I think, a not unreasonable sense among the American population that while Daniel Patrick Moynihan's Family Assistance Plan didn't happen, enough things happened to give us a sense of the ability of direct government spending to ameliorate and to -- well, in Moynihan's phrase, to "change a culture and save it from itself." And I think if you look at the combination -- you know, America's sort of direct family assistance is much more patchwork and haphazard than a direct family assistance plan

would have been. But when you combine the Child Tax Credit with the Earned Income Tax Credit, you know, with TANF, you know, even post-welfare reform, there are still welfare programs, and so on, you do have something like -- albeit on a smaller scale -- what Moynihan would have championed and did champion. And I think it is difficult, you know, after decades and decades of the existence of those programs, for liberal politicians and activists to persuade people that the answer is simply further direct spending in that direction.

So, that's what I think we won't do. What I think plausibly could happen surrounding this set of issues is a kind of bipartisan supply side -- not supply side tax cuts, but supply side effort aimed particularly at low-income America and aimed particularly at, you know, we talked before about the pool of marriageable men in low-income communities being an enormous part of this problem. And I think you can imagine, and, you know, both of these goals face enormous, enormous hurdles, but I think you can imagine, from the left with some support on the right, a push for prison reform and the reform of the nation's drug laws; and then from the right with support from the neo-liberal left, a greater push for school choice, charter schools, and so forth, acting as a kind of pincer movement on entrenched poverty and on this question of the fact that in low-income communities, you know, huge proportions of the men are likely to be in jail and, at the same time, huge swaths of the school systems just don't work at all.

And I see -- again, in both cases you're dealing with entrenched interests. You're dealing with the resistance of education bureaucracies and the teachers unions on the one side, and you're dealing with the resistance, really, of voters and politicians who the issue of prison reform, drug reform, and crime, and so on, is such an easily demagogue-able issue that in that case you have to have some kind of political support and cover from Republicans to get anything done. But I do think that's possible. I sat at a meeting just up

the street at AEI a few months ago put together by Newt Gingrich on prison reform and drug law reform, and, you know, I mean, it exists. It exists in the community of conservative wonks and it exists in some areas, especially in the more evangelical areas, of the Republican Party. You have figures like Sam Brownback and so on, who are invested in some of these issues. And I think it's certainly more promising now especially since crime has continued to go down, even in the midst -- or especially in the midst of the current recession. I think it's possible to imagine a politics that looks hard at some of the things we do wrong in terms of mass incarceration and our drug laws.

So, that's, I think, the most promising direct policy avenue and some of the things that were talked about with, you know, KIP schools in Harlem, I think fit reasonably well into that.

Finally, I think there's what we probably won't do, but maybe should is in -- especially, I think, in the professor's remarks, the word "illegitimacy" was used and it was used apologetically and I think that that points to what is, in a sense, the deepest problem underlying all of this, which is that Americans have become much more allergic in public policy over the past 40 years than we would have been even, or especially in the great liberal moments of the 1930s and '40s. And we've become allergic -- and I was very heartened, actually, to hear Clarence talk about the idea of kicking nonnuclear families out of public housing, because these are the kind of things that I think, in many cases, are kind of unimaginable in American politics and I think will remain unimaginable probably for the duration of my lifetime, but it's not necessarily clear to me that they should be unimaginable.

I think it's in a sense very odd that we now live in a society where it's possible to say that the way to solve entrenched poverty and to deal with the tragic intersection of family breakdown and child poverty is to set up school systems that essentially take kids at the earliest possible age from their families and create a kind of

intense, overwhelming surrogate community, that that's okay. But it's not okay to say that, you know, no-fault divorce, maybe it hasn't worked out that well.

So, I think that that's the kind of issue that I think should be raised more often in these debates, that we are unwilling to say -- we're willing to take extraordinary measures for the kids, but we're unwilling to sometimes just say no directly to adults or to essentially talk about stigma in some of these issues. And, you know, there's a good reason for this, right? I mean, stigma is a terrible thing that destroys the lives of people who accidentally make one mistake and they're stuck being stigmatized for the rest of their lives. And I in my own life and -- I mean, I think Clarence talks about his son, right. I don't have a son yet, but maybe someday I will. And, you know, I hopefully will tell my son that if he has a kid he should be married and so on, but let's say my son has a kid out of wedlock. Am I not going to invite him to Thanksgiving dinner? You know, am I going to banish him from the family circle? That's something that was much more common in the America of 60 or 70 years ago than it is today, and it's less common now in part because we can afford it in a way.

I think one of the interesting things about this debate about the American family is that it's -- you know, there's the specific problem of the underclass and poverty and marriage, and that problem is a tragedy, but then there's the broader problem of marriage in American society where the lack of -- the high rate of out of wedlock births, the high divorce rate and so on, they're driving wage stagnation, it drives stratification, it drives inequality, but they're more manageable tragedies in a way because we are such a rich society. And I think because of that, you know, stigma emerges from necessity in a way. It tends to emerge from harsher circumstances and it may be that we simply can't imagine returning to older levels of moralism on these questions as long as the crisis doesn't appear that dire. And, you know, I mean, this I perhaps -- not perhaps, this is a good thing. It's a good thing

that we're a rich society and so on, but I think that that's -- there are choices that we could make both legally and as a society that would confront this problem directly, and that I think we aren't quite willing to make and will probably remain unwilling to make.

So, on that note, no -- and I will make one point about Scandinavia. This is -- what's interesting about Scandinavia, and it's not clear what lessons it has for the American experience, but what happens in Scandinavia is that people have kids outside of wedlock, but then live with their partner. Scandinavia has amazingly high rates of extra marital or non-marital monogamy.

MR. DIONNE: Do you favor that?

MR. DOUTHAT: I am -- as a Roman Catholic, I'm personally against it, but I do think that it is -- you know, if you can get to a situation, I mean, from a social policy perspective, the point of marriage is monogamy, right? I mean, the reason that we in theory favor marriage rates is monogamy. If you lived in a society that was Scandinavian in its habits, the crisis of marriage would be less of a crisis, but for whatever reason, cultural or otherwise, in American life it doesn't work that way. In American life marriage tends to be the glue that binds couples together and when it's absent, so too is monogamy, cohabitation, and so on.

But I think it's like in Scandinavia, in spite of the low marriage rate, like a huge percentage of kids live with both biological parents up to the age of 15 or something. So, anyway, the quirks of Scandinavia.

On that note, let's --

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. I just want to say I had never thought I would hear Ross recite the classic line of the liberal Catholic politician whom he has criticized, I'm personally against it, but -- and secondly, you may have noticed something. One of the reasons I've always admired Ross is that he actually uses -- he's got a hidden

agenda which he shouldn't admit to, which is to use socially conservative arguments to make conservatives more liberal in caring a lot more about poverty than they do.

I want to ask two questions. I want to invite my fellow columnists to ask any questions they want, and then I want to open it up to the audience and they are sort of the yin and the yang in the Moynihan case from your book.

The first question is, to me, one of the paradoxes of the Moynihan Report is that it was designed to create action that would largely have moved in a liberal policy direction, and that while Moynihan himself in the report, as you noted, did not include a lot of policy recommendations, his whole fight all along during the war on poverty was in favor of programs that highlighted employment, particularly for low-income people. One quotation from Moynihan that you cite, "The fundamental overwhelming fact is that negro unemployment, except for a few years during World War II and the Korean War, has continued at disaster levels for 35 years."

DR. PATTERSON: That was in italics in the report.

MR. DIONNE: Yes. Could you talk about Moynihan's argument for employment and how he linked it with this family argument?

DR. PATTERSON: Yeah, I think various of the -- particularly Ross has made clear what he had in mind, that if a young black man can have stable living wage employment, which he would have supplied through large-scale government programs like the WPA, he would have also accompanied this with European-style family alliances, but this was never on the plate of most American policymakers. Whereas we did have experience with the WPA, that then these men would become stably employed, they might develop certain skills over time, they would be marriageable in the eyes of the women, and the women would marry them and you would have more stable unions. This was his argument.

Where I think I may disagree with Ross here is to say that the reason we haven't done this or aren't doing it today is because of budgetary pressures is true, but it's also true that we haven't done it when we haven't had budgetary pressures. And, in fact, the historical memory about the WPA, which was actually a pretty successful program, was jokes like we piddle around, and pictures of people leaning on their shovels and doing nothing. And so it's a hard sell to get Americans to support make-work programs, as they're called, a la public policy. And to the extent that they are involved in infrastructure, they're terribly expensive, much more so than simply handing out checks because of the need to plan and equipment and so forth, and organize things.

So, this has always been a hard sell and if by some magical moment we were able to get budget surpluses again, I don't think it would happen. I'm very pessimistic about that.

MR. DIONNE: Could I sneak in a third question in the middle of my two? Because it's something Clarence raised that I've always been curious about, which is the role of Moynihan's own family situation in bringing him to this view, that he was raised himself by a single mom, and the connection of that to Catholic social thought. Could you talk about that a little bit?

DR. PATTERSON: Well, it's hard, I must say, to pin down. You hear people writing about Moynihan who say both these things, as I have, and certainly he must have been scarred by his experience as a young boy. He rarely wanted to talk about it, but he did sometimes and hugely. I think, frankly, Moynihan was very good with the press, to get a reporter to describe his life, and then he would say, well, I didn't say that or he'd say, well, I never told him that. But it would come out that Moynihan had shined shoes and so forth, and was a stevedore on the docks, which he was, and so forth and so on.

So, I would think, yes, that his early childhood had an effect upon this and

so did his Catholic social doctrine. Moynihan went to church on a fairly regular basis. He had a funeral in a Catholic church here in Washington, but he was open in his support of birth control. Of course, most American Catholics have been -- most Catholics anywhere have been, and -- but I do think these two things had an effect, but I can't begin to measure it. I just don't know. He didn't ever come out and say, this is why I did this.

MR. DIONNE: Right. Then the other side of it, the blaming the victim, and I think Clarence gave us a good feel for why that happened. I just wanted to read a couple of other quotations from the book. You quote Whitney Young saying that indeed -- Whitney Young saying, "I think that the title, *The Negro Family*, was tragic in that as a result it has stigmatized an entire group of people when the majority of that group of people do not fall into the category of the Negro family that Moynihan describes," which, in fact, on the numbers of the time, that is a true statement. The danger -- and then Martin Luther King, as you said, was restrained in what he said, but he did say that the danger of the Moynihan Report in emphasizing negative accounts of Negro family life is that "problems will be attributed to innate Negro weaknesses and used to justify and neglect and rationalize oppression."

Can you talk about -- in some ways it is easy to understand exactly why both of them said what they said and why others said that, how Moynihan reacted at the time and to what -- why it just stopped there and didn't go somewhere else? William J. Wilson said years later that the great tragedy is we didn't take it from there and continue the discussion on the state of the black family. Could you talk about that whole --

DR. PATTERSON: You've asked a lot of questions here.

MR. DIONNE: It's one question packing in a lot of stuff.

DR. PATTERSON: It was unfortunate, probably, that he titled this *The Negro Family*, but I think Whitney Young was a little unfair also because Moynihan made it

very clear in the course of the report, which, as I say, very few people actually read, on three or four occasions that there were two -- that the black community, the Negro community was bifurcated between the lower classes and the middle classes, and it was very different. He would have had to have a longer title, maybe, *The Lower Class Negro Family: The Case for National Action*, so he was right here, but Moynihan clearly wasn't talking about all black families. But it was easy to say that he had and Whitney Young, who was not a militant or black power type at all --

MR. DIONNE: He never looked like Clarence Page.

DR. PATTERSON: That's there now, you asked also about -- what?

MR. DIONNE: Moynihan's reaction and -- you know, Moynihan's own reaction at that moment, and then why it just kind of stopped there and it really was a 20-year gap where we kind of ran away from a discussion we should have kept having.

DR. PATTERSON: Well, I mean, he was really badly burned by being called a racist, as anybody would be, and did not believe he blamed the victim. I don't believe he blamed the victim. He made it very clear that the problem was poverty, unemployment, the history of slavery and discrimination, and so forth. I mean, the racist virus in the American bloodstream, a case for national action -- this was not somebody dissing blacks or dissing lower blacks.

But I think he -- as Lee Rainwater and a man named Yancy wrote a wonderful book which is a place to start with all this called, *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy*, which has the virtue of reprinting the entire Howard address and the entire Moynihan Report and a whole lot of commentary about it, some of which you've just quoted. He said Moynihan obviously underestimated how hurtful this would be to his readers. He just could not put himself in the position of a black person reading this, and that's true. I mean, this was an unrelentingly diagnostic completely without any of the

moralistic language that Johnson uses in his speech. It's just one bad thing after another, and I think this was a mistake in his strategy. But he was doing the same thing that his friend and drinking companion, Michael Harrington, did in *The Other America*, who goes much further and says blacks are caught in a cultural poverty as if, you know, you can't get out of it, it's puncture proof, except then he goes on to say we've got to spend zillions of dollars to do it.

It's what Jacob Reese did, it's what a lot of people do who want to get people to start thinking, you, if anything, exaggerate the problem, you make people understand, you hit them over the head with it, and then you hope someone will listen.

MR. PAGE: But didn't Harrington talk about white poverty, too?

DR. PATTERSON: Yeah, he did.

MR. PAGE: I mean, that's a big difference there. That's why I tried to put some context around that summer when the Moynihan leaked out with Bob Novak's help and a few other people. It's a -- the very next year we were in the midst of black power summer, which arose like the Tea Party Movement, a slogan without an agenda or a program, but it gripped black America and it gripped the headline writers, et cetera. These were very tense times, a lot of social stresses going on, and Moynihan had no way to predict that he was going to pop up right in the middle of all this.

MR. DOUTHAT: Well, I mean, the other thing is -- and this doesn't relate to the immediate reception of the report, but the message of the Moynihan Report, you're talking about the two lost decades. In those two lost decades it wasn't a message that white America wanted to hear because white America, I mean, especially upper middle class, liberal, white America, wanted to believe that family structure didn't matter either. You know, I mean, these were the years where people published endless books saying, you know, don't worry, it's better for the kids if you get divorced. Right? I mean, there was this -- you

know, we were entering a period at that point where I think white America wanted to believe, or a certain section of white America wanted to believe, that the sexual revolution wasn't going to have any negative consequences and so, you know, if black America was offended by the report, I think white America, for a long time, didn't want to grapple with its implications for them.

MR. PAGE: And by the way, I think white America still don't want to grapple with that.

SPEAKER: Well, no -- I mean, yeah, nobody wants to --

MR. PAGE: I mean, it's really fun to watch *Mad Men*, you know, speaking of culture and movies and all that, you know, early 1960s, how much our attitudes have changed.

And I didn't mean to jump in, but I can't contain myself anymore, though. You raised the point about stigma. You know, just last weekend I was down in the Dominican Republic at a wedding party, sitting around a table with, you know, half a dozen I'd say upper quintile African-American men, elder of my generation, drinking very good bourbon and talking about things. And somehow we got into talking about first marriages. And all of us have had at least one marriage behind us -- excuse me, at least two or three, everybody. But out of the five or six of us, four were shotgun marriages, what we were talking about. And everybody had a funny story to tell -- funny in retrospect -- about revealing the news to their daddies, uncles, or grandfathers that they just got their girlfriend pregnant. First thing out of the mouths was when you getting married? Every one of them, the first thing they heard was when are you getting married?

Well, I don't want to talk about marriage. I mean, I just been -- when you getting married? And they all got married and none of their marriages lasted very long. One of them only lasted three months. But this is the flipside of the shotgun wedding thing.

Yeah, there's a stigma, but the stigma don't mean -- that doesn't solve the problem either. Because just because you force somebody into marriage don't mean it's going to be a successful marriage.

So, once again, I'm dropped us off the cliff of no answer to this, but -- except social revolution.

DR. PATTERSON: Yeah, let me just say one thing. Also, I think it's a pipe dream, Ross, to think that we will ever move back in any direction towards stigmatizing any of these things. Andrew Cherlin's written a very good book called *The Marriage Go-Round*, which I recommend, which talks about this in the larger context of whites as well as blacks, Western Europe as well as here. And he uses a phrase called "expressive individualism." You could use others. I think it's rooted, as you suggested, in the extraordinary prosperity of the '60s and off and on since. The much greater life choices people have, the freedoms that they have, the example of the Civil Rights Movement, rights consciousness generally which affects blacks, women, gay people, the handicapped, the disabled -- all the way along the line this has been an area where we just have become much more liberal about a whole range of things. I often like to tell my students when I was teaching that maybe the conservatives dominated the political spectrum in the aftermath of the '60s in reaction to some of the excesses, but the culture wars were won by the liberals, and they won it big time and I don't see any turning back.

MR. DOUTHAT: I think that's basically true. The only countervailing argument is that, you know, there is one part of America where there is -- you know, where eventually they brought the stigma back. And that's, you know, if you go to Ivy League universities, very few people parents are divorced, nobody's having kids out of wedlock. And, you know, if you did have a kid out of wedlock, while you were an undergraduate at Harvard University, you would be stigmatized. I mean, you know, it does -- there are still --

there are precincts of upper middle class and upper class America that have restored a kind of effective stigma. And I agree, I don't see how it's possible to transfer that to society as a whole, but I think it's, you know -- even in an age of expressive individualism there are still things that are stigmatized and places where things get stigmatized.

MR. DIONNE: I want to turn it to the audience, but before I want to quote a prominent social conservative who was quoted in Professor Patterson's book. "More than half of all black children live in single parent households, a number that has doubled -- doubled -- since we were children. Too many fathers are MIA. Too many fathers are AWOL, missing from too many lives in too many homes. They have abandoned their responsibilities, acting like boys instead of men, and the foundations of our families are weaker because of it. Fathers," he emphasized, "need to realize that responsibility does not end at conception."

And the social conservative I just quoted is President Barack Obama and those are Obama's words. And I think those words actually mean a lot in terms of how this debate --

MR. PAGE: For which Jesse Jackson wanted to cut his you-know-what off.

MR. DIONNE: What?

MR. PAGE: For which Jesse Jackson wanted to cut his you-know-what off.

MR. DIONNE: Yeah, but there was a lot of debate after that.

MR. PAGE: Yeah.

MR. DIONNE: Yeah.

MR. PAGE: Lot of debate.

MR. DIONNE: Please, the gentleman in the back. And we've got a mic going around. If you wouldn't mind, if you could identify yourself, we'd appreciate it.

MR. ANDREWS: Sure. Leon Andrews with the National League of Cities.

I actually have one question packed with a couple of things really quickly.

MR. DOUTHAT: If I can get away with it, you can get away with it.

MR. ANDREWS: I figured I'd use that as my framing first.

It's funny, you just mentioned President Obama. I wondered, you started with framing the Bill Cosby and *The Cosby Show* as the change in the '80s. I wonder from the panel there's no reflection on potentially the new President and the First Family and potentially what that image has within the context of changing paradigms, right? And so I wonder that.

MR. PAGE: The Obama Effect.

MR. ANDREWS: The Obama Effect.

MR. PAGE: Right.

MR. ANDREWS: And so I wonder your reactions and reflections on that.

But I also want to pick up on the gentleman, Ross' comments about there's no difference, that this is a growing problem across families. I find myself in all of these discussions that we end up here every time we talk about black issues, right? That we don't want to focus in to say that there is a problem, that there is a disproportionate impact. I think Professor Patterson did a really good job saying that there is a disproportionate impact, 70 percent, 80 percent, 90 percent of families within black families that are unwed, right? And granted, you know, it's 28 percent in white families, but --

MR. DIONNE: It's of children, right? And I think that Ross made important

--

MR. PAGE: Of births.

MR. DIONNE: -- points about births --

MR. PAGE: Out of wedlock births.

MR. DIONNE: -- which I do think it is very important to say the number has

gone down and that the number of kids that are being born inside into black families has declined a lot, so that does push that 70 percent up. I just want to, for the sake of the discussion, but please go on.

MR. ANDREWS: So the question really is -- really quickly is, are we -- in reflection from the panel, are we in a place do we think as a society where you can frame a conversation, you know, in today's society versus the '60s around a race-specific focus, black men, right? Because we're much more diverse than we were 40 years ago, as you brought up, Ross, obviously. And so what kind of reaction would we get if we said, well, even though there is disproportionate impact, there are other populations and ethnicities that are impacted. So as a society would there be support for something like that?

MR. DIONNE: Do you want to start?

DR. PATTERSON: No, go ahead, please. I've talked enough.

MR. PAGE: You're speaking here about -- can we talk about marriage across racial lines and not just black folks, was that the point you're raising?

MR. DOUTHAT: No, I think he's saying have we reached a point where we can feel comfortable saying -- talking about it as a black problem without getting bogged down in sort of some of the civil rights era debates about whether it's racist to say that or --

MR. ANDREWS: No.

MR. DOUTHAT: I'm sorry.

MR. ANDREWS: Well, no. The question is more -- if I (inaudible) more people being where you are, which is that we talked about it as a black problem, the question would be, well, it's also a Hispanic problem and it's also a white problem.

MR. DOUTHAT: Right.

MR. ANDREWS: And it's true. And so then you lose, obviously, the focus on the black issues. So it sounds like that's where we are as a society even though there is

disproportionate impact, 80 percent, 90 percent. And you clearly see whether we're talking about families or education, the dropout issue or a crime or arrest or drugs, disproportionate impact that impact, let's say, blacks in this country, that as a society it's difficult for us to say it's a black problem or we should focus on black males or black families because it impacts so many other families.

And so could we even be where -- 40 years ago, 50 years ago, with Moynihan the black family had a different kind -- it was received differently then because the diversity wasn't as we are today. So I wonder if we ever -- you know, could we do that now? Could we have a focus on -- a black focus in this country versus a something-else focus?

MR. DOUTHAT: But don't you think we kind of -- I mean, to me, I feel like the fact that Hispanics have such a high out of wedlock birth rate, you know, I think it's well-known to people sitting in a room at Brookings. I think it's not nearly as well-known even now, even in a multiracial, diverse, you know, black President society than the fact that African-Americans have such a -- I mean, I think America spends a lot of time talking about it even now as a black problem. I don't know what -- I mean, it seems like --

MR. PAGE: Yeah, I --

MR. DOUTHAT: I mean, I think it's, you know, it's more uncomfortable for white people to sort of have that conversation, but certainly, I mean, you know, you quoted Obama, you quote Bill Cosby. I mean, it's -- certainly within the black -- I mean, we think of this like -- don't you think we think of this as sort of this big black America debate? It's like, you know, Cosby and Obama and, you know, Michael Eric Dyson and, you know, Jesse Jackson going back and forth.

MR. PAGE: Yeah, I'm trying to pin down where you're coming from here because I don't think any of these topics are anywhere near as controversial now as they were in '65. William Joyce Wilson's latest book, which is not just -- the title is *Not Just Race*,

I believe it is.

DR. PATTERSON: I'll find it for you here.

MR. PAGE: Yeah. I'm blanking on it now. I wrote about it last year when it came out, but I thought a very intelligent, balanced view where he is, you know, matured in his thinking along with the rest of us, saying that both sides of this argument -- you know, whether it's culture or whether it's changes in the -- structural changes in the economy -- that both arguments are valid, that there are problems with both. And he compares black and Hispanic and immigrant social behavior and marriage behavior briefly in there as well, areas that would have been pretty touchy and taboo a few years back. I'm noticing a lot of comfort with this.

In fact, Walter Benn Michaels at the University of Illinois, who says we put too much attention on race without talking more about class and economic inequality, he says that we don't have a problem having a conversation about race. Americans love to talk about race as long as it helps them to avoid talking about class. And I tend to agree with that as well, that we don't -- we haven't studied the Hispanic community very much, beginning with the word "Hispanic" itself. It is a problematic word, as the Census people will tell you, when Hispanic people are filling out their Census forms. Some view themselves a race, some view themselves as an ethnic group.

I mean, until you can even pin down things like that, I think there's a very -- you raise a very good point here about further study is needed here. But I just don't see that discomfort level.

Now, I see everybody being very comfortable with talking about it as long as they haven't got to spend any money.

MR. DIONNE: Could I say two quick things that are a little intention in response to your question, if not in contradiction?

On the one hand, I think that there is a whole other way to talk about this, which is that young, low-income, black men face problems in this society that are different and deeper than a lot of other people in this society. Three liberal writers -- the late Paul Offner, who actually worked for Moynihan; Harry Holzer; and Peter Edelman -- wrote a very important book a few years back -- it was after Paul Offner died -- on how social policy really hasn't tried hard enough, we have not done nearly enough to deal with the very specific and deep problems these fellow citizens confront. And I do think we need a focus there simply because these are people in our society who are suffering the most, who have a lot of problems, and that connects to all of the things we're talking about.

On the other side, it's also very clear -- and Ross actually has written about this -- low-income Americans across races and ethnic groups face a crisis in marriage unlike the crisis among better-off Americans. There are a lot of numbers, you know, across the board where this is a real problem. And so I think we also have to think about that and what is cause-and-effect here. And I was glad you raised that because I think one of the problems with this discussion is that sometimes you can -- there is -- the cause and effect are confused here. You know, I think they both are happening at the same time.

So anyway, that's my response. But I just think as a society we cannot avoid a specific discussion of the problems of low-income black men. And I don't think that is -- you know, and I think there are many ways of having that discussion without getting caught in conversations about it being racist. I don't think it's racist to deal with the problems of a very disadvantaged group in the society.

MR. DOUTHAT: And don't you think -- I mean, I think one thing we've gained, I think, that we have now that we didn't have for very good reasons in the mid-'60s is the ability to have that kind -- I mean, I don't think you could have had the kind of conversation that, you know, Obama and Cosby are part of in that era for, you know, for

excellent reasons. Because everything -- you know, at that point everything -- you know, the most immediate black experience was the experience of segregation and obviously the experience of slavery before that. Whereas now, I mean, I think -- you know, and this is a white guy on the outside looking in to black America, but it seems like while the marriage problem is worse in black America, the conversation about the marriage problem is better in black America than in the rest of society. Like, nobody talks about the -- you know, I mean, people talk about it, but people are much less likely to talk about, you know, the working class white marriage crisis or the Hispanic marriage crisis whereas I feel like inside the black community it is -- as it should be -- a subject of intense and lively debate and discussion.

MR. PAGE: Well, I think one reason why it needs to be intense and lively is because we too often overlook the remaining segregation in our society. The white underclass is a lot less separated from the white middle class than the black underclass is separated from the black middle class. Except for certain concentrations, like certain rural trailer parks or something, you don't have white ghettos, so to speak. You have -- most low-income white households are integrated in fairly well with working class and middle class white households compared to the segregation that we have for lower income black households. And this is something.

The more we have scattered-site public housing, for example, the less concentration you see, but we've got a long way to go there. And that's one reason I think you have had this type of -- this real skewing of marriage rates in the black community, that those who -- young, low-income blacks have fewer married households around them to serve as role models.

MR. DIONNE: By the way, I don't want to lose the point. You were comparing the Black Power Movement with the Tea Party.

MR. PAGE: I'll compare it to the Yippie.

MR. DIONNE: If you haven't, I really want you to write that column.

MR. PAGE: Yeah, I'll compare -- I've already compared them to the Yippies. I'll compare them to Black Power next.

MR. DIONNE: I was trying to count up how many people you'd offend with that column.

MR. PAGE: Believe me, I'll offend a lot.

MR. DIONNE: Your e-mail would be wonderful.

MR. PAGE: But don't you feel disappointed when you don't get e-mail for a column?

MR. DIONNE: I have -- yeah, I have stories about that. Sir?

MR. LEFARG: Hello. My name is Franz Lefarg. I'm from the New School, Eugene Lang College in New York. And I had a couple sort of -- I guess a statement and lastly a question about sort of the way the conversation's unfolding in the panel.

And the first point is about this issue of I think one of the things that has been raised is affect, the way that one of the things about the Moynihan Report is that suddenly what was (inaudible) was not necessarily a public policy discussion, but also -- but more so a conversation about sentiment. Should we have these feelings about the black family? Should we feel this way about African Americans? And I think that's part of where the Moynihan Report got lodged into, is also these American sentiments around African-American families and also -- and I think also black women in particular.

Which leads to my second point. One of the issues with the report, also I think one of the things that we've yet to reconcile, is exactly sort of what is the nature of the report? Is it a public policy document? Is it a social policy document? Is it an academic document? And is it an attempt at -- you know, African-American history, African-American studies, where -- how do we contextualize the report?

Because, on the one hand, I think as you've mentioned, the information is not necessarily new. Frazier talked about this, you know, Rockefeller. Rockefeller, I think, that gets Myrtle to write his report. I mean, W.E.B. DuBois is saying very similar things in 1903. Anna Julia Cooper is saying this, you know, very similar things, 1896. So even Booker T. Washington, they're all writing at the turn of the 20th century. And so what Moynihan is saying in '65 is not necessarily new, but it's -- I think part of the question is why is he saying this and exactly who is he -- you know, once it goes into his vault, who is really the intended audience of the report?

But I think the question I kind of have for the panel, though, is a number of you have mentioned or used the term "this lost historical moment." And I'm wondering, though, in hindsight, is the moment -- are we still thinking of the '60s in the same way in terms of this lost moment or at least or rather can we think about it, look at it from the African-American perspective or one of the -- I guess, many African-America perspectives of what might have been lost in the '60s?

It may not necessarily have been sort of this lost moment in Johnson's Great Society moving forward, but what about some of the potential gains of, I think, the broader Civil Rights Movement that were also seemingly lost; or, more specifically, in terms of social policy, that not all social programs are created equal? There's a very big difference in terms of how the GI Bill -- the impact that the GI Bill had in terms of not only transforming American society, getting more people -- getting more men, in particular, middle class and lower income men into colleges and also, I think, sort of, you know, creating the suburbs and this new professional class. But it's a very different kind of impact that welfare would have or in terms of African Americans moving into public housing in the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s.

So in terms of thinking about sort of how you've been talking about this lost

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

moment, I'm wondering what are some of the other things that were lost when we think about the '60s in hindsight, not necessarily the '60s in terms of kind of Johnson's Great Society?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you so much. And, in fact, there are two -- there's -- I'd like to turn the first comment, which is really helpful, into a question, which is Moynihan's sense of his audience when he was writing this. Because while it was an internal government document, I can't imagine Moynihan didn't have other audiences in mind.

And then the second part of that on the lost moment, please.

DR. PATTERSON: Well, I -- again, Moynihan really did intend this as an internal document. On the other hand, there are people who believe that he leaked it. So this is one of these questions that the historian can't answer. And I would be inclined to take him at his word, that he really thought this would be something that could be discussed within the administration. And only after this had been done would you sit down and really try to get some public policy from it.

But yeah, remember, he was running -- I didn't tell you. The reason he left the Johnson Administration a month after he wrote the report -- well, a month after the Howard speech in mid-July, he ran as -- on a ticket, a Democratic ticket, in New York City, running for the head of the City Council of the City of New York. And he had to resign from the administration to do that, so he was in no position to defend himself or defend the report. And Johnson was in -- had no reason to defend somebody who was no longer working for him, and didn't, and nor did Willard Wirtz, both of whom had otherwise been in favor of it.

So there are people that think he did leak the report in order to curry voters -- curry favor with voters in the city of New York when he was running for City Council. Well, it turns out he got badly beaten.

MR. DIONNE: Blacks or whites? Who was he currying favor with?

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

DR. PATTERSON: Well, that's a good question. Liberals, I think, probably. And, you know, New York being a very liberal city and this being the highlight -- high point maybe of the Civil Rights Movement, we're going to take a new step forward and go beyond, you know, freedom from discrimination to equality, that message.

But I don't know whether he leaked it and I don't know whether he had this in mind.

MR. PAGE: I don't know if it was a lost moment, and I'd love to get some reactions from you on this. It was lost in the sense of if you wanted Swedish-style social networks, et cetera, we had the money. Of course, it went -- of course, Vietnam had a lot to do with our loss of an ability to spend on big programs. But we did have a war on poverty. Whether or not poverty won, as Reagan says, African Americans, once we changed the law in this country, from '65 to '85, it went from a black poverty rate -- it's just like you said, over 50 percent to, by the mid-'80s, it was around 32 percent, as I recall.

DR. PATTERSON: You got it, yeah.

MR. PAGE: And then by the mid-'90s, it was down to about 24 percent. It's bumped up, I hear, by a couple points.

DR. PATTERSON: Yeah, yeah.

MR. PAGE: I hear, with this latest round of recessions.

DR. PATTERSON: Yeah.

MR. PAGE: But I defy you to find me any ethnic group on this planet that made that much of an advance in 20 years, 20 or 30 years.

DR. PATTERSON: The elderly.

MR. PAGE: What's that?

DR. PATTERSON: The elderly. The elderly.

MR. PAGE: Well, the elderly, okay. The elderly, and that was -- you know,

massive spending was put behind that, which shows it does pay to turn out the vote, doesn't it?

MR. DIONNE: Just on the lost moment point, very quickly. The Great Society was far -- something Moynihan said later is that the Great Society had a lot more successful programs in it than people remembered. There were programs that continued, Medicare being the classic; Head Start being another. Moynihan could be critical of the Great Society. He wrote a book called *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding*, criticizing community action. But he later said of the Great Society -- and it's a classic Moynihan phrase -- "There were more successes than we wanted to know." And that's true.

And that the -- what -- when you look back at this extraordinary legislative achievement, there's a great book called *The Liberal Hour* by Cal Mackenzie and a colleague -- whose name, I apologize, escapes me -- about this legislative productivity in that period. You just wonder where we would have gone absent Vietnam and the bitterness that that created. Were we facing bitterness anyway as the Watts Riots suggested, that we were going to have a more difficult period or were there other possibilities of further experimentation? Who knows? I mean, the New Deal eventually ended, too. But, you know, it is -- you know, if you are a liberal of any kind and you look at how much was done and wonder what might have been done, how might you have fixed programs that weren't working, that was a lost opportunity. And then could you have had this discussion in a better context? It's a what-ifs of history.

DR. PATTERSON: Well, you know, my view has always been that the United States, compared to most Western European countries, is -- for lack of a better word -- a conservative country, and that the spates of liberal output that result in legislation that lasts and is important are rare and they occur under extraordinary circumstances. The first being the Depression and the second being the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, which

was luminous in its moral power and had an enormous spillover effect on rights consciousness and a whole range of other groups. But these come and these go very quickly.

And this was one of the messages of my book on the Conservative Coalition in Congress in the 1930s. Roosevelt was elected in 1936 with 60-odd percent of the vote. He has 76 Democrats as senators, there were 16 Republicans -- there were only 96 senators then -- and the others were Progressives, like George Norris and Robert La Follette. He puts forward the court-backing plan, which was a stupid thing to do, and a number of other things happened and he can't get anything done in his second term with this enormous majority in Congress. We're seeing something similar, right?

Because actually the election of 2008 was the closest thing to the election of 1964 that we've had. No Democratic presidential candidate since -- I can't remember whether Jimmy Carter barely had it, but since Johnson has won 50 percent of the vote up until Barack Obama did in 2008. So this is not a liberal country. And the liberal things don't last long.

And so that's why I say, well, Moynihan says it was a moment lost, and I'm saying, well, maybe. But you don't know that. What you had were a lot of things combining the Watts Riot, the escalation of Vietnam, and, boom, it does in a huge hurry.

MR. DIONNE: I have just discovered we have gone way over time and I see a whole bunch of hands. I am wondering how disciplined can everyone be to make a very brief comment just so I feel like I don't want people to leave left out. That lady in the back has been very patient. If you can try -- I know we have talked a lot. I'm asking a discipline of you that we have not imposed upon ourselves, but if you could do that, I'd be grateful and then we can --

DR. PATTERSON: I will also sign books, if you want to wait around.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

MR. DIONNE: And we don't want to lose his audience. So if you could all be very quick, I'd appreciate it.

MS. SANDOVAL: Yeah, hello. My name is Amanda Sandoval. And my question is regarding this marriage.

So back when I was young, I watched *The Cosby Show* and it was a mom and a dad and they were married. And now my children watch TV shows and especially athletes, who have extramarital affairs, Kobe Bryant. I watched Princess Diana get a divorce. I saw her get married and then I saw her get divorced.

So my question is what role does the media have on these marriages that you're talking about, not only in my community -- the Hispanic community -- but in the black community and in the white community and for my children?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. This gentleman right here.

MR. OTIE: My name's Anthony Otie. Listening to discussions from a Western European point of view, I'm struck by a paradox. There are two things we tell ourselves widely in Western Europe.

Number one, that the fact that young people don't get married anymore is a reflection of the secularization of society. Europeans don't go to church anymore.

Number two, we say but the United States is totally different from us. They are still going to church. Their politicians happily talk about religion at every possible opportunity.

Why doesn't the strength of religion in the United States make more of a difference in the collapse of marriage than it seems to do?

MR. DIONNE: What a great question. Please.

MS. WAX: Yeah, my name is Amy Wax. It was my book that was very kindly mentioned by Professor Patterson. I just wanted to briefly mention two fallacies that

seem to bedevil these discussions and come up over and over again. And these are just factual fallacies that I think really need to be corrected.

The first is this notion that the crisis in the black community of out of wedlock births is a underclass crisis. It is not. You cannot get a 73 percent out of wedlock birth rate without affecting the community from top to bottom. It is also not a crisis of black men marrying white women or a shortage of black men. And demographers, if you open the demography literature, you will see that demographers concur that even though there is somewhat of a mismatch, it's a very small part of the problem of out of wedlock births in the black community.

Even controlling for education and income, black men marry at far lower rates than men from other communities. The Hispanics are catching up, it's true, but at far, far lower rates. This is a non-marriage problem that is a cultural and choice problem; that people are not getting married who could get married. So that is a really important part of this.

The second is that the family has collapsed across the board. I think Ross Douhat did allude to this. The family is extremely strong among college-educated whites and Asians. They may talk like it's the '60s, but they live like it's the '50s.

The out of wedlock birth rate among college-educated whites last year was 5 percent, right. So, the family is not doomed and I think that it's very important to look at and emulate the groups who are living traditional, conventional, two parent, stable, family lives. It can be done. And to give up on it is a mistake.

MR. PAGE: What percentage of the white population is college graduates?

MS. WAX: Right now it's about 40 percent. Right now, 40 percent of whites --

MR. PAGE: Less than half, in other words, yeah.

MS. WAX: -- are going to college. I think over --

MR. PAGE: Going to college.

MS. WAX: Yeah. But now we have to look at --

MR. PAGE: I was thinking of -- are you referring to four-year graduates?

MS. WAX: Yes, I am. They are --

MR. PAGE: Forty percent of white Americans? I think it's lower. The four-year graduates --

MS. WAX: No, actually, I'm going to correct that. Forty percent are going to college, 25 percent are graduating.

MR. PAGE: Twenty-five percent.

MS. WAX: Twenty-five percent are graduating, yes.

MR. PAGE: Right, that's what I thought.

MS. WAX: Yes.

MR. PAGE: That's what I thought.

MS. WAX: Are actually getting through it, getting a BA.

MR. PAGE: That to me does not tell me marriage is being saved.

MS. WAX: Well, but that's a big chunk.

MR. PAGE: You're pointing at 25 percent of the white population, you know. I mean, I think marriage is going down across the board. I don't really think that college graduates are -- but anyway, like I say --

MS. WAX: Well, but there are people with some college.

MR. PAGE: This deserves more discussion. This deserves more discussion.

MR. DIONNE: Two more voices and then we want to sell votes.

(Laughter)

Oh, we got one. Sir? Ma'am, and then --

SPEAKER: Good afternoon. I just want to back up a little. You talked about lost opportunities, and part of the Moynihan Report talked about black women, which is kind of lost in this discussion here. And that was a lost opportunity because black women scholars write about that moment in time and compare it to the 1890s, when black women actually moved when a white man wrote about what black women were not doing.

And what happens after the Moynihan Report that I think bears today is how black women have been stigmatized. And when you talk about media throughout the '80s -- although you had *Bill Cosby* -- the face of poverty, the face of welfare, all the negative faces had to do with black women. So when you move the conversation here to talk about black men, again black women are being marginalized in the discussion, even though the part of this here has to do about single households equals the feminization of poverty and, in this case, black women.

So how can we really talk about this here without having a serious conversation about what is happening with black women?

MR. DIONNE: Bless you. Thank you. I note two attacks on the media, just so far.

That gentleman has the mic, this lady, and then we're going to -- I'll have to shut it down. This lady's been very patient, so I --

Sir?

MR. WEST: Andrew Clark West from Mathematica Policy Research, also a former student of your distant cousin, Orlando. (Laughter) And, anyway, one quick one.

I think the Hispanic piece has been pushed too far. I think that it's actually not true that Hispanics were not affected by the same forces as African Americans. You see substantially higher rates of out of wedlock births and very little stability among Dominican --

among Hispanics who are from slave cultures: African backgrounds, Dominican Republic, Cubans, Puerto Ricans.

But more broadly, you've talked about important issues -- I mean, about the choices that people make. I mean, Mr. Page brought up, you know, people decide to get married, why they want to get married, and talked about the availability of partners out there. But it doesn't bring up the issue of what -- when you have partnerships -- was one of the major problems, what the relationship quality of these partners are that -- there doesn't seem to be a problem of people don't want to get married. Marriage -- I mean, among African Americans, in particular. The large majority of people say they want to get married and, in fact, when you find couples -- this comes from the Fragile Families research and the Building Strong Families evaluation that we're doing in Mathematica.

These couples, they have a kid and they want to get married, but they break up at enormously high rates. And the problem is not convincing that this is desirable. The problem is convincing people that if they get married, that this is a relationship that is going to work out.

This is the change, and the change over time isn't necessarily relationship quality has gone down, you know, compared to 100 years ago or whatever. But now when people have bad relationships, they leave. And also, now, increasingly, people want to be very convinced that their relationship is going to be good if they're going to get married.

And so, part of the issue -- and there seems to be -- and this particular issue of relationship quality is lower among blacks than in any stats you find. So the question is, what you can do about it. And it's like policies that Mr. Douthat brings up, like education, drug reform, prison reform. Is that going to change relationship quality? Or, if not, what can you actually do?

MR. DIONNE: And then, lastly, over here.

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

SPEAKER: We've been through a lot of history. We've allowed our race to -- and I won't say they're excuses, but first there was slavery that separated the family. Then we had the welfare system that would not allow the families to combine. Then we have the black man choosing to do biracial dating. I'm wondering is there a study or a survey done to ask the black man himself why he has chosen to separate from the black woman?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you very much. Quick answers from Ross and Clarence on all these. I'll let Professor Patterson say a closing word.

MR. DOUTHAT: Well, Bill Wilson's book, *When Work Disappears*, as was mentioned earlier, focuses on the lack of marriageable men. It's not our choice just out of prison. And, of course, racially it's high; mostly unemployment rates and the incarceration rate has shot up, too, now, over the last 20 years, as we've seen.

But, you know, he mostly focuses on Chicago where I and others have witnessed the de-industrialization of America, on the West Side and South Side, steel mills, Sears, you name it. And that's a national phenomenon and it happened to coincide, as Nicholas -- *The Great Migration* -- Nicholas Lemon chronicled the post-war migration of black folks as opposed to the post-World War I migration that my family came up with. They came up at a time when jobs were about to disappear. And we really saw that in the '60s and the '70s and the '80s.

The upshot is that, you know, you want to get married, but you need a job for a traditional marriage. And that traditional role, that was a controversial aspect of the Moynihan Report. You talked about Diane Rehm this morning, but he at that time suggested the possibility of black women giving up their jobs for black men because black women had a higher employment rate. And, by the way, black men haven't been fairing that well in the media either. And as a member of the media, I've seen it happen. And as

someone who used to be a regular on BET, I've seen it happen among the bootie shaking, hip hop videos, et cetera, et cetera.

But, anyway, I talked enough.

MR. PAGE: So, quickly, so the media, yes. But one of the things that's happened in the media -- one of the reasons that you have a less moralistic media than you had 50 years ago is simply diversity and fracturing in the media landscape. Like, one of the reasons that the media -- 50 or 60 years ago, you could imagine, sort of having a media that was more moralistic was because the media was not -- it was smaller. It was a -- you know, if you had three broadcast networks and they all refused to air a show, for instance, that show didn't get aired. That doesn't happen anymore. And I think that's part of -- you know, there are a lot of things going on, but part of what drives what I think a lot of parents rightly see as a kind of lowest common denominator race to the media bottom, is this kind of incredibly diverse and highly competitive media landscape.

Europe and America and religion, two things. One, you should read -- I think you mentioned it -- Andrew Cherlin's *The Marriage-Go-Round*, which is a book about how America, unlike Europe, valorizes marriage more. But this -- we sort of end up in the same place because it means that -- and this goes to the gentleman from Mathematica's point, that we're more likely to be dissatisfied with our marriage because it's placed on this pedestal. I mean, if you look at marital satisfaction numbers, you know -- they've gone down since the '50s and '60s. People have become more dissatisfied with their marriages even as -- you know, so Americans are much more likely to be serial marriers, I think, than Western Europeans are.

And on the religion point, I'm supposed to be writing -- God help me -- a book about American religion that in theory, if I ever write it, will touch on why American religion isn't nearly as moralistic and conservative in a sort of classic, theological sense as I

think a lot of secular people and Western Europeans think it is.

And Amy Wax -- wait, what was I going to say? Oh, yeah, the question about the supply side issue, I was just curious, does that take into account, though -- I mean, clearly, there isn't like a demographic mismatch. There are enough black men to marry black women and vice versa, but does that take into account the impact of incarceration rates? Because there you are -- it does? Even with taking --

MS. WAX: Ben Victor at Cornell says that, at most, 20 percent of the low marriage rates among blacks is due to shortage of men from incarceration, death, and unemployment.

MR. PAGE: Right. Oh, yeah, all --

MS. WAX: Because there's this huge section of employed black men. In fact, that's the paradox, is that although we do have an unemployment problem and there are a large number of incarcerated men, there's also been progress in the black community. Paradoxically, with the decline in marriage rates. So, even men who are educated and working class and working are not getting married. And they've crunched the numbers -- Ben Victor, Bob Schone, I can name a half a dozen demographers who say it's a myth. It does not account for most of the non-married and out of wedlock births in the black community.

MR. PAGE: Right.

DR. PATTERSON: I have a statistic here. I hope it's right. It says only 39 percent of black women ever marry; 63 percent of white women do. I mean, that's a very high percentage of what black women -- as well as, obviously, as well as black men -- who just never marry.

MR. DIONNE: I wanted to say a quick thing on the role model because I'm the only person you'll ever meet who defended Charles Barkley when he made that ad

many years ago saying I am not a role model. I am paid to wreck havoc on the basketball court. And I argued that, you know, I love athletes. I watch sports. Those aren't -- I don't look to them as role models for all kinds of behavior. And I think we need to figure out our notion of role models. We should admire people for what they do in the spheres they're in when they do it well, but not pretend that they can provide us role models in all other spheres. That's just a personal view on this matter.

MR. PAGE: It especially applies to newspaper columnists. They're not role models in the flesh.

MR. DIONNE: Well, yes. Well, no one looks to us as role models.

DR. PATTERSON: But they do to historians, so I want --

SPEAKER: John McWorter's written about that, too, you know. Why do people, you know, idolize various people instead of Obama, or Louis Armstrong, or somebody, you know? They choose all kinds of people that you wouldn't want to emulate.

MR. DIONNE: So I want to invite you to buy the book. The line in the Moynihan Report I loved is -- in this book, "The Moynihan Report is probably the most famous piece of social scientific analysis never published," it was written. Fortunately, we have since --

DR. PATTERSON: That's not my statement. That's (inaudible).

MR. DIONNE: Yes, it was written of the Moynihan Report. You could tell he wasn't worried about tenure. This book has been published. We are very grateful that Professor Patterson wrote it.

And I thank you all for a really wonderful discussion. And thanks to Ross and Clarence. (Applause)

* * * * *

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING
706 Duke Street, Suite 100
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190