

Senator Dave Durenberger

REMARKS OF
SENATOR DAVE DURENBERGER
NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON VOLUNTEERISM
OCTOBER 12, 1980

THANK YOU. IT'S A GREAT PLEASURE TO BE HERE TONIGHT AND TAKE PART IN THIS HISTORIC OCCASION--THE FIRST JOINT CONFERENCES OF FOUR OF THE NATION'S LEADING VOLUNTARY ACTION ORGANIZATIONS.

IT'S APPROPRIATE THAT THESE CONVENTIONS ARE BEING HELD IN MINNESOTA. I THINK IT'S MORE THAN PAROCHIAL PRIDE WHEN I REFER TO MY STATE AS THE "HEART" OF VOLUNTEERISM IN OUR COUNTRY. THE PEOPLE OF MINNESOTA HAVE A TRADITION OF SAYING, "I MUST DO SOMETHING," INSTEAD OF JUST SAYING, "SOMETHING MUST BE DONE."

THAT SPIRIT IS WHAT BRINGS YOU TOGETHER THIS WEEK. EVERY PERSON IN THIS ROOM, AT ONE TIME OR ANOTHER, LOOKED AT WHAT WAS HAPPENING IN OUR COMMUNITIES, OUR STATES AND OUR COUNTRY AND SAID, "I MUST DO SOMETHING." SO, YOU BECAME INVOLVED. YOU JOINED ONE OF THE MORE THAN 6 MILLION VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS IN OUR COUNTRY AND STARTED TO WORK FOR CHANGE THROUGH PRIVATE INITIATIVES.

YOU BECAME PART OF A TRADITION THAT IS AS OLD AS OUR NATION. OUR INDEPENDENCE WAS WON BY VOLUNTEERS; OUR MOST IMPORTANT SOCIAL CHANGES HAVE COME WHEN VOLUNTEERS RECOGNIZED A NEED AND STARTED A REFORM MOVEMENT; AND, DURING MUCH OF THE COUNTRY'S HISTORY, OUR MOST IMPORTANT PUBLIC SERVICES HAVE BEEN PROVIDED BY VOLUNTEERS,

THROUGH ALL THESE ACCOMPLISHMENTS, THERE HAS BEEN A RECURRING THEME THAT HAS SET AMERICA APART FROM OTHER SOCIETIES, EVEN OTHER DEMOCRACIES. PRIVATE CITIZENS HAVE ALWAYS BEEN INVOLVED IN THE DELIVERY OF SERVICES AS WELL AS THE DETERMINATION OF POLICY,

THE PRIVATE, NON-PROFIT INVOLVEMENT IN THE DELIVERY OF SOME OF OUR MOST BASIC SERVICES IS A CENTURIES-OLD TRADITION. IN EDUCATION, FOR EXAMPLE, THE MEMBERS OF A COMMUNITY WOULD ALL PITCH IN ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS TO CUT THE TIMBER AND SHAPE THE STONES THAT FORMED THE BUILDING. THE TEACHING WAS DONE BY THE BEST EDUCATED OR THE PERSON WHO OWNED THE MOST BOOKS. SOMETIMES GOVERNMENT WAS CALLED ON FOR REVENUES, OTHER TIMES THE HAT WAS PASSED AROUND THE NEIGHBORHOOD. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE WORKED HAND-IN-HAND,

EVEN TODAY, PTA'S AND PTO'S SUPPLEMENT GOVERNMENT-RUN SCHOOLS WITH FUNDRAISING PROJECTS AND VOLUNTEER CONTRIBUTIONS OF TIME. MOST STATE-RUN UNIVERSITIES HAVE SEMI-INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITY FOUNDATIONS THAT SEEK GIFTS AND GRANTS TO AUGMENT THE TAX MONEY VOTED BY THE STATE LEGISLATURES, WHILE PRIVATE SCHOOLS ACTIVELY SEEK PUBLIC FUNDS FOR RESEARCH PROJECTS AND TUITION ASSISTANCE.

MUCH THE SAME CAN BE SAID IN THE AREA OF HEALTH CARE. MANY OF THE VITAL SERVICES WE TAKE FOR GRANTED WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE WITHOUT VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS OF TIME AND MONEY. PRE-SCHOOL VISION AND HEARING SCREENINGS, SUPPORT STAFF IN NURSING HOMES, AND MEDICAL RESEARCH ARE JUST A FEW EXAMPLES OF HOW THE NON-PROFIT SECTOR IS IMPROVING OUR COUNTRY'S STANDARD OF HEALTH CARE.

LOOK AT SOME OF THE CORNERSTONES OF OUR SOCIETY, AND YOU'LL FIND THAT THEY WERE PUT IN PLACE BY VOLUNTEERS WHO COMBINED THE DELIVERY OF A SPECIFIC SERVICE WITH THE ADVOCACY OF CHANGE IN PUBLIC POLICY. THE MOVEMENTS TO ABOLISH SLAVERY, TO PROVIDE EQUAL RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITIES, TO TAKE CARE OF THE UNDER-PRIVILEGED, TO CONSERVE AND MAKE BETTER USE OF OUR NATURAL RESOURCES, AND TO REFORM OUR COUNTRY'S PRISONS...ALL OF THESE CRUSADES STARTED IN THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN PROVIDING A SERVICE AND ADVOCATING CHANGE IN PUBLIC POLICY HAS ALWAYS BEEN FUZZY. IN THE MID-19TH CENTURY, FOR EXAMPLE, THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD THAT BROUGHT SLAVES FROM THE PLANTATIONS TO FREEDOM WAS A SERVICE, BUT IT WAS ALSO A STATEMENT THAT A POLICY CHANGE WAS NEEDED. IN MANY CASES, THE PROVISION OF THE SERVICE PRECIPITATED THE CHANGE IN POLICY.

EVENTUALLY, THOUGH, THE PENDULUM OF VOLUNTEERISM SWUNG IN THE OTHER DIRECTION; ADVOCACY PRECEDED SERVICE. IN FACT, IN SOME CASES, THE ADVOCACY BY VOLUNTEER ORGANIZATIONS WAS SO SUCCESSFUL THAT THE GOVERNMENT RESPONDED TO THE PRESSURE FOR CHANGE WITH A SERVICE.

THAT HAS BEEN THE CASE IN THE LAST 3 DECADES. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., HIS SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE AND OTHER CIVIL RIGHTS GROUPS FOCUSED THE EYES OF THE NATION ON DISCRIMINATION. THE SIERRA CLUB, THE AUDUBON SOCIETY, THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION AND OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS SHOWED US THE DAMAGE WE WERE DOING TO OUR LAND, WATER AND AIR. POLITICAL LEADERS TOLD YOUNG PERSONS TO GET INVOLVED BY ORGANIZING AROUND THEIR BELIEFS AND PRESSURING FOR CHANGE, AND THEY FOLLOWED THE ADVICE.

RATHER THAN DELIVER A SPECIFIC SERVICE, THESE GROUPS WERE ADVOCATES FOR A GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSE TO SOCIAL PROBLEMS. POLITICIANS USUALLY FOUND IT IN THEIR BEST INTERESTS TO RESPOND TO THE PRESSURE BY ADDING NEW LAWS, NEW REGULATIONS, NEW BUREAUCRACIES AND, OF COURSE, NEW EXPENDITURES.

IT TOOK THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ALMOST TWO CENTURIES TO REACH THE 100 BILLION-DOLLAR SPENDING LEVEL IN 1962; IT WILL TAKE LESS THAN A GENERATION--25 YEARS--TO PASS THE ONE TRILLION DOLLAR SPENDING MARK. EVEN THOUGH NATIONAL TAXES HAVE MORE THAN DOUBLED IN THE LAST FOUR YEARS, THAT HASN'T BEEN ENOUGH TO KEEP PACE WITH THIS RAPID INCREASE IN SPENDING. BETWEEN 1961 AND 1981 THERE HAS BEEN ONLY ONE BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET.

IN THE FISCAL YEAR JUST ENDED, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RECORDED THE SECOND HIGHEST DEFICIT IN HISTORY--MORE THAN 60 BILLION DOLLARS. FISCAL '81 IS EVEN WORSE! DESPITE ALL THE PROMISES OF LAST SPRING, THE DEFICIT IN THE NEW FISCAL YEAR WILL COME CLOSE TO 100 BILLION DOLLARS. THE LAME DUCK SESSION OF CONGRESS THAT STARTS A MONTH FROM TODAY COULD PUSH THE FISCAL '81 DEFICIT TO A RECORD-SETTING 100 BILLION DOLLARS. OUR DEFICIT COULD BE AS HIGH AS TOTAL FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SPENDING WAS LESS THAN TWO DECADES AGO.

THE HUGE DEFICITS THAT GOVERNMENT RUNS UP CONTRIBUTE TO WHAT MAY BE THE MOST PRESSING PROBLEM FOR VOLUNTEERISM AND, IN FACT, FOR OUR WHOLE COUNTRY--INFLATION.

THE RELATED PROBLEMS OF GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND INFLATION WILL FORCE VOLUNTEER ORGANIZATIONS TO FACE NEW CHALLENGES. LAST YEAR, AMERICANS GAVE MORE THAN 40 BILLION DOLLARS TO CHARITIES, AND THAT AMOUNT WILL CERTAINLY INCREASE THIS YEAR. BUT, IT WON'T INCREASE BY THE 13 OR 14 PERCENT NEEDED TO KEEP PACE WITH INFLATION, TO SAY NOTHING OF THE ADDITIONAL FUNDS NEEDED TO EXPAND OUR SERVICES. IF INFLATION CONTINUES AT 14 PERCENT, YOUR BUDGETS WILL HAVE TO DOUBLE ABOUT EVERY FIVE YEARS JUST TO STAY EVEN.

THE COST OF VOLUNTEERING IS RISING ASTRONOMICALLY. A 1971 STUDY SAID THAT THE AVERAGE VOLUNTEER PAID UP TO 75 DOLLARS A YEAR IN OUT-OF-POCKET EXPENSES JUST TO VOLUNTEER. TODAY, THOSE COSTS HAVE NEARLY TRIPLED. WHEN FAMILY BUDGETS ARE HARD-PRESSED, IT'S BECOMING MORE AND MORE DIFFICULT TO AFFORD THOSE EXPENSES.

YOUR AVAILABLE VOLUNTEER FORCE IS CHANGING, IN PART DUE TO INFLATION. FOR THE FIRST TIME IN OUR COUNTRY'S HISTORY MORE THAN HALF OF ALL MARRIED WOMEN ARE NOW WORKING. IN MANY CASES THEY ARE WORKING TO SUPPLEMENT THE FAMILY INCOME, BUT A SIDE EFFECT IS THAT THEY ARE REALIZING NEW OPPORTUNITIES. THAT, AND AN UNCERTAIN ECONOMY, ARE DRIVING DOWN THE BIRTHRATE.

THE VOLUNTEER OF THE FUTURE IS LIKELY TO BE AN OLDER AMERICAN, YET INFLATION IS KEEPING SENIOR CITIZENS AT THEIR JOBS LONGER. THEY CAN'T AFFORD RETIREMENT.

FINALLY, VOLUNTEERISM NEEDS A HEALTHY ECONOMY TO THRIVE. PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS AND CORPORATIONS MUST HAVE THE INCOME AND THE PROFITS TO CONTRIBUTE, JUST AS INDIVIDUALS NEED THE INCOME TO AFFORD BOTH THEIR DAY-TO-DAY EXPENSES AND A CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION.

THE HUGE AND RAPID GROWTH OF GOVERNMENT THAT HAS LED TO THIS INFLATION IS CAUSING MANY PEOPLE TO QUESTION THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT. IN TWO SHORT DECADES, A LARGE SEGMENT OF THE POPULATION HAS GONE FROM BELIEVING THAT GOVERNMENT CAN DO EVERYTHING BETTER, TO SAYING THAT GOVERNMENT CAN'T DO ANYTHING RIGHT.

EVEN THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR, WHICH HAS BEEN AT LEAST IN PART RESPONSIBLE FOR THE GROWTH OF GOVERNMENT IN THE HUMAN SERVICE DELIVERY AREA, HAS BEEN AMONG THIS GOVERNMENT'S LOUDEST CRITICS. MY GOOD FRIEND, KEN ALLEN, THE EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT OF VOLUNTEER, TOLD THAT ORGANIZATION'S NATIONAL CONFERENCE THAT DEFINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND VOLUNTARY GROUPS MUST BE A TOP PRIORITY IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS.

AFTER SAYING THAT THE "ANTI-GOVERNMENT MOOD MAY BE POSITIVE FOR THOSE WHO ARE SEEKING BASIC REFORMS," HE WENT ON TO SAY:

"I AM SEEING A DISTRESSING TENDENCY ON THE PART OF LARGE WELL-ESTABLISHED VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS TOWARD EXPRESSING ANTI-GOVERNMENT SENTIMENTS IN WAYS THAT, IF REALIZED, WOULD IMPERIL MUCH OF THE SOCIAL LEGISLATION OF THE PAST 20 YEARS. I AM SEEING THE GLIMMERINGS OF A NEW MACHO VOLUNTARY SECTOR THAT WISHES TO ASSERT THAT THERE IS NO NEED FOR GOVERNMENT, THAT IN FACT THE SOLUTION TO SOCIAL PROBLEMS SHOULD BE THE EXCLUSIVE DOMAIN OF PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS, BOTH NON-PROFIT AND FOR-PROFIT, WHICH ARE CONTROLLED BY A RELATIVELY FEW."

WHAT KEN SEES IN HIS WORK WITH THE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS, I SEE IN MY TRIPS AROUND THE STATE AND THE COUNTRY, THE MAIL I RECEIVE IN MY SENATE OFFICE AND THE REACTION I RECEIVED FROM SOME GROUPS WHEN I INTRODUCED MY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON VOLUNTEERISM.

WE ARE ON THE VERGE OF GOING OVERBOARD, OF GIVING UP MANY OF THE REFORMS AND THE POSITIVE SOCIAL LEGISLATION THAT YOU AND I, WORKING AS VOLUNTEERS, HAVE BROUGHT TO GOVERNMENT IN THE PAST TWO DECADES. REFORM OF GOVERNMENT TOO OFTEN IS BEING EQUATED WITH ELIMINATION OF GOVERNMENT.

FRANKLY, THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, IN 1980, ARE SEVERAL YEARS INTO A KIND OF FUNDAMENTAL CHANGE IN THE INSTITUTIONS AND PROCESSES OF SOCIAL LIFE THAT HAS OCCURRED IN THE HISTORY OF OUR COUNTRY ABOUT ONCE EVERY 100 YEARS. THE FIRST ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF OUR HISTORY REFLECTED THE REASONS FOR OUR REVOLUTION FROM ENGLAND--OUR DESIRE TO DEVELOP OUR OWN COMMERCIAL AND ECONOMIC INTEREST. THE GOVERNMENT WE ESTABLISHED IN THE 1780'S WAS DESIGNED TO PROTECT AND TO ENCOURAGE A SYSTEM OF BUSINESS ENTERPRISE.

IT DID ITS JOB SO WELL THAT THE INDUSTRIALIZATION AND URBANIZATION OF THIS COUNTRY WHICH RAPIDLY FOLLOWED THE CIVIL WAR GAVE RISE TO ENORMOUS MATERIAL PROGRESS. BUT, IT ALSO GAVE US CROWDED CITIES, THE EXPLOITATION OF LABOR, THE DESPOILATION OF THE LANDSCAPE AND AN ARRAY OF BUSINESS PRACTICES UNFAIR TO EVERYONE.

OUR NEED WAS, THEN, TO ASSERT THE INTERESTS OF THE PUBLIC AND OF THE COMMUNITY AGAINST THE DOMINANT POWER OF PRIVATE INTERESTS. SO, WE TURNED TO GOVERNMENT, AND ESPECIALLY TO THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT, FOR LEADERSHIP. DECISIONS WERE MADE INCREASINGLY THROUGH THE PROCESS OF POLITICS AND CARRIED OUT THROUGH A NEW BUREAUCRACY. ONE OF ITS MOST NOTED--AND REPUBLICAN--INSTIGATORS WAS THEODORE ROOSEVELT WHO ARTICULATED THE IDEA OF A STRONG NATIONAL GOVERNMENT OPERATING IN THE INTERESTS OF THE COMMON PEOPLE IN HIS CONCEPT OF A "NEW NATIONALISM." AFTER THE NEW NATIONALISM CAME WOODROW WILSON'S NEW FREEDOM, FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT'S NEW DEAL, HARRY TRUMAN'S FAIR DEAL, JOHN KENNEDY'S NEW FRONTIER, AND ON AND ON.

THEY ALL BOIL DOWN TO THE SAME THING: AN EXPANSION IN THE USE OF THE POLITICAL SYSTEM AND GOVERNMENT JUSTIFIED BY AND FOR HUMANITARIAN PURPOSES. THE TOOLS OF EXPANSION WERE LAWS AND REGULATIONS AND SUBSIDIES AND ENTITLEMENTS. ONLY THE CONSTITUTIONAL NATURE OF THE AMERICAN FEDERAL SYSTEM STOPPED THIS EXPANSION FROM GOING AS FAR AS THE SOCIALIST FORM OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENT WHICH CAPTURED EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

OUR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT WAS CONSISTENTLY RESTRAINED FROM THE DIRECT DELIVERY OF PUBLIC SERVICES UNTIL COMMUNITIES, VOLUNTARY AGENCIES, COUNTIES AND STATES FACED A GROWING NEED FOR REVENUE. THE DEVELOPMENT OF CATEGORICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN THE 1950'S AND AFTER MADE IT POSSIBLE FOR THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT--WITH ITS SUPERIOR RESOURCES--TO BEGIN TO DO THROUGH STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND THE NON-PROFIT SECTOR WHAT IT COULD NOT DO DIRECTLY.

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES THAT ONCE WERE DELIVERED AND CONTROLLED LOCALLY OR PRIVATELY FELL UNDER THE THUMB OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT. FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION, URBAN REDEVELOPMENT, THE USE AND PROTECTION OF OUR LAND, AIR AND WATER, HUMAN AND SOCIAL SERVICES, AND HUNDREDS OF OTHER PROGRAMS WERE ALL ACCOMPANIED BY PLANNING REQUIREMENTS AND REGULATIONS DETAILING THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES TO BE USED AND THE PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED.

SO, TODAY, WE ARE AT THE BEGINNING OF ANOTHER HUNDRED-YEAR CYCLE AND THE CENTRAL QUESTION IS WHETHER OUR PROCESS FOR DOING SOMETHING ABOUT OUR PUBLIC PROBLEMS NEEDS TO BE ALTERED IN SOME WAY. POLITICAL DECISION-MAKING AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION WERE EFFECTIVE WHEN THE PROBLEMS THAT NEEDED TO BE REFORMED WERE LARGELY IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR. THE QUESTION IS: HOW WILL WE EFFECTIVELY REFORM PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS THAT RESIST CHANGE WHILE RETAINING OUR CAPABILITY TO IDENTIFY AND SOLVE PROBLEMS?

IN MANY RESPECTS, THE QUESTION WAS ADDRESSED BY INTERIOR SECRETARY CECIL ANDRUS WHO LAST WEEK ANNOUNCED HE WAS LEAVING THE CABINET.

"WHEN I WAS GOVERNOR, I COULD IMPLEMENT A DECISION QUICKLY," HE SAID. "I COULD EVEN IMPLEMENT A POOR DECISION. I COULD CALL UP THE STATE POLICE OR THE NATIONAL GUARD AND THEY'D SAY, 'YES SIR.'"

"HERE, YOU CAN'T EVEN IMPLEMENT A GOOD DECISION IN A TIMELY FASHION."

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC IS REACTING IN MUCH THE SAME MANNER. AT THE HEART OF THE PROTEST IS THE DEMAND THAT GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE MADE MORE "RESPONSIVE." OF COURSE, A DIVERSE SOCIETY HAS DIVERSE DEFINITIONS OF "RESPONSIVE." SOME OF THOSE PRESSURING FOR THEIR BRAND OF RESPONSIVENESS REALLY OFFER NOTHING HELPFUL TO THE FUTURE. THEY ASK GOVERNMENT AND OTHER SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS SIMPLY TO DO LESS, TO RESPOND TO THE CRY FROM PEOPLE TO LEAVE US ALONE, NOT TO DISRUPT THE SETTLED ROUTINE, NOT TO DISAPPOINT EXPECTATIONS, NOT TO ASK INDIVIDUALS TO THINK ABOUT THE COMMUNITY, NOT TO COMPLICATE LIFE FOR PEOPLE. THAT'S THE RESPONSE OF THE "ME GENERATION" ABOUT WHOM WE ARE ALL DISTRESSED.

THE SAME KIND OF NON-CHANGE COMES FROM THOSE WHO FOLLOW THE RULE THAT GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT TAKE PRIVATE PROPERTY. IT SHOULD NOT DETERMINE THE LOCATION OF ELECTRICAL GENERATING FACILITIES. IT SHOULD NOT CLOSE A PLANT. IT SHOULD STOP NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION, BUT DON'T STORE THE WASTE IN OUR COUNTRY. IT SHOULD SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF TOXIC WASTE, BUT NOT BE DISPOSAL SITES IN MY COUNTY.

POLITICIANS ARE RESPONSIVE; THEREFORE GOVERNMENT CAN BE RESPONSIVE. BUT TOO OFTEN IT'S RESPONSIVE TO THOSE WHOSE NUMBERS ARE SMALL, BUT WHOSE EFFORTS ARE FOCUSED, ORGANIZED, AND VIGOROUS. A RESPONSIVE GOVERNMENT USES PRECIOUS FINANCIAL RESOURCES TO BAIL OUT CHRYSLER WHILE A RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT WOULD RESTORE PRODUCTIVITY AND CAPITAL FORMATION TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY.

THOSE WHO DON'T FALL INTO ONE OF THESE CATEGORIES INSIST WE CHANGE GOVERNMENT BY DEALING WITH THE RESPONSE MECHANISM. ONE CURE SAYS THAT THERE'S NOTHING WRONG WITH THE SYSTEM ITSELF, IT'S SIMPLY A PROBLEM OF THE PEOPLE WHO ARE RUNNING IT. ANOTHER CURE SAYS THE PEOPLE ARE OKAY, BUT WE'VE GOT TO REFORM THE SYSTEM, AND THE MORE RADICAL CURES SUGGEST THAT SPENDING LIMITATIONS AND TAXING LIMITATIONS, PREFERABLY THROUGH CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, WILL BEST IMPROVE THE GOVERNMENTAL RESPONSE MECHANISM.

ANOTHER WAY TO RESPONSIVENESS IS THROUGH DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION. IT BEGINS WITH THE THEORY, WHICH IS QUITE ACCURATE, THAT ALL LARGE SERVICE SYSTEMS TRANSFORM INDIVIDUALS INTO CLIENTS. THE SYSTEMS MAKE A LIVING DOING THINGS FOR PEOPLE. TO GROW, THEY NEED MORE CLIENTS, AND IF NOT MORE CLIENTS, AT LEAST MORE PROBLEMS. THE SERVICE SYSTEMS CREATE NEEDS SO THEY CAN CONTINUE TO GROW, DOING MORE THINGS FOR MORE CLIENTS.

THE PERSON WHO WANTS TO BREAK DOWN THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT DOES SO BY ASSERTING THE RIGHT AND THE ABILITY OF PEOPLE TO DO FOR THEMSELVES: THE SELF-HELPERS, THE NEIGHBORHOOD MOVEMENTS, THE EFFORT TO SECURE LAY REPRESENTATION ON BOARDS OF GOVERNANCE.

SOME EXPRESS THIS RESPONSE WITH THE CONCEPT THAT SMALL IS BEAUTIFUL, DECENTRALIZATION IS GOOD, AND SELF-SUFFICIENCY IS IDEAL.

ACTUALLY, THIS GROWING ASSERTION OF THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS TO DECIDE IS ONE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL CHALLENGES TO EXISTING INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR PUBLIC SERVICE DELIVERY. IT ASKS THE QUESTION: "WHO DECIDES?" WHO DECIDES HOW A CHILD SHOULD BE EDUCATED? WHO DECIDES WHEN AND HOW LIFE SHOULD BEGIN AND END? WHO DECIDES HOW WE USE OUR NATURAL RESOURCES?

A FINAL THOUGHT ON THE SUBJECT OF INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE COMES FROM ALBERT HIRSCHMAN, WHO TEN YEARS AGO PUT FORTH THE THOUGHT THAT THERE ARE TWO ALTERNATIVE WAYS IN WHICH AN INSTITUTION'S FAILING BEHAVIOR CAN BE CORRECTED. PEOPLE CAN STAY AND TALK IT OUT, SO TO SPEAK, OR THEY CAN WALK AWAY. ONE IS CALLED VOICE, THE OTHER EXIT.

IN HIRSCHMAN'S TERMS, THE PROBLEMS IN THIS COUNTRY ARE AN EXCESSIVE RELIANCE ON VOICE IN RESPONDING TO THE PROBLEMS AND THE OPPORTUNITIES THAT FACE US. ELECTIONS ARE VOICE, PUBLIC HEARINGS ARE VOICE, ADVISORY COMMITTEES ARE VOICE, INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM ARE VOICE, GOAL SETTING, PLANNING COMMISSIONS AND ABOVE ALL--STUDIES--ARE ALL VOICE. AS MORE AND MORE ACTIVITIES AND MORE AND MORE PEOPLE MIGRATE INTO THE PUBLIC SECTOR, THEY BECOME STAKE-HOLDERS WHO DECIDE TO STAY AND TALK IT OUT RATHER THAN EXITING.

THE WHOLE SYSTEM ACTUALLY WOULD WORK BETTER IF IT WOULD REALIZE THAT EXIT IS NEEDED TO MAKE VOICE EFFECTIVE. IN OTHER WORDS, PROTEST AGAINST THE SYSTEM MAKES PROTEST WITHIN THE SYSTEM MORE POWERFUL. EACH APPROACH MAKES THE SYSTEM MORE ACCOUNTABLE.

THE SYSTEM WE'VE BUILT OVER THE LAST 100 YEARS RESPONDED TO THE ESSENTIAL JOB OF ASSERTING A MAJORITY INTEREST AGAINST THE POWER AND PRIVILEGE OF A MINORITY: IN OTHER WORDS, PEACEFULLY REDISTRIBUTING A GROWING PIE. IT WORKED WELL. NOW THE INTERESTS THAT MUST BE ATTACKED ARE THE MAJORITY INTERESTS--THE WASTE, THE CONSUMPTION, THE LACK OF PRODUCTIVITY, THE UNWILLINGNESS TO SAVE, TO INVEST OR TO TRADE OFF TODAY FOR TOMORROW.

THE ANSWER IS TO FOCUS THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT ON TRULY NATIONAL ISSUES AND TO DIRECT ELECTED OFFICIALS TO WHAT ARE TRULY POLICY ISSUES. WE DO THAT BY CONCENTRATING OUR EFFORTS ON RESTRUCTURING THAT AREA OF PUBLIC LIFE IN WHICH ELECTED OFFICIALS ARE TODAY EXCESSIVELY AND UNNECESSARILY INVOLVED. THAT IS PARTICULARLY THE AREA OF LOCAL PUBLIC SERVICE DELIVERY.

TO INCREASE THE ABILITY OF ELECTED OFFICIALS TO ACCEPT CHANGE IN OUR MAJOR PUBLIC SYSTEMS, WE MUST ENCOURAGE BROAD INNOVATION IN SERVICE DELIVERY AND BE WILLING TO PERMIT SERVICE DECISIONS TO COME FROM THE CHOICES OF THE USERS.

INCREASINGLY, RESPONSIVENESS, ACCOUNTABILITY AND EFFICIENCY SHOULD BECOME ISSUES NOT BETWEEN ELECTED OFFICIALS AND MANAGERS, BUT BETWEEN ENTERPRISE MANAGERS AND CITIZEN CONSUMERS. THE POLITICIAN MUST BE THE DECIDER, BUT NOT ALWAYS THE DOER. HE/SHE MUST ENCOURAGE MORE DIVERSITY BY SOLICITING FROM A VARIETY OF ORGANIZATIONS INITIATIVES FOR NEW WAYS OF DELIVERING SERVICES ----- AND THEN LETTING DECISIONS EMERGE INCREASINGLY THROUGH THE PATTERN OF CHOICE MADE BY THE PEOPLE WHO USE THOSE SERVICES.

UNDER THIS SYSTEM, PUBLIC POLICY CAN SET OBJECTIVES; PUBLIC POLICY CAN SET THE STANDARDS FOR PROGRAM OPERATIONS; PUBLIC POLICY CAN DETERMINE THE LEVEL AT WHICH SERVICES ARE FINANCED AND PUBLIC POLICY CAN REDISTRIBUTE RESOURCES TO MAKE SURE THEY ARE EQUALLY AVAILABLE.

WOULD THE CENTRAL FUNCTION OF GOVERNMENT BE WEAKENED IF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES BECAME MORE ACCOUNTABLE TO USERS OF THEIR SERVICE? MIGHT IT NOT BE POSSIBLE TO ACCEPT AND TO TOLERATE MORE DIVERSITY THAN WE HAVE IN THE PAST? ISN'T IT BEST THAT NEW IDEAS BE ALLOWED AND EVEN REQUIRED TO SPREAD? AREN'T THERE OPPORTUNITIES TO BUILD ON THE COMPETENCE OF PEOPLE OF INDIVIDUALS WHO FACE REALITY FAIRLY WELL, WHO MAKE ADJUSTMENTS AND WHO SET PRIORITIES?

AREN'T PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY FAR MORE COMPETENT TODAY THAN WE WERE IN ANOTHER TIME TO ARRANGE A GREAT MANY SERVICES FOR THEMSELVES? OF COURSE! PLUS--A SYSTEM WITH MORE CHOICES WILL GIVE THE DISADVANTAGED MORE LEVERAGE ALONG WITH MORE RESPONSIBILITY. YOU KNOW ALL THESE ANSWERS, BECAUSE YOU'RE READY TO PROVE THIS SYSTEM CAN WORK.

BUT, YOU HAVE A PROBLEM.

IF GOVERNMENT IS TO GIVE UP ITS ROLE AS DOER, THEN ITS POLICIES MUST ENCOURAGE THE PRIVATE FOR-PROFIT AND NON-PROFIT SECTORS TO TAKE OVER. TAX POLICIES THAT WERE DESIGNED TO FINANCE THE GOVERNMENTAL DELIVERY OF SERVICES MUST BE CHANGED TO FINANCE THE DELIVERY OF THESE SERVICES THROUGH THE PRIVATE SECTOR.

BUT, YOU HAVE ANOTHER PROBLEM.

IF THE CONSUMER OF SERVICES IS TO PLAY AN APPROPRIATE ROLE IN THE QUALITY, COST, AND DIVERSITY OF SERVICE, THEN THE CITIZEN CONSUMER MUST BE WELL INFORMED AND FINANCIALLY EQUIPPED TO MAKE GOOD CHOICES. AS I HAVE DISCOVERED IN PROPOUNDING COMPETITIVE HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICANS, GOVERNMENT CAN HELP RESCUE US FROM OUR IGNORANCE OF HEALTH CARE DELIVERY OPTIONS BY REQUIRING AND FACILITATING CHOICES. IN ADDITION, A MAJOR OVERHAUL OF THIS NATION'S PRIVATE AND PUBLICLY FINANCED INCOME SECURITY SYSTEM IS ESSENTIAL IN THE EARLY '80'S TO PREPARE US TO AFFORD THE ROLE OF CHOOSING--AND BUYING--PUBLIC SERVICES.

BUT, YOU HAVE STILL ANOTHER PROBLEM.

VOLUNTEERS MUST BE CHALLENGED BECAUSE THEIR NEEDS CHANGE, VOLUNTEER ORGANIZATIONS MUST BE CHALLENGED BECAUSE TOO MANY, TOO OFTEN REFUSE, TO KEEP UP WITH CHANGING PUBLIC NEEDS.

I DON'T THINK IN THIS NEXT 100 YEARS THERE WILL BE MUCH VALUE TO VOLUNTARY SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS MARKETING THEIR LONGEVITY AS AN ORGANIZATION UNLESS THEY'VE RADICALLY CHANGED THEIR APPROACH TO SERVICE DELIVERY AND EVEN THE NEEDS THEY WERE DESIGNED TO SERVICE.

AND COMMUNITIES MUST BE WILLING TO DROP THEIR SUPPORT OF AGENCIES THAT DON'T RESPOND TO CONSUMER CHOICE AND TO GET BEHIND THOSE THAT DO.

IN SUMMARY, MAKING THE GOVERNMENT MORE RESPONSIVE WILL REQUIRE US TO RE-EXAMINE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS. AS CONGRESSMAN BARBER CONABLE SAID, "WE VERY MUCH NEED TO HAVE A NATIONWIDE DIALOGUE ON THIS ISSUE OF THE SURVIVAL OF PRIVATE AND VOLUNTEER EFFORTS TO DEAL WITH OUR SOCIAL NEEDS AND PROBLEMS. WE EITHER BELIEVE IN MAINTAINING A VIGOROUS VOLUNTEERISM OR WE ARE WILLING FOR GOVERNMENT TO TAKE ON MORE AND MORE, AT GREATER AND GREATER COSTS. EVERYBODY TALKS A GREAT LINE ABOUT THE VALUES AND VIRTUES OF THE VOLUNTARY THIRD SECTOR. WE NEED TO FIND OUT IF WE MEAN IT."

THAT WAS THE PURPOSE OF MY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON VOLUNTEERISM. IT MAY NOT HAVE BEEN THE BEST FORUM FOR A NATIONAL DISCUSSION ON VOLUNTEERISM, AND IT CERTAINLY IS NOT THE ONLY FORUM.

BUT IT WAS A SINCERE ATTEMPT TO MAKE GOVERNMENT MORE RESPONSIVE, TO BROADEN OUR CHOICES IN PUBLIC SERVICES, BY EXAMINING THE ISSUES WITH WHICH WE ARE FACED, THEN SETTING A COURSE TO FIND THE SOLUTIONS.

ON WEDNESDAY OF THIS WEEK, WE TAKE THE FIRST STEP IN THAT DIRECTION WITH SENATE GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE HEARINGS IN MINNEAPOLIS ON THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF VOLUNTEERISM. THIS CONFERENCE WILL BE THE OPENING TESTIMONY TO THAT FUTURE. ON OCTOBER 20 IN WASHINGTON, WE WILL HAVE A SECOND HEARING WITH MORE NATIONAL LEADERS.

FRANKLY, I'M OPTIMISTIC ABOUT OUR FUTURE. I LOOK ON THE '80'S AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO GIVE MORE FREEDOM OF CHOICE TO INDIVIDUALS, TO PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS AND TO VOLUNTEERISM. I SEE THE 1980'S AS A CHANCE TO EXPLORE AND IMPLEMENT ALTERNATIVES, RATHER THAN FALLING BACK ON THE OLD ANSWER OF MORE GOVERNMENT.

I'M CONVINCED THAT ONCE WE DEFINE THE ROLES OF DOER AND DECIDER OUR COUNTRY CAN BE MORE PRODUCTIVE, WE CAN ACHIEVE MORE GOALS, WE CAN ACCOMPLISH MORE GOOD THAN WE EVER THOUGHT POSSIBLE.

THANK YOU.

