*Keynote Address**

ROGER W. JONES,
Chairman, U. S. Civil Service Commission,
Former Deputy Director, U. S. Bureau of the Budget

Introduction

ROBERT H. RANDALL, *U. S. Bureau of the Budget, Honorary Member, A.S.P.*

Very recently our keynote speaker became the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission. Previously he was Deputy Director of the U. S. Bureau of the Budget. That brings to mind a story connected with budget affairs which I think was made up by our friend George Whitmore on an occasion when he introduced me.

Three gentlemen, worthy public servants, went out in a motor boat to fish from one of our coastal cities. After quite awhile, they hadn't caught many fish. They wanted to go ashore. But the motor refused cooperation. As they hadn't brought oars, they were in a predicament. One and only one could swim. He was delegated to swim ashore, get oars or another boat and come to the rescue. This gentleman started paddling toward the shore. He hadn't gone very far when shark fins began to be visible, coming from all directions. Of course, this caused much worry to those in the boat. But strange to them and hardly believable the sharks did not attack the swimmer. Instead they formed a sort of guard of honor or escort on each side of the swimmer, and accompanied him ashore. After he had come out in another boat, he was asked "Why in the world didn't those sharks attack you?" "Well," he said, "I thought you knew that I'm from the Bureau of the Budget; they recognized me as a member of the fraternity and accorded me all professional courtesies!"

According to my observation, there are two open seasons in conducting business in the Federal Government in Washington. About September 15 the departments and establishments come to the Budget Bureau en route to The President, preliminary to preparing the annual budget. Beginning with that date and continuing until about the first week in the following January, the representatives of the government agencies treat Budget people with kindliness, consideration, and even with a sort of seemingly temporary respect. But after the annual budget book comes out a big change occurs. Beginning then and continuing until the next September 15, it's open season on Budget people. This being March, Mr. Jones is getting into his new field at the right time.

But I do want to say that the shark story in no way applies to him.

It was my pleasure to know Mr. Jones when he was in the Central Statistical Board; this must have been something like twenty years ago. I have had the fun and profit of knowing Roger in the intervening years. He was in the Armed Services for awhile, attached to the General Staff, I believe. I think it's known to many that pressure was brought on him to stay in the Army. But he resisted and came back to Civil Service. You may read his record in *Who's Who* and all such publications; it will get longer and longer.

As the new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission Roger Jones continues his public service. He has been the recipient of the highest awards that our Government gives for distinguished public service:—Awards from such organizations as the Civil Service Association which represents not only those in the Federal Service, but people interested in Civil Service at all levels, all over the country.

Those who have been fortunate enough to know Roger Jones look forward not only to his talk today, but especially to his future service in one of the most elemental and fundamental parts of our public business, the Civil Service Commission.

It is my pleasure and honor to introduce the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Honorable Roger W. Jones.

The Address

Roger W. Jones

Ladies and gentlemen of the consecutive meetings.

It is definitely a pleasure to be with you. I know little about the fields to which you are giving your lives. Being in these surroundings gives me relief from the recent pressure of my office. Since I took the oath of office on Monday last the procession of people through my office has been so steady and constant that I am now a little confused and bewildered; I am glad to get a break.

Bob Randall referred to my having been given several awards. You will soon have evidence that I never had an award for making a good speech! When I realize that I follow Larry Gould and John Theobald, who were

* Presented at the ASP-ACSM General Assembly, Hotel Shoreham, Washington, D. C. March 11, 1959.

your keynote speakers recently, I have a definite feeling of inferiority.

Briefly and informally I want to talk about what I call *acknowledgement of democratic responsibility*, for lack of a better term. That responsibility is a matter which concerns all of us today. From such responsibility we cannot escape, no matter how much we may try.

Perhaps two of my past experiences with your fields of mapping will clearly illustrate what I have to say. One is deadly serious; the other is less serious, possibly a little joking.

As a sophomore at Cornell University—a good many years ago—I took a course that was supposed to give me some familiarity with maps—map reading and such matters. The instructor was one of the best teachers I have ever known, who later was one of my very good friends. Subsequently he was a distinguished Army officer. His tragic death at the start of World War II removed a potentially great combat commander.

I cannot now recall the name of the Pope, or the Maker of Maps about whom Stonewall Jackson spoke when he introduced us to this elementary course in military sketching and map reading. But I have always remembered the story. It goes like this:

Late in the Fourteenth Century, a brave maker of maps was denounced to the Pope as a heretic because he insisted on putting things on maps that were unknown, at least to the Churchmen of his day. The Pope had a deep interest in geography and listened to this denunciation. He then turned to the officers of the church making it and said that he found it very difficult to believe that God wished the seeker after truth to be deemed a heretic.

Perhaps more than most people in this world today, you are seekers after truth by profession. Everything you do must be geared to the twin goals of accuracy of presentation and accuracy of interpretation. Against that backdrop, I would like to talk briefly to you.

In America today, in fact everywhere in the democratic world of today—the free world of today—we are faced with an implacable foe to our way of life. *This foe, of course, is communism.* Its glittering promises of a kind of brotherhood of man have a great appeal for those who have never had any of the material things of this world that we take for granted; a strong appeal to people who have been hungry most of their lives or who have never known decent housing or decent clothing or who have little or no education.

It is not at all surprising that to them these false doctrines of communism have a very considerable appeal and a very considerable degree of mystery. With this there is a lack of understanding about democracy.

When we stop to think, it is equally perhaps surprising that we have come to take our form of government and our way of life so completely for granted that we sometimes forget their most obvious truths.

This is regrettable. These are matters about which each one of us has a real responsibility. I am sure that to you—a technical group of scientifically oriented people—what I have to say will have some significance.

Our democratic institutions are probably the most important thing in our heritage. They recognize, they accept, and they advance the thesis that men are created equal and that God has given us certain rights. Among those are the possession of a soul, the right to seek spiritual freedom and freedom of other kinds. We have built in this country probably the most gigantic monument to the democratic process that has ever been reared anywhere.

I don't think I would agree that older models of democracy were better than the model we have built. But I do think that because we built it and have come to take it for granted, we have also developed for ourselves a very unique opportunity to kick it all away. That is of great concern to me. First, because I am a civil servant—a servant of the public welfare—and next because the citizenry of the country today seems to be willing to share the complacency that is growing up within and outside of the government.

I come, then, to the first point I would like to make. If we are to protect our heritage, *we must reject complacency. We must not take our freedom for granted.* We in government have a particular obligation. You who are not in the government have an obligation but a different kind. You must see to it that we don't become complacent and that you do not, by your own example, give us an excuse to become complacent.

What does this have to do with those engaged in surveying, mapping, and photogrammetry? It has this to do with it—yours is a precise science, and one in which nothing can be taken for granted. Your pursuits are those in which the truth is always set forth in the simplest terms. It is reduced to conventional signs and terms, which are susceptible of common understanding by a large number of people; signs and terms which are universal.

From the start of your careers you have spoken a universal kind of language. I ask you today to apply these principles in seeing that

we don't kick away what our forefathers earned for us.

With the simplicity and the straight-forwardness of a good map or a good aerial photograph, if you will make perfectly clear what there is to be seen, you will render a great public service.

What there is to be seen brings me to *the second point.*

One of the most important things for every American today is to take *individual responsibility for protecting our heritage, not evading this by saying that he can leave it to someone else or that the destiny of this country can be left to the safety of our elective processes.* The real American can't take the position that whereas democracy may make mistakes, it doesn't make them very often or for very long; accordingly he need have no responsibility.

No maker of maps can evade his responsibility for their accuracy nor does he seek to do so. If his job is to represent a point of view, he does this. But this is not true of all in our society. How many times have you seen a situation in which there was a consensus, but no one wanted to be the spokesman?

I ask that all of the responsibility and precision that is essential in your chosen profession go into seeing that other people accept their responsibilities for protecting, maintaining and continuing what we have earned in America—this great democratic set of aspirations, institutions, political systems, ways of life that are the only sure defense against the communist system with all of its faults. These need to be interpreted so all can understand them. You can and must help to give this interpretation and knowledge.

For those in the Federal Government it is easy to say, "let someone else do it." Those in the Executive Branch can pass the buck to the Legislative Branch. If a change in direction of program is needed we can say, "all right, we will do it when the Congress passes a law." It is just as easy for The Congress to pass the buck to the Executive Branch, "if you would only correctly interpret the law, and in light of its legislative history, all would be well and we would get ahead with this program."

But it is not that simple. Today, the hopes, the fears, the aspirations of America are being expressed as never expressed before, in terms of a reflection of popular will upward through our Federal programs in successive steps from the local level to the apex of the Federal Government in the Executive Branch, the Presidency.

Mass communication media, the instantaneous knowledge of whatever happens, the capacity of conveying at once how people think, how they react, have completely changed the focus of communication with the Federal Government.

Ninety-three per cent of the Federal employees are in the towns, the cities, the counties of America. Some $2\frac{1}{2}$ million of them are in civilian pursuits and as many more wear the uniform of our Armed Services. Every one of them today is a channel of communication for the Executive Branch of what America is thinking about. But what they need most of all is to know and to have the assurance that they can be an *accurate* channel of communication. I believe no one can help to obtain this degree of accuracy more and better than the men and women who are committed to your way of life and your professions. They need to be taught precision and how to express themselves in terms which cannot be misunderstood.

Inaccuracy is anathema to your whole way of life.

Third and finally, democratic responsibility, as I see it today, requires that people not only accept responsibility and reject complacency, but *to act.*

It is part of the genius of America that we insist upon action in our government. In fact we will accept mistaken action with much more grace and patience than a lack of action.

Americans instinctively distrust the decision that comes about by happenstance, rather than the decision taken as a result of consideration of all of the factors involved. That is good. And again, it is something which all of you here accept as a part of your day-to-day methods of operation.

There are no longer areas of gray on a conventional map. The map maker acts. Things either are or they aren't; whether it be a contour line or a demonstration of how a stream flows, or some other physical feature. Very rapidly our photographic maps are coming to have the same kind of precision. The photograph is good or bad, and someone acts to accept it or reject it.

Here again, most of us have had a tendency to be just a little lax. We often will not act. We have adopted an attitude of let John do it; it doesn't concern me.

The national issues before us today concern everyone of us. We must each play a part in acting positively on them. And even in a partisan sense, these issues concern each one of us. Partisanship has been the essential life blood in the development of America. It is not bad. But it requires commitments and action. The great middle segments of both political parties

agree very largely on the ends to be sought by government; because they may disagree on measures and methods to achieve those ends, does not excuse failure to take a stand.

Much earlier I said that I wanted to tell you two little stories; the second less serious than the first. The first was told. I come now to the second.

As a brand new Second Lieutenant of Infantry, on my first short tour of active duty, I was given the job of teaching a course in military sketching and map reading. This was to a group of officer candidates in the old Citizens Military Training Corps, which was a device of the early 30's that produced some amazingly good reserve officers who distinguished themselves subsequently in World War II. They were a strange and polyglot collection of candidates in almost every camp, with a few exceptions. One of these exceptions was at Fort Dix, New Jersey, where the entire contingent came from the upper metropolitan area of New York, with all of its peculiar kinds of prejudices, and all of its very special urban qualities.

I thought I had done pretty well with teaching this course because in the quiz sessions, the young men had given extremely good textbook answers. Actually I was quite pleased with myself. Finally, we came to the final quiz of this famous five hour course. I asked a young man (I learned not long ago, he later commanded a regiment in Korea) if he would give a definition of a map. He repeated dutifully that a map was a pictorial representation of a part of the earth's surface. Then he said, "oh damn," very audibly. I asked, "What's the matter, don't you like the definition?" He said, "Yes, I like the definition but it upsets me." I then said, "What upsets you about it?" He replied, "I want to ask you something, Lieutenant. How in the hell can you keep from being confused by a map?"

Well, the whole structure that I had worked so hard to build crumbled right then and there. We settled back into being a noisy semi-laughing, semi-serious group of about twenty-five or thirty people, with a Lieutenant obviously embarrassed and feeling that he had completely destroyed the usefulness of himself and his mission.

How can we keep from being confused by a map? Can we rely too much on the conventional signs and symbols? The answer is obviously yes, we can.

What each one of us has to do is to learn to interpret that map for himself. Each of us needs the same symbols but we must read them for ourselves. If we read them correctly, we shall not go astray. What we have had passed on to us by our forefathers is a uniquely successful form of government. It has been capable of adjusting very rapidly to whatever America expected of it; but the great secret of its success, I think, has been that our American democracy has been so highly individual a thing. While made up of a very definite set of conventional signs and symbols, it has been susceptible at all times and has always demanded a personal interpretation. It has had to be adapted to fit your needs and mine. But it has never needed to confuse any of us.

Of this, we should be very proud. But I do not think we should take it for granted.

Therefore, I hope that when you go back to your Federal jobs, or to your homes away from Washington wherever they may be, you will take with you one thought from me. *As Americans today, we can maintain what we have if we adopt the three imperatives of rejecting complacency, assuming responsibility, and acting on behalf of the one form of government which can guarantee freedom to the world.*