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The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 in
Room 3-146, The Capitol, Hon. 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. They are here to discuss these matters with us, and I extend a warm welcome to them.

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, and really the perceptive part of these proposals.

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.

However, I would add, the reason for these hearings is both mainly because of the excellence of ideas, because it is Mr. Rockefeller's initiative in this regard, Senator Mathias' in the project, and particularly because my own staunch colleague, Senator Javits, has taken very strong interest in this idea and has expressed within the Subcommittee that we should hold these hearings.

At the present time, we are absent one member of Congress, and 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, NEW YORK; 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 3rd 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 realize, 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 ten years ago. The original legislation, passed in 1966, stressed 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 play 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 offi-
cial recognition when the ARBC was converted to American

Whatever the reasons -- and it will take a future
historian to explain them -- it is clear that the true promised
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 may concern lies. As
matters stand now, the opportunity of the Bicentennial is not
being used to address the critical social and economic prob-
lems that confront us at 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
collection 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 success-
fully as possible.

But before the last fireworks of this coming 4th of July
fizzle out, let us get down to hard work for the next 13 years.

Success will require that three factors, which I men-
tioned 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. 1300 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, and I will have to re-
cess the Committee for a few moments and I would hope Senator
Javits may be down and he can resume the hearing.

(Short recess.)

Senator Javits. The Subcommittee will come to order.

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

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 the 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 this 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 -- I repeat, 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 the 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 was curious. Let us have an example of the kinds of specific projects about which you envision might be done under this legislation.

Mr. Rockefeller. There are a number, Senator, that are in various stages of development, of some 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 and the whole concept of it is to stir greater citizen participa-

tion in the handling of community properties. It goes back to the goals of the Dulles effort under Eric Johnson a number of years ago after Kennedy's tragic death.

Another one which also I have been closely in touch with is work in American Institute, which is trying to find a new
perspective for labor-management relationships. It is an on-going 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 Federalists Papers, updating the Federalist Papers concept in terms of today.

Senator Pell. You might care to submit these thoughts if there are any papers on them 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 was a summary paper, prepared last fall in response to Mrs. Schroeder's initial approach to us asking was not there something that could be done to lift the Bicentennial and give it greater meaning and impact. So I would be very pleased to give you those two statements.

(The material referred to follows:)

(Subcommittee insert.)
Senator Pell. Thank you.

I will now turn over the meeting to my colleague which, as I said earlier, it is his initiative that we are really holding these committees as we are, Senator Javits.

Senator Javits (now presiding). Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Rockefeller, why should this be a government effort? Why should the organization not stay with the American Constitutional Bicentennial Foundation and remain in that activity for 13 years?

Mr. Rockefeller. Senator, we tried. We tried hard with that group to lift this situation and move it forward and that was more than a year ago. Sometimes people refer to the problem -- to the situation -- as being comparable to being five minutes before midnight, and I really feel that is where we are with the Bicentennial now.

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

Let me mention one other thing.

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 amounts of money; and it always was
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 was expected of them in the private sector, and we,
as you know, tried in Washington to get leadership here but
we were not successful.

To me this action that is proposed could be of signifi-
cant importance right now.

Senator Javits. Now, do I understand the amount sought
is $15 million in '77 and twenty in '78?

Mr. Rockefeller. I thought it was thirty-five.

Senator Javits. Thirty-five?

Mr. Rockefeller. Each year.

Senator Javits. Have you put in a bill?

Mrs. Schroeder. We have put in a bill.

Senator Javits. Is there a copy of it --

Senator Pell. I think that bill should be incorporated
in the record of the hearing, and without objection --

(The material referred to follows:)

(Subcommittee insert.)
Senator Javits. I gather you would see this as an umbrella organization? In other words, you ticked off a number of activities which are now being carried on in the non-profit private sector so that this foundation would, as it were, would be 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. Now, we now have, I assume -- and you can correct me if I am wrong -- would this come under the Foundation of Humanities? Suppose it were coming in off the street for a 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 bill unfortunately is a rather irregular procedure and is being referred to the Judiciary. It is not before us as of now.

Senator Javits. Then it should not appear in the record unless you want the text -- at least, the House bill should.

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. 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 one subject.

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 AREA, 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, as for example, a grantee of the National Endowment on the humanities?

Mr. Rockefeller. I think it would get lost there. I just think at this late date it must stand by itself. It must be seeable from the public angle. The leadership must be focused entirely on this particular program and effort.

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

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 for six months and worked around it, public, private, government; and we just felt, Senator, that the situation is so far along that there was nothing in the private sector further that we could do to give it the strength and the impact that we believe is required to do the job that is there.

I hate to say no to your question, but I believe very strongly in the private sector. I just feel though at this point this is not so. I really do. I think there needs to be a national commitment and a national sense of mission; and I do not think the private sector could give that at this point.

Senator Enright. 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.

This is one of the two papers I wanted to --

Senator Javits. I ask unanimous consent that that may be included, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Pell. No objection.

(The material referred to follows:)

(Subcommittee insert.)
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 Revolution Bicentennial Commission's continuance in existence to '83 as well as install the foundation you recommend, which goes for six years beyond that?

Mr. Rockefeller. My understanding is that that has already been repealed, Senator; that when the present organization was created, the other one went out of existence.

Senator Javits. So we have no possible --

Mr. Rockefeller. ANBA goes out of existence this year; so this would pick up after they were gone.

Senator Javits. Well, it is a very, very interesting and very fine initiative, and I have gone on the bill, as has Senator Pell; that is, the bill already introduced. We would of course if we did this want 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 I do not know
whether that is --

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 that?

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;
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. My own feeling, I would be happier if
it were $1 for $1, on the same basis as the existing documents
are; but my feeling would be that the private would come along
and at least at the same rate; and I would hope would go
substantially further.

Senator Pell. There is in the private funding Mrs.
Schroeder's bill calls for some funding anyway?

Mr. Rockefeller. $35 million.

Senator Pell. You are talking about additional funding,
over and above the thirty-five?

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, that is, 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. What is the top limit?

Would it be a government open-ended matching fund provision?

Mr. Rockefeller. Mrs. Schroeder's bill is $35 million a year during the duration of the bill, and the private -- to get any of that money would have to match it two to one.

What I am urging is that that be cut back to one for one as far as the bill is concerned, but then anticipate the private 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 stimulated my own interest in it and, as you know, as of now, they are not directly before our jurisdiction. We have held these hearings as a matter of general interest, and we look forward to seeing this testimony developed and find it very obviously good and fine and I congratulate you.

Senator Javits. Could I just ask one other question?
Has any effort been made for getting up a budget for the
foundation --

Mr. Rockefeller. I do not think so.

Senator Javits. -- preparing any kind of budget so we
could get a look at why twenty-five and not thirty-five or
forty-five?

Mr. Rockefeller. My own feeling is --

Senator Javits. If you can tell us anything about this
we would have some kind of a budget as to exactly what this
money was going to be used for and what the overhead cost
would be, et cetera, estimated.

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 very much.

Thank you for allowing me to testify.

This 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 if that is all right.

Senator Pell. All right; and it will be done, without
objection.

(The material referred to follows:)

Senator Pell.

Mrs. Schroeder.

Thank you.

Chairman Pell.

Our next witness is Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder.
Mrs. Schroeder. I apologized earlier, as I am on the Armed Services Committee and we have the authorization and amendments up right now, so I am very anxious to get back over there and complete that.

I do appreciate your allowing me to come over here because, along with Mr. Rockefeller, I think he really has pointed out something that an awful lot of us have been very concerned about, and that is the Bicentennial has done a beautiful job of recalling our past, and we all sit basking in the glory of what the gentlemen did 200 years ago, but we have not got enough reflection on the future and have not gotten our own image of who we are and where we are and where we are going; and I think if you go back and read much of the founding father, what the founding fathers had done was -- one of the things interesting about this was in many of their dialogues, they talked about the future and the next generation and the duty to turn over the country a little bit better than they found it; and that was 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 as our population increases.

All sorts of things changed tremendously; and where do we
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 hopes that you are just not going to have access to. I do not want to totally include them, but for the other 85 percent, you have to have this two-to-one 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 have 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. This is what, the seed money you start out with?

Mrs. Schroeder. You mean the $2 million for administrative costs?

Senator Pell. Yes.

Mrs. Schroeder. Yes.

Senator Pell. 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 the Administration getting going and the remaining $33 million, 15 percent would be unmatched? The other eighty-five percent would be -- in order to be used, if not matched, it could not be used?

Mrs. Schroeder. That is correct. 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 co-sponsor, 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, an innovative way that would be greatly appreciated.

It might be tied in with the current endowment if it was able to maintain a separate identity and have separate goals and not be consumed by the endowment, in a separate line item funding, but I think we have -- and Mr. Rockefeller may correct me -- we have to make -- if we do that, we have to make it very clear that we do keep it a separate identity and have its own integrity so it does not become consumed as part of the other things, because I think what the project is, that are envisioned, that are set up in the items that have been included in the record by Mr. Rockefeller are clearly very distinguishable from what anybody else is doing, and to keep them on track and into this revitalization and into the citizen participation which we really need to make sure it does have -- a separate entity.

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 the Judiciary of 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.

I do not think it does any good, and the issue is here and we are not pleased about it; so the Post Office and Civil Service did put $35 million into the tentative budget on the House side when we were getting ready for our March 15th 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, if there are some ways we can work together and work something out between the two bodies.

Senator Pell. Do we have any administrative reaction to it?

Mrs. Schroeder. I am not sure of any administrative 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 endowment bill. I do not think we would want to throw the endowment 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 a pretty good strategem.

Mrs. Schroeder. Yes, you are.

Senator Javits. But let us see what can be done.

Mrs. Schroeder. Thank you so much.

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

STATEMENT OF DANIEL YANKELOVICH, PRESIDENT, YANKELOVICH, SKELLY & WHITE, INC., NEW YORK, NEW YORK

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 rightfully ironic that its views do not count, that he has very little to say about the decisions that deeply affect his 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, this erosion of the 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 the 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 ten 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 do they harbor 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 three kinds of loss, a loss that comes from a transition between old values that are being undermined, new values that have not quite fathomed out, and a feeling of loss of trust and 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. Well, those who flaunt the rules seem to make out just
fine. There is the feeling that the system is rigged, undermining and 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 observe the values 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, less commitment to goals -- traditional goals of success.

There is a loss of a sense of meaning.

Why has this happened?

Well, the reasons are very complex and varied. They have to do with the aftermath of Watergate, Vietnam, with weathering the economy, and the fact that modern industrial life requires large-scale bureaucracy or centralization and we have not learned how to attain this, with the fact that many people recognize the traditional goals of success just are not as attractive as they used to be, either because are felt to be out of reach for some people or because they have not proven satisfying for others when they have not been met and, also, 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 main-
taining 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 every-day concern for one
another, with the feeling of one's being treated as a human
being with dignity and not manipulated with the feeling that
one has of getting a fair break, with trusting people you may
not know personally, such as a garage mechanic, schoolteachers,
the mayor, one's congressman.

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.

America feels today confident that their political
freedom is being protected but they have an uneasiness about
other lives 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 and, in fact, however intangible they may be, they are real and so for that they may indeed be the central issue in the up and coming Presidential campaign and 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 your own, the operation of political and the psychology of the country, of the public line, than perhaps the many professionals, economists, lawyers, 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 pretty gloomy and pessimistic and felt they were being victims of the events — fearful that we were plunging into a deep depression.

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

Thank you.

Senator Javits. Thank you very much, Mr. Yankelovitch.

Only one question that I really have.

I am an admirer of yours in terms of the work you do. This would be 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 that which we appropriate for, yet in a philosophic sense, I am sure it
could be, I assume, under such an umbrella, a philosophic
operation, as Mr. Rockefeller has described, and Mrs.
Schroeder.

What is the public acceptance? Do you think the public
would accept more work under that aegis and pay more atten-
tion to it -- be more interested in it than, for example, the
report of the Commission which we have set up and financed
on productivity and living style, whatever the technical term?

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, and I think that that is important because of
the feeling that the public has that somehow the existing
institutions rightfully or wrongfully, the existing institu-
tions are not being responsive and that whatever mechanism
and whatever machinery we have just is not being responsive
to the kinds of concerns and feelings of the situation being
raised, not having an opportunity to participate.

Let me be a little more specific for just a moment, and 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, somehow conforming
to the social norms, but do make sense.
Now, what has happened in the past few years is that the people have come to feel that the rules do not make sense, that they work hard, and instead of rewarding them, the fellow who gets the reward is the criminal rather than the victim and the criminal gets away with it, and that where they work with promotion practices the work does not give them the opportunity to get what they should have.

It would seem to me that this kind of a program could help to identify those anomalies in the law, in our practice that are undermining this feeling of people having to conform to the rules does 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 make sense while on the other hand you have a lot of laws, a lot of practices that are undermining them.

If you had this kind of a program you could start with that feeling of people having identity -- you could perhaps identify what these anomalies are, what these dysfunctions are, what the laws are, what the particular rules are, what institutional practices are undermining this feeling.
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, as well as it might be brought to bear some more response to our newer values.

Senator Javits. One thing does concern me. I am frank about it because I have some much affection and admiration for Mr. Rockefeller and his associates, and that is whether or not this could be governmental organization without being constrained by the fact that it is coming to the Congress; and I would really want this to be a revolutionary thing.

I am very concerned about that in this matter, and you know, with all the love and affection 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. Yankelowich. 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 smoked out to support this and 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 if you do not have some initiative that starts from the government, these people are -- around the country are waiting for some signal from the government and they just want to follow through. They want to come in with their resources which I feel Mr. Rockefeller is right about in coming back to the fact that it has got to start somewhere; 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.

Senator Javits. I think it is imminently useful. I have no doubt. 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 that they might be free 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 and been successful; and this is something very sober to think about.

Senator Pell. Also, the fate that awaited those on the other side if the good Americans had reached their demise at that time.

Thank you very much, Mr. Yankelovich.
Senator Pell. Our next witness is 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 GENTRY, CITIZENS INVOLVEMENT NETWORK, VICE PRESIDENT, WIRTZ AND 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. You are Mr. Gentry?

Mr. Gentry. Yes.

And secondly 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 and Delley 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 with their communities.

The facts underlying this action on the part of these foundations were twofold; first, they shared with other Americans a deep, increasing 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 for any Americans that have been quite shocking.

One of these surveys, I might add, was prepared for a subcommittee of the United States Senate back in 1973 by the Louis Harris & Associates organization, and 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 the disbelief in an individual's ability to influence public policy.

One quote from that, and one from that survey should be
called to your attention, and 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 if people were given the opportunity to participate more directly in public affairs and, 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."

Another 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 the 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 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 is also a significant dispensation of such effort by reason of their fragmented ad hoc nature, the limited availability of resources for such activity, and the lack of capacity for research evaluation and information sharing.

The Kettering conclusions, which were shared also by the JDR III, Fund and the Leiley 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.

In 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 were provided by the three foundations previously mentioned as well as the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration. The Network is governed by a distinguished Board of Directors, the Chairman of which is Mr. William 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. Chair-
man, that both Mr. Friday and Mr. Wirtz would very much --
Senator Javits. Could I interrupt?
I must go and vote in another Committee where I am
urgently demanded. I will return in about ten minutes; so if
Senator Pell has to go, would you suspend?
Senator Pell. I will be here another four 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 par-
ticipate in a three-year research demonstration project to
assess the potential or broad-based citizen participation.
In the first six months of its operation, the Network
staff identified approximately 250 citizen-involvement pro-
grams 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 -- and, programs, I might add, ranging in size from the State of Washington, with over three 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 there is an emerging and a number of communities throughout the United States and other developments that we should all be paying a great deal more attention to.

People in all walks of life and communities, large and small, are initiating citizen action programs that promote the opportunity for much larger personal roles in shaping their own 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 or another.

For example, some of the programs are of a goal setting in nature which representatives of the community come together to plan and create, in terms of what they like to have the community look like for ten, 20, 30 years in the future.

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.)


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 going on right now.

Go ahead.

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 Dallas, Corpus Christi, Texas, Charlotte, North Carolina, and the State of Washington -- all, a number of programs that have more of an issue-oriented position.

There is one -- the so-called Acorn project in Arkansas, and a number of others around the country.

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 out together to solve them and, finally, there are a variety of planning groups, often with a research basis in the 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; but there are a couple of final points I want to make, that we feel that the citizen involvement programs do represent a significant constructive, indeed, a whole new force in the political process in this country and, moreover, it is our strong conviction that if these are to be paid attention to
by the government at the Federal level, these local programs should be encouraged and perhaps the need is financial. 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 of communities.

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

Senator Pell. Thank you; and your full statement will be incorporated in the record.

(The material referred to follows:)

(Subcommittee insert.)
Senator Pell. 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 Pell. Your statement will be incorporated.

(The material referred to follows:)

(Subcommittee insert.)
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 to politicians for years. 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 a 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 elections steadily delineate more and more Americans are acting through their neighborhood organizations through direct action -- direct citizen action and neighborhoods at the city, metropolitan, State and National level.

The Democratic and Republican parties may not be doing too well, but Common Cause 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 the participation, as well as some remarks of the 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 they might do 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 citizen responsibility in public affaizrs, such as a vehicle that is vital to analyze, monitor, encourage public participation, to have a joint economic committee.

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 as the basic
element of change. It is a coin of progress and it requires Congress' steady attention and it requires money.

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

Secondly, we need a direct documentation of the public duties and responsibilities which enable an organization and citizen organization action groups defining duties and responsibilities, that they want to carry out for the improvement of our common lives.

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

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

Neighborhood organizations need model charters to equip them with the legislation and effective structures of public responsibilities. They should also be Federally endorsed to encourage state government to charter neighborhoods as units of local government.

Congress has to find ways possibly to continue the Act of 1978 to let taxpayers' money down to the level where the taxpayer pays it in their own neighborhood; and I would urge such a Commission to review that matter of fiscal shares to citizen groups and to neighborhood groups.
Congress must have some way of revealing its legislation in revenue sharing, in housing, in block grants to see that the public's money gets down to -- past the local politician and gets down to the public level of our neighborhoods and our citizen action groups.

Congress could develop through the work of this Foundation to begin having a basis for developing a citizen participation impact standard like we have an environmental standard.

I think there are many other things we should do; and one other thing I should mention in the composition of this Bicentennial Foundation must be that we assure that it draws the representation from neighborhoods, from citizens, action groups, and that the Federal Government and Congress must review its agencies to be sure that the representation from direct participation groups is included in the various agencies.

Thank you.

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 led before us.

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

(Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the Subcommittee was
adjourned.)