

University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Bicentennial Observance (1976)

Education: National Endowment for the Arts
and Humanities, Subject Files II (1962-1996)

4-9-1976

Bicentennial Observance (1976): Report 02

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_27

Recommended Citation

"Bicentennial Observance (1976): Report 02" (1976). *Bicentennial Observance (1976)*. Paper 7.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_II_27/7

This Report is brought to you by the University of Rhode Island. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bicentennial Observance (1976) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu. For permission to reuse copyrighted content, contact the author directly.

BICENTENNIAL ERA PROGRAMS, 1976

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SELECT COMMITTEE ON
ARTS AND HUMANITIES
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE
UNITED STATES SENATE
NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

**PROPOSALS AND IDEAS RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A
PROGRAM WHICH WOULD HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL BENEFIT
TO OUR NATION, FOCUSED ON A "BICENTENNIAL ERA"**

APRIL 9, 1976.



Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1976

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey, *Chairman*

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia	JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island	RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts	ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin	J. GLENN BEALL, Jr., Maryland
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota	ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri	PAUL LAXALT, Nevada
ALAN CRANSTON, California	
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine	
JOHN A. DURKIN, New Hampshire	

DONALD ELISBURG, *General Counsel*
MARJORIE M. WHITTAKER, *Chief Clerk*
JAY B. CUTLER, *Minority Counsel*

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin	JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
THOMAS F. EAGLETON, Missouri	ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio
WALTER F. MONDALE, Minnesota	ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine	
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey	

(*ex officio*)

LIVINGSTON BIDDLE, *Professional Staff Member*
GREGORY FUSCO, *Minority*

BICENTENNIAL ERA PROGRAMS, 1976

FRIDAY, APRIL 9, 1976

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES
OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10.05 a.m. in room S-146, the Capitol, Senator Claiborne Pell (chairman of the subcommittee), presiding.

the Capitol, Senator Claiborne Pell (chairman of the subcommittee), presiding.

Present: Senators Pell and Javits.

Senator PELL. Today the Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities is holding hearings on proposals and ideas relating to establishing a program which would have substantial benefit to our nation and which would be focused on a "Bicentennial Era"—a period of time extending from the present to the 200th Anniversary of the Constitution of the United States. This would involve a period of 13 years; from 1976 to 1989.

It has been proposed that during this time it would be of abiding value to our country to concentrate on our founding principles, to assess where we stand today in relation to those principles, and from historic perspective to examine and develop those priorities and goals of greatest value for the future.

In this regard, an overall program which would place stress on achievement and on building tangible bridges to the future would seem most worthy of our consideration.

We are here today to consider both the scope such a program might have, the subject areas most germane to it, and how it might be best implemented.

Senator Charles Mathias, Representative Patricia Schroeder and Representative Paul Simon have exerted leadership with respect to this Bicentennial Era approach. Representative Schroeder will be here to discuss these matters with us, and I extend a warm welcome to her in advance.

I would add that we are not today considering specific legislation. Rather, we are considering how these laudable concepts I have briefly outlined could perhaps become best applicable within the broad scope and mandate of the Arts and Humanities.

Let me call attention to the Declaration of Purpose of the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965. In part, this declaration states:

that a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science and technology alone, but must give full value and support to the other great branches of man's scholarly and cultural activity in order to achieve a better understanding of the past, a better analysis of the present, and a better view of the future.

Our witnesses today include Mr. John D. Rockefeller III, with whom I have conferred on these matters already on a conceptual basis. Mr. Rockefeller's leadership is identified with and is a most important part of these proposals. His perception and initiative has greatly impressed me.

I believe a great many people feel that the Bicentennial celebration we are now experiencing should transcend the ceremonial and observances of temporary note, and that 1976 should signal a new spirit of dedication toward more substantive considerations of what our first 200 years as a nation means and on how we can improve on the past.

I would add that fundamental to these hearings is the excellence of ideas expressed by Mr. Rockefeller, and by Senator Mathias and Representative Schroeder. In particular, my staunch colleague, Senator Javits, has taken very strong interest in these concepts and has expressed the wish within the subcommittee that we should hold these hearings.

I will now include in the record an excellent statement by Senator Mathias who has expressed to us his regrets that he cannot testify in person.

[The statement referred to follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. Chairman, I commend the Subcommittee for its interest in the concept of the Bicentennial era and in what such an era, if given some formal structure, might help us achieve during the Bicentennial of our Constitution. As you know, I recently introduced S. 3100, a bill which would establish an American Constitution Bicentennial Foundation. I am deeply grateful that the members of this committee feel that the purposes of S. 3100 may well mesh with their own efforts to work out additional legislative approaches for S. 1800.

If, in our Bicentennial year, we were equipped to look ahead with as much reason, courage, and passion as our founders possessed in their particular times, we would not have to take your time this morning. As so many recent barometers of social, political and economic change have shown, however, our democratic system, in which so many issues seem to our citizens to be decided undemocratically, is faced with fundamental challenges. Serious challenges should not go unrecognized, much less unmet. Thus, I believe the Committee, in convening this hearing, is recognizing the challenges our system is undergoing today. I am hopeful that it will provide a framework within which our citizens can prepare themselves to answer such challenges in the context of their particular times.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to seem to declare our Bicentennial year a disaster. Nor is there much sense, as Arthur Schlesinger recently said, in "succumbing too eagerly to bicentennial gloom." As he added, "the centennial year was not so hot either." The point I would like to make, though, is the non-stop, non-partisan changes which flood over us in 1976 will continue to do so in the foreseeable future. Celebration of our 200th birthday as revolutionary freedom fighters, therefore, fades quickly in light of present struggles to reignite the eroded faith and sensitivity of our citizenry. What the Bicentennial offers us is an appropriate time to dedicate all our energies to forging new principles based on our historic values, principles which should fully reflect the challenges of our times and the realities we wish to experience in our third century.

As many of you know, the questions evoked by the Bicentennial have been very close to my heart for a long time—beginning formally with my sponsorship of the legislation which established the first Bicentennial Commission on July 4, 1966. It was my hope that the commemoration would be a time when we would bring Americans together around a set of goals which had the first Revolution as its guide and inspiration, and third century resources as its tools to fashion new concepts worthy of the rich, innovative, complex culture we have become.

I had envisioned broad national discussions of the goals of the revolution and what we need today to achieve similar goals in the context of our times.

As we know, much historical data has been organized and discussed and many worthwhile community-spirited projects have been accomplished. In my opinion, 1976 should be the crossing of the river from historical fact-finding and celebration to serious confrontation with deep dilemmas—from dealing with the effects of potential nuclear holocaust, to feeding millions of starving persons, to reviving the spirit of democratic policy-making.

I believe the essential ingredient to meeting these challenges, to providing for change without violence, is people participation. We must recognize those citizens who are involved in shaping a more humane society, learn how they organize and interest others in this work, and we must encourage and imitate them. For democracy will not follow its natural course if there is no support for citizens efforts to define their futures after thoughtful consideration of the alternatives. It distresses me that so much citizen energy has to be spent in establishing facts about poverty, about waste in government, about consumer travails—when this energy should be conserved for solving the problems we all know exist. Government is so often found in court versus the people, versus the environment and consequently versus itself, that it is small wonder that the vacuum of people power is critically felt in Washington today. People and their elected governments should work together.

First of all, it goes without question that government must find better ways to make information available quickly and efficiently to any citizen who requests it. Further, government, through the example of the challenge grant concept underway at the Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, can avoid being the originator of so many programs. Through the challenge grant, it can more often serve in partnership with the private sector in financing ongoing projects and in encouraging new, untried approaches to problem solving with initial funding. It is time to take the hopes of the Bicentennial spirit, the hopes of the people and the resources of government and the private sector, bind them together and begin the task of wisely, courageously and passionately carrying on the peaceful, democratic revolution. This is a task which the Humanities can rightly be involved in and thus I support the Committee's effort to find a place in its legislation for the work of the people in 1976.

I know some of the witnesses will point out this morning that considerable evidence exists to prove that citizens are indeed concerned about taking part in the democratic process. The forming of neighborhood alliances, citizen involvement networks, cooperatives, the takeover of failing local factories and operating them collectively for profit—all these efforts demonstrate a willingness on the part of citizens to become part of the solutions to present challenges. There is no need to point out that many of these efforts are under way without the involvement of Washington or even state or county capitals. The problems are returning to the people to solve and they are solving them in many cases in many ways.

And while we can be pleased that many Americans have decided to "define themselves for themselves," as black poet Claude McKay once wrote, we in government cannot afford to ignore these trends in neighborhood, community and special interest self-help programs. It is heartening to witness this morning's search for the people's pulse and we must go further to insure that citizens are supported in their work of problem solving. With the help of the private sector, government can place information, seed money, encouragement and a federal network of experience in the hands of every citizen who wants them. This partnership can support responsible citizen participation and new approaches to problem-solving on every level of our society where these efforts exist today, and where they can be encouraged to spring up tomorrow.

I feel very strongly that the members of this committee are responding to an exciting challenge. I believe that this challenge is of sufficient scope and merit to justify the establishment of a self-contained entity which citizens could readily identify as the place where people power rules. I look forward to working with you in the weeks ahead to make certain these efforts are realized. Thank you very much.

Senator PELL. At the present time, without Mrs. Schroeder, I would ask Mr. Rockefeller if he would care to make his statement now.

STATEMENT OF JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER III, NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE BICENTENNIAL ERA, NEW YORK, N.Y., ACCOMPANIED BY GARY KNISELY, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE BICENTENNIAL ERA

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Thank you, Senator.

I will read the statement, if I might, please.

My name is John D. Rockefeller 3d and I appear here today as a private citizen much concerned about the Bicentennial.

It has been a subject of special interest to me for several years. I have always recognized that it would be a time for celebration—for taking pride in past accomplishments, for giving thanks that we have endured for 200 years, and for simply having fun in the Fourth of July spirit. All of this would happen as a matter of course, I realized, needing little in the way of special encouragement.

On the other hand, the real opportunity it seemed to me, was to be found in going beyond celebration, beyond the birthday party of 1976, to deeper and more substantive questions.

Our country is in serious trouble. This is a critical time in our history, at least as perilous and demanding as 200 years ago when the Nation was created through the sacrifice, dedication, and courage of the people and their leaders.

The Bicentennial should become a means to a reaffirmation of our basic values and ideals, to new initiatives to resolve our complex problems, to a new period of achievement if we are to move our country forward and build a better future.

It was always clear that special encouragement would be necessary for such purposes to be realized. They would not come as easily and naturally as celebration. They would require sound planning and effective leadership and substantial funding—in short, a national commitment and sense of mission.

Let me say here and now, Mr. Chairman, as I start these brief remarks, that we have not had this sound planning and leadership. We have not had this national commitment and sense of mission. The result, as I see it, is that the Bicentennial is on the verge of becoming a lost opportunity. It is a situation that is deeply disturbing to me.

It was in this frame of mind that I accepted the invitation of Senator Pell and Senator Javits to testify here today. I saw hope in their interest and in the concern of Congresswoman Schroeder and Senator Mathias as reflected in the bills they have introduced in the House and the Senate.

I hope that the substance of these bills can be incorporated into S. 1800. If this can be done, if the Congress approves and the funds asked are appropriated, we will have a good chance of reversing the trend and giving our 200th anniversary the depth and meaning that it must have at this critical juncture in our history.

The situation today is all the more ironic when one recalls the excellent beginning of the Bicentennial 10 years ago. The original legislation, passed in 1966, stressed that the commemoration should be marked by an emphasis on the ideas associated with the American Revolution.

It also contained a significant innovation—the era concept. The law specified that the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission—

ARBC—should stay in existence until 1983, the 200th anniversary of the end of the Revolutionary War.

The Bicentennial was thus extended beyond 1976 to encompass a substantial period of time. The reason was to allow for serious and substantive activities, in addition to celebration.

Following up on this important beginning, the early speeches of President Nixon seemed strong and positive. In a similar spirit, the 1970 report of the ARBC to the Congress was a constructive and forward-looking document, emphasizing the opportunity the occasion afforded to face up to our problems and to plan for the third century of American life.

Shortly thereafter, however, the Bicentennial began to go astray. The country found itself gripped in a series of traumatic crises—Vietnam, the Mideast, energy, the combined recession-inflation, and most important, Watergate.

Soon, the pollsters began to tell us that alienation and fear were on the increase, that the confidence of the American people in the institutions of our society—in particular, the institutions of government—was eroding to an alarming degree. The Federal Bicentennial effort had lost its early spirit and momentum. Even the concept of the era was dropped from official recognition when the ARBC was converted to the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration (ARBA) in 1974.

Whatever the reasons—and it will take a future historian to explain them—it is clear that the true promise of the Bicentennial remains unfulfilled. At this moment we are headed for a national birthday party this July, and little more.

In saying this, in no sense do I mean to denigrate what has come to be called the “grassroots” Bicentennial, the planning of celebrations in literally thousands of American communities. These are generally worthwhile and in many cases will have lasting benefits.

At all levels—local, regional, and national—there are excellent programs in the cultural and historical fields. But it is beyond these activities that my concern lies. As matters stand now, the opportunity of the Bicentennial is not being used to address the critical social and economic problems that confront us on every side. We need to take advantage of the inspiration and timing of the Bicentennial if we are to progress toward the goal of a healthy and vigorous nation in the years immediately ahead.

In an effort to help restore the idea of a more meaningful national occasion, some 40 citizens from across the country, myself included, prepared and signed a “Bicentennial Declaration” in early 1975.

We strongly endorsed the concept of an era which would link the two greatest documents in American history, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

We did so not only because such an era would be historically accurate and inherently educational, but also because it would be operationally useful. By this I mean that it would set forth a realistic time period—from now until 1989—during which one could hope to accomplish serious and substantive purposes.

There were two other important points stressed in our Declaration:

One is that the Bicentennial should become a time when the American tradition of individual initiative is rediscovered. The other is that it should become a great period of achievement in American life.

I believe that these two points—within the necessary framework of an era—begin to explain what we mean when we speak of the opportunity before us of going beyond the birthday party to deal with the real issues and problems that affect our great country today.

In expressing this point of view in the Declaration a year ago, we of course realized that it was very late in the game to hope to significantly affect the course and tone of the 1976 celebration. And if we have learned anything, it is that celebration and serious purpose do not mix very well, that rather than coexisting they should be seen as occurring in sequence. In other words, let the celebration of 1976 emerge and play out its course, hopefully as exuberantly and successfully as possible.

But before the last fireworks of this coming Fourth of July fizzle out, let us get down to hard work for the next 13 years.

Success will require that the three factors, which I mentioned earlier—sound planning, effective leadership, and substantial funding—be realized.

This, I take it, is what these hearings are all about. I urge you to take action in S. 1800 to create a new Federal program for the Bicentennial era. I hope that in so doing, you will consider the four fundamental principles that we in the private sector have stressed—the era concept, inspiration, achievement, and individual initiative.

Senator PELL. Excuse me. A vote is going on on the floor of the Senate, and I will have to recess the committee for a few moments. I would hope Senator Javits would be here shortly, and he can resume the hearing.

[Short recess.]

Senator JAVITS [presiding pro tempore]. The subcommittee will come to order.

Mr. Rockefeller, would you be kind enough to proceed? Just start from where you left off.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Success will require the three factors I mentioned earlier—sound planning, effective leadership, and substantial funding. This, I take it, is what these hearings are all about. I urge you to take action in S. 1800 to create a new Federal program for the Bicentennial era. I hope that in so doing you will consider the four fundamental principles that we in the private sector have stressed—the era concept, inspiration, achievement, and individual initiative.

Of critical importance in any such legislative action will be creation of a new Federal organization with a clear identity of its own, to exist during the 13-year span, from 1976 to 1989.

The name proposed for it in the Mathias-Schroeder bills is the American Constitution Bicentennial Foundation. Earlier, I had suggested that it be called the National Endowment for the Bicentennial Era.

The name obviously is of much less importance than the institution itself. For, make no mistake, without an organizational base there will be no Bicentennial era, no focal point for leadership and funding.

At this stage, the initiative must come from the Federal Government. There is no way that the private sector can produce a central

focus of leadership for such an effort. But I believe firmly the private sector will respond to the Federal initiative to create the intimate and fruitful public-private collaboration which is so essential to success.

The central concern of the new institution would be the continued vitality of representative government in this oldest democracy in the world. This suggests that its goal should include increasing understanding of our heritage, strengthening democratic institutions, encouraging citizen participation, furthering the process of setting goals and priorities—at the local and national levels, and helping to develop new insights into the resolution of our difficult social problems.

These are the goals that must be pursued if we are to make the most of the Bicentennial opportunity. A new entity charged with such a mission will fill a much-needed role in full partnership and cooperation with the existing Federal institutions in the arts, science, and the humanities.

In conclusion, a word should be said about the problem of overly great expectations. The goals I have discussed are difficult ones. I doubt that anyone expects that by itself a new institution will achieve any of them, even over a span of 13 years. Rather, the intent must be to provide a catalytic agent that can stimulate creative energies in both public and private sectors.

Clearly, creating a new Federal institution is only a beginning. But as matters now stand, it offers the one hope of redeeming the missed opportunity of the Bicentennial. Enabling legislation should be passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. If this is done, Members of Congress and the President of the United States will have demonstrated the national commitment and sense of mission I spoke of earlier.

They could give no greater gift to the American people on July 4, 1976.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Rockefeller. I believe it would be helpful to have some examples of the kinds of specific projects which you envision might take place under legislation which we might adopt.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. There are a number, Senator, that are in various stages of development, some of exciting promise.

One, about which I believe you are going to hear later this morning, is the Citizens Involvement Network. I work closely with them. I have been excited by their potential. The whole concept of it is to stir greater citizen participation in the handling of community problems. It goes back to the Goals for Dallas effort under Eric Johnson a number of years ago after President Kennedy's tragic death.

Another one which I have been closely in touch with is the work in the American Institute, which is trying to find a new perspective for labor management relationships. It is an ongoing operation with government, labor and business all represented as donors and on its board.

Another field is the study of the structure and operations of the National Government, which is sometimes referred to as the third Hoover Commission. This seems particularly timely and appropriate right now. That is moving and moving encouragingly.

Another one, quite different, is the concept of new Federalist Papers, updating the Federalist Papers concept in terms of today.

Senator PELL. You might care to supplement these thoughts for the record.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. There are two documents I would appreciate leaving with you.

One is our Bicentennial declaration, which is very brief, which I referred to in my statement; and the other is a summary paper, prepared last fall in response to Mrs. Schroeder's approach to us asking whether there was not something that could be done to lift the Bicentennial and give it greater meaning and impact. I am pleased to give you these two statements.

[The material referred to follows:]

Senator PELL. Thank you.

I will now turn over the meeting to my colleague, Senator Javits. As I said earlier, it is due to his initiative that we are holding these hearings.

Senator JAVITS [now presiding]. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Allow me to ask you this, Mr. Rockefeller, why should this be a Government effort? Why should the organization not stay with the American Revolution Bicentennial Foundation and remain in that activity for 13 years?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Senator, we tried. We tried hard within the private sector to lift this situation and move it forward and that was more than 1 year ago. Sometimes people refer to a problem—to a situation—as being “5 minutes before midnight.” I really feel that is where we are with the Bicentennial now.

I just feel there is no private group with the impact, the initiative to move this situation effectively on the private front; but I do feel, Senator, that if the Federal Government would be willing to take the initiative, that there would be a strong response from the private sector.

In connection with our Bicentennial declaration, we approached a number of corporations asking for financing. The initial reaction was always very positive, but we did not get terribly much in the way of money.

It always came down to the fact that they could not find what to hold on to in relation to the Bicentennial—they could not find what the focus of it was, what Washington expected of them in the private sector. We, as you know, tried in Washington to get leadership, but we were not successful.

To me this action that is proposed could be of significant importance right now.

Senator JAVITS. Now, do I understand the amount sought is \$15 million in fiscal year 1977 and \$20 million in fiscal year 1978?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thought it was \$35 million.

Senator JAVITS. \$35 million?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Each year.

Senator JAVITS. Have you put that amount in the House bill?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. We have put in our bill.

Senator JAVITS. Is there a copy of it?

Senator PELL. I think it would be helpful if that bill were incorporated in the record of the hearing. It has not been referred to us, but it could be useful for information purposes, as we consider whether its concepts are to be further developed.

[The bill referred to follows:]

Senator JAVITS. I gather you would see this as an umbrella organization? You have listed a number of activities which are now being carried out by the nonprofit, private sector. Do you propose that this entity would be, as it were, an umbrella organization for projects of that kind?

Would it carry on any projects of its own in an operating sense?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I would think not. It would be a catalyst working between Government agencies and the private sector and its own self to serve the public interest.

Senator JAVITS. I assume we now have—and you can correct me if I am wrong—this type of activity authorized under the endowment for the humanities? Suppose it were requesting a Federal grant. Would it come to the humanities or would it come to the National Endowment for the Arts?

Senator PELL. May I interrupt for a moment here?

The specifics of legislation have yet to be developed. The specific bills of Senator Mathias and Representative Schroeder are referred elsewhere. We are concerned today with their concepts.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Our hope—our feeling is it is terribly important to have this a separate institution, and not tucked in under the national—

Senator JAVITS. Endowments for the humanities or arts?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. But it must be perceptible to the public, must stand out as something new and fragile and the leadership must be focusing on the basics I have outlined.

Senator JAVITS. Is there any comparable institution in Government other than the National Endowment itself?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Not in relation to the Bicentennial.

Senator JAVITS. Well, or any other activity? Is there any comparable institution to the American Constitution Bicentennial Foundation?

Perhaps the ARBA, I assume, would be comparable.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I guess I do not know my Government well enough to answer that.

Senator JAVITS. You do not feel that it could fit in, for example, as a grantee of the National Endowment on the Humanities?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I think, above all, it must be seeable from the public angle, it must have impact.

Senator JAVITS. You foresee, for example, an organization like the American Film Institute, which derives important support from the National Endowment of the Arts and also derives great private support, including industry support. One part is functioning as a separate entity but not authorized by Federal law of a special kind such as you have proposed here that we do. That was the reason for my questions as to whether it would fit into the humanities endowment.

Is there anything—after all, we are discussing a concept.

Is it not a fact that the concept could be preserved in an organization which was not necessarily a federally established foundation?

It could be done. In other words, if you got the necessary money through one of the endowments, this could be set up as an integral organization deriving a good deal of its support from one of the existing endowments, and you would need no Federal law at all.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Well, we have lived with this problem of private leadership for many months now and we have become convinced, Senator, that the situation is so far along that there is nothing further in the private sector that we can do to provide an entity with the strength and the impact that we believe is required to do the job.

I hate to say no to your question, as I believe very strongly in the private sector. I just feel though at this point it cannot take the initiative required. I really do. I think there is need for a national commitment and a national sense of mission; and I think only the Congress can provide that at this late point.

Senator JAVITS. You spoke of a group of 40. Are those 40 individuals?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. That is right.

Senator JAVITS. Is it permissible to ask who they are?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes.

They are mentioned in one of the two papers I asked included previously.

Senator JAVITS. Then it has already been included in the record.

[The information referred to appears on p. —.]

Senator JAVITS. Now, your testimony says that one of the innovative things in the statute establishing the American Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission was the provision that it stay in existence until 1983.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Yes.

Senator JAVITS. This particular proposal seeks an agency or a foundation that would stay in business until 1989.

Would you repeal, therefore, the American Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission's continuance in existence to 1983 as well as install the foundation you recommend, which goes for 6 years beyond that?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. My understanding is that that has already been repealed, Senator; that when the present organization (ARBA) was created, the earlier one went out of existence. ARBA goes out of existence this year; so this would pick up after they were gone.

Senator JAVITS. I am advised that your understanding of ARBC and ARBA is correct.

Well, it is a very interesting and very fine initiative. I am cosponsoring the bill, S. 3100, now before the Judiciary Committee, as has Senator Pell. We did this to develop a framework and the legislation which we feel would be congenial to the situation and the activities we are already carrying on; and I certainly would welcome the testimony of the other witnesses as well as anything of our own that you would wish to add respecting the activities. You gave us some examples, and you may wish to add more subsequently.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. And there are more in here—one of the two documents we want to leave with you.

Senator JAVITS. Well, fine.

Have we accepted these documents, Mr. Chairman?

Senator PELL. Yes.

Senator JAVITS. Thank you very, very much. I think it is a very stimulating, interesting concept.

Senator PELL. One followup question.

Do you visualize much private funding going into this program and, if so, what percentage of private funding to Government funding?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The way Mrs. Schroeder's bill is written, it would be \$1 for \$2. I would be happier if it were \$1 for \$1, on the same basis as the existing endowments; but my belief is that the private sector would come along at least at the same rate; and I would hope would go substantially further.

Senator PELL. What funding is called for in Mrs. Schroeder's bill?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. \$35 million.

Senator PELL. You are talking about additional funding, over and above the 35?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Right.

Senator PELL. On a matching basis; and up to what limit?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. My point to you is, I would hope the private sector would put in more money beyond what is called for in the bill on the matching basis. I think if this could really get off the ground, the private sector could be counted on in a more substantial way, beyond what the bill calls for.

Senator PELL. Is there a top limit?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mrs. Schroeder's bill calls for \$35 million a year during the duration of the bill, and to get any of that money it would have to be matched 2 to 1.

What I am urging is that the matching be cut back to 1 for 1 as far as the bill is concerned, but then anticipate the private sector would do much more on its own.

Senator PELL. I join Senator Javits in congratulating you on this idea. Our luncheon meeting the other day further stimulated my own interest. As you know, specific legislation is not before our jurisdiction. We have held these hearings as a matter of general interest, and we look forward to seeing this testimony developed. The concepts are obviously good and fine and I congratulate you for helping to advance them.

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, could I just ask one other question?

Has any effort been made to draw up a proposed budget for the foundation?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I do not think so.

Senator JAVITS. Has there been prepared any kind of budget so we could get a look at why \$25 million, and not \$35 or \$45 million? If you can tell us anything about this it would be helped. We would have some kind of a budget as to exactly how this money would be used, and what the estimated overhead cost would be, et cetera.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. We would be glad to work on that.

Senator PELL. Our next witness is Congresswoman Schroeder.

**STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO**

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you for allowing me to testify.

Mr. Rockefeller is going to be a tough act to follow, but I will try to go forward with some of the fervor I think he has been able to convey.

I would ask unanimous consent to put my statement in the record.

Senator PELL. All right; and it will be done, without objection at the conclusion of your testimony.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. As I apologized earlier, I am on the Armed Services Committee and we have the authorization and amendments up right now on the House floor, so I am very anxious to get back over there and complete that.

I do appreciate your allowing me to come over here because I think Mr. Rockefeller really has pointed out something that a lot of us have been very concerned about, and that while the Bicentennial has done a beautiful job of recalling our past, and we all sit basking in the glory of what was accomplished 200 years ago, we have not done enough reflection on the future and on who we are, where we are, and where we are going as a Nation. I think, if you go back and read much of the founding fathers, what the founding fathers did was to concentrate significantly on the future and the next generation and the duty to turn over the country a little bit better than they found it; and that is one of the things they had and that has been left out of this whole Bicentennial celebration.

So I think that what this bill would do would really help us to revitalize our own vision of what we Americans are all about and what is the heritage we are planning to carry forward and how does it make some meaning in the world 200 years later.

All sorts of things have changed tremendously; and where do we go from here?

I think this gives us some understanding.

It requires for every Federal dollar, two private dollars, so it requires a real commitment by the private people and it is not just going to be a ripoff.

Senator JAVITS. Mrs. Schroeder, I am not clear.

You say every dollar requires two private dollars; but does that include the \$35 million?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes.

Senator JAVITS. You draw a dollar of the \$35 million for every \$2?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Except for 15 percent of the project.

In other words, \$35 million goes into the kitty; 15 percent of that project will be permitted not to have the matching, and that is so you can get some small projects that are just not going to have access to matching funds. For the other 85 percent, you have to have this 2-to-1 match; so I think it really shows substantial commitment; and yet you are not totally shutting out everybody to participation.

Senator PELL. To start out, you need to have some seed money. You cannot start out with each dollar being matched; is that your thought?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That \$35 million is your money that goes in.

Senator PELL. With respect to seed money, let's assume perhaps \$2 million for start-up needs and administrative costs. That would not be matched?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. No.

Senator PELL. In other words, it would be \$33 million and \$2 million, would it not?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The other \$33 million, and 15 percent would be put aside and not be required to be matched.

Senator PELL. In other words, \$2 million would be allocated directly to administrative beginnings. Of the remaining \$33 million, 15 percent would be unmatched.

The other 85 percent would require matching.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is correct.

Now, there is probably a lot of things that might be done if the bill as it stands can go on its own. I think tying this into the celebration on July 4th is very critical. What you might be able to do is draw a separate line item with language that there is a lot of things that might transpire.

Congressman Simon, as a cosponsor, feels very badly that he could not be here today, and he is in Chicago with plane difficulties, so he did not quite make it; but basically we worked this up and introduced it and we put it in, we hope, as an innovative way to move this concept along.

It might be tied in with the current Endowment for the Humanities if it was able to maintain a separate identity and have separate goals. But I think we have to make it very clear that we do give it a separate identity with its own integrity so that it does not become consumed as part of the other things.

Other than that, I really do not have a whole lot to add except I certainly hope that all of us in our collective creative wisdom can find some way to deal with this before the July 4 celebration comes off and we sit here and say, "Was not that fun?"

Senator PELL. Do you think you will have any success getting it through committee in the House? What is your prognosis?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. We have this on the Post Office and Civil Service House side, which is interesting; and we did get it—I have oversight on that Bicentennial thing, and this is how partly I got interested.

The Post Office and Civil Service did put \$35 million into the tentative budget request on the House side when we were getting ready for our March 15 deadline. So, we got over that hurdle, and hopefully, we can get over a few more hurdles, but it seems to be very much on track here, if there are some ways we can work together and work something out between the two bodies.

Senator PELL. Do we have any administration reaction to it?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am not sure of any administration reaction that we have at this point.

Senator PELL. Thank you.

Senator JAVITS. I think we have got the story from you, Mrs. Schroeder, and we certainly can see what can be done here in terms of the committee's jurisdiction, procedure, et cetera.

We are marking up the Arts and Humanities reauthorization bill. I do not think we would want to throw that bill to some other committee and complicate its life.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That makes a lot of sense.

Senator JAVITS. I meant here in the Senate. So let us think it through. We are generally pretty good strategists.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Yes; you are.

Senator JAVITS. Let us see what can be done.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Thank you so much.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mrs. Schroeder follows:]

Senator PELL. Our next witness is Mr. Daniel Yankelovich, a very distinguished, well-known public opinion analyst and social scientist.

STATEMENT OF DANIEL YANKELOVICH, PUBLIC OPINION ANALYST AND SOCIAL SCIENTIST, PRESIDENT, YANKELOVICH, SKELLY & WHITE, INC., NEW YORK, N.Y.

MR. YANKELOVICH. Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to testify. I trust that it might be useful for me to say a few words about the nature of the social needs that such a program might meet.

Taking as a point of departure some of the studies that my organization has carried out, plus those of other social research firms, such as the Harris organization and the Gallup organization and the University of Michigan, the studies over the past decade have converged in showing a sharp erosion of confidence and trust in our national institutions, especially in government and business, and they have also showed an increase of people's feelings of powerlessness.

More and more, the average American has come to feel, with a sense of irony, that his or her views do not count, that he or she has very little to say about the decisions that deeply affect his or her life on the job and in the community.

I think it might be helpful if I were to say a few words about what the findings are and what these trends are that substantiate this erosion of confidence, and what it means and what it does not mean.

It is important not to overreact or misinterpret the findings. They do not mean a collapse of faith by Americans in our political system of representative democracy. There is a national consensus on this—the old values, in other words, are strong and intact. Nor do they mean any rejection by our citizens of the free enterprise system.

Fewer than 10 percent of the public would like to see business nationalized and most people—two-thirds of the majority are willing to make sacrifices in order to preserve the free enterprise system. Nor are these findings harbingers of large-scale violence and protest as was in the 1960's, although a majority of the people feel something is wrong.

Most Americans—more than 80 percent, are satisfied with their own personal and family life.

What, then, do the signals of change and distress mean?

Well, we have come to feel that they signify various kinds of loss: A loss that comes from a transition between old values that are being undermined, and from new values that have not yet been fathomed out; and a feeling of loss of trust in ordinary, everyday mores and norms—the glue that really holds this society together.

There is a very widespread feeling in the country that the people who work hard and live by the rules do not get a fair break, while those who flaunt the rules seem to make out just fine. There is the feeling that the system is rigged, undermining the trust and traditional values of self-reliance, initiative, hard work, the value of education, justice, self-improvement. In other words, people have come to feel like suckers when they make these interpretations, and they do not find themselves rewarded or reinforced in the larger society.

Second, there has been a sense of loss of involvement and participation in the life of the community. And thirdly, a discernible loss of the sense of purpose—I mean less commitment to goals, the traditional goals of success.

There is a loss of sense of meaning.

Why has this happened?

The reasons are very complex and varied. They have to do with the aftermath of Watergate, Vietnam, with questions about the economy, and the fact that modern industrial life requires large-scale bureaucracy or centralization and that people feel we have not learned how to make this function correctly. Many people believe the traditional goals of success just are not as attractive as they used to be, either because they are felt to be out of reach for some people or because they have not proven satisfying for others when they have been met. Also, we are dealing with the fact that the country has been undergoing a virtual revolution in social values which leaves people very much up in the air...

As a society, we have been very vigilant about some aspects of being citizens in a free democracy. We have been alert to the needs to protect our freedom and civil liberties, but perhaps we have not been as vigilant about some other aspects of being free citizens that are equally important to maintaining our kind of open society.

We do not even have a good name for what I am talking about; but it has a lot to do with everyday concern for one another, with the feeling of one's being treated as a human being with dignity and not manipulated and with the feeling that one needs to get a fair break. It has to do with trusting people you may not know personally, such as a garage mechanic, schoolteachers, the mayor, one's Congressmen.

It has to do with revitalizing the social bond that holds communities together and keeps the society from degenerating into the nightmare that Thomas Harps described a long time ago—each against all and all against each; and there is that fear—that underlying fear in this society that people have that things come apart in that sense, and this has to do with wanting to participate and find ways to be involved in the life of the community and the country.

Americans feel today confident that their political freedom is being protected, but they have an uneasiness about other aspects of life that we share in common as citizens. These are intangibles but they are nonetheless real. They have to do with normalcy and stability and having a common purpose, shared values, a sense of fairness.

In fact, however intangible these factors may be, they are real. So much so that they may indeed be the central issue in the coming Presidential campaign. Certainly, that is my interpretation is what is going on.

Now, these brief remarks may indicate why I feel that this program is so timely and important. Its emphasis is coming at this particular time and coincides with the emergence of the new, pressing and vital national need to reaffirm and revitalize the shared ideas that give us a distinctive American civilization, to find new ways to create citizen involvement and participation, to find new ways for the public and private sector to work together, and to find and appreciate an approach to the problems that our country faces.

The reason that I was eager to come here to testify on behalf of this program was because I feel that this particular set of problems may be clearer to people in my line of work, which is similar to your own: Namely, the operation of political and the psychological aspects of the country, of public life, as compared to areas considered by economists, lawyers, or administrators, who are necessarily looking at more fixed, more tangible aspects of American life.

In January of this year there occurred a rather startling change in the trend of public moods. For several years, people were gloomy and pessimistic and felt they were victims of uncontrollable events—fearful that we were plunging into a deep depression.

Then the trend changed very abruptly, very suddenly, beginning in January. Most people now feel that the worst is behind them, not ahead of them; and there is a hunger in the country to be positive and to act positively and optimistically and constructively. Thus, the timing for this program, not only in terms of the symbolism involved—the Bicentennial—but in terms of the mood of the country and its needs, just could not be better. I think that this program can therefore be very helpful and constructive.

Thank you.

Senator JAVITS. Thank you very much, Mr. Yankelovich.

I really have only one question.

I am an admirer of yours in terms of the work you do. This would be the kind of a philosophic and general approach to recreating the values which developed the American Revolution. Most of these activities are carried on privately or publicly.

For example, I noticed Mr. Rockefeller's analysis here was a provision respecting productivity, and I forget the title of it—

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Work in America.

Senator JAVITS. We have a commission for productivity for which we appropriate Federal funds. Yet in a philosophic sense, I am sure it could be under such an umbrella. It could be a philosophic operation, as Mr. Rockefeller and Mrs. Schroeder have described.

What is the public acceptance? Do you think the public would accept more work under that aegis and pay more attention to it? Would the public be more interested in it than, for example, the report of the commission which we have set up and financed on productivity?

Mr. YANKELOVICH. Well, Mr. Rockefeller stressed the need for this program to have a kind of a special visibility, to be given initiative and leadership; so that it would stand out, be prominent. I think that is important because of the feeling that the public has that somehow the existing institutions are not being responsive, and that whatever mechanism and whatever machinery we now have just is not being responsive to the kinds of concerns and feelings people have, especially with regard to an opportunity to participate.

Let me be a little more specific for just a moment. I do not know whether this is the kind of program that properly fits in, but at least it corresponds to my analysis of the public need.

I think the most fundamental rule of any society is that people have to feel the rules make sense. They must somehow conform to the social norms, but they must make sense.

Now, what has happened in the past few years is that people have come to feel that the rules do not make sense. They feel they work hard, but instead of being rewarded, the fellow who gets the reward

is the criminal rather than the victim, and the criminal gets away with it.

It would seem to me that this kind of a program could help to identify those seeming anomalies in the law, and in our practices, that are undermining this feeling people have of conforming to rules which do not make sense.

Now, the reason that that ties in so well, I think, is because many of the traditional values on which the country was based are still very much alive—work ethic, self reliance, desire to control one's own fate; but they need reinforcement. People need to feel they can make sense, so what you have on the one hand is this need on the part of people to feel that these rules must make sense, while on the other hand you have practices that are undermining these desires and needs.

If you had this kind of a program you could place emphasis on identifying more precisely these problem areas and what institutional practices are causing concerns I have mentioned.

So I feel that you do need to have some special entity that will say to people that we are dedicating our Bicentennial anniversary to understanding what is standing in the way of some of these old values that have not been working out as well as they used to, and that we are responsive to new solutions, to new values.

Senator JAVITS. One thing does concern me. I am frank about it because I have so much affection and admiration for Mr. Rockefeller and his associates. My concern is whether or not this could be a governmental organization without being constrained that it is coming from the Congress; and must seek appropriations annually. I would really want this to be a revolutionary thing.

I am very concerned about this aspect, notwithstanding all the love and affection that I have for the proponents. We have to think through whether or not this really can do what is so admirably set forth in its purpose when it gets involved in the bureaucracy and governmental processes and popular ideology.

I think you are right that a lot of matrixes have to be broken and that this would be very much in the spirit of the revolution. I admire it a great deal.

Mr. YANKELOVICH. The point Mr. Rockefeller made, which I have also found to be true, is that corporate leaders in the private sector who have money and leadership to give do not have a sense of direction.

Now, it is possible therefore that if the leadership and the initial funding and a sense of direction came from that kind of a program that there are plenty of followers; and once that leadership was given, many of these private groups would be encouraged to support this. Perhaps some of them would offer a more far-reaching program that would not necessarily have to have the combination of Government and private funding, that they could then be more privately funded, giving them a greater freedom. But some initiative that starts from Government is very important, some signal from the Government that gives an opportunity for followthrough. I feel Mr. Rockefeller is right. It is not going to start from the private sector because of lack of clarity, and if it starts with a clarity of definition from the Government, then some of the more useful programs might not have to have that process later on.

Senator JAVITS. I think it is eminently useful. I have no doubt of that. It only worries me whether the Government is going to contribute

money to destroy some of its own structure which urgently needs to be dismantled.

Mr. YANKELOVICH. Well, you know, I think putting it that way, it sounds paradoxical, sounds impossible, but there is another way of looking at it which is not that there would be a great deal of resistance to the pursuit of revolutionary new values, but there would be an enormous amount of support for taking traditional values that have been undermined and finding ways to revitalize them and give them full life once again.

Senator JAVITS. Maybe I am expressing my hopes, but when I think of these Founding Fathers, I think of them as revolutionaries who, if they had been caught, would have been hung. Not too many Americans understand that. I am very serious, I am very serious. Not all of the lovely celebration of these men would be recognized if the British had been successful; and this is something very sober to think about.

Senator PELL. Also, the fate that awaited those on the other side if they had been victorious.

Thank you very much, Mr. Yankelovich.

Senator PELL. Our next witnesses are Mr. John Gentry and Mr. Milton Kotler.

Mr. Gentry represents the Citizens Involvement Network, and Mr. Kotler represents the Alliance for Neighborhood Government.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN N. GENTRY, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT,
CITIZENS INVOLVEMENT NETWORK, VICE PRESIDENT, WIRTZ &
GENTRY, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Mr. GENTRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the opportunity to be here today.

It is my understanding that the purpose of these hearings amongst other things is to explore legislative ways to maintain and strengthen democratic institutions and processes and to encourage public participation in such.

Senator PELL. That is correct.

Mr. GENTRY. And second, to develop fresh insights and approaches to resolving some of the critical social and economic problems which confront us today.

The testimony that I will be submitting is as brief as possible and will be limited to highlighting the recent findings of the organization I represent and to suggest to you why we feel the purpose the subcommittee is pursuing is of critical importance.

Two years ago, three foundations—the JDR III Fund; the Charles F. Kettering Foundation; and the Lealley Endowment—joined forces to explore the emerging phenomena of community-based citizen participation programs.

It was their original intent to, one, assess the diversity of citizen involvement activities throughout the country and, two, if circumstances seemed to warrant, to facilitate the establishment of a network of citizen participation programs that would be examined in depth over a period of several years, with a view toward sharing the experiences of these local programs with a much broader array of citizen groups and with their communities.

The facts underlying this action on the part of these foundations were twofold; first, they shared with other Americans a deep, increas-

ing evidence that the vast majority of our citizens had become alienated and distrustful toward public institutions, as Mr. Yankelovich alluded to; and that there have been a number of surveys in recent years which for many Americans have been quite shocking.

One of those surveys, I might add, was prepared for a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate back in 1973 by the Louis Harris & Associates organization. That survey documented to a large degree the extent to which we are living in a time of pervasive disaffection with large-scale institutions, particularly public, and with the disbelief in an individual's ability to influence public policy.

One quote from that survey might be called to your attention. It says,

The majority of people now do not know how to involve themselves directly with the workings of government. The crisis is broad and deep and involves the basic elements of trust and confidence in government.

I should point out, however, that the same survey also indicates that there are signs of encouragement provided people can be given the opportunity to participate more directly in public affairs. Again, I quote:

The public feels deeply that it can and would participate much more than now in an open and inviting process and wants to participate in an even more pluralistic and vigorous system involving dialogue between leaders and the led.

The second fact which influenced the same three foundations to explore this area was the increasing evidence that a number of communities throughout the United States were developing mechanisms to give citizens a greater voice in addressing common concerns. Substantial evidence of this growth in citizen-participation programs stem from the work of Kettering Foundation in the early 1970's.

During that period the foundation devoted a considerable amount of staff time and resources to identifying localities with community-based citizen involvement programs and to examining the extent to which these programs appeared to meet the individual citizen's desire for greater participation.

The Kettering staff concluded that while the limited number of programs they examined appeared to be serving a constructive purpose within their community, there were several handicaps in several respects.

While there is a considerable amount of citizen involvement activity now taking place, there are also significant drawbacks, caused by the fragmented ad hoc nature of such efforts, by the limited availability of resources for such activity, and by the lack of capacity for research evaluation and information sharing.

The Kettering conclusions, which were shared also by the the JDR III, Fund and the Lalley Endowment were that a need existed to collect and systematically fashion more information on citizen involvement—activities, and to develop the capacity among such programs for evaluation and the common sharing of their experiences.

These early discussions among these three foundations led, in the fall of 1974, to the creation of the Citizen Involvement Network, a nonprofit tax-exempt organization supported by a combination of public and private funds.

The initial planning grant for the network was provided by the three foundations previously mentioned as well as by the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration. The Network is governed by a distinguished board of directors, the Chairman of which is Mr. Wil-

liam Friday, the president of the University of North Carolina, and along with the president of the Network is Mr. Willard Wirtz; and I might add, Mr. Chairman, that both Mr. Friday and Mr. Wirtz would very much like to be here, if that were possible—

Senator JAVITS. Could I interrupt?

I must go and vote in another committee where I am urgently demanded. I will return in about 10 minutes; so if Senator Pell must depart, would you suspend?

Senator PELL. I will be here another 4 minutes and then I have to go.

Mr. GENTRY. I will move along as quickly as I can.

Senator PELL. If you wish, you can put your statement in the record.

Mr. GENTRY. I understand.

As I was saying, I was sorry both Mr. Friday and Mr. Wirtz could not be with us today but unfortunately they did have prior commitments.

The primary purpose of the network involvement was to identify some 20 diverse community programs that would participate in a 3-year research demonstration project to assess the potential of broad-based citizen participation.

In the first 6 months of its operation, the Network staff identified approximately 250 citizen-involvement programs throughout the United States which expressed an interest in our program.

These community programs submitted detailed written descriptions of their organization and activities to the network. Each in turn was subject to an intensive screening process to determine the extent to which they represented broad-based citizen programs rather than being limited to a single issue or subject matter focus.

Following this initial screening, the network staff and consultants visited approximately 60 programs scattered throughout the country—programs, I might add, ranging in size from the State of Washington, with over 3 million, to the small town of Clarendon, Iowa, with a population of 5,000.

On the basis of these visits, extensive review by our board of directors, 20 communities were ultimately selected to form the nucleus of the Citizens Involvement Network.

It would be a disservice to these programs to attempt to summarize for you what we discovered through a review and site visit. Suffice it to say this is an emerging development in communities throughout the United States. There are other developments that we should all be paying a great deal more attention to.

People in all walks of life and in communities, large and small, are initiating citizen participation programs that promote the opportunity for much larger personal roles in shaping the future.

These programs are often privately initiated but they also frequently have activity support from the local government.

In some locations, a substantial number of the population becomes involved in other participations which are more limited but in each program the participants are representative of all segments of the community. Each program we have examined has its own unique characteristics, even though each falls within a broad descriptive category.

For example, some of the programs are of a goal-setting nature in which representatives of the community come together to plan and create what they would wish for the community in 10, 20, 30 years from now.

Senator PELL. I must ask you to excuse me and recess for a moment and Senator JAVITS will be back. I am sorry.

[Short recess.]

Senator JAVITS [presiding pro tempore]. The subcommittee will come to order. Proceed, please.

Mr. KOTLER. Mr. Gentry has not finished his statement and I will follow him briefly.

Senator JAVITS. I hope you can contract your time. I have a Foreign Relations Committee meeting which has already begun.

Please proceed.

Mr. GENTRY. I was referring earlier to just the variety of types of citizen-involvement programs that exist around the country, and in order to just give you a sense of both the scope of the program and the type, I will give you a few examples.

There are, as Mr. Rockefeller referred to earlier, so-called community-wide goal-setting programs such as in Dallas, and Corpus Christi, Tex.; in Charlotte, N.C., and in the State of Washington—and a number of other programs that have more of an issue-oriented position.

One example is the so-called Acorn project in Arkansas.

A third group, which Mr. Kotler will refer to more in detail, is the so-called Neighborhood Coalition, where people within a neighborhood have common problems and seek ways to work together to solve them. Finally, there are a variety of planning groups, often with a research base in a university, where the university reaches out to the community itself and tries to help community residents to resolve common problems.

I could go on in some detail in terms of trying to suggest how we feel about these goals of local-citizen programs, but I know that you are time-pressed; and I will, if appropriate, incorporate in the record my full statement. There are a couple of final points I want to make. We feel that the citizen involvement programs do represent a significant constructive, indeed, a whole new force in the political process in this country. Moreover, it is our strong conviction that if these are to be given attention by the Government at the Federal level, these local programs should be encouraged financially. The vast majority of the programs we have examined operate with only minimal financial assistance and, since participation is and should be essential, a volunteer effort must be made; but some financial resources are essential in maintaining staff support and services required to insure practical effectiveness and continuity.

These programs deserve the financial support of government foundations and corporations.

In closing, let me reinforce our feeling that legislation to encourage greater public participation in the democratic process is sorely needed. We know that the many citizen-participation programs operating throughout the country will improve the quality of life, and particularly the life of communities.

We feel equally strongly that such programs can go a long way toward correcting the distrust and lack of confidence that individual citizens feel with respect to various levels of government.

Senator JAVITS. Thank you. Your full statement will be incorporated in the record.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Gentry follows:]

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Kotler?

STATEMENT OF MILTON KOTLER, POLITICAL SCIENTIST, ALLIANCE FOR NEIGHBORHOOD GOVERNMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. KOTLER. Senator, I will submit the bulk of my statement—

Senator JAVITS. Your statement and attachments will be incorporated in full in the record at the conclusion of your testimony.

Mr. KOTLER. I would like to make just a few brief introductory remarks.

I want to thank you for this opportunity as I speak in behalf of the Alliance for Neighborhood Government, representing neighborhood coalitions and neighborhood organizations, and many American citizens in small towns.

The British journalist, Henry Fairley, said some things in *The Washington Post* recently that some of us Americans have been saying to deaf ears for some time. It took an Englishman to get it out in the *Outlook* section.

The American people, Mr. Fairley claims, are not alienated from public life in their desire for public responsibility, but only alienated from politics in the representative system.

While the proportion of Americans who have confidence in our Government and who vote in election steadily deteriorate, more and more Americans are acting through their neighborhood organizations through direct action—direct citizen participation in neighborhoods at the city, metropolitan, State and national level.

The Democratic and Republican Parties may not be doing too well, but Common Cause, The Alliance for Neighborhood Government, and many other direct-action groups are doing quite well.

Now, when Ralph Nader withdrew his name from the Massachusetts primary several months ago and scored the State officials for failing to see the distinction between citizen action and party politics, the point should be made clear to us. There is something new in American politics today—a new dawn of political participation.

Our challenge, beginning in the Bicentennial Year of our Revolution, is to find a new mix of representative government and direct citizen action in the decades to come.

Now, as a part-time historian, I am going to put into the record my remarks on the origin and rise and fall of this participation, as well as some remarks on their survival at the neighborhood level, and come to the end with some recommendations to keep in mind with respect to the Bicentennial affiliation, and some of the things that might be accomplished with respect to citizen participation.

I think it is important that Congress have a vehicle for study and support of citizens' participation throughout the country. For a Nation which requires citizens responsibility in public affairs, such a vehicle is vital to analyze, monitor, and encourage public participation.

There was a time of carelessness and prosperity when we thought we would build a new society on a professional basis.

Now, that myth is thankfully shattered and we now realize we can only progress through citizen participation—participation which we

have found and understand to be the basic element of change. It is a mask of progress and it requires Congress' steady attention and it requires money.

There is nothing wrong with having public money spent for public participation. That is how the citizens want their money spent.

In addition, we need a direct documentation of the public duties and responsibilities which enable citizen organization groups to carry out programs and projects for the improvement of our common lives.

We have expert opinion on whether or not to have public participation.

Let us get documentation directly from the horse's mouth, from the neighborhood groups on what responsibility they wish to carry out.

Neighborhood organizations need model charters to equip them with the legislature and effective structures for public responsibilities. They should also be federally endorsed to encourage State governments to charter neighborhood organizations as appropriate units of local government.

Congress should find ways, possibly to continue the act of 1975, to get taxpayers' money down to the level where the taxpayer pays for improving his own neighborhood; and I would urge use of a Commission to review the matter of making fiscal shares available to citizen groups and to neighborhood groups.

Congress needs to refine the legislative concept inherent in revenue sharing, in housing, in block grants to see that the public's money gets down to the public level of our neighborhoods and our citizen participation groups.

Congress could develop, through the work of this new program being proposed, a citizen participation impact standard, just as we have an environmental standard.

I should also mention that in the composition of this Bicentennial Foundation or new entity we are discussing, there should be an assurance of representation from neighborhoods, from citizens participation groups. Moreover, the Federal Government and Congress should review appropriate agencies to be sure that the representation from direct participation groups is included in such agencies.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Kotler with attachments and additional materials supplied for the record follows:]

Senator JAVITS. Well, gentlemen, thank you very much for being so patient and for being so very informative, so very supportive of the concept which Mr. Rockefeller has laid before us.

We will take this all under a very serious consideration in connection with the imminent markup of S. 1800, the pending Arts and Humanities bill, when our bill is presented. But you have been very helpful. I consider it a splendid hearing, a remarkably fine exposition and the record will be kept open for 1 week for any additional statements or documents which any of the witnesses care to submit. The subcommittee will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

