

D378
B285c
1978

THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE: A CASE STUDY
IN THE APPLICATION OF A NORMATIVE-BASED
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

by

CHARLES RAYBURN BARTON

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
the Department of Political Science
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA

1978

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For their assistance in the preparation of this study, the author wishes to thank the members of his dissertation committee: Dr. Joseph C. Pilegge, Dr. Robert B. Highsaw, Dr. L. Franklin Blitz, Dr. H. Ray Collins, and Dr. Majeed Alsikafi. A special word of appreciation is due to Mr. Ozell Sutton, Southeast Regional Director of the Community Relations Service and to Mr. Warner Hudson and the other employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region from 1970 to 1973. The author also wishes to thank Jean Gentry for typing the dissertation and Jean Dee Rosene for providing research assistance at some critical moments in the study's final preparation. Finally, and most importantly, the author wishes to thank his wife Kathy and his daughter Kathryn Anne for their patience, understanding, and encouragement exhibited during the preparation of the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
Chapter	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Focus of the Study.....	3
Methodology.....	5
I. THE NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION MOVEMENT.....	16
The Honey Report.....	18
Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration.....	24
The Minnowbrook Conference.....	27
Frank Marini and Dwight Waldo after Minnowbrook.....	35
New Public Administration Continued.....	39
Normative Character of the New Public Administration.....	43
Conclusion.....	50
II. ROLES ADVOCATED BY THE NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION..	51
Role Defined.....	52
Roles Advocated in the New Public Administration Literature.....	53
Major Roles Advocated in the New Public Administration Literature.....	68
What's New About the Major Roles Advocated in the New Public Administration Literature?.....	70
New Public Administration Roles and Minorities.....	72
Conclusion.....	75
III. THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE.....	77
The First Attempt to Establish a Community Relations Service.....	78
Attempts to Create a Community Relations Service During the Kennedy Administration.....	88

Creation of the Community Relations Service.....	104
The Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce.....	110
The Community Relations Service in the Department of Justice.....	122
Conclusion.....	137
IV. NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ROLES AS MANIFEST IN THE BEHAVIOR OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE EMPLOYEES.....	140
Community Relations Service Employees as Social Equity Advocates.....	145
Community Relations Service Employees as Change Agents.....	161
Community Relations Service Employees as Representative Bureaucrats.....	171
Community Relations Service Employees as Advocacy Administrators.....	178
Community Relations Service Employees as Non-Consolidating Bureaucrats.....	189
Community Relations Service Employees' Perceptions of New Public Administration Roles Pursued.....	190
Conclusion.....	205
V. CUTBACKS IN THE PROGRAMMATIC ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE.....	207
The Executive Branch and Community Relations Service Programs.....	208
The Legislative Branch and Community Relations Service Programs.....	218
Other Federal Agencies and Community Relations Service Programs.....	223
Local Clientele, Local Elected Officials, and Community Relations Service Programs.....	228
Conclusion.....	237
CONCLUSION.....	241
The Community Relations Service Experience: Implications for the Application of a Normative-Based Public Administration.....	241
.....	
APPENDIX.....	251
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	277

LIST OF TABLES

1. Types of Programs Serviced in Communities.....	116
2. Behavior of Community Relations Service Employees in Southeastern State Programs by New Public Administration Roles.....	143
3. Attitude Scale of Southeastern Region Community Relations Service Employees' Perceptions of New Public Administration Roles Pursued.....	192
4. Chi Square Goodness of Fit Test Applied to Southeast Region Community Relations Service Employees' Perceptions of New Public Administration Roles Pursued.....	198
5. Author's Classification of New Public Administration Roles Pursued by Community Relations Service Employees Compared With Community Relations Service Employees' Perceptions of New Public Administration Roles Pursued.....	203

INTRODUCTION

Within the last decade, there has been in the public administration literature a move on the part of some writers in the direction of normativism. This move has come to be known within the discipline as the new public administration. Its roots can be traced to the writings of the participants in the Minnowbrook Conference at Syracuse University in 1968 under the sponsorship of Dwight Waldo. Both before and after the conference writers such as George Frederickson, Orion White, Frank Marini, et al., joined Waldo in the production of works devoted to a discussion of the adequacies of contemporary public administration.

Some would say that their works and the Minnowbrook Conference have served as a catalyst for a normative revolution in public administration; some say that they are only a small number of public administrationists representative of a particular viewpoint. Even some critics, however, recognize the new public administration as a movement within the discipline. Robert F. Wilcox describes the new public administration as a "faith without a scripture, a cult without a creed." Nevertheless, he feels that the "new public administration movement" will increasingly "influence the way administrators think and behave because it appears to

reflect some of the higher realities of a changed--and ever-changing society." Wilcox thus questions the validity of the new public administration, but he does recognize it as a movement within the discipline.¹

Whether one accepts the new public administration as a revolution, a movement, or a mere viewpoint, one cannot deny the attention it has received in the literature. It continues to be a subject of concern to public administrators. One of the reasons for this concern, in the opinion of this writer, is because of the roles advocated for them. In the literature one is repeatedly confronted with normative statements regarding the roles that should be pursued by public administrators.

Yet a survey of the literature reveals what appears to be a major weakness--the lack of practical application. There has been much academic discussion of the roles advocated for administrators, but there has been little or no attempt to study their application in an actual bureaucratic setting. Frederickson recognizes this problem. In a 1974 Public Administration Review symposium on social equity and public administration, he states that there is little coherence or identity with the idea. The reason he feels is because "there have been few examples of its practical

¹Robert F. Wilcox, "The New P.A.: Have Things Really Changed that Much?", Public Management 53 (March 1971):4.

application."² It is felt that Frederickson's view regarding social equity is representative of many of the roles advocated by the new public administration.

Focus of the Study

It was the purpose of this study to deal with the lack of practical application in the new public administration. An attempt was made to ascertain whether or not application of the roles advocated for administrators by the new public administration is feasible, i.e., it was the principal objective of the study to determine what type support is needed within the political environment for administrators to successfully pursue such roles. In order to do this it was necessary to examine an organization in which there was activity by administrators which approximates the roles advocated by the new public administration.

It was also necessary to identify a series of related roles advocated by the new public administration which lent themselves to coherent analysis, since it seemed unlikely that all the roles advocated for administrators would be found in any one organization. Also the number of roles dealt with had to be sufficiently delimited in order to facilitate thorough analysis of them. Such a series of roles should be one of the major components of the new public administration.

²H. George Frederickson, "A Symposium: Social Equity and Public Administration," Public Administration Review 34 (January/February 1974):1.

The study was, accordingly, based upon two major propositions:

- 1) The roles advocated for administrators on behalf of minorities by the new public administration is a series of related roles that lend themselves to coherent analysis.
- 2) The Community Relations Service of the United States Department of Justice is an organization in which an application of new public administration roles, those relating to minority advocacy, may be studied.

The Community Relations Service appeared to lend itself to such a study for several reasons. It is an agency which is first and foremost an advocate of minority betterment. It had during the period 1970-1973 a number of programs whose objectives were the achievement of a better life for minorities. These included programs in the areas of administration of justice, housing, education, economic development, and media communications. These programs were client oriented. The agency worked to implement programs that community groups desired to have enacted. The Community Relations Service was in a good position to understand minority problems due to minority representation on its staff. A majority were from minority groups. Many had civil rights backgrounds. Agency employees came from the black, Indian, and Spanish-speaking segments of American society, in addition to Anglo-Americans.

To test the study's two general propositions, the following hypothesis was proposed:

Roles pursued by Community Relations Service employees and/or advocated for administrators by the

new public administration will be unsuccessful without adequate political support.

- 1) They will be unsuccessful without adequate executive (presidential) support.
- 2) They will be unsuccessful without adequate legislative (congressional) support.
- 3) They will be unsuccessful if they duplicate or interfere with the programs administered by other federal agencies.
- 4) They will be unsuccessful if opposed by elected officials and clientele at the state and local levels.

This hypothesis was based upon the generally accepted fact that the roles advocated for administrators on behalf of minorities is one of the major components of the new public administration, although a portion of the study was devoted to demonstrating the reasons why this is generally accepted as true within the discipline of public administration. The hypothesis was also based upon the assumption, which was subject to proof within the study, that roles pursued by Community Relations Service employees in the period 1970-1973 were similar to those advocated for administrators on behalf of minorities by the new public administration.

Methodology

This hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses were tested in the five major chapters of the study. Chapter I traces the development of the new public administration movement from its inception through the decade of the seventies. It is argued that the movement is the result of a number of

conferences, works, and events, four of which may be considered major landmarks: the Honey Report on Higher Education for Public Service; the Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration; the Minnowbrook Conference; and the publication of two works: Toward a New Public Administration and Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence. Chapter I also attempts to demonstrate the normative character of the new public administration. It is argued that the new public administration includes both normative and prescriptive statements. That is to say, it includes statements regarding what public administrators ought to do and statements outlining methods and courses of action to be utilized in the accomplishment of desired ends.

Chapter II examines the various roles that have been advocated for public administrators by the new public administration and attempts to demonstrate that those advocated on behalf of minorities is one of the major components of the new public administration. Since the focus was upon the roles of the administrator, the first task was to define the manner in which the term role was to be utilized. The definition chosen had to contain a component which would account for the normative recommendations of the new public administration as well as a component which could be used to evaluate the actual behavior of Community Relations Service employees to ascertain whether or not they did in fact embody the recommendations of the new public administration literature.

The literature on role analysis and the general area of role theory revealed two broad categories of definitions which are employed when one speaks of role: 1) normative statements to refer to a set of notions about the way a person who holds a particular position should behave or 2) statements regarding the actual behavior of a particular individual who occupies a certain position.

The problem in the present study was to forge a definition which would incorporate both categories (to account for the recommendations of the new public administration and the actual behavior of Community Relations Service employees). Role, therefore, was defined as behavior of Community Relations Service employees which incorporates, either consciously or unconsciously, normative prescriptions of the new public administration.

As with defining the concept role itself, it was necessary to explicitly delimit or define the roles identified in the review of the literature. It is argued that the roles advocated on behalf of minorities by the new public administration may be reduced to five major ones in number: social equity advocate, change agent, representative bureaucrat, advocacy administrator, and non-consolidating bureaucrat. The kinds of behavior which demonstrate these roles are enumerated in detail.

Having defined the concept role and identified the major roles advocated in the literature, one task remained before proceeding to a treatment of our principal

assumption. It was necessary to discuss the origin and development of the Community Relations Service as an operational agency at the federal level. This is the topic of Chapter III. Based upon presidential, congressional, Department of Commerce, Department of Justice, and Community Relations Service documents, a detailed history of the Community Relations Service is presented. The following topics are discussed: early attempts to establish the agency; creation of the agency by the Civil Rights Act of 1964; the early experience of the agency in the Department of Commerce; transfer of the agency to and early activities within the Department of Justice; and programmatic activities of the agency during the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The ground work for the study is laid in the first three chapters. The new public administration movement and the Community Relations Service are examined, as are the roles advocated for administrators on behalf of minorities. Chapter IV is crucial to the entire study. It is here that the assumption that roles pursued by Community Relations Service employees during the period 1970-1973 are similar to those advocated on behalf of minorities is tested. It is demonstrated that the behavior of Community Relations Service employees is similar to the roles advocated by the new public administration literature. The first step toward demonstrating the feasibility of applying the new public administration roles within a bureaucratic setting is taken, and a case in which administrative behavior approximates

the roles advocated by the new public administration literature is demonstrated.

The roles advocated on behalf of minorities is related to the behavior of Community Relations Service employees through a reconstruction of the agency's programmatic activities. This is based upon a first-hand examination of the agency's files in the Southeast Regional Office in Atlanta and a review of pertinent government documents. The primary source was the agency's inhouse files, where day to day records were kept on program development and implementation.

The period 1970-1973 is the framework that was utilized for testing our major assumption. It was during this period that the agency switched from a single conflict resolution function to the initiation of programs designed to prevent the conditions which lead to racial tension and strife. Roles pursued by Community Relations Service employees in the development and implementation of the southeastern state programs were examined.³

The objective in examining the roles pursued by

³These programs by state were: Alabama--Economic Development, Education; Florida--Administration of Justice, Education, Housing; Georgia--Administration of Justice; Kentucky--Education, Housing; Mississippi--Administration of Justice, Communications; North Carolina--Administration of Justice, Communications, Education, Housing; and South Carolina--Administration of Justice, Communications, Education, Housing. These were chosen for examination because they were the ones in operation, i.e., either being developed or implemented, in the Southeast Region of the Community Relations Service from 1970-1973. There were no programs in Tennessee due to personnel vacancies.

Community Relations Service employees in these programs was to demonstrate the similarity between these roles and those advocated for administrators by the new public administration. This similarity was demonstrated by a two-step process. First, the behavior of employees in each program was categorized according to the one new public administration role which it most closely approximated. That is not to say that only one role was present in each program, because more than one appeared in some of the programs. The behavior of agency personnel was categorized according to one role only to simplify the procedure of demonstrating the presence of new public administration roles in the behavior of the agency's personnel.

The author of the study was cognizant of the subjective nature of the above proceedings. He had to say what the roles were and he had to make the judgment as to whether or not they existed in the behavior of Community Relations Service employees. To counteract this subjective element, the second step was taken. A questionnaire was administered to the agency's employees who participated in the development of the programs mentioned above.

The questionnaire was constructed by formulating a set of questions related to each of the major roles identified in the review of the new public administration literature. Respondents were queried about their behavior during the development of these programs to determine whether or not it approximated the behavior described in the

literature as being representative of a particular role. Five groups of questions were used, one for each of the five major roles. Respondents were requested to answer yes, no, or do not know to each question.

Responses given in the questionnaires were then compared with the author's classification in order to see if the agency's employees had indeed pursued the roles which a review of the programs seemed to indicate. The large number of yes responses indicated that the employees felt that they had pursued all of the roles depicted in the author's classification, as well as all of the five major new public administration roles. The chi square goodness of fit test was utilized to test the validity of the responses given in the questionnaires. This method verified the similarity between the new public administration roles and the behavior of the Community Relations Service employees. The study's principal assumption was confirmed, and the foundation for testing the study's major hypothesis in Chapter V was laid.

Chapter V examines the reasons for the abandonment of the Community Relations Service's programmatic approach in terms of the four sub-hypotheses of the major hypothesis. In the post 1973 period, the agency was forced to abandon the programs considered in Chapter IV and return to its original mission of conflict resolution. Having demonstrated that the roles pursued by Community Relations Service employees during the period 1970-1973 were similar to those advocated by the new public administration, then examination

of the reasons why the agency was forced to abandon these programs after 1973 would allow a determination as to what type political support is needed for public administrators to pursue roles advocated by the new public administration.

Four possible reasons for the cutback in the Community Relations Service's programmatic activities were examined: 1) lack of executive (presidential) support; 2) lack of legislative (congressional) support; 3) possible duplication of or interference with programs administered by other federal agencies; and 4) possible opposition to the agency's programs by elected officials and clientele at the state and local levels.

Executive support or lack of support was determined by interviews with Office of Management and Budget officials; by consideration of the Fiscal Year 1974 Budget of the United States; analysis of appropriations and other congressional hearings; and examination of relevant newspaper articles. It was determined that the Nixon Administration sought the elimination of the agency's programs to reduce federal spending and to prevent increases in federal taxes. Additionally, it was felt that the agency had exceeded its legislative mandate by embarking upon the development and implementation of programs to prevent racial disputes. Indications are also present which suggest that the Nixon Administration felt the agency had been ineffective in its approach and its operations should be drastically reduced. It was decided that the Office of Management and Budget

would be responsible for achieving these reductions through budget cuts.

Congressional appropriations hearings and hearings dealing with Community Relations Service program cutbacks were the key to unlocking congressional support or lack of support for the agency. These sources indicated that there was some very strong support for the agency within Congress, but not enough to prevent the programs from being terminated. The matter was not debated in either house, and one would have to conclude that the Congress was partially responsible for the program cutbacks because it approved the budget cuts recommended by the Nixon Administration.

The third possible reason for program cutbacks, interference with the programs of other federal agencies, was the most difficult to confirm or disprove because of the reluctance of federal employees to publicly criticize those in another federal agency. Examination of agency files and correspondence indicated no evidence that the Community Relations Service's programs were terminated due to their duplication of programs administered by other federal agencies. On the contrary, there was much evidence of cooperation between the Community Relations Service and other federal agencies. The Office of Management and Budget suggested that duplication of effort by the Community Relations Service and other agencies was one reason for the cutbacks, but this appears to have been a rationalization for the budget cuts rather than an actual fact.

Three methods were utilized to determine the level of local and state support for Community Relations Service programs: examination of congressional hearings dealing with cutbacks in the agency's programs; a sample review of state newspapers in the southeastern states in which the agency's programs were operative; and interviews with local clientele and elected officials by means of telephone. Two newspapers from each of the seven southeastern states in which the agency's programs were operative were reviewed for the year 1973, the year in which the programs were terminated. Five individuals from each state were interviewed by telephone for a total of thirty-five individuals.

Congressional hearings revealed testimony by local officials highly favorable to the agency and opposed to the program cutbacks; review of the newspapers revealed no local opposition to the agency; and the telephone interviews revealed strong support for the agency and a feeling that the Nixon Administration was responsible for the program cutbacks.

Examination of the four possible reasons for the program cutbacks revealed that the major responsibility rested with the Nixon Administration. The Congress was partially responsible for it concurred in the recommended cuts in the agency's budget. Duplication of other agencies' programs and local and state opposition had nothing to do with the cutbacks.

By testing the above-mentioned hypotheses within the

context of the Community Relations Service, we were able to ascertain the feasibility of applying some of the roles advocated for administrators, those related to minority advocacy, by the new public administration. We were able to determine the type of political support that is required for their application. We discovered that more is required for the application of these roles than is required for more traditional roles advocated for public administrators. By studying these roles within the context of the Community Relations Service, we have arrived at some conclusions which may be utilized to eliminate a major weakness of the new public administration literature--the lack of practical application. These findings are presented in the study's concluding section where the implications of the Community Relations Service experience for the application of a normative-based public administration is discussed.

CHAPTER I

THE NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION MOVEMENT

The decade of the 1960s brought many changes in American society. The nation raced to put a man on the moon; we were involved in a military conflict that would lead to the nation's first loss of a war; and we elected a president who would eventually become the first in our history to resign his office in disgrace. We also witnessed the black civil rights movement; the Great Society programs of the Johnson Administration; and the assassinations of John and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr. The decade was one of hope and at the same time one of despair. It was one in which there were great expectations of the national government, and one that would lead some to conclude that the national government was incapable of solving the complex problems of modern society.

Public administrators, like other members of the population, were deeply affected by the events of the decade. Some of them began to question their discipline and profession and "much of the blame was placed on the administrative infirmities of American government."⁴ Out of the

⁴Allen Schick, "The Trauma of Politics: Public Administration in the Sixties," in American Public

political turbulence and dissatisfaction of public administrators, a movement developed within the discipline in search of a new public administration, one sensitive to and capable of solving societal problems that had gone unresolved in the decade of the sixties. Some writers, e.g., Orion White, Jr., date the beginning of the new public administration movement from the Minnowbrook Conference at Syracuse University in 1968. Others argue that earlier developments led to the movement: thus Allen Schick stresses the importance of the Honey Report on Higher Education for Public Service and Dwight Waldo the Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration, both of which occurred in 1967.

The present study views the new public administration movement as a product of numerous conferences, works, and events, four of which appear as major landmarks: 1) the Honey Report on Higher Education for Public Service; (1967); 2) the Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration, (1967); 3) the Minnowbrook Conference, (1968); and 4) the publication of two works in 1971: Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective edited by Frank Marini and Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence edited by Dwight Waldo. These will be considered seriatim.

Administration: Past, Present, Future, ed. Frederick C. Mosher (University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1975), p. 148.

The Honey Report

The Honey Report was the result of an evaluative study of public administration as a field of study in American universities.⁵ It was undertaken by John C. Honey of Syracuse University at the request of the Council of Graduate Education for Public Administration (CGEPA), which is now the National Association of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) and is affiliated with the American Society for Public Administration. The study was financed by a \$15,000 grant from the Carnegie Foundation of New York. The grant was approved in February, 1966, and the report of the study's findings was completed in November, 1966. As approved, the grant was to enable CGEPA to "undertake a review of the problems of education for public administration."⁶

The report was important not only for its recommendations regarding the content of public administration curricula, but because of the view of public administration that it encouraged. Public administration is a field which goes beyond training and practice centered around personnel, budgeting, and management. Contemporary realities "dictate the pursuit of a much broader outlook and indeed of equating public administration with the total governmental process

⁵John C. Honey, "A Report: Higher Education for Public Service," Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):294-321.

⁶Ferrel Heady, "Higher Education for Public Service: Introductory Comment," Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):292.

(executive, legislative, and judicial) in both its career and political manifestations."⁷ This broader outlook is necessitated by four problems confronting the discipline: 1) insufficient resources of all kinds (students, faculty, research funds); 2) an intellectual argument over the status of the discipline (is it a field, discipline, science, or profession?); 3) institutional weakness (inadequacy of public administration and public affairs schools); and 4) the gap between academic public administrators and practicing public administrators.

To overcome these problems, a nine-point proposal for immediate action and a two-point research program were recommended. Proposals for immediate action included the following:

1) The establishment of a National Commission on Public Service Education to exert broad leadership in meeting the needs of governments for educated manpower.

2) A substantial fellowship program (perhaps initially 2,500 a year) for graduate students who are preparing for public service at the masters and doctoral levels and also including preparation for professional degrees.

3) Internship programs to operate at federal, state, and local levels for graduate students and advanced undergraduates preparing for public service careers.

4) A special fellowship program for those planning to become teachers in schools and programs of public administration and public affairs.

5) A program to provide opportunities for practical governmental experience to university faculty engaged in public affairs teaching and research.

⁷Honey, p. 294.

6) A program of assistance to universities for public affairs curricular experimentation and development.

7) Support for university personnel engaged in research on governmental and public affairs issues.

8) Support from federal, state, and local governments, as well as from private industry, for the provision of facilities to schools and programs of public administration and public affairs.

9) The establishment of an advisory service for new public affairs programs and the development of personnel rosters to provide current information on experienced graduates of schools of public administration and public affairs.

The two major proposals for research projects were:

1) It [was] recommended that a study of the Universities and Education for public service be undertaken, the purposes to show how various types of institutions now approach their public service educational and other tasks and to identify stimulating and innovative developments as well as deficiencies and problems.

2) The second major and closely associated research proposal [was] for a study of the Professions, Professional Education, and the Public Service.⁸

The recommendations made by the Honey Report were themselves of value to public administration; the reaction to them was, however, of more importance to the development of the new public administration movement because they "sparked the feeling that public administration had little to say about contemporary problems and issues and led to Minnowbrook."⁹

Commentaries accompanying the Honey Report in the November, 1967, issue of the Public Administration Review are illustrative of the questions raised about public

⁸Ibid., pp. 319-320.

⁹Schick, p. 162.

administration in response to the report. Though the primary focus of the commentaries is upon academic institutions, the need for a new focus in public administration is reflected. James M. Banovetz calls for a "new approach" within the discipline--one that focuses upon the policy-making and implementation process of government.¹⁰ Academic public administration needs to change in the same manner that practicing public administration has already changed. For some years practitioners have abandoned the fictitious politics-administration dichotomy and have focused upon program and policy development. Academic public administration, meanwhile, clings to two basic approaches: 1) the traditional approach with an emphasis upon staff functions and 2) the administrative science approach with a focus upon organization theory and computer technology. Banovetz's new approach would have academic public administration shift its focus to the policy-making and implementation process as seen from the "administrator's micro-viewpoint"--to the "perspective and problems of the single individual caught up in the workings of a small portion of the total policy development process."¹¹

Frederick C. Mosher calls for a concentrated effort on the part of public administration to meet the growing

¹⁰James M. Banovetz, "Needed: New Experiences in Public Administration," Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):321-324.

¹¹Ibid., p. 323.

urban problems in American society.¹² This he feels to be the major problem facing American society as well as public administration. Yet public administration is ill-prepared to meet the challenge because of its emphasis upon specialization. Administrators are specialized by function and vocation and are unable to view the urban problem as a whole. University public administration programs exacerbate the problem due to their emphasis upon specialization. What is needed, according to Mosher, is an emphasis upon broader goals and a corollary growth in the number of administrators capable of visualizing long range goals and integrating specialized activities to achieve these goals.

Mosher's emphasis is somewhat the opposite of Banovetz, but he nevertheless urges a changing focus in public administration. As he points out, "the time is ripe" not only to focus upon broader goals, but also to meet the challenge posed by youthful critics:

It is no secret that among the younger generation there is rising unrest, dissatisfaction, and even rebellion against the "establishment." Among many, the "establishment" is identified first of all with government and particularly its administration. Such dissatisfaction could be the stimulus for initiative, imagination, and reform--as indeed it was during the thirties.¹³

Paul R. Van Riper is critical of the Honey Report for being too "soft-voiced and muted." He criticizes the attitude of liberal arts colleges, the foundations, and the

¹²Frederick C. Mosher, "The Universities and the Problems of the Cities," Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):325-328.

¹³Ibid., p. 327.

professions for their lack of concern with education for the public service. Given this lack of concern, he proceeds to outline what he considers to be the "basic and minimal needs" of education for the public service. Two of his recommendations would later be heard at Minnowbrook: Education in public administration should be "primarily aimed at social action, . . . and not just the intellectual goal of social thought." Likewise, public administration faculties should be composed of individuals who "have or have had at some point in their careers experience with and some commitment to getting something done" ¹⁴ Public administration should thus be a discipline concerned with the accomplishment of action-oriented programs in the social arena.

Banovetz, Mosher, and Van Riper represent three responses to the Honey Report that reflect the mood of needed reform within the discipline after its publication. This is not to say that all who responded to the report immediately became revolutionary advocates of a new public administration. There were some who advocated change more in terms of expanding existing approaches to public administration and less in terms of adopting a completely new focus. ¹⁵

¹⁴Paul R. Van Riper, "Hit 'Em Harder, John, Hit 'Em Harder!," Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967): 339-342.

¹⁵See the following in the November, 1967 issue of Public Administration Review: J. Kenneth Mulligan, "A View from Washington," pp. 328-334; Henry Reining, Jr., "A Reversal of Emphasis," pp. 334-337; Harvey Sherman, "Some Questions About the Question," pp. 337-339; and Rufus E. Miles, Jr., "The Search for Identity of Graduate Schools of Public Affairs," pp. 343-356.

The major contribution of the Honey Report in terms of the new public administration movement was the fact that it served as a catalyst in stimulating discussion within the discipline relative to the adequacies of public administration in dealing with the problems of contemporary society. This debate was to be continued at the Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration.

Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration

In accordance with its stated purpose of seeking to "gather and present reliable information" to the public for use in the formulation of "intelligent and accurate" judgments, the American Academy of Political and Social Science convened a conference in Philadelphia on 28 and 29 December, 1967 to consider the topic: The Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods. Cognizant of other studies dealing with the adequacies of contemporary public administration, the Academy felt that there had been, as of 1967, recent developments within the field that justified another evaluation.¹⁶

The conference format consisted of formal papers, commentary, and discussion. Two papers were presented on each of the three topics: scope, objectives, and methods. Two critiques or commentaries were presented on each paper,

¹⁶Account of the details of the conference are based upon the Foreword to James C. Charlesworth, ed., Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods (Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968).

followed by general conference discussion. Conference participants and their affiliated institutions at the time are presented in Appendix A.

James C. Charlesworth, chairman of the conference, describes the mood of the participants as follows:

. . . the participants in this meeting evinced a "mood to make a bold and synoptic approach" to the discipline of public administration, and "sought to measure the importance" of public administration "in a broad philosophic context and to consider whether it is an adornment of the mind as well as a practical instrument of government."¹⁷

The picture of public administration that emerged from the conference is varied and eclectic. Attempts were made to deal with public administration as an academic discipline, a field exercise, and a profession. Some of the participants ventured definitions of public administration. These ranged from "administration in the public interest" to "governmental administration." No one definition emerged from the conference, and there were those who insisted that definition is impossible because the field has no discernable boundaries and is characterized by an identity crisis, which stems in part from the relationship between public administration and political science.

Although the participants arrived at no precise definition of public administration, there were several points of consensus:

1) It is just as difficult to delineate the scope of public administration as it is to define it.

¹⁷Ibid., p. ix.

2) Public administration agencies make policy and the policy-administration dichotomy is erroneous.

3) American public administration as a discipline should deal restrictively with public administration in America.

4) Bureaucracy should be studied functionally as well as structurally.

5) Public administration and business administration training should not be combined since they are similar only in unimportant aspects.

6) Public administration as a profession should remain separate from the profession and discipline of political science.

7) Normative administrative theory as well as descriptive-analytic theory in public administration is in a state of disarray.

8) A hierarchical/pyramidal view of organizational authority is no longer appropriate; administrators must view workers as "coordinates" rather than "subordinates."

9) Policy and political considerations are replacing management ability as the major focus of concern in public administration.

10) Administrators of the future should be trained in professional schools; public administration curricula should emphasize not only administrative organization and procedures but also the "psychological, financial, sociological, and anthropological envelopment of the subject."¹⁸

The Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration presented the view of a discipline in a state of flux. There were points of agreement among the participants, but many of these pointed in the direction of change. Public administration, though it is difficult to define and delineate its boundaries, should be a discipline separate from political science. It is a discipline whose

¹⁸Ibid., p. 327.

theoretical components are in disarray; it is a discipline that has been unable to cope with societal problems:

[Public administration] has not caught up with emerging problems, like the huge military-industrial complex, labor unions and strikes, riots, slums, the impingement of science, and developing countries. [Public administrators have been] too preoccupied with identification, meanings, semantics, and boundaries.¹⁹

Public administration is also a discipline that cannot totally envelope the scientific methodologies of contemporary social science. There are portions of the discipline that are subject to being dealt with scientifically; others, perhaps the most significant aspects of the discipline, are not subject to scientific treatment. Charlesworth feels that only small parts of the discipline can be dealt with scientifically:

We can be scientific, if we severely limit the scope of our discipline, but if we did would we not excise its most valuable parts? And we are scientific, in some corners of our subject, but in other corners our subject is heavy with values and prescriptions, which can never be scientific.²⁰

These arguments, that public administration is ill-equipped to tackle societal problems, that it cannot become overly scientific, that it should be concerned with values, would all be repeated at the Minnowbrook Conference.

The Minnowbrook Conference

The Minnowbrook Conference was a gathering of young public administrationists that convened at the Minnowbrook

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid., p. 335.

conference site of Syracuse University in September, 1968.²¹ The idea for the conference originated with Dwight Waldo, Albert Schweitzer Professor in the Humanities at Syracuse. His interest in a conference of young public administrators was based upon his concern over the turbulent events of the sixties and the problem of a possible "generation gap" within the discipline of public administration.

In the Marini edition, Waldo states that he had concluded that neither the discipline nor the profession of public administration were making appropriate responses to the turbulent events of the decade. These same sentiments were earlier expressed in his article "Public Administration in a Time of Revolutions," which appeared in the July/August, 1968 edition of Public Administration Review. Waldo was further concerned with the future of public administration. Were talented young persons entering public administration in sufficient numbers to ensure its continued success in the future? If so, were the older members of the field communicating with the new arrivals?

With these thoughts occupying his mind, Waldo was confronted with two events which served as a catalyst for convening the Minnowbrook Conference: 1) The Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration and 2) a

²¹Account of the details of the Minnowbrook Conference is based upon Dwight Waldo's "Foreword" and Frank Marini's "Introduction" to Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective, ed. Frank Marini (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971).

conversation with a young public administration professor regarding the Honey Report. Waldo's impression of the conference was that it successfully achieved a "high-level, critical assessment" of the public administration discipline. He was, however, impressed by the fact that all of the conferees were over thirty-five years of age and the majority were either in their fifties or sixties. Where were the public administrators and public administration professors of the next generation Waldo thought.

Two months following the Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration, Waldo was confronted with a youthful public administrator's opinion of the Honey Report. Waldo, who thought the report and accompanying commentaries in the November, 1967, issue of Public Administration Review of high quality, was shocked to hear them described as "shameful." What was the reason for such a response?

Because [the report] presented old men talking to old men about irrelevancies, old men out of touch with the real problems of a chaotic and dangerous world and the youth who would have to deal with them.²²

Thus was born the idea for a youth conference on public administration which would henceforth be known within the discipline as the Minnowbrook Conference. Dwight Waldo's role in the conference, other than that of sponsor and part-time observer, ended with the decision to carry forth the idea to fruition. The actual work of bringing the participants to Minnowbrook fell to a committee of his junior

²²Ibid., p. xiv.

colleagues at Syracuse: H. George Frederickson, W. Henry Lambright, and Frank Marini.

The committee corresponded with more than twenty notable academic and practicing public administrators soliciting names of possible attendees at the conference. The correspondence resulted in a list of approximately one hundred and fifty young men of "outstanding ability," which was reduced to fifty. Of these, thirty-four actually attended. The conference participants and their institutions at the time are presented in Appendix B. The committee selected nine major topics which would be dealt with in formal papers and commentaries. These were: relevance; administrative adaptation in a changing society; adaptation capacity and organizational development; public administration and selected developments in the social sciences; normative theory; empirical theory; comparative public administration; policy making; and administrative rationality. The papers and commentaries, along with the following items, were sent to the persons chosen to attend: 1) the Honey Report; 2) Waldo's paper "Public Administration in a Time of Revolutions"; and 3) the Honey-Savage correspondence on the Honey Report.²³

The participants objected to the formal presentation of papers at the outset of the conference, preferring

²³Waldo's article and the Honey-Savage correspondence appeared in the July/August, 1968 issue of Public Administration Review.

instead to break into small groups to discuss the "real problems" confronting the discipline. After much debate over the agenda, it was agreed that the formal presentations would be completed during the first two days, the third day being devoted to small group discussions. The evening of the second day was devoted to drafting an agenda for the small group discussions. The agenda proposed by Peter Savage was chosen since it encompassed many of the ideas of other proposals and summarized the major concerns which had emerged during the previous discussions. Savage's proposal became not only the agenda for small group discussions but also a statement regarding the purpose of the conference. The Savage statement is presented in Appendix C.

Guided by the Savage statement, the participants broke into small groups to continue their discussions. Reports of each group were later presented at a plenary session which was presided over by Matthew Crenson. He prepared a summary of the small group reports which serves as a statement of the topics which were discussed:

Well, it might be useful to try to sum this up, and under two general headings. First, are there any common themes under all this smoke of discussion as reported to us; and second are they new?

First, I think there are common themes: Almost every group arrived at the conclusion that there ought to be greater emphasis upon normative concerns in public administration. That leads to the question about the role of the administrator, whether he should be value neutral or somehow committed to policies or to value neutrality. That leads to the next question: If administrators are committed to certain values, what do they do? And the answer to that on the part of some people seems to be that Public Administrators should act as agents of change, which leads to the next question: What sorts of organizations must there be in order for change to be

facilitated. Which leads to: What things should organizations respond to in changing, namely, the environment? Others seem to put greater emphasis upon environmental factors, consequences for the environment of things in the organization administration. The question is, of course, whether there is agreement on all these things, and if there is, whether that's "new"?²⁴

The statements by Savage and Crenson summarize the general purpose of the Minnowbrook Conference and the major themes that emerged during the small group discussions. Frank Marini has endeavored to identify the major themes of the papers presented as well as the discussions which took place at the conference.²⁵ He identifies five dominant themes: relevance; postpositivism; adaptation to a turbulent environment; new forms of organization; and client-focused organizations. The theme of relevance was an often-repeated one. The participants felt the discipline to be out of touch with current problems presented by the "turbulent times." There was also criticism of the academic literature and the comparative administration field. Critics insisted that the literature should be characterized by "normative introspection, and openly wed to the consideration of fundamental values as well as factual or analytical data."²⁶ Arguments were also advanced that comparative

²⁴Ibid., p. 12.

²⁵Frank Marini, "The Minnowbrook Perspective and the Future of Public Administration Education," in Toward a New Public Administration, ed. Frank Marini (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971), pp. 346-367.

²⁶Ibid., p. 349.

public administration should focus upon studies indigenous to the United States.

The calls for a postpositivist approach in the discipline stressed the need to break with recent emphases upon value-free and value-neutral empirical research in favor of an approach which emphasizes social equity. In order for public administration to adapt to a turbulent environment, new forms of organization were called for, organizations which place a high premium upon client-organization interaction. Greater emphasis upon client loyalty and program loyalty were also stressed.

Allen Schick argues that there are four major themes which permeate the Minnowbrook Conference and subsequent new public administration literature: relevance; values; social equity; and change.²⁷ He, like Marini, stresses the fact that the conference participants found the field and practice of public administration irrelevant for "these times." Such cries have faded in the "comparative calm" of the seventies, but they left their impact in the form of revised/reformed graduate programs of public administration. The emphasis upon values is the same argument made by Marini relative to a postpositivist emphasis. Public administrators should be concerned with values; they should pursue a normative approach to the discipline instead of stressing value-neutral empiricism. Social equity calls for administrators to become advocates on behalf of

²⁷Schick, pp. 162-165.

minorities and the economically disadvantaged segments of society. To accomplish this goal, administrators must become advocates of change. They must attempt to change the status quo, which works for the benefit of the majority or dominant elements of society.

The Minnowbrook Conference would have to be considered the apogee in the development of the new public administration movement. It was the occasion in the 1960s for the most vociferous expression of the problems confronting the discipline of public administration; it was the first gathering of those devoted to remolding the discipline into a new image--that of a discipline concerned with redressing the grievances faced by the minority elements of society. The ideas or themes of Minnowbrook were eloquently restated in Marini's volume Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective. They were carried forth by Dwight Waldo's Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence.²⁸

²⁸In the two-year period between the Minnowbrook Conference and the appearance of the Marini and Waldo volumes, 1969-1970, there were meetings of the new public administration orientation held in Sonoma, California in June, 1969 (sponsored by the Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley); Austin, Texas in April, 1970 (sponsored by the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas); and Boulder, Colorado in May, 1970 (sponsored by the Center for Governmental Research, Washington, D.C.). New public administration was also a topic of great interest at the annual conferences of the American Society for Public Administration during this period. For an account of the new public administration at these meetings see Orion White, Jr. and Frank Marini, "Toward a New Public Administration--Theory and Politics," (Mimeographed).

Frank Marini and Dwight Waldo after Minnowbrook

The importance of the role played by Marini and Waldo in the initiation of the Minnowbrook Conference cannot be overstated. Their role in the movement following the conference was perhaps of greater importance because they contributed to its spread through their writings. Marini was the first to publish a work dealing with the new public administration. His volume presents the formal papers and commentaries that were given at the conference, in addition to summary statements of the small group discussions. Frederickson, Lambright, and he contributed three additional articles which attempted to expand the themes of Minnowbrook; to explain what this thing called the new public administration really is; and to place it in its proper perspective in relation to the other component elements of public administration. These three articles were pioneers in the new public administration literature: "Toward a New Public Administration," H. George Frederickson; "The Minnowbrook Perspective and the Future of Public Affairs," W. Henry Lambright; and "The Minnowbrook Perspective and the Future of Public Administration," Frank Marini.

Dwight Waldo's contribution to the new public administration after Minnowbrook was his attempt to "carry forward the 'Minnowbrook idea.'"²⁹ This was done through the

²⁹Account of Waldo's attempt to "carry forward the 'Minnowbrook idea'" is based upon the Preface to his Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971).

organization of a series of panel discussions at the 1969 convention of the American Political Science Association. The theme of these discussions was Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, the later title of the published work containing most of the papers presented at the convention. Waldo's intention in designing the agenda was to bring together a number of "younger professionals" and give them the opportunity to "have their say." Due to the time factor, he was unable to accomplish what he had originally planned, which was to have fifteen papers presented under five major topics. Unable to match a young professional with each of his planned topics, he settled for several panelists who had passed their thirtieth birthdays and two "who had entered the antiquity of their forties."³⁰

The outcome of the panel was not what Waldo had expected. There was more diversity than had been anticipated and some of the presentations were not addressed to the "turbulent subjects" that had been suggested. Also there were components of the new public administration movement which were not addressed, e.g., there was no discussion of a new approach to administration based upon existentialism or phenomenology. The edited volume which resulted may however be considered a companion volume to Marini's work on the Minnowbrook Conference.

Several people participated in both: Peter Savage, Richard S. Page, W. Henry Lambright, Orion White, Jr., and

³⁰Ibid., p. vii.

Waldo himself. There is additionally much similarity in the subject matter of each: the need for new forms of organization to cope with rapid environmental change; for participatory administration; for administrative decentralization; for academic reform in public administration, etc. There is also specific reference to the new public administration discussed at Minnowbrook. Let us examine some typical comments.

James M. Elden relates the "new left" political movement to the new public administration:

While New Public administration is not a direct result of the New Left, both seem responsive to similar sets of problems, albeit through different routes. Moreover, they bear an important relationship to each other. New Public Administration is a logical vehicle for converting the New Left's critique into an actionable agenda for public administration: New Left, for example, cries for participatory democracy; New Public Administration researches non-bureaucratic organizational forms.³¹

Edward Friedland contends that technology will "produce results that parallel the changes in attitude which characterize the 'New Public Administration'"³² Marvin Meade refers to the creativity and innovation of the new public administration: "Surely public administrationists in academe--at least the spokesmen for the New Public

³¹James M. Elden, "Radical Politics and the Future of Public Administration in the Postindustrial Era," in Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, ed. Dwight Waldo (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971), p. 37.

³²Edward Friedland, "Turbulence and Technology: Public Administration and the Role of Information-Processing Technology," in Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, p. 135.

Administration . . . --are capable of fresh, creative insights, of innovative responses to the needs before us."³³

Frederick C. Mosher refers to the emerging public administration--"the 'truly' new public administration." Its primary problem will be adaptation to rapid change. It will utilize sophisticated tools of decision-making; will be concerned with human goals; will attempt to accommodate both centralization and decentralization in the governmental process; and its aim will be competence at every level of government.³⁴

And finally, Waldo offers some sober "thoughts" to those who advocate a new public administration by pointing to "the difficulties they face in seeking answers" to the questions they have raised and reminding them that they may be making excessive demands upon their field:

Public administration cannot conveniently "compose" the world in order to solve its own problems. And while it can hope, without danger of hubris, to have some part in determining the destiny of the whole, its own destiny rests with the whole, not in its own hands.³⁵

Waldo's assessment of the 1969 panel on Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence was that "there was no common animating spirit, no ideological or programmatic

³³Marvin Meade, "'Participative' Administration--Emerging Reality or Wishful Thinking," in Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, pp. 184-185.

³⁴Frederick C. Mosher, "The Public Service in the Temporary Society," in Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, p. 242.

³⁵Dwight Waldo, "Some Thoughts on Alternatives, Dilemmas, and Paradoxes in a Time of Turbulence," in Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, p. 266.

unity" and that "some of the presentations . . . were not addressed . . . to the subjects" he had in mind when making the assignment of topics to be discussed.³⁶ The panel and the subsequent volume by the same name may not have met all expectations of their originator, but they served the new public administration movement well. They not only "carried forth" the Minnowbrook idea; they became a cornerstone of the movement, as frequent reference to them in the literature will attest.

New Public Administration Continued

Since the appearance of the Marini and Waldo volumes in 1971, there has been no publication in the new public administration that is their equal.³⁷ Continued writings

³⁶Waldo, Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, p. vii.

³⁷There were writings devoted to the new public administration prior to 1971, but the Marini and Waldo volumes would, however, have to be considered the central documents of the movement. For pre-1971 writings see: Wesley E. Bjur, "What is the New Public Administration," Public Administration Review 30 (March/April 1970):202-203; H. George Frederickson, "Is the Minnowbrook Perspective Representative?," paper presented to American Society for Public Administration annual conference, May, 1969; P. Gordon, "A Decisive Direction for a New Public Administration," Berkeley: Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of California, 1969; Richard S. Page, "A New Public Administration?," Public Administration Review 29 (May/June 1969):303-304; Lyle J. Sumeck and Franklin D. Reinow, "New Public Administration: For a Time of Crisis--In a Time of Change," Midwest Review of Public Administration 4 (August 1970):108-111; Dwight Waldo, "Public Administration in a Time of Revolutions," Public Administration Review 28 (July/August 1968):362-368; Orion White, Jr., "The New Public Administration as a Radical Political Theory," paper presented to American Political Science Association meeting, Los Angeles, September, 1970.

there have been, but most have been devoted to what Keith M. Henderson calls a "continuing dialogue between 'believers' and 'nonbelievers'."³⁸

Much of the "believers" literature has appeared in the Public Administration Review and is devoted to major themes that appeared at the Minnowbrook Conference--social equity; minorities in administration; administrative decentralization; citizen participation; organizations of the future; urban problems; etc.³⁹ Among the ranks of the "believers," there have been works produced which reflect "variations" on the Minnowbrook themes. Henderson cites works by Eugene Dvorin, Robert Simmons, and George E. Berkley as representative of this type.⁴⁰ He also sees a "counterpart of the academic 'new' perspective" within the federal bureaucracy. Attention is called to the actions

³⁸Keith M. Henderson, Synthesis in American Public Administration, 2nd ed. (New York: Asia Publishing House, forthcoming), p. 3.

³⁹See the special symposia of the Public Administration Review: Alienation, Decentralization, and Participation (January/February 1969); The American City Manager: An Urban Administrator in a Complex and Evolving Situation (January/February 1971); Neighborhoods and Citizen Involvement (May/June 1972); Organizations of the Future (July/August 1973); Social Equity and Public Administration (January/February 1974); Minorities in Public Administration (November/December 1974). See also: the September, 1972 Special issue on Citizen Action in Model Cities and CAP Programs and the October, 1972 special issue on Curriculum Essays on Citizens, Politics, and Administration in Urban Neighborhoods.

⁴⁰Eugene Dvorin and Robert Simmons, From Amoral to Humane Bureaucracy (San Francisco: Canfield Publishing Company, 1972); George E. Berkley, The Administrative Revolution: Notes on the Passing of Administrative Man (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971).

of young dissidents in the Departments of State and Health, Education, and Welfare who organized to voice opposition to the "traditions and policies" of their agencies.

The "nonbelievers" literature produced during the seventies has been highly critical of the new public administration. Victor Thompson is representative of this type. His opposition to the new public administration is voiced in two recent works.⁴¹ Thompson characterizes the new public administration as an audacious effort to "steal the popular sovereignty," and says that no sane person can accept its political absurdity and immaturity.

In the latter work, he refers to new public administrationists as "short-haired radicals" who urge action, which is outside their legal obligations and the power structure, to seek new power coalitions with the disadvantaged (poor, blacks, young people, unemployed, women, prison inmates, migrant workers, etc.). They further seek a redress between the haves and have-nots regardless of the organizational goals established by Congress and the President. In order for administrators to follow the new public administration prophets, says Thompson, they will "have to seek legitimacy in natural law or religious dogma (or a mystical national interest)" rather than in the political system.⁴²

⁴¹Victor Thompson, Without Sympathy or Enthusiasm: The Problem of Administrative Compassion (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1975); and Bureaucracy and the Modern World (Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1976).

⁴²Thompson, Bureaucracy, p. 127.

Allen Schick is another "nonbeliever" in the new public administration. Though he is not as caustic as Thompson in his remarks, he is, nonetheless, just as skeptical. He believes the new public administration to be an inappropriate challenge to legitimate political authority and incapable of attainment:

. . . public administration is called upon to withstand the power of the powerful, to compensate for the wrongs of society. Does this mean that majority will must be rejected by the administrator if it is contrary to his own view of the right course of action? The logical answer is "yes", but this presents grave and moral difficulties in administrative practice.⁴³

Interspersed with the dialogue of the "believers" and "nonbelievers" during the 1970s have been some attempts to assess the impact of the new public administration movement. Dwight Waldo, the father figure of the movement, has made one of the most stimulating attempts. He will not concede that the new public administration achieved the status of a movement, and he believes that it has lost much of its "coherence and identity." Yet he will not deny its impact upon the discipline to date nor its probable future influence:

Its adherents were centrally involved in change in the American Society for Public Administration designed to give it a more forward stance. The literature it has produced is widely read; its ideas and sentiments circulate in the public administration community, particularly in academia. As its adherents, both original and converts, are largely on the young side and still to reach positions of maximum influence, it is likely to exert a continuing, if unpredictable, influence. In brief, it is unlikely to transform radically Public Administration short run, but long run this is a

⁴³Schick, pp. 164-165.

possibility; and in any case it now is and will continue to be a yeasty addition to the entire complex of theories, techniques, and aspirations.⁴⁴

The new public administration movement was conceived in the turbulent decade of the sixties. It was a reaction to the events of the decade and an attempt to reform public administration in such a manner as to make it capable of coping with complex problems that the alleged "old" public administration had been unable to solve. The fetus of the movement could be seen in the attacks of the Honey Report upon academic public administration; its first steps were taken during the questions raised at the Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration. The movement emerged as a rebellious youth at the Minnowbrook Conference and became an adult in the Marini and Waldo volumes. The age of the movement is now questioned. Some contend that it is plagued by old age; others say it is a virile adult whose best years are yet to come.

Normative Character of the New Public Administration

Having traced the development of the new public administration movement, we may now turn to a discussion of its normative character. First, it is necessary to define the manner in which the term normative will be utilized.

⁴⁴Dwight Waldo, "Developments in Public Administration," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 404 (1972):239.

For this purpose, we will rely upon Vernon Van Dyke's distinction between the descriptive and normative approaches in political science.⁴⁵

As utilized by Van Dyke, the descriptive approach applies to the so-called behavioral/empirical approach in political science with its emphasis upon scientific methodology, objectivity, measurement, quantification, and theory building directed at "what is" or "what exists" in the real political world. It emphasizes a value-free or value-neutral approach to the study of things political. The normative approach, on the other hand, is concerned with "what ought to be" or with the desirable. It concerns "not what is but what ought to be, endorsing ends, purposes, or norms."⁴⁶

Van Dyke takes the descriptive-normative dichotomy one step further to a discussion of the prescriptive. "Statements belonging in it are called prescriptive: on the basis of an assumption concerning the end(s) or value(s) to be promoted, they prescribe a method or course of action to be pursued."⁴⁷ Prescriptive statements outline the manner in which desired ends or values are to be realized. Normativism as applied to the new public administration may involve either normative or prescriptive statements as defined

⁴⁵Vernon Van Dyke, Political Science: A Philosophical Analysis (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960), pp. 8-12

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 8.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 12.

by Van Dyke. There are statements regarding what public administration ought to be as well as statements outlining methods and courses of action to be utilized in the accomplishment of desired ends.

Evidence of the new public administration's normative character is easily found. In fact, there are some who think normativism is the primary distinguishing characteristic of the movement. "In essence, the 'new' public administration movement represents little more than a sharpened sensitiveness to the normative dimension of our field."⁴⁸ Although not all writers on the new public administration state the case for normativism so strongly, this element has been present from the beginning. The Honey Report could not be described as having a strong normative flavor, but it was certainly a prescriptive document, especially in its nine-point proposal for immediate action to meet the pressing problems of the discipline.

It was at the Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration that the normative element first began to appear. Here references to normativism were made by Dwight Waldo; Stephen K. Bailey; Emmette S. Redford; Arthur Naftalin; and James C. Charlesworth. Waldo refers to the problems confronting the discipline. Paramount among these are "grand and perennial questions about the nature

⁴⁸George K. Najjar, "Development Administration and 'New' Public Administration: A Convergence of Perspectives," Public Administration Review 34 (November/December 1974): 586.

and ends of government" and value problems which include the following: 1) problems of personal ethics in and related to administration; 2) problems of politics and power; 3) problems of status, law, and jurisprudence; 4) problems of public policy; and 5) problems of political theory and philosophy. He then discusses a "larger circle of theoretical concern," among which he includes the question of justice. Public administrators will find themselves participating in the "never-ending inquiry into the origins, nature, and dictates of justice."⁴⁹

Bailey addressed himself to the "Objectives of the Theory of Public Administration." In so doing, he delineates four types of theory needed within the discipline.

These are:

- 1) Descriptive-Explanatory theory to serve as explanatory models of reality;
- 2) Normative theory to establish norms by which to evaluate the accomplishment of proposed objectives;
- 3) Assumptive theory to set forth propositions which articulate root assumptions about the nature of man and the tractability of institutions; and
- 4) Instrumental theory to operationalize what is needed within the discipline (tools, techniques, and timing).⁵⁰

⁴⁹Dwight Waldo, "Scope of the Theory of Public Administration," in Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods, ed. James C. Charlesworth (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968), pp. 14-20.

⁵⁰Stephen K. Bailey, "Objectives of the Theory of Public Administration," in Theory and Practice of Public Administration, pp. 128-139.

Commenting upon Bailey's typology of theories, Redford finds normative theory of particular relevance to public administration. The function of the normative theorist is to define the ideals of administrative practice and search for ways to implement them. He finds this element of public administration in a state of disarray and challenges normative theorists to reanalyze the "ultimate and instrumental" values within the discipline.⁵¹ Naftalin, also commenting on Bailey's typology, agrees with Redford on the value of normative theory for public administration:

Bailey appears to me to be saying that, if we are to train for the public service, we must be more than explanatory or descriptive or analytical. We must also worry about the normative, about values, about goals; we must raise questions concerning how man relates to society and to himself; we must even ask about man's potentiality; and finally we must deal with the instrumental questions that tell us about the strategies for realizing our goals.⁵²

Charlesworth summarizes the importance of normativism to public administration in his concluding article on the Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration: "Normativism, if it is anything, is synoptic, and therefore requires a bold and comprehensive statement."⁵³

The normative element was very much in evidence at Minnowbrook. Reference has previously been made to the

⁵¹Emmette S. Redford, "Comment on Bailey's Paper," in Theory and Practice of Public Administration, pp. 145-148.

⁵²Arthur Naftalin, "Conference Discussion on the Objectives of the Theory of Public Administration," in Theory and Practice of Public Administration, p. 153.

⁵³Charlesworth, p. 325.

attempts of Frank Marini and Allen Schick to summarize the major themes that emerged from the conference. Both found a concern for normativism to be one of these. Marini refers to the "calls for a postpositivist approach" which would abandon the recent emphasis upon value-free empirical research; Schick argues that new public administration is openly normative:

New public administration is openly normative. It rejects the value-concealing behavioralism of contemporary political science as well as the procedural neutrality of orthodox public administration. The willingness to espouse values springs from two convictions: that value neutral public administration (or political science) is impossible; and that public administrators ought to be advocates for disadvantaged interests.⁵⁴

Normativism was also a topic of discussion in the formal papers and in the small group discussions, not only the papers which dealt specifically with normative theory but also those devoted to the study of organization theory and empirical theory. It was argued that normative presuppositions and premises of organizational theories should be considered and that thoughtful consideration of the models used in organization theory is needed. Appropriateness of organizational theories and models for publicly administered organizations should be questioned.

Discussion devoted to empirical theory expressed concern with the status and direction of empirical theory, yet there was a normative tone. What should be the purpose of empirical theory? Theory for the sake of theory is not

⁵⁴Schick, p. 163.

sufficient. It should be guided by a moral purpose, by a "desire to make the academic study of the social universe directly concerned with questions of social justice."⁵⁵

Almost any assessment, pro or con, of the Minnowbrook Conference or the new public administration movement as a whole reveals its normative character. Richard S. Page was one of the first to report the proceedings of Minnowbrook. He believes that three new dimensions of the field emerged. One of these was that the discipline has no "set of sound normative values, no prescriptive advice to offer student, practitioner, or citizen caught in the whirling confusion of modern industrial or developing society."⁵⁶ It is the objective of the new public administration to fill this vacuum in the discipline. An early critic of the movement reported that "a significant consensus emerging from Minnowbrook gave the new view that there is developing in the body politic a definite view that . . . the manner in which public policy is administered is less relevant than the ends for which it is administered."⁵⁷

Perhaps the best description of the new public administration's normative character was provided by Dwight Waldo

⁵⁵Bob Zimring, "Empirical Theory and the New Public Administration," in Toward a New Public Administration, p. 230.

⁵⁶Richard S. Page, "A New Public Administration," Public Administration Review 29 (May/June 1969):303.

⁵⁷Robert F. Wilcox, "The New P.A.: Have Things Really Changed That Much?," Public Management 53 (March 1971):5.

immediately following the Minnowbrook Conference. He describes the conference and the emerging movement as:

. . . some sort of movement in the direction of normative theory, philosophy, social concern, activism. A turning away from positivism and scientism. An interest in philosophy, personal/organizational morality and values.⁵⁸

Conclusion

The primary concern of the present chapter has been to trace the development of the new public administration and to demonstrate its normative character. It was suggested that the movement was the product of numerous conferences, works, and events, the most outstanding of which were: 1) the Honey Report; 2) the Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration; 3) the Minnowbrook Conference; and 4) the publication of the Marini and Waldo volumes in 1971. Further it was argued that the normative character of the new public administration has been present from the very beginning, with some writers viewing this as the movement's primary distinguishing characteristic. The next chapter will examine the roles advocated for administrators by this normative-based public administration.

⁵⁸Dwight Waldo, "Foreword," in Toward a New Public Administration, ed. Frank Marini, p. xvi.

CHAPTER II

ROLES ADVOCATED FOR ADMINISTRATORS BY THE NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

One aspect of the new public administration's normativism has been the recommendation of various roles that should be pursued by public administrators. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine the various roles that have been recommended and to show that the roles advocated on behalf of minorities is one of the major components of the new public administration. We will begin by examining the concept of role itself and attempt to arrive at a definition which is suitable for the present study.⁵⁹ We will then examine the roles which have been advocated in the literature; ascertain whether or not there is anything new about

⁵⁹Some may find objectionable the use of role to describe the prescriptive statements of the new public administration, preferring instead to utilize the concept norm. It is the view of the present study that while some of the concepts discussed by the new public administration, e.g. social equity, are indeed norms, activity by public administrators in the pursuit of such norms may be considered roles.

This appears feasible since role is sometimes defined as the pursuit of agreed upon norms. Theodore H. Newcomb, et al., view role in this manner: "The [term] role is used in a rather extended sense. Very commonly it refers to widely shared norms . . . This usage refers to an idealized or prescribed role." Social Psychology (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965), p. 323.

these roles; and, finally, discuss the relationship of these roles to minorities.

Role Defined

Role theory or role analysis is a much used concept in the social sciences and presents a definitional problem since there is no common agreement as to what constitutes a role. Sociologists, psychologists, political scientists, and other social scientists utilize the definitions which best fit their particular circumstance. However, of the various definitions encountered in the literature, there appear to be two basic types: 1) normative statements to refer to a set of notions about the way a person who holds a particular position should behave or 2) statements regarding the actual behavior of a particular individual who occupies a certain position.⁶⁰

With the present problem being to forge a definition which incorporates both categories (to account for the recommendations of the new public administration and the actual

⁶⁰The following definitions are illustrative of these two basic types: a) "Perhaps the most common definition is that role is the set of prescriptions defining what the behavior of a position member should be."; b) "A careful review of the definitions reveals, however, that there is one nearly universal common denominator, namely, that the concept pertains to the behavior of particular persons." Bruce J. Biddle and Edwin J. Thomas, eds., Role Theory: Concepts and Research (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 29. See also Neal Gross, et al., Explorations in Role Analysis (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 11, p. 14; Walter F. Murphy and Joseph Tanenhaus, The Study of Public Law (New York: Random House, 1972), p. 140, p. 34.

behavior of Community Relations Service employees), role will be defined as behavior of Community Relations Service employees which embodies, either consciously or unconsciously, normative prescriptions of the new public administration. In the remainder of the present chapter, we will examine the roles advocated by the new public administration; in a following chapter we will endeavor to demonstrate that the roles pursued by Community Relations Service employees is similar to those advocated for public administrators on behalf of minorities.

Roles Advocated in the New Public Administration Literature

The most obvious source of roles advocated by the new public administration is the papers presented at the Minnowbrook Conference. Here H. George Frederickson advocated a social equity norm for public administration.⁶¹ In describing this norm, he suggests that its pursuit by public administrators will result in their engaging in administrative behavior which has not been characteristic of traditional public administration. This behavior includes advocacy of change, client focus, new organizations, improvement in the quality of life, and second-generation behavioralism. In keeping with our distinction between norm and role, we may say that one who engages in such behavior is pursuing

⁶¹H. George Frederickson, "Toward a New Public Administration," in Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective, ed. Frank Marini (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971), pp. 309-331.

the role of a social equity advocate. That is to say, he is engaged in administrative behavior which Frederickson says will result from the pursuit of a social equity norm. Let us examine the social equity norm and the behavior which may be described as a role of social equity advocate for the public administrator.

Social equity, according to Frederickson, seeks to redress the grievances faced by the minority elements of society: poverty, disease, unemployment, crime, etc. These problems are to be tackled by administrators because the:

procedures of representative bureaucracy [committee legislatures, seniority legislatures, entrenched bureaucracies, non-democratized political-party procedures, inequitable revenue-raising capacities in the lesser governments of the federal system] presently operate in a way that either fails or only very gradually attempts to reverse discrimination against disadvantaged minorities.⁶²

Social equity thus encourages administrators to pursue activities that will alleviate the problems faced by minorities and to redress the discriminatory aspects of the political system which work to the disadvantage of minorities. It, in effect, seeks to improve the "political power and economic well-being of minorities."

Elsewhere Frederickson refers to the new public administration which is committed to social equity, "that is to a distribution of public services which counters social, economic, and political inequalities . . ." and outlines the requisites of a social equity norm in public administration.

⁶²Ibid., p. 311.

The requisites of a social equity norm seem to be:

- 1) The recognition that administrative value neutrality is improbable, perhaps impossible, and certainly not desirable.
- 2) A public service is a general public good which can be generally well or badly done.
- 3) However well or badly done, generally provided public services vary in their impact on recipients depending on the recipient's social, economic, and political status.
- 4) Variations in the impact of public services tend to mirror social, economic, and political status; that is, higher quality services go to those with higher status.
- 5) The public administrator is morally obligated to counter this tendency.
- 6) Equity in the delivery of services, insofar as it is calculable, should be one of the standards by which the "goodness" of a public service is judged.
- 7) Variations from equity should always be in the direction of providing more and better services to those in lower social, economic, and political circumstances.
- 8) The isolation of administrators and public agencies from either political or administrative responsibility is not equity enhancing.⁶³

In order for public administrators to become social equity advocates, they must become advocates of change or change agents. This means that they must advocate policies that enhance social equity and seek to change those that inhibit social equity. It also means that administrators must work to change organizations that inhibit social equity. In their quest for change designed to enhance

⁶³H. George Frederickson, "The Case for Social Equity in New Public Administration," (Mimeographed), pp. 7-9.

social equity, public administrators are thus emphasizing client focus and modified forms of organization. These imply that the public administrator should be more concerned with the delivery of services to organization constituents, i.e., the end product or the service delivered should be of more concern than the economy or efficiency of the manner in which it is delivered.

Also administrators should seek to devise forms of organization which enhance the position of those who are located in the lower social, economic, and political levels of society. Frederickson suggests that such modified forms of organization include: "Decentralization, devolution, projects, contracts, sensitivity training, organization development, responsibility expansion, confrontation, and client involvement . . . "64

Frederickson further suggests that the Minnowbrook perspective calls for public administrators to pursue activities which are designed to improve the quality of life for all and which may be characterized as "second-generation behavioralism." Todd R. LaPorte, perhaps more than any other Minnowbrook participant, summarized the idea that public administrators should strive to improve the quality of life for all. Indeed, in his view, this is the major purpose of public organizations: "I would argue that our primary normative premise should be that the purpose of public

⁶⁴Frederickson, "Toward a New Public Administration," p. 312.

organization is the reduction of economic, social, and psychic suffering and the enhancement of life opportunities for those inside and outside the organization."⁶⁵

The public administrator as a "second-generation behavioralist" stresses the "public part of Public Administration." He does not eschew completely the value of scientific approaches in public administration; he is not "antipositivist or antiscientific." But he is more concerned with the value of scientific skills as an aid to the realization of alternative approaches to public policy than as a route to describing how public organizations operate. He is more concerned with the end product of scientific methods than he is with an emphasis upon scientific neutrality. He is, in the final analysis, concerned with science as a possible resource to aid him toward his goal of an equitable distribution of public services:

In sum, then, the second-generation behavioralist is less "generic" and more "public" than his forbears, less "descriptive" and more "prescriptive," less "institution oriented" and more "client-oriented," less "neutral" and more "normative," and, it is hoped, no less scientific.⁶⁶

Louis C. Gawthrop, another participant at the Minnowbrook Conference, discusses the role of administrators in a

⁶⁵Todd R. LaPorte, "The Recovery of Relevance in the Study of Public Organization," in Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective, ed., Frank Marini (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971), p. 32.

⁶⁶Frederickson, "Toward a New Public Administration," p. 316.

manner reminiscent of Waldo's Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence.⁶⁷ In two chapters entitled "Environmental Turbulence" and "The Future of Administration" he discusses a new model of bureaucracy that is needed and the role that administrators will play in this bureaucracy. A new model of bureaucracy is needed because traditional bureaucracy is plagued by the problem of "structural rigidity" and a slowness to react to rapid environmental change brought about by technology in communication, transportation, and sociopolitical disturbances.

A "decentralized-nonincremental" model is needed to solve these problems. This would be an administrative system which utilizes "a nationally oriented cadre of administrative specialists skilled in policy analysis" to carry on planning and program functions and a "second group of highly trained administrative specialists, a cadre of professional change agents."⁶⁸ The second group of specialists would be located in boundary-spanning administrative units, i.e., units which have face to face contact with constituents or forces that are directly or indirectly affected by an organization's policies and programs. The administrative specialists or change agents would be the link between those affected by agency policies and the top-level executives and policy analysts of an organization.

⁶⁷Louis C. Gawthrop, Administrative Politics and Social Change (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975).

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 95-97.

Administrators, to Gawthrop, are to become change agents or administrative specialists with the ultimate goal being "to transform the feelings of political hopelessness and despair (which may ultimately lead in the direction of political violence) into political meaningfulness and relevance." As change agents, administrators are to have three major functions:

- 1) collection of data (performance of micro-analysis of future change in a turbulent environment) for the policy analysts who must have information to perform their planning and program functions;
- 2) serve as a link between centralized comprehensive planning and programming and decentralized administrative implementation. Working within the broad confines (policy parameters) established by top-level executives and their policy analysts, the change agents must devise and invent effective, equitable, and relevant solutions to the pressing technical and logistical and sociopolitical and ethical problems that develop within their specific environmental sectors; and
- 3) impart meaningfulness and direction to the direction of the public policy process . . . It is the change agents who must insure that equity enters into the administrative equation, and it is the change agents who must become the principal allocators of the agency's resources so as to strengthen the growth of the intangible, subjectively defined values of the individual.⁶⁹

The administrator as change agent is ultimately concerned with changing the image of bureaucracy and developing within bureaucracy a sense of social responsibility. As Gawthrop notes, bureaucracy to many represents an obstacle to change. This is true of the poor, the oppressed, the young, as well as many well-educated, affluent groups. To

⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 99-101.

overcome this problem administrators, both public and private, must develop a sense of social responsibility.

To maintain an effective, equitable, and responsive attitude in an unstable, complex, highly turbulent environment, all administrators, public and private, will have to develop a sense of social awareness and a commitment to a high degree of social responsibility.⁷⁰

Closely related to Gawthrop's arguments concerning the need for a changed bureaucracy and a new role for the administrator are the ideas of Louis C. Mainzer, whom Victor Thompson classifies as an advocate of the new public administration. Mainzer's major concern is with "controlling bureaucracy without crippling it or degrading the people in it."⁷¹ He attempts to answer critics who say that bureaucracy is uncontrollable, out of hand, and headed for administrative tyranny. According to Mainzer, bureaucracy is controllable in two traditional ways: control by the rule of law and control by politicians (Congress, the President, Constitution, courts, statutes). Bureaucracy is further controlled by three means which go beyond political control--means which encompass new roles for the administrator. He is to work toward a representative bureaucracy; to become an advocacy administrator; and to encourage citizen participation in administration.

The administrator should seek to make bureaucracy representative of the component elements of society and, in

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 105.

⁷¹Louis C. Mainzer, Political Bureaucracy (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1973), p. iv.

particular, seek to improve the position of minority elements of society within bureaucracy. Such a role for the administrator represents a protest to the merit system which has produced an unrepresentative public bureaucracy. It also suggests that ethnic considerations be taken into account in the staffing of public organizations.

Mainzer suggests that the case for administrative representativeness rests upon the following:

- 1) the idea that everyone in the working force should have a chance at the best job he can manage, with no exception based on race, class, or the like;
- 2) the fact that bureaucrats make policy, and their social background influences the kind of policy they make . . . ;
- 3) the belief that socio-economic-ethnic background affects the way people treat each other, so treatment of citizens by bureaucrats may be influenced by the background of the bureaucrat, especially if members of an agency are rather homogeneous; and
- 4) the psychological identification of the population with the bureaucracy, an element of government by consent, requires a representative bureaucracy.⁷²

The idea of representative bureaucracy discussed by Mainzer is more fully developed in a work by Samuel Krislov.⁷³ He traces the development of the idea of representativeness in bureaucracy and examines the concept in depth within the American bureaucracy. The major question involved in representative bureaucracy is whether or not bureaucracy should be reflective of the various segments

⁷²Ibid., pp. 129-130.

⁷³Samuel Krislov, Representative Bureaucracy (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974).

composing American society. The question, in reality, is whether or not a positive attempt should be made to increase the number of minorities within bureaucracy.

Representative bureaucracy as a concept was developed by J. Donald Kingsley in a 1944 work entitled Representative Bureaucracy.⁷⁴ He found American bureaucracy to be representative whereas the English bureaucracy was not due to its partiality to the upper classes of society. Krislov gives Kingsley credit for coining the term representative bureaucracy, but he feels that Kingsley also distorted the term. American bureaucracy, to Krislov, is not representative and administrators should do more to make it a reality.

Bureaucracy can never be fully representative; it "cannot be [a] microcosmic reproduction of total society." This is true for several reasons, among which are the skills, interests, and personality structure of potential employees and the requirement for specialization (engineers, lawyers, physicians, etc.). However, bureaucracy should and can be representative to a high degree:

. . . the bureaucracy is still at least more representative than other arms of government . . . it is important for bureaucracies to approximate representativeness even if they never fully achieve it.⁷⁵

There are several reasons why administrators can work toward a more representative bureaucracy: the size and

⁷⁴J. Donald Kingsley, Representative Bureaucracy (Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1944).

⁷⁵Krislov, p. 63.

diversity of programs within bureaucracy; the ability of bureaucracy to accommodate social strains and diversity more readily than other areas of government; the ability of bureaucracy to accommodate a large range of interests; the ability of bureaucracy to represent groups and elements of society not involved in the policy-making process; and the ability of bureaucracy to accommodate policy diversities and to insure policy continuity.

Representativeness, according to Krislov, results in the following advantages:

- 1) comprehensive presentation of formulations of view;
- 2) multiple perspectives in the process of consideration and decision;
- 3) broad-based representation from many strata; and
- 4) facilitation of legitimacy through increased public support.⁷⁶

Thus administrators should work for bureaucratic representativeness, even though complete representativeness is impossible. They should encourage more participation by minorities (blacks, Indians, chicanos, orientals, women) because bureaucracy can more adequately represent these groups than can elected officials in the legislative and executive branches of government.

Advocacy administration requires the commitment of the public administrator to use his "professional skills and official standing . . . on behalf of the least powerful and wealthy members of the community." Advocacy on the part of

⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 64-66.

the public administrator may take two forms: 1) "advocacy from within a government agency established to act in a manner adversary to other public agencies and programs" or 2) "advocacy by program officials within agencies serving or regulating the poor, as in public welfare." A third type of advocacy, which does not involve direct advocacy on the part of the public administrator, is advocacy planning from professionals who operate outside government agencies.⁷⁷

Poverty lawyers who worked for the Office of Economic Opportunity during the 1960s is one example of the first type of advocacy administration. They were in a position to file suits against other governmental agencies which they felt did not adequately represent the poor and minorities. They could "help force administrative agencies to act on behalf of the poor in areas such as housing codes and civil rights" and could "help develop law and administrative procedures and policies more favorable to the poor."⁷⁸

The second type of advocate is represented by "vigorous young administrators" who want to become advocates of the poor, particularly those who work for public welfare agencies. They are likely to be highly critical of their agencies in defense of their clientele groups:

The advocate administrator challenges civil service neutrality as his proper guide. He challenges hierarchical control of elected officials as the source of goals.⁷⁹

⁷⁷Mainzer, p. 132.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 134.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 135.

Advocacy administration of the type described by Mainzer is to be found among both academic and practicing new public administrationists:

A new breed of young public administration teachers and practitioners is arguing vigorously for public administrators (especially in local service agencies) to act on strong personal commitments to justice for the poor, rather than on hierarchical obedience and professional neutralism. The public administrator should represent the dispossessed, they argue. Justice for the poor is the goal, and advocacy not neutral competence and subservience to duly constituted authority, is the proper mode.⁸⁰

Mainzer's third role for the administrator is to encourage citizen participation in public administration. This concept is discussed by Mainzer, but a more detailed treatment is found in the writings of Alan A. Altshuler. He seeks to answer the question "what, if anything, might federal and state authorities" do to increase local government sensitivity to the "viewpoints of low income and racial minority groups? to enhance the opportunities of racial minority groups to participate in the private sector jobs and profits generated by government activity?"⁸¹ The answer to this question is neighborhood control. That is, to give neighborhood residents the opportunity to participate in the decision-making processes of government. Altshuler's solution is a pragmatic one. He is not interested in "abstract

⁸⁰Ibid.

⁸¹Alan A. Altshuler, Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities (New York: Pegasus, 1970), p. 171.

justice or efficiency" but in "social peace and political legitimacy." His ultimate goal is not one which could be classified as a new public administration prescription. Nevertheless, his means of achieving his ultimate goal is a vivid illustration of the role that public administrators should encourage citizen participation in public administration.

To this point, we have discussed roles advocated for administrators by those identified as new public administrationists (Frederickson, LaPorte, Gawthrop, Mainzer) or those whose writings amplify the roles advocated by new public administrationists (Krislov, Altshuler). There are also those who have written on the roles advocated by the new public administration but who are not themselves identified as new public administration advocates. Two such individuals are Keith M. Henderson and Gerald E. Caiden.

Henderson, whose account of the new public administration during the 1970s was discussed in Chapter I, believes there to be much divergence among new public administration advocates. However, several characteristics distinguish the administrator of the new public administration from the administrator of traditional public administration. He:

- 1) [is concerned] with moral values such as justice and equity--not efficiency or productivity--as the over-riding purposes of Public Administration;
- 2) [has] a "New Left" political disposition stressing the need for immediate change in institutions and values because of the repressive character of existing practices;

- 3) [has] a faith in the roles of young, moral, loving administrators as the most important change agents; and
- 4) [has] a strong, activist interest in minority rights, inclusion of women, and representativeness in government.⁸²

In discussing the possible future consequences of the new public administration, Henderson concerns himself with the major themes which he feels are found in the teachings of new public administrators. These themes may also be viewed as roles in the sense that they prescribe goals which public administrators should work toward. Academics of the new public administration variety urge their students to concern themselves with:

equity, justice, ethics, consociation, love, relevance, public choice, social activism, client-involvement, voting decisions, neighborhood government, ad hoc organizations, future shock, coping, advocacy administration, self-actualization, women's and minority rights, equal opportunity, and similar themes.⁸³

Perhaps more than anyone else, Gerald E. Caiden has spoken directly of the need for new administrative roles.⁸⁴ The image of the public administrator needs a "face lift." A change is needed from the traditional view of the administrator as a "consolidating bureaucrat." The turbulent environment of public administration will no longer permit administrators to restructure organizations in their own

⁸²Henderson, pp. 3-4.

⁸³Ibid., p. 9.

⁸⁴Gerald E. Caiden, The Dynamics of Public Administration: Guidelines to Current Transformations in Theory and Practice (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1971), pp. 290-291.

conservative, stabilizing image. No longer will the administrator who is not an innovator or original thinker suffice. Nor can the administrator be concerned only with what his political superiors think; he must also be concerned with the public's reception and response to his activities as a public servant.

The administrator's role as a "consolidating bureaucrat" must be replaced with new roles, which may be viewed as the component elements of one composite role--the non-consolidating bureaucrat. The non-consolidating bureaucrat may perform several roles simultaneously or move from one role to the other. It is because of this peripatetic nature that the non-consolidating bureaucrat may be considered as one major role which is composed of several minor or sub-roles. Among the subroles which may be pursued at any given time by the non-consolidating bureaucrat are: crusading reformer, proactive policy-maker, social-change agent, crisis manager, dynamic program manager, humanitarian employer, political campaigner, competent administrator, constructive thinker, interest broker, public relations expert, speedy decision maker, and optimistic leader. It should be re-emphasized that it is the total picture of the administrator which emerges from the pursuit of several of these subroles that is referred to as a non-consolidating bureaucrat.

Major Roles Advocated in the New Public Administration Literature

From the foregoing review of the new public

administration literature, five major roles emerge for the public administrator: social equity advocate; change agent; representative bureaucrat; advocacy administrator; and non-consolidating bureaucrat. The administrative behavior which typifies each of these may be summarized as follows.

The Social Equity Advocate:

Redresses grievances faced by minorities
 Improves the political power and economic well-being of minorities
 Counters social, economic, and political inequalities
 Advocates social change
 Utilizes modified forms of organization to achieve program objectives
 Works to improve the quality of life for all
 Is a second-generation behavioralist
 Is a value conscious policy leader

The Change Agent:

Transforms feelings of political hopelessness and despair into political meaningfulness and relevance
 Collects data for policy analysts
 Serves as a link between centralized comprehensive planning and decentralized administrative implementation
 Develops effective, equitable, and relevant solutions to pressing technical, logistical, sociopolitical, and ethical problems
 Insures that equity enters into the administrative process
 Strengthens the growth of the subjectively defined values of the individual
 Works to develop a sense of social awareness and social responsibility

The Representative Bureaucrat:

Makes bureaucracy representative of the component elements of society
 Improves the position of minority elements of society within bureaucracy
 Considers the ethnic background of an individual when filling organization positions
 Increases the number of minorities within bureaucracy
 Represents groups who are not involved in the policy-making process

The Advocacy Administrator:

Uses professional skills and official standing on behalf of the least powerful and wealthy members of society
 Criticizes the agency in defense of clientele groups
 Acts on a strong personal commitment to justice for the poor
 Encourages citizen participation in general and minority citizen participation in particular
 Works to protect minority rights

The Non-Consolidating Bureaucrat:

Transforms some aspect of community life according to preconceived notions of the ideal society
 Formulates policy which contains strategies to meet the unknown
 Accepts new ideas of social change
 Pushes others into accepting new ideas of social change
 Acts quickly and without anger in crisis situations
 Makes immediate improvisations in crisis situations
 Shapes new courses and adopts ongoing arrangements in the programs with which he works
 Treats staff personnel with respect
 Administers even-handed justice to staff personnel
 Responds to and is a champion of public causes
 Ensures effective program performance with the minimum of political embarrassment
 Chooses among competing interests and reconciles all parties to the outcome with skill
 Builds up public support for programs with skill
 Assumes responsibility for the success or failure of programs
 Gives clear instructions to staff personnel
 Resists being led astray by others who would make up his mind for him
 Is not discouraged by adversity
 Commands attention and stimulates subordinates

What's New About the Major Roles Advocated by the New Public Administration?

One of the problems encountered in classifying something "new" is the task of distinguishing how the new differs from that which is old or traditional. The debate within the discipline of public administration over the new public administration has been no exception. There are

those who contend that the roles and themes of the new public administration are not really new at all, and there are those who feel that there is indeed something new to be offered by the movement. There are also those who feel that it does not really matter if the new public administration is talking about new or old roles and themes. They would say that the movement is talking about roles and themes which must be addressed in the turbulent environment of modern, technological society. If these have previously been addressed in different form, then that is well and good.

It is not the intention here to attempt a settlement of this argument. But the question cannot be ignored. A word must be said about the major roles identified in the review of the literature and whether or not they can be found in more traditional works on public administration. The answer is basically an easy one. The roles identified have been discussed in more traditional works on public administration. Equity, representativeness, change, advocacy, etc. are not new ideas in the history of public administration. There is, however, something new about these concepts as discussed in the new public administration literature. Underlying each of these concepts is the basic question: for whom? Public administrators are to advocate social equity for whom; seek representativeness within bureaucracy for whom; advocate citizen participation for whom; advocate social change for whom?

The answer to each of these questions is that the new

public administrators are to pursue roles which will aid the poor, disadvantaged, and minority segments of society. They are to pursue social change to aid blacks, chicanos, and American Indians. They are, above all else, to pursue roles which will aid minorities. Herein lies the difference between the major roles advocated for public administrators in the new public administration literature and those advocated for them in the more traditional public administration. The ideas are not new; they have merely been given a new emphasis to focus upon the previously unheard-from segments of American society.

New Public Administration Roles and Minorities

Let us see how each of the major roles identified in the review of the new public administration literature is related to minorities. The social equity advocate, as discussed by Frederickson, will serve as our point of departure.

The equitable distribution of public services affects all members of society, but the primary reason for advocating social equity in public administration is to ensure that the disadvantaged segments of society receive their fair share. Indeed, Frederickson's concern is that the institutions of government work to the disadvantage of the minority segments of society. It is up to the public administrator to become the vehicle by which the problems of minority groups are to be solved. It is the task of the

public administrator to improve the social, economic, and political power of minority groups.

This is why the public administrator must become a vehicle of change to work toward the development of organizational forms designed to solve the problems faced by minorities. He must also, when new forms of organization are not called for, work to implement policies and programs within existing organizations which enhance the position of minorities. The objective of improving the quality of life for all certainly includes activities designed to enhance the position of minorities. Likewise, the de-emphasis of behavioralism in public administration calls for a greater concern with the product (service) that is delivered by public organizations than with the efficiency or economy involved in the delivery. The public administrator should inquire as to whether or not his organization is improving the status of the poor and the disadvantaged. To insure that his organization is achieving this objective (client focus), the administrator should encourage citizen participation in administration. He should give minorities an opportunity to engage in agency "feedback" for who better than they know whether or not policies and programs designed to improve their status are working effectively.

Gawthrop's change agent role for the administrator is designed to improve the delivery of governmental services in general and, in particular, to improve the position of minorities and other poor, disadvantaged groups of society.

These groups view bureaucracy as an obstacle to changes which would improve their lot; therefore, bureaucracy must develop a sense of social responsibility. The ultimate goal of Gawthrop's administrator is to replace "feelings of hopelessness and despair" with feelings of "political meaningfulness and relevance."

Mainzer's representative bureaucrat works to the advantage of minorities by seeking to increase their number participating within bureaucratic activities. He also seeks to make bureaucracy representative of all the component elements of society. Krislov's advocacy administrator encourages citizen participation in public administration, which gives minorities a chance to work in conjunction with governmental agencies and gives them a voice in the development of policies and programs which will operate to their advantage.

All the subroles performed by Caiden's non-consolidating bureaucrat have the potential for improving the position of minorities within society. He seeks to improve community life through social change. He not only seeks social change himself but pushes others into accepting it also. He wages campaigns on behalf of minorities, as well as employing them in the agency which he administers. He may serve as an interest broker on behalf of minorities and serve as a public champion of their causes. He accepts responsibility for programs designed to aid minorities and becomes a public relations expert to solicit public support

for them. In short, any of the subroles performed by the non-consolidating bureaucrat has the potential of aiding minorities.

Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to achieve two purposes: to examine the roles advocated for public administrators by the new public administration literature and to demonstrate that the roles advocated on behalf of minorities is a major component of this literature. We began with an examination of the concept of role, and after discovering that there are two basic types of definitions of role (prescriptive statements regarding proper behavior of individuals and the actual behavior of individuals) we coined a definition which incorporates both categories--to account for the prescriptive statements of the new public administration and the actual behavior of Community Relations Service employees. Accordingly, we defined role as behavior of Community Relations Service employees which incorporates, either consciously or unconsciously, prescriptive statements of the new public administration.

We examined the roles advocated for public administrators by several new public administrationists and some who, though not advocates of the new public administration themselves, have written on new public administration roles. From their writings, five major roles emerged for the public administrator: social equity advocate; change agent;

representative bureaucrat; advocacy administrator; and non-consolidating bureaucrat.

We argued that these roles per se are not new to the discipline of public administration. The novelty of the new public administration lies in the fact that these roles are advocated on behalf of the less fortunate segments of American society, particularly the minority segments. Having examined these various roles, we saw that they all involve activities on the part of the public administrator which have the potential for enhancing the position of minority groups within society.

In Chapter III we will examine the Community Relations Service as an operating governmental agency whose primary mission is to aid minorities. We will trace it from its creation by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 down to the adoption in 1970 of programs in administration of justice, communications, economic development, education, and housing. Chapter IV will endeavor to demonstrate that the above-mentioned programs required Community Relations Service employees to pursue roles similar to those identified in Chapter II.

CHAPTER III

THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Governmental action aimed at the protection and betterment of minorities, particularly blacks, is not new in the American political system. The legislative, executive, and judicial branches at the national level have long sought to eradicate the vestiges of slavery and to uplift minorities from the status of second-class citizenship. Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation; the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution; the Civil Rights Act of 1883; Franklin Roosevelt's 1941 executive order which created fair employment practices in war-related industries; Harry Truman's Special Commission on Civil Rights; the Brown decision of the Warren Court; Eisenhower's use of federal troops to integrate the public schools of Little Rock; and the activist civil rights programs of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations are but a few examples.

Yet governmental action to aid minorities has been sporadic and has come from numerous directions in the federal government. Not until the establishment of the Community Relations Service by the Civil Rights Act of 1964

was there a governmental agency which had as its sole function resolution of conflicts based upon racial prejudice and tension. This chapter will examine the Community Relations Service as an operational agency at the federal level. Emphasis will be placed upon the following: 1) early attempts to establish a Community Relations Service; 2) creation of the Community Relations Service by the Civil Rights Act of 1964; 3) the early experience of the Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce, 1964-1966; 4) transfer of the Community Relations Service to and early activities within the Department of Justice; and 5) the programmatic activities of the Community Relations Service during the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The First Attempt to Establish a Community Relations Service

Lyndon Johnson as Senate Majority Leader made the first attempt to establish a Community Relations Service in 1959. During the heated debate which would ultimately end with passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1960, Johnson introduced a bill (S. 499) in the Senate to establish a Community Relations Service; to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission; and to "secure and protect" the right of citizens to vote. Title I of S. 499 dealt with the proposed Community Relations Service. It was the purpose of the title to establish an independent federal service which would have the specific duty of providing:

. . . conciliation assistance in communities where (1) disagreements or difficulties regarding the laws or

Constitution of the United States, or (2) disagreements or difficulties which affect or may affect interstate commerce, are disrupting, or are threatening to disrupt, peaceful relations among citizens of such communities.⁸⁵

In performing its conciliation function, the proposed agency was to seek and use the cooperation and assistance of available state and local agencies and any nonpublic agency which it felt could be of assistance. Any dealings with officials of these agencies were to be conducted without publicity and were to be kept confidential. The agency was to be headed by a director, who would be assisted by five assistant directors. All of these were to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The director could appoint additional assistants, the total number of which could not exceed one hundred at any given time.

Thus the agency proposed by the Johnson bill was to be composed of a small corps of highly qualified conciliators who would function in a manner similar to those of the National Labor Relations Board. In introducing the bill on the floor of the Senate, Johnson emphasized the heavy responsibility that would be placed upon conciliators of the agency. They would have to be persons of imagination,

⁸⁵U.S., Congress, Senate, A Bill to Establish a Community Relations Service to Provide Conciliation Assistance in Communities Where Disagreements or Difficulties Among Citizens are Disrupting, or are Threatening to Disrupt, the Peaceful Life of the Community; to Extend the Commission on Civil Rights; to Provide Further Means of Securing and Protecting the Right to Vote; and for Other Purposes, S. 499, 86th Cong., 1st sess., 1959, p. 1. For the text of S. 499 see Appendix D.

understanding, and absolute integrity. They would also perform "the most important of all services"--helping people to communicate with each other.⁸⁶

Senator Johnson felt that the conciliation service to be established by S. 499 "could be one of the longest and most far-reaching steps toward the ultimate solution of the civil rights issue that could be taken" and would be "a new and a fresh approach to an extremely vexing and troublesome problem."⁸⁷ His colleagues in the Senate and the House of Representatives did not share his enthusiasm. The bill did not pass in the Senate and was never introduced in the House. In addition, there was much opposition voiced against it in the 1959 Senate and House hearings dealing with proposed civil rights legislation.

In the Senate hearings, opposition to the bill was voiced by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Jewish Congress, the American Veterans Committee, and by various political leaders from the southern states: Senators Lister Hill and John Sparkman of Alabama, Senator John Stennis of Mississippi, and Breed O. Mounger, President of the Mississippi Bar Association. Reasons for the opposition of the civil rights groups and the southern

⁸⁶U.S., Congress, Senate, Senator Johnson speaking for the bill to establish a Community Relations Service, S. 499, 86th Cong., 1st sess., 20 January 1959, Congressional Record 105:876.

⁸⁷Ibid.

politicians differed greatly, but they were, nevertheless, equally opposed to the proposed agency.

Civil rights advocates viewed the proposal as an attempt to take the enforcement of civil rights out of the hands of the federal courts and replace strict enforcement and compliance with "a new concept called conciliation." Joseph L. Rauh, Counsel for the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, compared the proposed conciliation service of the Community Relations Service to conciliation in the area of property rights. He insisted that it would be unthinkable to suggest conciliation as a substitute for redress in a case where one's property is taken or where there is interference with contractual rights in violation of the law. Yet S. 499 proposed substitution of conciliation "for the basic constitutional right of equal treatment under the law." The bill was not even a compromise on civil rights but was a definite step backward. It was, according to Rauh, a patent attempt by the Senate Majority Leader to sweep the issue of civil rights and desegregation "under the rug" until the 1960 presidential election had passed.⁸⁸

Roy Wilkins, Executive Director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, also attacked the conciliation provision of S. 499, which he described as the bill's principal feature. Under no circumstances would

⁸⁸U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Civil Rights--1959. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. 86th Cong., 1st sess., 1959, pp. 308-309.

a bill which advocated conciliation of civil rights be acceptable to him or the organization which he represented. He further felt that the bill was designed to appeal to people who feel that one should not fight for his constitutional rights but should "talk this matter over." Such an approach was out of the question to Wilkins because constitutional rights cannot be talked over, conciliated, or entrusted to a federal agency for protection.⁸⁹

As Director of the American Veterans Committee, Irvin Lechliter attacked S. 499 for its ambiguity in regard to the Community Relations Service. Neither the jurisdiction, mode of operation, nor relationship of the agency to the courts was spelled out. But more importantly, he objected to the conciliation provision. Neither he nor the American Veterans Committee were opposed to the concept of conciliation "properly applied." For example, property rights may be conciliated, but "a constitutional right can never be the subject of conciliation."⁹⁰

William Maslow, speaking for the American Jewish Congress, condemned Senator Johnson's bill for the affect that it would have on desegregation of public schools: "the Johnson bill fails to come to grips with the civil rights problem. With its stress on conciliation, it would create the impression that the question whether the states must end enforced segregation is still open."⁹¹

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 299.

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 408.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 329.

Opposition to S. 499 by southern politicians obviously was not due to their concern for the protection of civil rights of minorities. Rather it was based upon arguments grounded in states' rights ideology and fiscal conservatism. John Sparkman attacked the proposal as a further infringement upon the "rights which belong to the States"; Lister Hill insisted that the proposed agency would be a "waste of taxpayers' money and would contribute nothing to the betterment of racial relations"; and John Stennis felt that a Community Relations Service might possibly do some good in the "border states" or in "states where the racial problem is encountered for the first time."⁹²

One might assume that he felt a Community Relations Service would be of no value in the South since racial problems had been encountered there many times. That notwithstanding, he felt that the language of S. 499 should be revised to indicate that the Community Relations Service could render its conciliation service only upon the invitation of a community experiencing racial problems. It should not have the authority to initiate such action of its own accord.

Breed O. Mounger saw S. 499 and other civil rights bills being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee as an attempt to make the Brown decision the supreme law of the land.

Senate bill 499 . . . erroneously proclaims that the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in the Brown case,

⁹²Ibid., pp. 360, 1071, 1226.

rendered in 1954, is now and ever shall, when you take it procedurally, be unchangeable the supreme law of the land, applicable to all persons whomsoever under all circumstances whatsoever.⁹³

There was some support for the Johnson bill evidenced in the 1959 Senate hearings; however, it was inconsequential in comparison to the vociferous opposition. The primary support came from various Jewish organizations, e.g., B'nai B'rith and the American Jewish Committee; the Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State; and the United States National Student Association. The Jewish organizations supported the concept of conciliation but felt that clarification was needed in the Johnson bill in order to insure that constitutional rights of the individual would not be endangered.

Herman Edelsberg of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith commended Senator Johnson, "a southerner by geography and orientation," on the introduction of a civil rights bill. However, he thought that it should be made crystal clear by both Johnson and the Senate Judiciary Committee that conciliation to be carried on by the proposed Community Relations Service would have two milestones or guideposts in its work. "One is that it must not relieve community tensions at the cost of constitutional rights," and "it must defend and preserve the American public school system."⁹⁴

Support from the Protestants and Other Americans

⁹³Ibid., p. 1237.

⁹⁴Ibid., pp. 366-367.

United for Separation of Church and State came from a concern over the protection of religious rights of students in public schools. They did, however, urge that S. 499 be passed into law and that the proposed Community Relations Service have authority to offer conciliation services in disagreements stemming from religious matters. The United States National Student Association too supported the conciliation concept contained in S. 499. But like the Jewish organizations, it insisted that constitutional rights of minorities not be conciliated "away" by a federal agency.

In the 1959 House hearings on proposed civil rights legislation, S. 499 received much opposition and little support as had been the case in the Senate. It will be recalled that the Johnson bill was not introduced in the House, but it was a topic of discussion among the witnesses who appeared before the House Judiciary Committee. Some of the witnesses who appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee also appeared in the House: William Maslow of the American Jewish Congress and Roy Wilkins of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. New voices of opposition were raised by Al Harnett of the AFL-CIO, Representative William L. Dawson of Illinois, and Representative James Roosevelt of California. Opposition from all three was based upon the fear that S. 499 would replace civil rights enforcement by the courts with the conciliation of civil rights by a small federal agency.

Harnett felt that he was restraining his comments

during the hearings: "If I were to say all that I felt about the Johnson bill during the course of this hearing we would probably consume the rest of the afternoon but I will not embarrass anybody." Though his comments were brief, he left no doubt as to what he thought of the proposed Community Relations Service: "Horse trading by a so-called liberal on a level proposed by . . . U.S. Senator Lyndon Johnson can be considered nothing less than a betrayal of the liberal concepts of civil rights."⁹⁵

Representative Dawson couched his arguments solely in terms of constitutional rights. He opposed conciliation of constitutional rights by the so-called Community Relations Service because they are legal rights "to be decided by the courts which our Constitution established to decide constitutional issues." When a constitutional issue is decided by the courts, "it is no longer a proper issue for 'conciliation'. Such an approach simply envisages 'conciliating' away the guaranties of the Constitution."⁹⁶ Representative Roosevelt confined his opposition to two questions: "Will the approach hamper enforcement [of civil rights]?" and "Will conciliation, at the level it is proposed, be a necessary prerequisite to judicial action?"⁹⁷

⁹⁵U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Civil Rights. Hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary. 86th Cong., 1st sess., 1959, p. 285.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 177.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 293.

Those who appeared in the Senate to testify in favor of S. 499 also appeared before the House Judiciary Committee. Certain Jewish groups, particularly community relations agencies, and the United States National Student Association spoke in favor of conciliation in the area of civil rights. Again, however, they cautioned against the possibility of endangering minority civil rights by an agency such as the Community Relations Service proposed by the Johnson bill.

Conciliation in the area of civil rights was an idea whose time had not arrived in 1959. Civil rights organizations, members of the Congress, and various other groups, e.g., organized labor, who supported civil rights legislation were unwilling to rely upon an administrative agency of the federal government to protect the civil rights of minorities. Perhaps the mistrust stemmed from the fact that S. 499 was introduced by a Senator from the South. Perhaps it was felt that only the courts could be trusted to vigorously enforce civil rights. Available public evidence, which can never reveal internal human motives, suggests that in 1959 most people interested in civil rights looked to the federal courts for protection.

The Supreme Court, in the Brown case, was the only branch at the federal level that had adopted a truly activist approach to civil rights. Congress had passed the Civil Rights Act of 1957, which early proved to be a "watered down" piece of legislation, and Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower had taken some initiatives

in this area. But the fact remained. Neither the executive nor legislative branches had as yet chosen to become true advocates of minority rights. This, however, would not long be the case. President Kennedy's Administration assumed an active role once in office, and the Congress would pass another civil rights bill in 1960. But a Community Relations Service would have to wait until 1963, at which time both the executive and legislative branches were willing to see such an agency created.

Attempts to Create a Community Relations Service During the Kennedy Administration

After S. 499 failed in the Senate and was not introduced in the House, and the Civil Rights Act of 1960 contained no provision for the creation of a Community Relations Service, it was 1963 before there would be attempts by either the executive or legislative branches to create such an agency to deal with civil rights problems. In this year, President John F. Kennedy proposed a comprehensive civil rights package which, if passed by the Congress, was to become the Civil Rights Act of 1963. In a June 19, 1963, message to the Congress on civil rights and job opportunities, the President asked the Congress to stay in session until it passed such a bill. Until the legislation was passed, he proposed to establish a Community Relations Service by executive order.

It is my intention, therefore, to establish by Executive Order (until such time as it can be created by statute) an independent Community Relations Service . . . working through regional, State, and local communities to the

extent possible, and offering its services in tension-torn communities either upon its own motion or upon the request of a local official or other party.⁹⁸

As described by the President, the proposed agency was to work with biracial human relations committees to improve race relations through voluntary action. He had earlier, in a June 9, 1963, Honolulu address before the United States Conference of Mayors, urged each member of the conference to establish such committees in their cities. They were to identify racial tensions before reaching the crisis stage and to advise local governmental officials, businessmen, and local organizations as to what actions could be taken to alleviate racial tensions.

The proposed Community Relations Service was to work with such committees where they existed and to fulfill the purpose of such a committee in communities where they did not exist. In an apparent effort to overcome some of the arguments levied against the Community Relations Service proposed by Senator Johnson in S. 499, the President said:

Such an effort is in no way a substitute for effective legislative guarantees of human rights. But conciliation and cooperation can facilitate the achievement of those rights, enabling legislation to operate more smoothly and more effectively.⁹⁹

The agency proposed by President Kennedy was not created by executive order prior to his death on November

⁹⁸U.S., President, Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, 1961-), John F. Kennedy, 1963, pp. 455-456.

⁹⁹Ibid.

22, 1963, but it was contained within his civil rights proposals which were debated in the House of Representatives (H.R. 7152) and the Senate (S. 1731, S. 1975).¹⁰⁰

With the exception of H.R. 1632, whose sole purpose was the establishment of a Community Relations Service, most of the bills in the first session of the Eighty-Eighth Congress which called for the establishment of a Community Relations Service were comprehensive civil rights packages which sought, among other things, to protect voting rights, extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission, prevent discrimination in public accommodations, and eliminate discrimination in public education. They were also fairly uniform in regard to their provisions which sought to establish a Community Relations Service, duplicating to a large extent the provisions of the 1959 Johnson bill.

The purpose of the agency proposed by these bills was to assist communities experiencing problems relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin and which threatened to impair the rights of citizens or interfere with interstate commerce. The agency was to use

¹⁰⁰In addition to H.R. 7152, which was the omnibus bill containing President Kennedy's civil rights proposals in 1963, the following bills introduced in the House of Representatives during the first session of the Eighty-Eighth Congress contained provisions calling for the creation of a Community Relations Service: H.R. 1632, H.R. 7157, H.R. 7182, H.R. 7197, H.R. 7204, H.R. 7208, H.R. 7212, H.R. 7223, H.R. 7224, H.R. 7226, H.R. 7246, H.R. 7255, H.R. 7266, H.R. 7281, H.R. 7298, H.R. 7328, H.R. 7338, H.R. 7375, H.R. 7453, H.R. 7521, H.R. 7702. For the text of the Community Relations Service provisions of H.R. 7152, S. 1731, and S. 1750, see Appendix E.

the assistance of state and local officials or any nonpublic agency available in the performance of its duties. It could further offer its services upon its own initiative or upon the request of a local governmental official. All operations of the agency were to be conducted without publicity, and information accumulated in the course of its activities was to be considered confidential. In the 1963 House and Senate hearings dealing with civil rights bills, there was much discussion of the proposed Community Relations Service.

In the Senate, Robert Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, testified in favor of the proposed agency. He presented the view of the Kennedy Administration in regard to civil rights problems, which was to seek local solutions through voluntary negotiations and persuasion prior to court action. Referring to racial problems in Birmingham, Alabama, he noted the success of the Kennedy Administration in utilizing such an approach. All too often, however, communications between whites and blacks had broken down completely. "The presence of an outside catalyst" such as the Community Relations Service could "help restore it and then establish effective negotiation." He reiterated the President's goal of having the agency work with biracial human relations committees which he had proposed in the June 9th Honolulu address. It was the President's and the Attorney General's hope that "mediation and persuasion" by a formal agency of the federal government would help the

country "to avoid future Birminghams, Cambridges, and Danvilles."¹⁰¹

In a letter to Senator Sam Ervin, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Louis J. Lefkowitz, Attorney General of New York, strongly endorsed the recommendations contained in President Kennedy's civil rights program. He believed the proposed Community Relations Service would have "the support of all people of good will," and he found it noteworthy that the federal government intended to utilize "peaceful persuasion" as a first recourse in the resolution of problems based upon racial discrimination. However, he noticed a "conspicuous absence" in the activities of the proposed Community Relations Service--it lacked the authority to deal with discrimination based upon religion. Religious discrimination was not threatening "the peace of our communal life" in the same manner as racial discrimination, but it still persisted in the State of New York at the time. Lefkowitz, therefore, thought religious discrimination should be included within the realm of authority of the proposed agency.¹⁰²

Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina was an outspoken

¹⁰¹U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Civil Rights--The President's Program, 1963. Hearings before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, p. 103.

¹⁰²U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Civil Rights. Hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary. 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, pp. 2638-2639.

critic of the proposed agency. He objected to it on two grounds: expansion of the federal bureaucracy and encroachment of the "centralized Federal Government" upon local communities. He pointed out that proposed legislation gave the Community Relations Service only conciliatory powers. But should the agency, once created, follow the example of all federal agencies since the beginning of the country, it would be before the Congress requesting coercive powers in addition to the conciliatory powers proposed. His second objection was that under such an agency:

. . . a centralized Federal Government would send its employees throughout the length and breadth of the land in numbers like the locusts to eat up the substance of the taxpayers and intermeddle in affairs and controversies which can be solved satisfactorily by voluntary action on the part of the people living in communities.¹⁰³

There was much more discussion of the Community Relations Service in the House of Representatives in 1963 because, as Chairman Emanuel Celler of the House Judiciary Committee pointed out, 170 civil rights bills were introduced during the first session of the Eighty-Eighth Congress. Not all of these contained provisions to establish a Community Relations Service, but there were approximately twenty-five proposals calling for the creation of such an agency. Support for the Community Relations Service was voiced by the Attorney General of the United States; church

¹⁰³U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Civil Rights--The President's Program, 1963. Hearings before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, p. 327.

spokesmen (National Council of Churches, Washington City Church of the Brethren); civil rights groups (American Civil Liberties Union, Congress of Racial Equality, Japanese-American Citizens League, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Political Association of Spanish Speaking Organizations); educational groups (Southern Conference Educational Fund, United States National Student Association); organized labor (AFL-CIO, United Automobile Workers); and northern politicians (Representatives Dominick V. Daniels of New Jersey, John W. Dingell of Michigan, Seymour Halpern and James Healey of New York).

Attorney General Kennedy's testimony contained essentially the same line of arguments he had presented in the Senate hearings. Administration efforts to mediate racial problems were enumerated, but the primary emphasis was upon the need for an agency "which could devote its full energies to mediation in seriously troubled areas." Leading citizens, both black and white, in racially troubled communities were willing to confer with each other on the solution of racial problems, but an outside force was needed to bring them together--the Community Relations Service. Such a service would not "block or slow down the vindication of constitutional rights" but would "with a congressional mandate [seek] to provide mediation assistance to communities where racial tensions are rising or have erupted."¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁴U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Civil Rights. Hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 of the

Support of some religious groups for the Community Relations Service was based on the success of human relations commissions which were operative at the state and local levels. Reverend Duane H. Ramsey, Pastor of the Washington City Church of the Brethren, thought the success of such commissions impressive enough that a similar organization was needed at the federal level. It could seek out "areas of discrimination early" in order to prevent crisis situations. It could also aid those minority citizens who were being discriminated against but who were not aware of their constitutional rights or did not have sufficient funds to bring a legal suit or know-how to present their grievances. Dr. Eugene Carson Blake of the National Council of Churches was disturbed by the fact that the proposed agency would deal with discrimination based upon race, color, or national origin but not upon religion. He queried the members of the House Judiciary Committee on the issue, but after hearing their arguments to the effect that religious discrimination was not widespread in the United States, he conceded that there was no need to include such a provision in legislation designed to establish a Community Relations Service.¹⁰⁵

Civil rights organizations in 1963 were willing to accept a Community Relations Service as part of the federal

House Committee on the Judiciary. 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, pp. 1382-1383.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., pp. 1991-1992, 2028-2029.

government's efforts to better the position of minorities, yet they were still, as they had been in 1959, somewhat skeptical of such an agency. They feared that it might be viewed as a substitute for judicial enforcement of constitutional rights. John De J. Pemberton, speaking for the American Civil Liberties Union, offered the "caveat that the Service not be mistaken for an enforcement agency. Its functions should be supplementary to all other means, both civil and criminal, for achieving the goal of equality." James Farmer, National Director of the Congress of Racial Equality, was "very pleased, indeed," to see the federal government acknowledge the need for a "Federal body to review the daily indignities" suffered by the nation's minorities. However, he felt that the Community Relations Service should serve as an adjunct to "strict and ironclad enforcement measures against discrimination."¹⁰⁶

Similar views were expressed by the Japanese-American Citizens League, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Political Association of Spanish Speaking Organizations. The statement presented by the Japanese-American Citizens League summarized well the cautious optimism of the civil rights organizations:

" . . . an authorized Federal agency in resolving community tensions and differences to prepare an area to accept public policy as enunciated by Government augurs well for the proposed Community Relations Service."¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 2121, 2237. ¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 2533.

Support of a Community Relations Service by the United States National Student Association and the Southern Conference Educational Fund was based upon divergent reasoning. The former group optimistically hailed the proposed agency as a device to be utilized "in securing the rights of all people" and in supporting "freedom and equality" for all American citizens. The latter was more pragmatic in approach. John M. Coe, vice-president of the organization, alluded to the possible influence of the Community Relations Service in the South. While there was only a small minority who would actively support civil rights in the South, there was a very large, "inactive minority, or perhaps even a majority," who were desirous of seeing an end to racial strife and tension. They would welcome the assistance of the Community Relations Service, particularly in view of the proposal providing for the confidential nature of its activities.¹⁰⁸

Enumerating the efforts of the AFL-CIO in the area of civil rights, George Meany committed a large segment of organized labor to the ranks of those who supported civil rights conciliation of the type to be offered by the proposed Community Relations Service. The AFL-CIO national convention in 1961 instructed its member organizations to cooperate with interracial committees in their areas or to originate such committees if they did not exist. Meany also, after labor leaders met with President Kennedy in

¹⁰⁸Ibid., pp. 1852, 2388.

early 1963, instructed the "State and local central bodies of the AFL-CIO" to implement the policy adopted in 1961. He summarized the view of his organization toward the proposed agency by saying: "We are wholly in favor of Federal efforts to encourage interracial dialogue, which Title IV [of H.R. 7152] contemplates." The testimony of Walter P. Reuther, President of the United Automobile Workers, further exemplified the support of organized labor for the Community Relations Service. He viewed the proposed agency as one which would "serve the useful purpose of bringing together people of influence in both races to work toward elimination of discriminatory practices."¹⁰⁹

Among the members of the House of Representatives, support and opposition for the Community Relations Service tended to follow sectional lines, with those from the North supporting and those from the South opposing. Representative Dominick V. Daniels of New Jersey insisted that the Community Relations Service would bring about the "voluntary abandonment of discriminatory practices"; Representative John D. Dingell of Michigan argued that it would "facilitate the integration of nonwhite citizens into the mainstream of American life"; Representative Seymour Halpern of New York gave the Community Relations Service such priority that he introduced H.R. 1632, whose sole purpose was the creation of this agency; and Representative James C. Healey of New York urged the creation of a Community Relations Service

¹⁰⁹Ibid., pp. 1785, 1940.

because its value could not "be emphasized enough. Lacking the power of subpoena, it would advise and assist local officials in improving the communication and cooperation between the races. By so doing, the service would go a long way in helping to preclude recurrences of racial crises."¹¹⁰

Opposition to the Community Relations Service in the 1963 House hearings was confined to private citizens, fundamentalist church leaders, and United States Representatives from the southern states. Private citizens who opposed the agency were Douglas McKay, Jr., an attorney from Columbia, South Carolina, and Kitty L. Reynolds, a concerned citizen from Arlington, Virginia. McKay felt that the Community Relations Service, along with the Civil Rights Commission and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, were all agencies which gave the executive branch of the federal government additional power to "agitate the race problem and stir up discord." They provided for "government by threat" in which the federal government harrasses the states by withholding federal monies that have been paid into the federal treasury by state taxpayers. Such action, according to McKay, would hurt Negroes as badly as whites and would do nothing to solve the race problem. "Voluntary and willing action of both races" was the only solution. Activities of the federal government through such agencies as the Community Relations Service gave minorities "a club to hold over

¹¹⁰Ibid., pp. 2512, 2514, 2351, 1863.

the heads of whites" and "set black against white." They "impair rather than improve the status of the minority."¹¹¹

Kitty Reynolds objected to the Community Relations Service as well as the entire civil rights program contained in H.R. 7152. She felt that the bill violated the constitutional and natural rights of American citizens and would result in a "police state with agents swarming over our land." Her specific objection to the Community Relations Service provision of H.R. 7152 was that it made no reference to the number of employees that would be required to carry out the mission of the agency, and it gave no indication as to what the cost to the taxpayers would be.¹¹²

C. W. Lockey, Director of the Methodist Ministry to Spanish Speaking Missions in the Southwest, insisted that passage of H.R. 7152, if carried to its ultimate, would "build the same conditions that we called communism in Russia, East Germany, and elsewhere in the world." It would further bring about the "destruction of democratic constitutional government, the destruction of local authority in government and local control." The Community Relations Service should not be created because it would be very expensive and "not helpful in any respect." Indeed, the provision calling for its creation was a "vicious piece of legislation." Instead what was needed was legislation which would make it a federal crime for anyone to cross a state

¹¹¹Ibid., p. 2139.

¹¹²Ibid., pp. 2580-2581.

line for the "purposes of agitation, demonstrations, and participation in any activity in violation of state and local law."¹¹³

As was the case in 1959, members of the Congress from the southern states based their arguments against the Community Relations Service on the grounds of states' rights and fiscal conservatism. Representative William Jennings Bryan Dorn of South Carolina saw the agency as a domestic peace corps which would engage in unlimited meddling in the affairs of private citizens:

. . . I envision all kinds of people coming down--kind of a glorified domestic peace corps of a sort, coming down and prying into religious activity, social gatherings, trying to work out some kind of a hypothetical dream, or imagining discrimination exists somewhere and projecting themselves into it, into all fields, checking up on the Kiwanis Club or the Rotary Club or Lions Club or the Lions' dinner for charity, stirring up suspicion, distrust, and hatred and, oh yes, sending reports to Washington.¹¹⁴

Armistead Selden of Alabama insisted that the people of the United States had not moved so far toward centralized authority to accept the position that community relations is an area of proper concern for the federal government. Community relations are by definition the province of the state and local governments into which the federal government may not move "legislatively or otherwise." Basil Whitener of North Carolina was convinced that there was no need for such an agency in light of the "plenary evidence . . . of the

¹¹³Ibid., pp. 2177-2178, 2184.

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 1593.

commendable efforts on the part of communities throughout the Nation to voluntarily meet the problems brought about by race relations issues."¹¹⁵

Representative William M. Tuck of Virginia introduced as evidence a pamphlet by the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government entitled Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs. In this pamphlet, the commission raised the question as to what the function of the Community Relations Service would be? The answer was a duplication of the efforts by existing federal agencies already engaged in civil rights activities (the Civil Rights Commission, the President's Fair Employment Practices Committee, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department), not to mention the numerous churches, civic bodies, and racial commissions around the country. Yet, the commission's major objection to the Community Relations Service was the fact that "it is simply not the function of Congress, under any provisions of the United States Constitution, to dispatch Federal agents to countless communities in order to resolve racial disagreements among 'persons therein.'"¹¹⁶

The 1963 House and Senate Judiciary Committee hearings evidenced substantial support for a Community Relations

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 1722.

¹¹⁶Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs quoted in U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Civil Rights. Hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary. 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, p. 2614.

Service; the actions of these committees did not. The Senate Judiciary Committee held hearings on the President's proposals which were contained in bills S. 1731 and S. 1750, but took no further action due to the influence of its anti-civil rights Chairman James O. Eastland of Mississippi. Senate Democratic floor leaders also held off on any floor action on civil rights. "They planned to wait for the House-passed bill and take that measure up, bypassing the Judiciary Committee."¹¹⁷

In the House Judiciary Committee, the provision of the President's bill (H.R. 7152) which called for the creation of a Community Relations Service was deleted. The original proposal calling for the agency was contained within the bill which Subcommittee No. 5 sent to the full Judiciary Committee, but when the full committee on November 20, 1963 formally reported its "bipartisan bill (H.R. 7152-H.Rept. 914)," it contained no provision calling for the creation of a Community Relations Service. With this report, the attempts to create such an agency during the Kennedy Administration failed because two days later Lee Harvey Oswald's fatal bullets were to be fired in Dallas.

There were additional attempts to get H.R. 7152, without the Community Relations Service provision, passed prior to President Kennedy's death. House Judiciary Chairman Emanuel Celler on November 20th asked House Rules

¹¹⁷Henrietta and Nelson Poynter, eds., Congressional Quarterly Almanac 16 (1960):334.

Chairman Howard W. Smith "to schedule an early hearing on a rule for floor debate on H.R. 7152."¹¹⁸ Smith, a Democrat from Virginia and an opponent of civil rights legislation, took no action. The Community Relations Service and the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963 would have to await the interment of a slain civil rights advocate, John F. Kennedy, and the swearing into office of another, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Creation of the Community Relations Service

Immediately upon taking office, President Johnson began to push for passage of H.R. 7152, which was to become Public Law 88-352, the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In an address to a joint session of Congress on November 27, 1963, only five days after the assassination of President Kennedy, he called for immediate action on the civil rights bill for which Kennedy had long labored:

. . . no memorial oration or eulogy could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the Civil Rights bill for which he fought so long. We have talked long enough in this country about equal rights. We have talked for 100 years or more. It is time now to write the next chapter--and to write it in the books of law.¹¹⁹

The Congress accepted President Johnson's call and returned to work on H.R. 7152.¹²⁰ It will be recalled that

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 353.

¹¹⁹U.S., President, Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, 1963-), Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963, p. 8.

¹²⁰Account of House and Senate action on H.R. 7152 is based upon the Congressional Quarterly Almanac, Vol. XIX, 1963, pp. 334-358 and Vol. XX, 1964, pp. 338-380. For

the bill was lodged in the House Rules Committee immediately prior to President Kennedy's assassination, where Chairman Howard W. Smith refused to take action. But Representative Richard Bolling, a liberal Democratic member of the Rules Committee, took the first action on November 27th to dislodge the bill from the Committee. He introduced House Resolution 574 which was designed to provide for floor debate. It was then possible for Chairman Emanuel Celler of the House Judiciary Committee to file a discharge petition in an attempt to prevent the Rules Committee from considering the bill further and to bring it to the floor for debate. President Johnson informed the Democratic leadership that he would give such a petition his full support, but Republicans in the House were highly critical of the petition, accusing Bolling of appealing to black civil rights groups for partisan gain.

Partisan disagreement over the discharge petition led House Republicans on December 11th to attempt, through "Calendar Wednesday" procedures, to bring the bill to the floor for immediate debate.¹²¹ This attempt was designed to

the legislative history of H.R. 7152, see U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, 1964, 1968; Voting Rights Act of 1965; and Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970. 91st Cong., 2nd sess., 1970, p. 43.

¹²¹"Under this procedure, each Wednesday the names of standing committees are called out alphabetically by the Clerk. The Chairman of a committee desiring immediate action on a bill may call up the bill [from the Rules Committee] when his committee's name is reached. Action on such a bill must be completed by the end of the legislative day,

turn the table on Democratic members of the House who had admonished Republicans to vote for Celler's discharge petition "if they really [were] for civil rights." The Calendar Wednesday move would have forced the Democrats "to a record vote on whether to move to early debate on the civil rights bill." Majority Leader Carl Albert moved to adjourn the House on December 11th, insisting that H.R. 7152 was too controversial an issue to be considered under Calendar Wednesday procedures. His motion carried on a roll-call vote of 214-166.

Republican efforts to defeat the discharge petition failed, but much of its momentum had already been removed. Chairman Smith had announced on December 5th that the Rules Committee would hold hearings on H.R. 7152, and on December 8th he set January 9, 1964, as the first day of the hearings. When the House adjourned for the year on December 24, 1963, both Democratic and Republican attempts to dislodge H.R. 7152 from the Rules Committee had failed.

Upon reconvening in January, 1964, Congress began immediate consideration of the bill. The House Rules Committee held hearings between January 9th and 19th. Five members of the House testified in favor of the bill and twenty-eight, nearly all southerners, against it. On January 30th, the committee in an 11-4 vote sent the bill to the floor for debate under an open rule.

under a two-hour limit for general debate." Congressional Quarterly Almanac, Vol. XVI, 1960, p. 295.

During the House debate, an amendment to replace the Community Relations Service provision which had been removed by the Judiciary Committee was offered by Representative Robert T. Ashmore of South Carolina. The amendment, which was to become Title X of P.L. 88-352, called for the creation of a Community Relations Service within the Department of Commerce. It was to have the same functions as the Community Relations Service proposed by Senator Johnson in 1959 and by President Kennedy in the original version of H.R. 7152. However, it was not to be an independent agency and its total staff, rather than being unlimited as in the President's bill, was not to exceed six.¹²²

The amendment was accepted by both the Republican and Democratic leadership in the House. No representative spoke in opposition to the specific amendment, and only one, Representative William J. Randall of Missouri, alluded to some criticisms that had been raised prior to its introduction.

In the past few days we have been hearing suggestions that there would be objections to this amendment by some on the grounds that it would create another executive bureau. I shall answer these objections . . . I submit that the argument is not logical because it is not large enough to be called a bureau, but is a service which would pay its way many, many times over in reduced costs of otherwise necessary litigation.¹²³

¹²²For the text of the Ashmore Amendment see Appendix F.

¹²³U.S., Congress, House, Representative Randall speaking for the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1964, H.R. 7152, 88th Cong., 2nd sess., 10 February 1964, Congressional Record 110:2786-2787.

Randall further explained that one of the reasons why the Community Relations Service provision had been deleted by the full Judiciary Committee was the preference of some committee members to have the agency established by executive order as President Kennedy had originally planned. Such an argument admitted the value of the service but was a lazy out or the old "Let George do it" attitude. In this case it would be "Let Lyndon do it." Randall insisted that H.R. 7152 was placing a great "burden of administration" on the President. Congress should also give him the tools with which to carry out this burden. The Community Relations Service proposed by the Ashmore Amendment was one such tool. After Randall's defense of the Community Relations Service, the Ashmore Amendment was adopted by voice vote and became Title X of the amended H.R. 7152, which the House passed by a 290-130 roll-call vote on February 10, 1964. The bill was then sent to the Senate.

By a 54-37 roll-call vote on February 26th, the bill was placed directly on the Senate calendar rather than sending it to the Judiciary Committee where it could have been delayed by Chairman James Eastland of Mississippi. There was an attempt by Majority Leader Mansfield to get the bill sent to the Judiciary Committee for a ten-day period of hearings, at the end of which the bill was to be reported back to the floor "without recommendations or amendment." This move was designed to appease Minority Leader Dirksen

and other Senators, including Wayne Morse of Oregon, who insisted that there ought to be some hearings on the House version of the bill.

After this attempt failed, the Senate began debate on whether or not to consider H.R. 7152. On March 26th the Senate voted 67-17 to consider the measure. Debate, which formally began on March 30th, would continue until passage of the bill on June 19th. During this period there was to be much filibustering, a cloture vote, and the introduction by Minority Leader Dirksen of an amendment in the form of a substitute bill, which had been worked out by him, the Democratic leadership, and the Department of Justice.

It was this substitute bill, amendment number 656 offered on May 26th, which affected the Community Relations Service.¹²⁴ It made two basic changes in the Community Relations Service provision of the bill. Under Title II of the House version, cases involving discrimination in public accommodations, in states where no public accommodations laws existed, could be referred to the Community Relations Service by the federal courts if voluntary compliance could reasonably be expected. Amendment 656 increased the possibility of the Community Relations Service being involved in such cases by the changes which it made in Title II of the bill, the public accommodations section. Reflecting the possibility of this increased activity, the second change in

¹²⁴For the Community Relations Service provision of Amendment 656 see Appendix G.

the House version involved removing the limit of six employees which the Community Relations Service could have.

The Senate adopted Dirksen's substitute bill on June 17th, eighty-one days after the bill had first been placed before the Senate, and by a 73-27 roll-call vote on July 19th, passed its final version of the bill. On July 2d the House of Representatives adopted H.Res. 789 which approved the bill as it had been amended by the Senate. It was signed into law by President Johnson the same day. The Community Relations Service was at last a reality, and President Johnson, who had been the first to propose such an agency, would now have the responsibility of choosing its first director and guiding it through its first days as an operating federal agency.

The Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce

President Johnson's first action under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was to initiate the process that would make the Community Relations Service created by Title X of the Act a reality.¹²⁵ In an East Room signing ceremony, which was broadcast on nationwide radio and television, he outlined the steps that would be taken to implement the law. The first two of these dealt with the Community Relations Service:

First, I will send to the Senate my nomination of Leroy Collins to be Director of the Community Relations

¹²⁵For the text of Title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 see Appendix H.

Service . . . Second, I shall appoint an advisory committee of distinguished Americans to assist Governor Collins in his assignment.¹²⁶

This announcement was possible because the President had for some time been searching for an individual to head the Community Relations Service once the Civil Rights Act was passed. In a June 23rd press conference, he revealed that he had talked to a number of individuals who were seriously considering the position if it were to be offered. LeRoy Collins, a former Governor of Florida, was one of those considered and the one who turned out to be the President's choice. The nomination of Governor Collins was confirmed by the Senate, and he thus became the agency's first director.

The advisory committee to which the President referred was to serve as an adjunct to the Community Relations Service. It was to be composed of national leaders in business, education, labor, and religion, and its goal was to work with the Community Relations Service in obtaining voluntary compliance with the 1964 act. Shortly after signing the Act, the President sent telegrams to several hundred citizens in forty-one states requesting that they serve on the National Citizens Committee for Community Relations. Four hundred and sixty persons accepted the President's invitation to serve on the committee, which was to be chaired

¹²⁶U.S., President, Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service 1963-), Lyndon B. Johnson, 1964, p. 446.

by Arthur H. Dean, a senior member in the New York law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell. The committee met with the President in the Rose Garden of the White House on August 18, 1964. He told them that they had:

. . . come to begin work as important as any ever undertaken by any Americans . . . Upon you in your communities fall the great task of these times, the task of fostering understanding, the task of securing observation and compliance, the task of assuring justice for all Americans.¹²⁷

The executive committee of the National Citizens Committee for Community Relations defined the organization as an "action group" which would work with the Community Relations Service. In order to do this, it established several subcommittees to focus on all forms of discrimination that came under coverage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Subcommittees on housing, education, labor, public accommodations, and employment were included. In addition, subcommittees were formed to work with institutions and groups which were influential in fostering desegregation. These included subcommittees on religion, communications, and organizations concerned with promoting citizenship.

Much of the National Citizens Committee's work was done on a consulting basis. Individual members of the committee would work with the Community Relations Service in communities experiencing racial difficulty. The following illustrates this type activity.

¹²⁷U.S., Department of Commerce, Community Relations Service, A New Community Resource: National Citizens Committee for Community Relations (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965). p. 3.

A North Carolina member of the NCC was instrumental in convincing the mayor of his city to endorse compliance with the public accommodations section of the Civil Rights Act and worked with the mayor to draft a statement of principles.¹²⁸

The committee also formed a "voluntary speakers bureau" of approximately 120 members who served as a "voice of civil rights" in their speaking engagements throughout the nation. At the end of its first year, the National Citizens Committee received high praise for its work with the Community Relations Service.

Upon leaving the Community Relations Service after one year to become Under Secretary of Commerce, LeRoy Collins stated that one of the most rewarding aspects of his experience had been the opportunity to work with the members of the National Citizens Committee. He had worked with them from "Massachusetts to California" and found that all his encounters reinforced his opinion "about the value of the NCC in helping America solve its racial problems." A report to President Johnson on the first twelve months activity of the Community Relations Service also lauded the contribution of the National Citizens Committee. Its members "not only served as reliable sources of information but . . . worked well as field conciliators."¹²⁹

The National Citizens Committee continued to be an important part of the Community Relations Service's work

¹²⁸Ibid., p. 7.

¹²⁹U.S., Department of Commerce, Community Relations Service, National Citizens Committee Bulletin 4 (September 13, 1965):1-2.

through 1966. After this year, it figured less prominently in the agency's activities. The explanation for this is simple. The committee was an organization designed to facilitate voluntary compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Once the act was generally accepted and massive resistance to the civil rights movement, particularly in the South, had subsided, there was less need for its services. The staff of the Community Relations Service had developed the expertise to handle problems upon which it was called for resolution. The National Citizens Committee had been, after all, somewhat of a guardian for the Community Relations Service. The latter was now a mature agency rather than a struggling infant. Moreover, the environment in which it had to operate was less turbulent than had been the case immediately following passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The contribution of the National Citizens Committee to the work of the Community Relations Service from 1964 to 1966 was noteworthy, but members of the agency staff too were very busy during this period, for the initiation of a government agency, no matter how miniscule, is no minor undertaking. Much of the Community Relations Service's time during Fiscal Year 1965 was devoted to administrative management procedures.¹³⁰ The first actions were taken by President Johnson prior to passage of the Civil Rights Act

¹³⁰Account of the Community Relations Service's activities during Fiscal Years 1965 and 1966 is based upon the Annual Reports of the agency.

on July 2, 1964. A task force of eighteen persons was created and financed by a \$25,000 allocation from the President's Emergency Fund. Staff members of other agencies also contributed services to assist in the organization and development of the agency. Much energy was devoted to the recruitment of personnel and the development of agency policies. On October 7, 1964, the President signed a Supplemental Appropriations Act which gave the agency \$1,100,000 and authorized a fifty-one member staff. The agency could then begin in earnest the duties with which it was charged by the 1964 act.

Although a major portion of Fiscal Year 1965 was devoted to administrative management procedures, the agency did initiate its conciliation function. It assisted 120 communities in twenty-eight states as a result of 213 complaints which were filed by individuals and groups. The types and numbers of problems handled by the agency during Fiscal Year 1965 are outlined in Table 1. Most of these came under the conciliation function of the agency.

Conciliation as utilized by the Community Relations Service differs from mediation, where a compromise solution is reached between two parties, and arbitration, where an outside agent is given authority to arrive at a settlement in a given dispute. Conciliation to the Community Relations Service implies the process whereby two disputing parties move to peaceful and voluntary compliance with the law through "(a) presentation of facts and interpretation,

TABLE 1

TYPES OF PROBLEMS SERVICED IN COMMUNITIES

	Fiscal Year 1965*		Fiscal Year 1966	
	Number of communities	Percent of total communities	Number of communities	Percent of total communities
School desegregation	45	38	122	54
Housing, real estate	35	29	101	45
Employment, manpower	33	28	100	44
Police-community relations	34	28	92	41
Public facilities	31	26	67	30
Public accommodations	55	46	63	28
Media discrimination	16	13	40	18
Voter discrimination	22	18	37	16
General tension	65	54	100	44
Total problems	336		722	
Total communities	120		225	

Source: Annual Report of the Community Relations Service for Fiscal Year 1966, p. 25.

*From October 1, 1964 only.

(b) suggestion of alternatives and solutions, and (c) liaison between groups." Conciliation in racial disputes operates in three phases of a community's life: precrisis, crisis, and postcrisis. In each phase the conciliator has two major goals. Precrisis is characterized by "fact-finding and affirmative action"; crisis by "tension-reduction and conflict resolution"; and postcrisis by "re-integration and affirmative action."¹³¹

When a conciliator is involved in either of these three phases, he proceeds to achieve his goals in the following sequence: 1) "he sees persons individually" to ascertain their problems and views of the given situation and to gather pertinent facts; 2) "he sees groups of like-minded persons" to identify priorities and to encourage constructive actions; 3) "he brings disputants together privately" to identify common problems and discuss alternative solutions; and 4) "he brings factions together publicly" for a negotiated settlement of the dispute.¹³²

In addition to conciliation, the Community Relations Service was engaged in numerous activities during its first fiscal year: it worked to establish human relations commissions in cities and states plagued by racial disputes; served as a liaison between numerous community groups and

¹³¹U.S., Department of Commerce, Community Relations Service, Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Secretary of Commerce, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1965, p. 5.

¹³²Ibid.

other federal agencies; worked with state and local agencies to eliminate racial discrimination; and worked with the media (radio, television, and newspapers) in regard to proper procedures to be followed in the coverage of race relations issues.

In Fiscal Year 1966, the Community Relations Service "began turning its attention toward resolution of the factors that cause community conflict rather than concentrating solely on those cases where these problems have ripened into crisis." This meant that the agency spent much of the year "adjusting its resources to an emphasis on large urban areas," whereas it had previously concentrated on crisis situations that were located for the most part in small, southern communities. The key figure in this strategy was the Community Relations Service field representative, who was to serve as a liaison between community groups and state and federal agencies.¹³³

Urban operations of the agency began with people living in the ghetto or barrio. The field representative sought to learn the community power structure and familiarize himself with their goals. He also attempted to develop a working relationship with the leaders of such community organizations. Having done this, he then sought to bring to the attention of municipal, state, and federal decision-

¹³³U.S., Department of Justice, Community Relations Service, Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1966, p. 1.

makers the problems faced by minority ghetto and barrio residents which had the potential for erupting into racial violence. "Thus the cornerstone of his work [was] to help establish, or at least to facilitate, meaningful relationships between ghetto residents and the political and business power in the community in which he [worked]."¹³⁴

This approach is illustrated by the efforts of the Community Relations Service to develop an ongoing program in an eastern city of 60,000, of which 23,000 were nonwhite. The city was experiencing several racial problems: police-minority animosities, minority under-employment and unemployment, and large income disparities between the majority and minority communities. Civil rights demonstrations were transpiring and there was a lack of meaningful communication between the white majority and the minority community leadership. The Community Relations Service became involved in the situation and was able to achieve the following results.

The agency made the following recommendations to the community:

- 1) upgrading its local human relations commission through more adequate funding, hiring of a professional staff, development of constructive programming, and appointment of more representative minority group members;
- 2) establishment of a permanent police-community relations program in the police department; and

¹³⁴Ibid., p. 2.

- 3) creation of an employer's council for cooperative efforts to open more employment areas for the minority group.

Within a month, the city had effected the following changes.

- 1) The mayor abolished the old human relations commission, revised and strengthened the ordinance authorizing the commission, obtained an increased appropriation and appointed minority group members who accurately reflected the minority community;
- 2) A community relations division was established in the police department, staffed by a sergeant and two patrolmen; and
- 3) Employers in major hotels, restaurants, and entertainment places began an on-the-job training program for minority group members, using for recruitment and supportive services the leaders of civil rights groups who had previously staged demonstrations.¹³⁵

In addition to programs of this type, the Community Relations Service engaged in numerous activities beyond its conciliation function.¹³⁶ It served on several teams composed of different federal agencies, e.g., the Vice-President's Youth Opportunity Task Force; it extended consultative services to the Department of Defense, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Civil Service Commission; it continued to work with the National Citizens Committee for

¹³⁵Ibid., p. 9.

¹³⁶Though such urban activities as the one described above were considered to be programs, they were not comprehensive programs of the type that would be initiated by the agency following the appointment of Ben Holman as Director in 1968. Programs of this type will be considered later in the present chapter and in the following chapter.

Community Relations; and it assisted state and local governments in the creation of human relations commissions.

Activities of the Community Relations Service were expanded in Fiscal Year 1966, and greater attention was focused upon problems confronted by minorities in large metropolitan areas. Yet crisis resolution continued to be the major focus of the agency. Assistance was provided to 225 communities, an increase of 105 over the number assisted in Fiscal Year 1965. The Service also provided assistance to eighty-nine communities outside the South, as compared with thirty-nine in 1965. There was also a significant increase in the size of the communities served. In Fiscal Year 1965, only nineteen cities were served in the population range of 100,000 to 500,000; in Fiscal Year 1966, this number had increased to fifty-two, reflecting the shift in emphasis from small southern communities to large metropolitan areas, many of which were located outside the South. Table 1 reflects the number and types of problems that were handled by the agency in Fiscal Year 1966, but the numbers are somewhat deceptive. They reflect the total number of communities in which the agency rendered assistance. Included are conciliation services to settle racial disputes and activities in urban areas designed to alleviate those problems which lead to racial disputes.

The period from July, 1964 to April, 1966 was a turbulent one for the Community Relations Service. It saw the legislative birth and creation of the agency; the initiation

of its conciliation activities which were confined primarily to southern communities during Fiscal Year 1965; and its continued conciliation efforts coupled with an expanded interest in resolving urban problems which were the root cause of racial problems in Fiscal Year 1966. As if these activities were not enough for a new agency to experience, it was to undergo a more drastic change--an executive reorganization. The Community Relations Service was to become an agency located within the vast domain of the United States Department of Justice.

The Community Relations Service in the Department of Justice

On September 24, 1965, the White House made public two memoranda which would directly affect the Community Relations Service. One was from Vice-President Humphrey to President Johnson recommending consolidation of the various federal agencies involved in the area of civil rights; the other was from the President to the Vice-President in which he concurred with the recommended consolidation.¹³⁷

Among the changes recommended by the Vice-President was the transfer of the Community Relations Service from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Justice in order that it could be directed by the Attorney General. The agency was originally placed within Commerce on the assumption that its primary function would be the conciliation of

¹³⁷U.S., President, Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, 1963-), Lyndon B. Johnson, 1965, pp. 1017-1019.

racial disputes arising under the public accommodations section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Humphrey pointed out that the acceptance of public accommodations provisions-- "even in those areas of the country where they constituted a reversal of generations of custom and practice--exceeded our most optimistic predictions."¹³⁸ He therefore believed, and the Secretary of Commerce concurred, that it was no longer appropriate for the Community Relations Service to be within the Department of Commerce.

The agency should be placed under the Attorney General due to the "deep and broad experience" of the Department of Justice in racial matters. He recognized that such a transfer would necessitate a reorganization plan, but he urged that such a plan be submitted to the Congress because it would "not only prevent duplication of effort and make civil rights responsibilities an integral part of operating responsibilities; it [would] also result in substantial savings."¹³⁹ President Johnson endorsed the recommendations of the Vice-President saying, "I concur in your recommendations to consolidate and streamline the civil rights effort of this Administration."¹⁴⁰ Subsequent to his endorsement of the Humphrey proposals, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 was prepared and submitted to the Congress on February 19, 1966.¹⁴¹ It was accepted by Congress and became effective

¹³⁸Ibid., p. 1018 ¹³⁹Ibid. ¹⁴⁰Ibid., p. 1017.

¹⁴¹For the text of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 see Appendix I.

on April 22, 1966--the Community Relations Service was now a part of the Department of Justice and was to be headed by an Assistant Attorney General.

Once transferred to the Department of Justice, the Community Relations Service, in addition to performing its conciliation function, continued to move in the direction which was begun in Fiscal Year 1966, i.e., to work toward the elimination of those problems that are the root cause of racial tension and strife.¹⁴² This led the agency in Fiscal Year 1967 to be concerned primarily with problems of police-community relations, employment, housing, education, and media relations. Within these problem areas, activities of the agency were broken down into six categories:

- 1) helping communities identify their problems;
- 2) aiding communities in development of their own resources for rapid, orderly change;
- 3) helping to expedite Federal programs and services designed to narrow the gap between majority and minority groups;
- 4) encouraging involvement of minorities in the decision-making processes of their communities;
- 5) assisting communities in dealing constructively with racial tensions; and
- 6) promoting impartial law enforcement in communities.¹⁴³

¹⁴²Account of the Community Relations Service's activities during Fiscal Years 1967-1970 is based upon the Annual Reports of the agency.

¹⁴³U.S., Department of Justice, Community Relations Service, Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1967, p. 1.

Following are representative examples of the agency's activities in 132 cities in thirty-nine states during Fiscal Year 1967.

Police-community relations efforts of the agency aimed at an understanding between the police and ghetto residents in urban areas. In a western city, a field representative of the agency organized a committee composed of Mexican-American community leaders and police representatives. The committee in turn convened the first community-wide conference between law enforcement officials and the Chicano minority to discuss problems and responsibilities of each. As a result of recommendations stemming from the conference, precinct stations began to hold regular community relations meetings for the purpose of acquainting policemen with the problems faced by the minority residents. They also formed citizen advisory councils to enable community members to meet with policemen and discuss mutual problems.

The agency worked to solve both unemployment and underemployment problems of minorities by advising community groups on the availability of federal funds and by working to eradicate discrimination on federal work projects. The experience of a midwestern city is illustrative. The city had experienced two outbreaks of civil disorder, stemming in part from the inability of Negro youths to find employment. The Community Relations Service enlisted the support of the United States Department of Labor and local business, labor, and social service leaders in the development of a

project to train and place in jobs the "unemployable" youths. The Labor Department awarded a \$1,500,000 grant to a private agency to operate the pilot project. In all, fifty different companies participated in the project, providing 3,000 jobs for the Negro youths. Requirements for high school diplomas, aptitude tests, and no police record were suspended by the companies. The project became a model for similar recruitment and training programs in metropolitan areas with large minority populations.

Community Relations Service efforts in housing are demonstrated by its work with the Model Cities Program in Fiscal Year 1967. At the request of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the agency evaluated the community relations aspects of applications from cities seeking planning grants under the Model Cities Program. Fifty such applications were reviewed and analyses were prepared relative to the programs and policies of the cities as they affected race relations and other ghetto problems. The analyses prepared were an integral part of the selection process utilized by Housing and Urban Development. Community Relations Service personnel also assisted Housing and Urban Development in the development of "citizen participation performance standards" to be met by cities which were awarded a planning grant under the Model Cities Program.

Educational activities of the agency during Fiscal Year 1967 involved efforts aimed at the integration of public schools and "improvement" in the quality of ghetto

schools through increased community control. A field representative assisted a minority community in a northern city gain greater community control over a school that was to be integrated. The local board of education attempted to attract white students to the school by picking outstanding teachers and providing increased financial aid. The minority community, however, wanted a voice in the selection process of teachers. Working with both the school board and a minority community group, a Community Relations Service representative was able to assist the community in arriving at the following solution. The board agreed to permit a community committee, which the Community Relations Service helped to form, review teachers' performance standards and to make removal recommendations with just cause.

Media relations activity of the agency was designed to "increase and improve communications between the majority and minority groups through the communications media."¹⁴⁴ These included working with local media in the coverage of racial tensions, assisting human relations commissions in gaining media coverage of their activities, and assisting minorities in their efforts to obtain greater receptivity by the media. Problems in the areas of police-community relations, employment, housing, education, and media relations occupied most of the agency's time during Fiscal Year 1967, yet "a great deal of effort was devoted to helping

¹⁴⁴Ibid., p. 10.

communities during precrisis, crisis, and postcrisis situations."¹⁴⁵ Conciliation services were rendered to 125 cities in thirty-seven states during this year.

During Fiscal Year 1968, the Community Relations Service continued to follow the approach that was adopted in 1966 and to deal for the most part with the same problems that had occupied its employees during Fiscal Year 1967; employment, education, Model Cities and housing, police-community relations, and media relations, coupled, of course, with its conciliation function. The organizational structure of the agency also remained the same, with there being three major offices to carry out its functions: the Office of Conciliation and Field Services; the Office of Community Action; and the Office of Media Relations. The Office of Conciliation and Field Services operated through field representatives stationed within specific communities and dealt with problems of the type mentioned above. The Office of Community Action had three general responsibilities:

- 1) to serve as a technical resource for the Field Service;
- 2) to lend expert services to communities not served by Field Staff; and
- 3) to develop programs to enhance the ability of national groups to work more effectively on community problems.¹⁴⁶

The Office of Media Relations worked to develop and promote mutual understanding and communication of problems involving the media and race relations. Since its basic

¹⁴⁵Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., p. 2.

approach and the problems handled were the same, "the main thrust of the Community Relations Service . . . during Fiscal 1968 was to provide greater and more responsive assistance to communities in the elimination of inequalities which affect the quality of life for members of minority groups."¹⁴⁷

More important than the activities of the Community Relations Service during Fiscal Year 1968 were a series of conferences which took place between Roger Wilkins, director of the agency, and then Attorney General Ramsey Clark. During their sessions, they seriously questioned the ad hoc approach that was being utilized by the agency. The record seemed to reveal that the "agency was merely jettisoning around the country applying band-aids that did not stick very well."¹⁴⁸ They were convinced that the agency had to develop a more systematic approach in dealing with the nation's racial problems or face the distinct possibility that Congress would revoke its mandate. Shortly thereafter, Wilkins convened a series of "planning meetings" to plot a new direction for the agency--one which would come to be known as a "programmatic approach."

The objective of the approach was to develop on-going

¹⁴⁷U.S., Department of Justice, Community Relations Service, Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1968, p. 2.

¹⁴⁸Presentation by Ben Holman, Director of the Community Relations Service, at a Management Training Conference, Washington, D.C., September 21, 1970, p. 1.

programs that would attack the root causes of racial problems. It will be recalled that the agency had, since Fiscal Year 1966, talked in terms of programs designed to alleviate racial problems. But these were not programs of the type which Wilkins had in mind. He was concerned with continuous activity of the agency in a particular problem area, e.g., housing or education, over a specified period of time, perhaps a number of years. Wilkins, however, would not be the one to initiate the programmatic approach of the Community Relations Service. This duty would fall to Ben Holman, Richard Nixon's first choice to be director of the agency after his election to the presidency in 1968.

On the first day after his nomination, Holman met with the Washington staff of the Community Relations Service and announced: "I accept your programs." This announcement carried with it another decision. If the Community Relations Service were to go programmatic, it would have to be judged in terms of specific achievements. Holman decided that "from now on the agency would spend seventy per cent of its man-hours working toward defined objectives, each of which [he] regarded as feasible of accomplishment and which, when accomplished, would make a measurable improvement in some source of racial difficulty."¹⁴⁹

The transition to a programmatic approach was slow in coming. The staff of the agency was so accustomed to "applying band-aids" of the type described by Wilkins and Clark

¹⁴⁹Ibid., p. 2.

that they did not readily accept the idea of committing to long-term written objectives the activities which they were supposed to perform. Also there was much confusion about exactly what was meant by "going programmatic." In his second year in office, Holman was still trying to redirect the agency and to overcome "the series of shock waves that [had] gone through the agency" since the announcement of his acceptance of the programmatic approach.¹⁵⁰ At a 1971 Management Training Conference in Washington, D.C., he endeavored to explain what was meant by "going programmatic."

First, it did not mean a departure from Title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It perhaps meant a new emphasis, but more importantly it meant "the creation of a more realistic pattern of operation" It meant that the agency was beginning to limit its objectives, set goals, and make the most of available money and personnel. Going programmatic meant that the agency had finally recognized something which had been talked about for some time--the agency could not deal with racial crises unless it dealt with underlying problems. Thus, in terms of Title X, the new approach suggested that the agency would be dealing more with "difficulties" and less with "disputes."¹⁵¹

Second, going programmatic signaled the "imposition of certain management disciplines" with which most members of the agency were unfamiliar, but it was not Holman's intent to create a "bland bureaucracy." Rather he wanted to

¹⁵⁰Ibid.

¹⁵¹Ibid., p. 5.

mold an organization whose members could work well together and, at the same time, have "appropriate opportunities for individual creativity." It would be an organization with a "built-in capacity for change" and one "whose primary purpose was to work for orderly social change." It would, finally, be an organization which tried to guarantee that what was done in a community "was determined essentially by the needs of the minorities in that community"152

Third, the new approach did not mean an end to staff debate or dissent. It did mean that employees of the agency would have to accept the new approach and do their best to implement programs within given guidelines. Fourth, it did not mean absolute control from Washington. It meant that Washington would "set policies and procedures by which operations are decentralized, responsibility is delegated, and performance evaluated." Regional directors would be given as much responsibility as they could "prove themselves able to handle," but they would be held "responsible for operations within their regions, in exactly the same way the Attorney General and White House" held Holman responsible for the operation of the agency as a whole.¹⁵³

Fifth, and finally, the programmatic approach meant that the agency would develop programs with long-term, identifiable, and accomplishable objectives. It meant saying these are the things the agency will concentrate upon and not waste time trying to "answer every alarm that's

¹⁵²Ibid., pp. 5-6.

¹⁵³Ibid., pp. 6-7.

sounded." The agency would no longer be "tied to surface situations or temporary causes," nor be "playing it by ear." It would instead be moving "toward a more planned, and therefore more predictable pattern of operation."¹⁵⁴

Adoption of a programmatic approach by the Community Relations Service necessitated an inhouse reorganization, which was begun in 1969. The three offices (Conciliation and Field Services; Community Action; and Media Relations) were changed to two major divisions: Field Services and Support Services. The former entailed the decentralized aspect of the new approach and made up the regional and state offices of the agency. The latter was composed of Washington based specialists who were to assist state and regional personnel in the development of the agency's programs. In June of 1970, a third division was added to the new structure-- the Division of National Services. Its primary function was "to supervise all national program activities and projects that extended beyond individual regional boundaries." It was composed of two sections: Private Organizations Liaison and Special Minorities Projects. The Private Organizations Liaison Section sought to enlist the support of national private organizations in the development of social and economic programs at both the national and regional levels; the Special Minorities Projects Section was responsible for the development and implementation of programs relating to

¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 7.

Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, American Indians, Cubans, and similar ethnic minorities.¹⁵⁵

Having decided to adopt a programmatic approach and established the organizational structure to carry it out, the agency began in 1970 to develop guidelines to be utilized in the development of programs in the following areas: administration of justice, media communications, economic development, education, and housing. The guidelines in each program area had specific goals and objectives which were to be pursued by the agency. Let us consider some of the major ones.

Administration of Justice

The Administration of Justice is a coordinated effort to assure equal distribution and equal treatment for all people under current law and through the introduction of reform law in certain areas. It is "the use of authority to uphold what is right, just or lawful."

The Administration of Justice program is designed to cover comprehensively those areas of life where minority citizens, in their relationship to law, are the regular victims of inequalities. The chosen components of this program cover the spectrum of those current concerns of blacks, browns, and other minorities as they seek to face a justice that is blind.

The current focus is on Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Criminal Law Reform, Corrections, Minority-Police Relations, and Special Projects.

A common strain in each area covered is that existing institutions, in relationship to minorities, operate at a level which does not adequately respond to current needs. The program proposes to make indigenous minorities aware of already existing rights as well as to

¹⁵⁵U.S., Department of Justice, Community Relations Service, Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1970, p. 3.

acquaint them with those functions of these institutions which perennially and continuously deprive and penalize them.

If CRS, in several communities, can cause citizens of the majority, as well as the minority, to become the catalyst for community change, and to bridge the gap in the way that justice is meted out to whites on the one hand and blacks, browns and other minorities on the other--it will have made a significant contribution to the administration of justice.

Communications

- 1) To expand minority employment, ownership, and influence in media through:
 - a) Development and utilization of systematic and innovative methods of identifying and attacking racism as manifested in media policies, programs, and reporting.
 - b) Improvement of minority group communications and the quality of media coverage of the ghetto and barrio.
 - c) Expanding opportunities for minority skills development and training in the areas of communications and media.
- 2) To magnify the effectiveness of CRS programs to the fullest feasible utilization of private organizations and of the communications industry by:
 - a) Establishing and systematizing CRS relations with selected private organizations at both the national and local levels.
 - b) Harnessing communications forces to every CRS priority program.
 - c) Developing innovative CRS programs aimed at reducing racism.
- 3) To work with private organizations in an effort to identify and find ways of eliminating institutional racism as it adversely affects delivery of services to minorities.

Economic Development

To assist minority individuals and groups (1) to significantly increase the generation of capital flowing into and within their communities and their control over it

and (2) to enable them to utilize more effectively the capital resources already under their control or to which they have access.

Education

The Community Relations Service joins with those who believe that there are no shortcuts or panaceas to this complex problem. Minorities have a legitimate, well documented complaint. CRS therefore defines as its major educational goals:

- 1) The expansion of minority communities' participation in the education decision-making processes, at least proportionate to the extent of their subjection to the educational system.
- 2) The preparation of all segments of a community to cope more effectively with the trauma of educational change being brought about by the realities of student unrest, desegregation, financial stress, and decentralization of control.

Housing

The objectives of the CRS housing and planning program are:

- 1) Assistance for minority group organizations for community action and collective self-help, whether on a permanent basis such as tenant's rights organizations or of a short-term nature over a specific problem.
- 2) Organized activity for the expression of minority community interests in the development of comprehensive plans by city, county, metropolitan, and state authorities.
- 3) Development of community resources for preparing and advancing minority plans for physical redevelopment of inner city neighborhoods.
- 4) Increased capacity of minority community to upgrade quality of neighborhood housing.
- 5) Improved quality and delivery of services related to housing.
- 6) Assistance for minority groups and/or minority-majority coalitions so that they can evaluate housing programs and institutions.

- 7) Increased supply of low-cost housing in the metropolitan area.
- 8) Assistance to public and private agencies and groups working toward elimination of discrimination in sale and rental of housing.
- 9) To interest the private industrial sector in making investments to assure the availability of adequate low-cost housing both in the inner cities and the suburban areas.
- 10) To make available information and models needed by community organizations to work in the above program areas and to develop appropriate materials where none now exists.¹⁵⁶

In pursuit of these general goals outlined in the agency's program guidelines, field representatives were to develop on-going programs within their service states or cities. It is the activity of the Community Relations Service employees in the development of these programs which the present study assumes to be an embodiment of the roles advocated for public administrators by the new public administration literature.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have traced the development of the Community Relations Service as an operational federal agency. We saw that the first attempt to create such an agency in 1959 was unsuccessful. Major civil rights organizations and southern politicians opposed the effort, with the former fearing that it would lead to the abandonment of judicial

¹⁵⁶Community Relations Service program objectives are quoted from several inhouse memoranda issued by Ben Holman on June 24-25, 1970 to all Community Relations Service professional staff.

enforcement of constitutional rights and the latter, as usual, opposing any form of civil rights legislation.

The next attempt was President Kennedy's planned creation of the agency by executive order in 1963 until his civil rights proposals of the same year, which called for the agency's establishment by statute, could be passed by Congress. Lee Harvey Oswald's assassination of President Kennedy prevented this action, and it was not until passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that the agency became a reality. President Johnson took a keen interest in the agency, making his first actions under the 1964 Act his nomination of Governor LeRoy Collins to be its director and the appointment of a National Citizens Committee on Community Relations to assist him.

The agency originally was placed in the Department of Commerce upon the assumption that its major activities would arise under the public accommodations section of the 1964 Act. Here it remained for two years during which time its primary actions were concerned with the conciliation of racial disputes. Wide acceptance of the 1964 Act, even in the South, led Vice-President Humphrey in 1965 to recommend that the agency be transferred to the Department of Justice. President Johnson concurred with the recommendation and submitted Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966 to Congress requesting the transfer. The plan was approved by Congress and the agency was transferred to the Department of Justice in April, 1966.

In its new location, the agency began to broaden its activities beyond its conciliation function to attack the problems which it believed to be the root causes of racial disputes. This direction continued until 1968 when Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Director Roger Wilkins began to question the agency's ad hoc approach to settlement of the nation's racial problems. They began, and Ben Kolman once appointed by President Nixon continued, to move the agency toward the development of a "programmatic approach" to racial problems. During 1969 and 1970 an innouse reorganization was undertaken and guidelines were issued for the program areas of administration of justice, communications, economic development, education, and housing. Field representatives of the agency began to develop programs for their service areas in each of the program areas.

It is a principal assumption of the present study that the activity of the agency's employees in the development of these programs embodies the roles advocated for public administrators by the new public administration. In an attempt to prove this assumption, Chapter IV will examine the activity of the agency's employees in the Southeast Region, which is composed of the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

CHAPTER IV

NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ROLES AS MANIFEST IN THE BEHAVIOR OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In the latter part of Chapter III, we discussed the transition of the Community Relations Service to a programmatic approach in dealing with racial problems after 1970. We saw that the agency promulgated guidelines and began to implement programs in the areas of administration of justice; media communications; education; economic development; and housing. These programs are the subject of the present chapter. We will endeavor to demonstrate that the roles pursued by Community Relations Service employees in the development and implementation of these programs are similar to those advocated in the new public administration literature. We will, then, be attempting to show that Community Relations Service employees performed as social equity advocates; change agents; representative bureaucrats; advocacy administrators; and non-consolidating bureaucrats as these roles are defined in the new public administration literature.

The programs of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region, which is composed of the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee,

North Carolina, and South Carolina, will serve as the data base in this endeavor. Within these states, there were eighteen programs under development and implementation by the Community Relations Service between 1970 and 1973.¹⁵⁷

This chapter will report the results of research conducted in the Atlanta Regional Office of the Community Relations Service. Agency files were examined on each program to determine the role performed by Community Relations Service employees involved in its development and implementation. The activity of employees within each program was studied in comparison to the roles defined in Chapter II. An attempt was then made to classify the behavior of employees in each program according to the new public administration role which it most closely approximated. That is not to say that only one role was present in each program, because more than one appeared in some of the programs. The behavior of agency personnel was classified according to one role only to simplify the procedure of demonstrating the presence of new public administration roles in the behavior of the agency's personnel. This research yielded the following results.

¹⁵⁷These programs by state were: Alabama--Economic Development, Education; Florida--Administration of Justice, Education, Housing; Georgia--Administration of Justice; Kentucky--Education, Housing; Mississippi--Administration of Justice, Communications; North Carolina--Administration of Justice, Communications, Education, Housing; and South Carolina--Administration of Justice, Communications, Education, Housing. There were no programs in Tennessee due to personnel vacancies.

The behavior of Community Relations Service employees approximates that of a social equity advocate in the Housing Programs of North Carolina and South Carolina; the Administration of Justice Program of Georgia; and the Education Programs of Florida and Kentucky. Their behavior approximates that of a change agent in the Housing Program of Florida; the Economic Development and Education Programs of Alabama; and the Administration of Justice Program of Mississippi.

The representative bureaucrat role appears in their behavior in the Administration of Justice Program in Florida and the Communications Programs of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Mississippi. They performed as advocacy administrators in the Administration of Justice and Education Programs of South Carolina; the Education and Administration of Justice Programs of North Carolina; and the Housing Program of Kentucky. The non-consolidating bureaucrat role is evident in all of the programs. These classifications are more conveniently depicted in Table 2.

It should be readily apparent to the reader that classifying the behavior of Community Relations Service employees within these programs according to the new public administration roles which they appear to approximate is a highly subjective operation on the part of the author. It is he who says what the roles are and he who says what programs appear to reflect each role. To counteract the subjective nature of this operation, the latter part of this

TABLE 2

BEHAVIOR OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN
SOUTHEASTERN STATE PROGRAMS BY NEW
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ROLES

Social Equity Advocate

North Carolina Housing Program
South Carolina Housing Program
Georgia Administration of Justice Program
Florida Education Program
Kentucky Education Program

Change Agent

Florida Housing Program
Alabama Economic Development Program
Alabama Education Program
Mississippi Administration of Justice Program

Representative Bureaucrat

Florida Administration of Justice Program
North Carolina Communications Program
South Carolina Communications Program
Mississippi Communications Program

Advocacy Administrator

South Carolina Administration of Justice Program
South Carolina Education Program
North Carolina Education Program
Kentucky Education Program

Non-Consolidating Program

All Southeastern State Programs

chapter will report the results of a questionnaire which was administered to the Community Relations Service employees who participated in the development and implementation of the programs under study. By measuring the employees' perceptions of the roles they pursued during this time, we will be able to see if the subjective operation in the first part of the chapter has merit and whether or not there is in fact a similarity between the roles pursued by the Community Relations Service employees in these programs and those advocated for public administrators in the new public administration literature. We will briefly describe each of the programs; examine the reasons why the behavior of Community Relations Service employees in each appears to fit a certain new public administration role; and finally seek to verify the results of this classification by means of the questionnaire administered to employees involved in the development and implementation of the programs.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁸Descriptions of the Community Relations Service programs in the Southeast Region are based upon agency program development and implementation files. Since these files are composed of reports prepared by individual employees, or former employees, of the Community Relations Service and the Regional Director of the agency made them available to the author on the specific stipulation that no individual names of employees or other persons associated with the agency would be mentioned, the use of footnotes in this chapter in connection with the program descriptions has been avoided. This restriction was imposed by the Regional Director because of the confidentiality clause of Title X, Section 1003 (b), of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, under which the agency operates. The author expresses his grateful appreciation to the Regional Director for making these files available and to the employees who prepared the files, without which this study would not have been possible.

Community Relations Service Employees as Social Equity Advocates

The role of social equity advocate is evident in the Housing Programs of North Carolina and South Carolina; the Administration of Justice Program of Georgia; and the Education Programs of Florida and Kentucky.

North Carolina Housing Program

The North Carolina Housing Program sought to assist the General Baptist Convention of North Carolina in developing a state-wide program to stimulate the production of decent, safe and sanitary housing for low and moderate income families and to provide support and technical assistance to the sponsors of such housing. The Community Relations Service was, in effect, attempting to obtain a long-standing goal of American housing policy which was proclaimed by the Housing Act of 1949: "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family."

Community Relations Service personnel assessed the major problem in North Carolina housing policy to be the low level of low-cost housing units appropriated by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. In 1971, North Carolina was appropriated units at a rate that would barely handle half the applicant waiting list, and the picture for 1972 was worse--applications increased but the allocation of housing units remained the same. Community Relations Service personnel found that this problem was aggravated by the fact that the majority of Housing and Urban

Development allocations went to public housing programs under the control of city and county housing authorities which were not overly sympathetic to minority housing problems.

Community Relations Service employees found the major problems with city and county housing authorities to be:

- a) lack of sensitivity and understanding on the part of white management toward minority tenants. Predominantly black housing projects received the least maintenance;
- b) housing authorities in some cases disregarded Housing and Urban Development's intention and spirit in the creation of tenant organizations;
- c) site selections for public housing ignored the concept of breaking the boundaries of the ghetto. In many cases site selection maintained and perpetuated the ghetto;
- d) there was a conspicuous lack of minorities on housing authority boards and management staff; and
- e) lack of information in all communities as to what programs were available through Housing and Urban Development and other public and private organizations.

To overcome these problems and to increase the number of low-cost housing units available to minorities within the state, the Community Relations Service initiated a program in cooperation with the North Carolina General Baptist Convention. The long range goal of stimulating the production of safe and sanitary housing for low and moderate income families was to be achieved by 1) assisting the convention's Housing Committee in securing long-range funding for the purpose of opening and staffing a statewide housing assistance office; 2) assisting the Housing Committee to provide limited assistance to nonprofit sponsors in the interim preceding the acquisition of permanent funding; 3) assisting

the staff of the anticipated housing assistance office in developing their program; and 4) assisting the housing assistance office in identifying and working with possible nonprofit housing sponsors.

The Community Relations Service role in accomplishing each of these four goals was quite specific. In the first, Community Relations Service personnel were to propose to the Statewide Baptist Convention that a fixed amount of money be appropriated to the Housing Committee to be used as matching grant monies; to help the committee develop funding proposals and budgets; and to initiate contact with possible funding sources. To accomplish the second goal, the Community Relations Service was to provide limited interim assistance to the Housing Committee in identifying problem areas of sponsors associated with the Baptist Convention; identify technical assistance and funding sources for nonprofit sponsors; and provide liaison for these sponsors to local, state, and federal housing officials.

In assisting the staff of the anticipated housing assistance office in developing their program, the third goal, the Community Relations Service was to secure technical assistance in the form of consultants and support specialists for the purpose of providing training to the staff; to provide models of other organizations engaged in similar activities; and to participate in program development activities of the housing assistance office.

To accomplish the fourth goal of identifying and

working with possible local nonprofit housing sponsors, the personnel of the Community Relations Service were to aid in the development of guidelines for pre-application screening of prospective sponsors; in convening a housing seminar for the General Baptist Convention; and in providing liaison with local, state, and federal officials in support of applications for funds to be utilized in the program. The statewide housing assistance office would thus provide assistance to nonprofit housing sponsors at the local level, who would in turn work for the development of local housing through the application for grants to build public housing for low and moderate income families.

The primary social equity activity of Community Relations Service personnel in this program was directed toward improvement in the delivery of services to minorities. By assisting the Baptist Convention in the establishment of a statewide office and assisting in the identification of sponsors for low income housing at the local level, Community Relations Service personnel were helping to deliver housing throughout the State of North Carolina. This in turn improved the quality of life for minorities, removed one of their grievances, the lack of housing, and countered one of their social inequalities by making it possible for them not to live in a slum environment.

South Carolina Housing Program

The South Carolina Housing Program sought to significantly reduce the incidence of default and delinquencies of

Section 235 homeowners in the minority community of the state.¹⁵⁹ In 1972, South Carolina ranked second in the number of housing units insured under the Department of Housing and Urban Development's 235 Program in the nation. Although second, South Carolina experienced the highest default rate in the nation. On March 28, 1972, the Columbia area office of the Department of Housing and Urban Development was advised by the Washington office that as of December 31, 1972, there were 1308 defaults in the state representing 11.8% of the total insured. They were further advised that this was the highest default rate in the nation.

In an effort to determine the reason for this high default rate, the Columbia area office of Housing and Urban Development, in January, 1972, initiated a study of the state's 235 Program. It found that the default rate was due to the inability of 235 mortgagees to meet emergency financial situations. The basic picture that evolved was that 235 mortgagees had temporary setbacks (slack employment, periods of unemployment, illness, etc.) for which they had no reserves to tide them over. In these times, food and clothing came ahead of the mortgage payment.

Heavy indebtedness by 235 mortgagees to creditors was also found to be a major reason for the high default rate. There was considerable evidence that easy credit had enticed some to purchase luxury items imprudently; color televisions,

¹⁵⁹Section 235 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, P.L. 90-448.

expensive tape players, and encyclopedia sets contributed to house payment default. Some purchased automobiles after occupancy due to the need for transportation to their places of employment. Other reasons mentioned by the Housing and Urban Development study for the high default rate included: South Carolina's early start over most other states in the 235 Program; pre-closing problems during the early stages of the program; location of 235 homes in areas outside the city; abandonment of 235 properties by mortgagees; Housing and Urban Development guidelines which allowed approval of applicants who were not ready for home ownership; and the poor economic condition of the state.

To curb the high default rate, Housing and Urban Development recommended the use of additional housing counselors utilizing Section 237 counseling assistance.¹⁶⁰ It was felt that expanded counseling would significantly reduce the number of foreclosures. As a result, in early 1972, Columbia, South Carolina became one of twenty cities in the nation targeted as areas to receive Housing and Urban Development money for a Section 237 counseling program. Midlands Community Action Agency, the Columbia area Office of Economic Opportunity agency, was chosen to administer the program, this because of its previous efforts to assist 235 occupants through a Homeownership Counseling Program financed with Office of Economic Opportunity funds.

¹⁶⁰Section 237 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, P.L. 90-448.

Midlands Community Action Agency received a twenty-six month contract to counsel delinquent and default mortgages under Housing and Urban Development's 235 and 237 Programs. This was the first Housing and Urban Development certified counseling program in the State of South Carolina. However, no funds were available through this program to counsel prospective 235 homeowners, only those mortgagees who were delinquent or in default could benefit from it. At this point the Community Relations Service entered the housing picture in South Carolina and began working to initiate a pre-occupancy counseling program for prospective 235 homeowners.

Following agency guidelines which stipulated that the Community Relations Service would "assist cooperative housing groups and community non-profit housing groups," employees of the agency began to work with the Midlands Community Action Agency in the development of a pre-occupancy counseling program for prospective 235 homeowners. They felt this to be a more logical approach than the delinquent counseling program which was being conducted by the Midlands Agency at that time because it would provide counseling to an individual before he bought a home. Such counseling, Community Relations Service employees felt, would make prospective 235 homeowners aware of all the financial responsibilities of home ownership. Community Relations Service employees were also acting upon the belief that after-the-fact

counseling under the twenty-six months Midlands contract had done little to reduce South Carolina's high default rate under the 235 Program.

Community Relations Service employees began their own investigation into the reasons for the high default rate in South Carolina. After considerable time spent, they concluded that the major causes for the high default rate were:

- 1) poor construction (defects) of homes sold under the 235 program;
- 2) inadequate number of HUD/FHA inspectors to insure quality construction;
- 3) heavy indebtedness of 235 homeowners;
- 4) poor employment opportunities for minorities;
- 5) location of 235 subdivisions in outlying areas where public transportation was not available;
- 6) failure of homeowners to fully understand the financial responsibilities when entering a contractual agreement to purchase a house; and
- 7) domestic problems peculiar to low-income families.

The Community Relations Service discovered that although Columbia, as of March 31, 1972, experienced the highest rate of default and foreclosures in the nation on a per capita basis, there were several other cities within the state in need of pre-occupancy counseling assistance: Charleston, Spartanburg, Aiken, Florence, and Greenville. It was thus decided that agency personnel would assist the Midlands Community Action Agency in establishing a pre-occupancy counseling program in Columbia which would also serve the purpose of training counselors to establish programs within

these cities. The Midlands Agency would counsel prospective 235 homeowners and develop training materials, with Community Relations Service assistance, to prepare representatives of other Community Action Agencies to provide the same type counseling.

Community Relations Service personnel were to assist in the establishment of the program by securing funding, assisting in the establishment of counseling centers, obtaining support of various lending institutions, and training counselors for the program. By reducing the number of people who were defaulting on their mortgages under the 235 Program, Community Relations Service personnel were helping minorities to redress their grievances, to improve their economic well-being, and to improve their quality of life by making it possible for them to own and keep their homes. They were also countering social and economic inequalities by allowing more minorities to own homes. These minorities no longer had to reside in slum housing, and the social stigma attached thereto was removed.

Georgia Administration of Justice Program

The Georgia Administration of Justice Program was centered in Atlanta and sought to rehabilitate the juvenile offender of stranger-to-stranger crime, who most often came from areas having the highest density of black residents, low income housing projects, and the largest concentration of minority businesses. The basic objective was to reduce the crime rate through placing youthful offenders in

employment situations which would have the support of the minority community. This was to be done by assisting the Atlanta Business League, composed primarily of small minority businessmen, and the Fulton County Juvenile Court Probation Department to establish a Coordinated Juvenile Work Release Program. The program sought to assist the youthful offender by providing upward mobility through training, job experience, and ongoing involvement in new job experiences and, at the same time, improve the overall community by assisting the minority businessman who was the major victim of juvenile crime.

The Community Relations Service had three major goals in assisting in the establishment of the Juvenile Work Release Program: 1) to assist in the initial establishment of the program; 2) planning ongoing workshops designed to effectuate total community involvement; and 3) to assist the Atlanta Business League, the Juvenile Court, and other agencies in maintaining program relevance and effectiveness through evaluation measurement.

Community Relations Service personnel were to assist in the establishment of the program by preparing a proposal for funding, by assisting in structuring the mechanics of the program, and by setting up an advisory council for the purpose of determining program effectiveness. Workshops were chosen as the mechanism to promote total community involvement. They were to provide information to community residents in regard to the program's existence and,

hopefully, to solicit community support for the program. Agency personnel were to aid in program evaluation by helping to structure an assessment design which would contribute to the program's viability, by providing consultants to be utilized in program evaluations, by providing program evaluation models for study or use, and by encouraging community participation in the evaluation process.

Several aspects of the Georgia Administration of Justice Program called for Community Relations Service employees to pursue social equity activities, both in terms of the individual youth offender, who most often was black, and the minority community at large. By placing the youthful offender in an employment situation instead of incarcerating him, agency employees were improving the economic well-being of the individual offender, as well as countering social inequalities which he experienced. One would also have to say that agency employees were working to improve the quality of life for these youths.

On the other hand, activities of the agency's employees were benefiting the minority community at large. They were helping to reduce the crime rate in the minority community, thus improving the quality of life. They were, in particular, improving the position of the minority businessman who was most often the victim of crimes perpetrated by youthful offenders. Placing the offender in work situations meant that minority businessmen no longer had to worry about being the victim of his crimes. Finally, one

would have to say that Community Relations Service employees were advocating a modified form of organization in that the program they were helping to establish in part was fulfilling the role that had previously been performed by the Juvenile Court Probation Department. This department did not cease to exist, but there was to be a new mechanism created to assist in handling the problem of the youthful offender--the work release program to be administered jointly by the Probation Department and the Atlanta Business League.

Florida Education Program

The migratory agricultural community, composed of blacks, latinos, and poor whites, was the target of the Florida Education Program. It sought to tackle problems these groups were having in regard to educating their children. Community Relations Service personnel attributed these problems to: programs insensitive to the needs of ethnic groups constituting Florida's migrant population; insensitivity of teachers to the problems faced by migrant children; and local school boards which viewed migrant children more as a burden than as a responsibility. The family environment of the migrant child was also identified as a contributing factor to his educational problems.

The existence of educational problems did not mean that government, both at the state and federal levels, had not attempted to tackle the problems faced by migrant parents and their children. In fact, it was found that seventy-

eight agencies in the State of Florida were identified as offering some kind of educational opportunities for adult migrant workers, and 121 agencies in the state claimed that they provided health and nutritional education for migrant children. In spite of these claims, a survey of migrant families revealed that only 4% of persons interviewed benefited from the adult education programs and only 13% of migrant parents responded that they had knowledge of educational services provided by the 121 agencies.¹⁶¹

The Community Relations Service's Education Program sought to improve the delivery of governmental services to the migrant community, not only educational services but also all governmental services which would indirectly have an effect upon the migrant child and his ability to perform as a productive student. The agency sought to assist three migrant organizations (Los Chicanos, Organized Migrants in Community Action, and Cry of Black Youth) in establishing a Migrant Education Resource Center at Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton. This center was to improve the delivery of services to migrants and serve as a base from which a statewide advisory committee to the Florida Migratory Child Compensatory Education Program in the State's Department of Education could be developed.

The Community Relations Service was to assist in the original planning of the center; conduct a workshop at which

¹⁶¹Phase II Report of the Florida Migratory Child Survey Center, a study conducted by Terrence M. Dempsey at the University of Miami.

migrant service agencies would assemble for the purpose of matching community needs to the resource agencies' services; and to assist the center in establishing a referral system which would serve as a two-way communication network between local, state and federal agencies and the migrant community in the State of Florida. Community Relations Service personnel worked directly with government agencies to receive commitments to support the center by keeping it informed of available services and by providing referrals to and accepting referrals from the center. Finally, Community Relations Service personnel were to assist in the establishment of a statewide board to serve in an advisory capacity to the Migratory Child Division of the State Department of Education. The board was to be composed of state officials and residents of the migratory communities within the state. Its primary purpose was to allow for citizen input into the educational process to make it more receptive to the educational needs of migratory children.

The Florida Education Program involved Community Relations Service employees in two primary social equity activities: improving the quality of education received by migrants and improving the delivery of government services to the migrant community in general. However, activity of the agency's personnel within this program reflects other social equity activity as defined in the new public administration literature. They worked to redress the educational grievances of the migrant community and improved their political

well-being by establishing the communications mechanism between the resources center and the government agencies operating within the state. They also exhibited behavior that is characteristic of the "second-generation" behavioralist discussed in the new public administration literature in that they were much more concerned with the delivery of governmental services by agencies than with the internal operations of the agency. Agency employees further pursued activities within this program which had the potential for improving the quality of life for migrant workers in the State of Florida.

Kentucky Education Program

In Kentucky, personnel of the Community Relations Service functioned in a supportive role to other organizations working in the field of education. Rather than initiating an entirely new program as was the case with the Florida Education Program, Community Relations Service personnel in Kentucky assisted other agencies to bring about greater school desegregation in the school system of Louisville. The major goal of the agency's activities then were designed to supplement the efforts of indigenous groups working for quality education and greater student desegregation. Some of these groups were neighborhood councils, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Louisville Urban League Education Committee, the Coalition of United Blacks, and the Housing Opportunity Center.

The agency identified six major goals which it would pursue over a period of five years: 1) to assist the Louisville Board of Education and the Louisville community move toward a stable desegregation plan reflective of the racial percentages of the area; 2) to assist the Board of Education in insuring quality education for minority students within the school system; 3) to work with the Board of Education in identifying problems which led to a high percentage of drop-outs among the black student population; 4) to serve as a liaison between the minority and majority communities in educational confrontations and disputes; 5) to work with minority community groups in obtaining better schools and school programs relevant to the needs of their children; and 6) to work with minority community groups in making the Board of Education accountable to the whole community, including the minority community. To achieve these objectives, the agency's personnel served a clearinghouse function to the community groups in the Louisville area, providing them with current information on desegregation plans, court orders, and research projects relevant to successful desegregation plans operating in other communities and states.

Although not as evident as in some of the agency's state programs, social equity activities can be identified in the behavior of Community Relations Service personnel in the Kentucky Education Program. By working to provide minority students of the area with a quality education, they were in effect countering social and political inequalities

that had existed under a segregated school system, and which continued to exist due to de facto segregation. They were also working to remove the grievances of minority parents in the area of education. By providing better education for minority students, they were assisting them to acquire the credentials which had the potential for improving their quality of life in later years, this due to the greater employment opportunities they would have as a result of their educational qualifications.

Community Relations Service Employees as Change Agents

In the Housing Program of Florida, the Economic Development and Education Programs of Alabama, and the Administration of Justice Program of Mississippi, the behavior of Community Relations Service employees approximated the new public administration change agent role.

Florida Housing Program

The Florida Housing Program sought to assist in the development of a new cooperatively owned and operated community for migrant farm workers, who as a result of technological automation in the agricultural industry were being displaced from their jobs. As long as a migrant continued to work in the traditional pattern of following the harvest, he was provided with housing, albeit substandard housing in most instances. When displaced by the process of automation, the migrant worker, who in effect was no longer a migrant worker, began to look for a place of permanent

residence. In the case of Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans, southern Florida was a particularly popular place for dropping out of the migrant cycle.

The Community Relations Service in cooperation with the Cooperative Agrícola de la Florida del Sur, an outgrowth of the Christian Family movement of the Catholic Church, sought to develop a "new town" in Palm Beach County for such former migrant workers. The new town planned was of the type envisioned by the New Communities Act of 1968, i.e., an independent, economically self-sufficient town controlled and operated by its residents. The project was planned as a total approach to community planning, including not only housing but also employment, education, and other community services. The new community was to be populated by Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans. There was ultimately to be a population of 600 families with a total residency of approximately 2500. Initial planning was to be for 60 families, then 240, and eventually the total 600.

The Community Relations Service's principle function was to work with a steering committee, an interim board of directors, in setting policies in the planning phase of the project. This group was to function as a community development committee with individual members responsible for various components of the project--housing, economic development, education, health, etc. Each member of the committee would serve as a liaison agent between government agencies offering such services and the participating community. The

steering committee was to be the instrument to bring about wide citizen participation in the project. Community Relations Service employees were to assist in training the steering committee and the wider community in the area of cooperatives.

The new town was to be owned and operated on a cooperative basis. Land, shopping centers, and other aspects of the community were to be cooperatively owned. The Community Relations Service was in a position to provide the project with expertise in the area of cooperative ownership, and it then sought to develop a totally new, self-sufficient community to be populated and run by former migrant workers of Mexican-American and Puerto Rican descent.

Community Relations Service personnel functioned as change agents due to the fact that they worked to change the total life style of former migrant workers, preparing them for departure from an agrarian life style to one in a small town setting. They worked to transform farmers into industrial workers, shop owners, and laborers. They sought to provide the poorly educated migrant workers with the process to educate their children and to perpetuate their new life style outside the agricultural community.

By placing the former migrant worker into a town setting where he could become a functioning citizen, agency personnel were moving him into a position of political influence, whereas in the migrant cycle he experienced political hopelessness and despair. Community Relations Service

employees were also working for effective and relevant solutions to the pressing sociopolitical problems faced by the former migrant. They worked in the comprehensive planning and administrative implementation of the new town project. By helping the former migrant in this manner, they were also helping him to develop a sense of social awareness and social responsibility within the setting of the new town.

Alabama Economic Development Program

Community Relations Service employees in Alabama sought to change the status of blacks by assisting them to participate more fully in the economic development of the state's urban and rural areas. Upon completion of an economic assessment of the state's growth potential, Community Relations Service employees concluded that the State of Alabama had demonstrated the will and ability to grow, but no forthright and dedicated efforts had been made to include blacks in the state's economic growth. Based on this conclusion, the agency determined that its efforts would be directed in four areas: 1) reducing the distance between majority community resources and minority community needs-- this to be done by increasing the flow of capital and technical assistance into minority economic development projects; 2) improving communication between federal and state agencies involved in economic development programs and minority economic development organizations; 3) developing institutions and mechanisms within the minority community to

accelerate the process of economic development; and 4) locating additional funding sources to assist minority economic development organizations.

To accomplish these objectives, the agency attempted to strengthen the capacity of minority economic development agencies within the state so that they could more effectively deliver their services to the minority community. This was done through creation of the Alabama Coordinating Council for Minority Economic Development. Involved in this organization were thirty-one agencies and counties throughout the state. Community Relations Service employees were to aid this organization in training its staff in proposal writing and working effectively with state and federal economic development agencies. The Community Relations Service, in effect, was to aid the organization in developing the expertise to bring more governmental dollars to the aid of the minority community of the state.

Agency personnel sought to improve the business capability of minority businessmen within the state. Workshops were to be conducted to train minority businessmen in writing contracts; bidding for projects; securing financing; acquiring management skills such as bookkeeping, marketing, advertising, and sales promotion; and in securing government contracts under the Office of Minority Business Enterprise within the Department of Commerce.

The agency also sought to improve the economic conditions of blacks in the rural areas of the state through

assistance to minority farmers. This effort was to take a similar approach utilized with minority businessmen, i.e., to assist them in becoming more skilled in the procedures of their trade with the assistance of state and federal governmental aid. In addition to assisting in the establishment of the Coordinating Council for Minority Economic Development, the Community Relations Service worked to support the development of three area subcouncils of the Coordinating Council, two minority banks, one minority bonding company, and a statewide contractors association to aid the minority contractors of the state.

The Community Relations Service's economic development efforts in Alabama were intended to aid minority economic organizations to aid themselves, and by so doing to change the economic status of the black residents of the state. Economic self-help, augmented by government technicians, consultants, and dollars, was the underlying theme of the program. Characteristics of the change agent role are easily seen in the program.

Community Relations Service employees were transforming feelings of political hopelessness and despair into feelings of political meaningfulness and relevance by aiding minority residents in the state deal more effectively with the agencies of the state and federal governments and by improving the delivery of governmental services to them. They also helped to plan the minority contractors association, the banks, and the bonding company. All the efforts

of the agency were aimed at finding effective and relevant solutions to the technical, sociopolitical, and other problems faced by the minority community within the State of Alabama. By assisting blacks to make themselves more economically self-sufficient, they were developing within them a sense of social responsibility and social awareness. They were, in effect, aiding blacks in becoming more productive members of society.

Alabama Education Program

Assistance to the minority community in coping more effectively with the transition from a segregated to a unitary school system was the major objective of Community Relations Service employees in the Alabama Education Program. This was to be achieved by working with community groups funded under the Emergency School Aid Program, whose main objective was to provide financial assistance for local school systems to aid them in their efforts to peacefully establish and maintain integrated school systems.

The program had two specific long range goals: 1) to develop the capacity of the eighteen Emergency School Aid Program groups within the state to effectively prepare the minority community to cope with the trauma of educational change emanating from the desegregation process and 2) to assist the minority communities in Wilcox, Clarke, Washington, and Choctaw Counties address themselves more effectively to educational change. In these four counties there were large minority populations and an inordinately high

number of problems related to school desegregation: lack of minority community participation in the educational decision-making process, student-teacher unrest, unequal distribution of school financial resources between the majority and minority communities, and curriculum related problems.

To achieve the first objective, the Community Relations Service was to work with the Human Resources Development Center at Tuskegee Institute. Efforts were to be made to coordinate the activities of all the Emergency School Aid Program groups within the state to make them function more effectively. This was to be done by holding meetings between all the groups to provide them with whatever assistance they felt was needed to implement their programs. Community Relations Service personnel and Tuskegee staff were to serve a clearinghouse function to provide the Emergency School Aid Program groups with needed information and technical assistance.

In Wilcox, Clarke, Washington, and Choctaw Counties, efforts were to be made to inform the minority community of governmental agencies available to assist them with their educational problems--United States Attorneys, the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Biracial committees established to alleviate desegregation problems were also to be assisted in their activities.

The major change agent activities of Community

Relations Service employees in the Education Program of Alabama was to bring about changes in the educational system which would lead to a resolution of the education problems faced by the minority segment of the population. Resolution of these problems would make the educational experience of minorities more relevant and meaningful and would develop within minority students a sense of responsibility toward their educational institutions. Activities of the Community Relations Service also sought to bring about a more equitable distribution in the educational resources and in the decision-making processes of the educational system within the State of Alabama. In working with Tuskegee Institute's Human Resources Development Center, Community Relations Service personnel were serving as a link between the centralized planning of this program and its decentralized implementation by the Emergency School Aid Program community groups. Agency personnel, additionally, collected data for the program's policy makers at Tuskegee Institute.

Mississippi Administration of Justice Program

Substantive change in the criminal justice system of Mississippi to make it more responsive to the needs of minorities was the long range goal of the Mississippi Administration of Justice Program. The major vehicle to bring about this change was to be a Criminal Justice Committee which would address itself, via task sub-groups, to problems and issues in law enforcement, courts, and corrections. The Criminal Justice Committee was to be composed of

criminal justice officials and community representatives from the majority and minority communities.

Community Relations Service personnel initiated the idea of the Criminal Justice Committee after concluding that it would be the most appropriate vehicle to allow for minority citizen input into the Mississippi criminal justice system. After an assessment of the major criminal justice problems in the state and holding numerous conferences with law enforcement officials, political leaders, and minority group representatives, it was agreed that a series of meetings would be conducted to establish the Criminal Justice Committee. Three such meetings were held over a three-month period. In these meetings, Community Relations Service personnel took the leadership role; the role played by agency personnel in the activities of the committee was to diminish as a working relationship was developed by members of the groups represented.

The committee was to function through task forces or sub-groups. Task forces were established in seven problem areas: bail/pre-release; law enforcement image/community education; rehabilitation of offenders; supervision of ex-offenders/job opportunity; delinquency prevention services; funding and structures; legislative. Each task force was to study criminal justice problems within its specific area of concern and make recommendations back to the entire committee membership, which in turn would make recommendations

to public officials in regard to corrective action needed to rectify the problems identified by the committee.

Development of equitable, effective, and relevant solutions to the pressing problems faced by minorities coming within the jurisdiction of the criminal justice system in Mississippi was the most noteworthy change agent activity of Community Relations Service personnel within this program. They developed the vehicle by which minorities could begin to have an input into the criminal justice system and begin to break down decades-old feelings of hostility between minority citizens, particularly youths, and police enforcement officials. The Criminal Justice Committee was a device whereby minority citizens could develop a sense of political meaningfulness and relevance because it provided them an opportunity to meet face-to-face with law enforcement and other public officials and to make recommendations in regard to needed changes within the criminal justice system. The Criminal Justice Committee was a vehicle for positive change, and Community Relations Service personnel were the change agents who brought about the creation of this vehicle.

Community Relations Service Employees as Representative Bureaucrats

The role of representative bureaucrat is evident in the Administration of Justice Program in Florida and the Communications Programs of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Mississippi.

Florida Administration of Justice Program

Community Relations Service Administration of Justice activity in Florida concerned itself with the establishment of a statewide minority officers association. This minority police organization was to establish its own by-laws and goals, but its major thrust was anticipated to be a statewide effort toward recruiting a pool of minority applicants on which all phases of the Florida administration of justice system (police, courts, and corrections) could draw in filling vacancies. The association was also to work to increase sensitivity on the part of law enforcement agencies toward minority problems.

Community Relations Service employees based their efforts toward establishment of the minority officers association upon the belief that the police officer is the most visible agent of government to most citizens and that all individuals must be treated with equal respect and dignity. They also felt that all citizens must have confidence in policemen if they are to effectively perform their duties. The agency thus felt that all ranks of law enforcement agencies must contain representatives from the state's minority communities. Only then would police-community relations in the state be successful, and only then would further alienation of substantial segments of the state's population from its administration of justice system be prevented.

By working directly with minority community groups and citizens, law enforcement officials, and other public

officials to increase the number of minorities in the state's criminal justice system, Community Relations Service employees were performing the specific activities advocated for public administrators by the representative bureaucrat role. They attempted to make law enforcement bureaucracies within the state representative of the component elements of the state's population; they worked to improve the position of minorities within law enforcement agencies; they argued that ethnic background should be considered in appointing personnel to vacancies within law enforcement agencies; and they attempted to make Florida's criminal justice system representative of groups who had not previously been involved in its decision-making processes. This was all to be achieved by increasing the number of minorities within the system.

North Carolina Communications Program

The North Carolina Communications Program sought to make the electronics communications industry in the state more representative by establishing a vehicle to improve training, employment, programming, and ownership for blacks.

The program was to be centered around Shaw University, Durham Business College, and radio station WAFR-FM, a black noncommercial station affiliated with the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Working with these institutions, the Community Relations Service sought to establish a Communications Resource Center in North Carolina's triangle area, Raleigh, Durham, and Chapel Hill. This center was to

be the vehicle for improving the position of minorities within the communications industry. It was initially to work in the triangle area and then to serve as a model for the establishment of other such centers in each of the state's eight educational districts.

The center, with the assistance of Shaw University, Durham Business College, and Community Relations Service personnel, was to serve as the basis for preparing minority citizens to participate in the communications industry. It was to coordinate training, assist the black community in obtaining more programming responsive to its needs, and serve as a liaison between blacks and radio and television stations in order to increase the number of blacks working there. It would also serve the function of educating minority community groups in obtaining access to cable television stations and challenging broadcasting licenses of stations unresponsive to the needs of blacks. It was also to establish training opportunities for community groups to be instructed in preparing news releases, newsletters, and promotional materials. In short, the center was to serve as a coordinating mechanism for a comprehensive effort to increase the number of minorities working in communications and to educate blacks on the ways to make the communications industry more responsive to their needs.

Although the communications industry may not be considered a public bureaucracy, efforts of Community Relations Service employees to improve the status of minorities here

is reflective of the representative bureaucrat role. They attempted to make the industry more representative of minorities; they sought to improve the position of minorities within the industry; they advocated consideration of ethnic background in filling communications industry vacancies; and they attempted to involve minorities in the decision-making processes of the North Carolina communications industry.

South Carolina Communications Program

The South Carolina Communications Program had one specific long-range goal--to expand minority employment and influence in the broadcasting media. This was to be done by improving the communications techniques of minorities; developing a mechanism for training and placing qualified minority persons in broadcasting jobs; and creating a vehicle by which the black community could influence the local media to develop programming responsive to its needs. Community Relations Service employees solicited the assistance of South Carolina colleges and the South Carolina Educational Television Network to achieve these objectives.

Communications training through on-the-job training programs at radio and television stations was to be the key to providing minority students with the necessary skills to compete for jobs. The University of South Carolina and the state's black colleges (Allen University, Benedict College, Morris College, South Carolina State College, and Voorhees College) all agreed to make a concerted effort to make broadcast training available to their students. Allen,

Benedict, and the University of South Carolina were to establish a cooperative broadcast-journalism training program. The University of South Carolina and South Carolina State College already had such an endeavor underway. The other black colleges were to place greater emphasis upon communications as a possible career for their students.

The South Carolina Press Association agreed to participate in the program and to encourage greater participation by black high school and college students in its Scholastic Press Association for high school students and its Collegiate Press Association. The South Carolina Broadcasters Association promised a similar recruitment drive aimed at increasing minority student membership and participation in high school broadcasting clubs. To apprise minorities of the opportunities within the communications industry and to encourage them to take an active part in obtaining programming responsive to their needs, Community Relations Service personnel persuaded the South Carolina Educational Television Network to conduct a thirteen-city workshop by educational television hookup around the state. In South Carolina, then, Community Relations Service personnel worked primarily with the educational institutions and broadcast and journalism professional organizations to increase minority participation in the communications industry.

The agency's personnel again pursued activities similar to those advocated by the representative bureaucrat role: making the industry more representative of minorities;

improving the position of minorities within the industry; advocating that more blacks be trained by and employed within the industry; and working to involve minorities in the decision-making processes of the industry. In short, their activities were designed to increase the number of black South Carolina citizens participating in the entire spectrum of the communications industry.

Mississippi Communications Program

Like the North Carolina and South Carolina Communications Programs, the Mississippi Communications Program's main objective was to increase the number of blacks participating within the state's communications industry, and to provide a mechanism whereby blacks could influence the decision-making of the industry in regard to programming responsive to their needs. Unlike the North Carolina and South Carolina Programs, the Mississippi Program sought to achieve these objectives through the creation of a Local Communications Coalition in Jackson, Mississippi. Employees of the agency encouraged minority community citizens and personnel within the communications industry to establish such a coalition. Once established, the agency's personnel would continue to work with the coalition to increase minority participation in the communications industry.

This would be done by maintaining a working relationship with station managers in the broadcast media; providing consultants to train coalition personnel in ways to influence the media; and working with coalition personnel to

persuade black educational institutions to place more emphasis upon career opportunities within the communications industry. Again, as with the Communications Programs in North Carolina and South Carolina, all the characteristics of the representative bureaucrat role can be seen in the behavior of Community Relations Service personnel within the Mississippi Communications Program.

Community Relations Service Employees as Advocacy Administrators

In the Administration of Justice and Education Programs of South Carolina, the Education and Administration of Justice Programs of North Carolina, and the Housing Program of Kentucky, the behavior of Community Relations Service employees approximated the new public administration role of an advocacy administrator.

South Carolina Administration of Justice Program

In the South Carolina Administration of Justice Program, Community Relations Service employees functioned as advocates for those incarcerated in the state's penal institutions. This was done by working to develop a mechanism whereby inmates of the state's penal institutions could receive more assistance from their relatives and friends. Agency employees aided the South Carolina Council on Human Relations in organizing a statewide group composed of relatives and friends of inmates. This organization was to deal with some of the immediate problems faced by inmates such as the denial of proper medical care, the denial of visitation

rights, and the denial of parole. It was also to work to provide reading materials for the inmates. Families of inmates were to be encouraged to write their incarcerated relatives more often and, where necessary, were to be given assistance in writing. The organization was also to provide transportation for relatives and friends to visit inmates.

The organization of relatives and friends was to address problems faced by families of inmates such as money, medical services, clothing, and housing. Community Relations Service personnel were to assist the families and friends organization in these endeavors by helping to form a coalition composed of members of the group and representatives from various private and public social service agencies. The formation of the coalition was to strengthen the relatives and friends organization and to improve the delivery of services for families of inmates and the inmates themselves.

Although the coalition was to facilitate the problems faced by inmates and their families, there would still be matters requiring legal action with which neither the relatives and friends organization nor the coalition could deal. To overcome this problem, Community Relations Service personnel were to assist the South Carolina Council on Human Relations and the University of South Carolina Law School in the development of a public interest law firm that would work in conjunction with the families and friends organization.

One of the basic goals of the public interest law firm was to be the enfranchisement of the poor. This was to be achieved through the use of test cases, which would seek to establish wide ranging legal principles or legal rules. An additional concentration of the firm would be toward the legislature, to seek new laws, and toward government agencies, to monitor administration of laws affecting the poor. By working with the relatives and friends organization, the public interest law firm was to develop group consciousness among inmates and their families and to bring pressure for constructive action on a wide range of private and public organizations.

Community Relations Service personnel advocated changes to assist inmates and their families and worked to create the relatives and friends organization, the coalition, and the public interest law firm to also become advocates for inmates and their families. By so doing they were engaging in similar behavior to that which characterizes the new public administration advocacy administrator role. They used their professional skills and official standing on behalf of the inmates; they acted on a strong commitment to justice for the inmates; they encouraged citizen participation in the penal system; and they worked to protect the rights of inmates and their families. Although they did not publicly criticize the South Carolina Department of Corrections, they worked closely with the South Carolina Council on Human Relations, which was an outspoken critic of the

state's corrections system. By so doing they indirectly, though not publicly, added their support to criticism of the corrections system.

South Carolina Education Program

The Community Relations Service's South Carolina Education Program placed agency personnel in the role of advocates for minority teachers and administrators displaced by the integration process. In moving from a dual, segregated school system to a unified, integrated system, some counties in the state found themselves with an excessive number of teachers and administrators. In some instances, black teachers and principals, because of their less impressive qualifications, were either demoted or dismissed. Members of the black community often times felt that these personnel were being demoted or dismissed solely for the reason that they were black.

To solve this problem, employees of the Community Relations Service sought to expand and facilitate minority community involvement in the educational decision-making process so as to better resolve educational problems incidental to teacher and administrator displacement in hard-hit minority communities. They also sought to establish a firm grievance procedure for teachers on a statewide basis. This was to be done in conjunction with the South Carolina Center for Displaced Teachers and Administrators at South Carolina State Teachers College, the largest black college in the state.

One of the first objectives of the program was to publicize the problem of minority teacher and administrator displacement throughout the state and to solicit minority community input in obtaining solutions to the problem. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People local chapters, South Carolina Education Association local chapters, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Urban League were encouraged to become active in the program and to bring pressure on local education officials to reinstate those teachers who had been displaced. Attempts were also made to inform displaced teachers of their rights and the procedures whereby they could possibly regain their positions. A long-range component of the program was to work with minority communities in getting more blacks elected to positions on school boards and to intensify their interest in becoming more active in the education decision-making process which had a direct effect upon minority teachers, administrators, and, in the final analysis, minority students. Effective completion of the program, it was hoped, would provide a rallying point around which coalitions of educators and lay citizens groups could develop effective reform efforts within the state's educational system.

As in the agency's Administration of Justice Program for South Carolina, Community Relations Service employees performed as advocacy administrators in the South Carolina Educational Program. They were advocates on behalf of the teachers and administrators displaced in the move toward an

integrated school system. They used their professional skills and standing on behalf of these teachers and administrators; they acted on a strong commitment to justice for them; they encouraged citizen participation in the resolution of the teacher displacement problem; and they worked to protect the rights of displaced teachers and administrators. Though they were not directly criticizing, i.e., publicly criticizing, the state's educational system, they were indirectly criticizing it by working with the minority community to resolve the problems faced by black teachers and administrators.

North Carolina Education Program

In North Carolina, Community Relations Service employees attempted to become advocates of the black community in dealing with educational problems stemming from the transition to an integrated school system--teacher and administrator displacement and demotion; assignment of an inordinately large number of black students to vocational education programs; expulsion of large numbers of black students from school; and lack of black representation on school boards and other educational decision-making bodies.

These problems were to be tackled by assisting community groups establish educational resource centers in each of the state's eight education districts. The long range goal of an educational resource center in each education district was to be achieved by first establishing a model center in Raleigh to be utilized as the basis for centers

in the other seven districts. Community Relations Service personnel were to assist the Raleigh Educational Resource Center in promulgating a countywide media approach for the purpose of informing minority community persons about educational matters in the Raleigh School System; in establishing liaison between the Raleigh Board of Education and the minority community in order to relate to the board the inadequacies, injustices, and inconsistencies as they existed in regard to the minority community; and in developing an organizational structure to allow it capability of serving as a network nerve center for expanding and replicating its operation statewide.

Once established in each of the state's education districts, the resource centers were to serve four main functions: 1) to provide counseling services to minority students who had been expelled or suspended; 2) to prepare and distribute printed materials to persons and groups interested in school affairs; 3) to film educational matters of concern to the minority community and make such films available at the center; and 4) to conduct meetings and workshops to focus on the problems faced by the minority community within the state's educational system.

Community Relations Service personnel performed an advocacy role in working for the establishment of the educational resource centers, which in turn were to perform an advocacy role once established. Community Relations Service employees engaged in behavior characteristic of the

new public administration advocacy administrator role. Agency personnel worked on behalf of the minority community which was composed of the least powerful and wealthy members of the state's population. They were strongly committed to achieving educational justice for minorities; they encouraged minority participation in the decision-making processes of the educational system; and they sought to give minorities some control over the educational system. By doing these things, Community Relations Service personnel were working to protect the rights of minorities in the field of education.

North Carolina Administration of Justice Program

In this program, Community Relations Service employees functioned as advocates for black inmates of North Carolina's penal institutions. They attempted to assist inmates in their dealings with the North Carolina Department of Corrections and with members of their own communities. Agency employee activities were aimed at the creation of a community volunteer pre-release program within the minority community to allow minority prisoners the opportunity to be released from prison for a few hours at a time prior to scheduled parole or release, with the expected results that these release periods would serve primarily to reorient the inmate into his community.

The State of North Carolina had such a program in existence where the inmate's released time was spent in such activities as church functions, sports activities, movies,

and other functions designed to aid the inmate in readjusting to life outside of prison. Community Relations Service employees felt this program did not function satisfactorily for minority inmates for two reasons: 1) minority inmates had difficulty relating to community volunteers who were either white or less than qualified minority members and 2) activities carried out through the Department of Corrections volunteer program had not offered substantial content that proved to be relevant to the minority inmate. They further found that traditionally there had been a reluctance on the part of members of the black community to become involved in activities designed to provide an inmate the needed assistance required to make a successful transition from a prison environment back into a normal life style within society. Community Relations Service personnel further felt that an inmate's community shared in the responsibility for his initial collision with the law and thus in the responsibility for seeing that he did not have a second such encounter.

Based upon these beliefs, Community Relations Service employees sought to identify community groups who would be willing to participate in a volunteer pre-release program. Three such groups were identified: the Raleigh Chapter of Women-in-Action, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the North Carolina-Virginia Commission on Racial Justice. Working with these groups, agency personnel were to assist in planning the program; in establishing a recruiting and training program within the

minority community to recruit and train volunteers responsible for one-to-one contact with inmates; in developing a channel of communications between the North Carolina Department of Corrections and the minority community volunteers to make the program function effectively; and in developing a job bank for all inmates participating in the program who needed employment as a condition of their release.

The advocacy administrator behavior evident in the North Carolina Education Program was also evident in the state's Administration of Justice Program. Community Relations Service employees worked on behalf of the inmates; they exhibited a strong commitment to justice for them; they encouraged minority citizen participation in the rehabilitation programs administered by the State Department of Corrections; and they encouraged neighborhood involvement in the volunteer pre-release program.

Kentucky Housing Program

Community Relations Service employees worked in this program to assist the Russell Area Council, one of nine neighborhood area councils under the Community Action Commission of Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky, become an advocate on behalf of minority residents of the Russell area, a 100 square block area in Louisville's inner city. The major goal of the program was to assist the Russell Area Council develop a mechanism whereby area minority residents would have an input into municipal housing policy affecting area residents. The goal was, in effect, to involve

minority citizens in the city's land use, zoning, and urban redevelopment policy decisions.

The council was to become the planning and coordinating agency for the Russell Community and to become a strong and viable organization through which area residents could work to effect change in the adverse conditions under which they lived--the Russell area contained a predominately black population and experienced a high incidence of poverty, unemployment, crime, and disease. Overall community development, guided by citizen participation, was to be the major concern of the council.

The Community Relations Service was to assist the council in its work by identifying community based groups willing to work with the council, by training council staff in the techniques of community development, by encouraging black businessmen to support the activities of the council, by establishing a productive working relationship with local governmental planning agencies, and by providing the council with "easy access" to other federal and state agencies involved in the administration of community development grants.

The primary advocacy administrator behavior exhibited by Community Relations Service personnel was their activities to assist the Russell Area Council, which had a stated goal of becoming a "strong advocate" for the black residents of the Russell area. Agency personnel also utilized their official standing and professional skills on behalf of the

poor residents of the Russell area; they worked to increase their participation in local housing policy decision-making; they exhibited a commitment to justice for the poor; and they sought to protect the rights of Russell area residents in the area of housing.

Community Relations Service Employees as Non-Consolidating Bureaucrats

To this point in our discussion of the Community Relations Service's programs in the Southeast Region, we have attempted to demonstrate that the behavior of the agency's personnel within each program approximates behavior which typifies a certain new public administration role. This is not to say that only one specific role can be identified in each program, for more than one role can be identified in some of the programs. It is to say that the behavior of the agency's personnel most closely approximates a certain role in each of the programs. However, this cannot be said of the non-consolidating bureaucrat; activities characteristic of the non-consolidating bureaucrat appear to permeate all the programs developed and implemented in the Southeast Region.

It can be said that Community Relations Service employees attempted to transform some aspect of community life according to preconceived notions of a better society; they accepted new ideas of social change; they attempted to persuade others to accept new ideas of social change; they attempted to build public support for their programs; they

attempted to shape new courses in the programs in which they worked; and they attempted to ensure effective program performance with the minimum of political embarrassment.

In short, one can see many of the characteristics of the non-consolidating bureaucrat in all of the agency's programs. However, in order to verify that Community Relations Service employees performed as non-consolidating bureaucrats, as well as social equity advocates, change agents, representative bureaucrats, and advocacy administrators, we must now turn to a consideration of the questionnaire administered to the agency employees who engaged in the development and implementation of these programs. Only if they indicate that they performed roles similar to the new public administration roles can we for certain demonstrate that they did so.

Community Relations Service Employees' Perceptions of New Public Administration Roles Pursued

Each of the programs under development and implementation by the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region between 1970-1973 has been considered, and the behavior of agency personnel within each program has been classified according to the one new public administration role which it most closely approximates. The reasons why the behavior of the agency's personnel within each program approximates a particular new public administration role have also been discussed. The questionnaire which was administered to the agency's personnel to ascertain their perceptions of the roles pursued in the agency's southeastern state programs

will be used to verify the classification of Community Relations Service employees' behavior by new public administration roles.

The questionnaire which was utilized in this endeavor appears in Appendix J. It was constructed by formulating a set of questions related to each of the major roles identified in the review of the new public administration literature. Five groups of questions were used, one for each of the five major roles. The questionnaire was administered to all of the agency's employees who participated in the development of the agency's southeastern state programs. There were eighteen individuals, and all were interviewed by means of the questionnaire. Each respondent was requested to answer yes, no, or do not know to the questions characterizing each role. Because of the seemingly close parallel between the behavior of the agency's personnel and the behavior advocated in the new public administration roles, it was expected that the respondents would answer yes to a vast majority of the questions appearing in the questionnaire. This proved to be the case as Table 3 indicates.

Table 3 presents an attitude scale which was constructed from the data collected in the questionnaire. Each group of questions in the questionnaire is presented as a group of statements in the attitude scale. There are five groups of statements, each one representing one of the five major new public administration roles. Beside each statement in the attitude scale appears a scale value.

TABLE 3

ATTITUDE SCALE OF SOUTHEASTERN REGION COMMUNITY RELATIONS
SERVICE EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTIONS OF NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
ROLES PURSUED

Scale
Value

Social Equity Advocate

- 18 Worked to redress the grievances faced by minorities.
- 18 Worked to improve the political power and economic well-being of minorities.
- 18 Work done for the Community Relations Service was for the public good or for the benefit of the American people in general.
- 18 Work done for the Community Relations Service was a reflection of personal values.
- 18 Did not view job primarily as a means of earning a living.
- 17 Worked as an advocate of change.
- 17 Was more concerned with serving the people than with fulfilling the wishes of superiors within the agency.
- 16 Attempted to counter or eradicate the political inequalities of American society.
- 16 Worked to improve the quality of life for all American citizens.
- 13 Became a Community Relations Service employee because of personal values held.
- 8 Sought to alter the organizational structure of the Community Relations Service in order to adequately serve minorities.

Change Agent

- 18 In regard to the people served by the Community Relations Service, attempted to transform feelings of political hopelessness and despair into political meaningfulness and relevance.
- 18 Worked to develop effective, equitable, and relevant solutions to pressing technical, logistical, socio-political, and ethical problems.

TABLE 3--Continued

- 18 In agency work was guided by a sense of social responsibility.
- 17 Social equity was a guiding principle in the work done for the agency.
- 14 Attempted to insure that social equity was a guiding principle in the work of other Community Relations Service employees.
- 12 Engaged in activity which could be described as collection of data for policy analysts.
- 11 Utilized the resources of the Community Relations Service to strengthen the growth of intangible, subjectively defined values of the agency's clientele.
- 8 Work done could be described as a link between centralized, comprehensive planning and decentralized administrative implementation.

Representative Bureaucrat

- 16 Attempted to improve the position of minority elements of society within the federal bureaucracy and the state bureaucracy, in the state where agency work was done.
- 15 Attempted to make the federal bureaucracy and the state bureaucracy, in the state where agency work was done, representative of the component elements of society.
- 13 Worked to increase the number of minorities in governmental positions at the federal and state levels.
- 12 Felt that the ethnic background of individuals should be taken into consideration in filling governmental (civil service) positions.
- 12 Sought to represent (speak for) groups not involved in the policy-making processes of government.

Advocacy Administrator

- 18 Worked to protect minority rights.
- 17 Actions were based on a strong commitment to the poor.

TABLE 3--Continued

- 17 Encouraged a wide range (different races and ethnic groups) of public participation in the programs of the Community Relations Service.
- 17 Especially encouraged minority citizen participation in the programs of the Community Relations Service.
- 16 Encouraged neighborhood control of publicly funded programs.
- 15 Used professional skills and official standing on behalf of the least powerful and wealthy members of society.
- 11 Criticized the Community Relations Service in defense of the clientele groups served.

Non-Consolidating Bureaucrat

- 18 Was ready to accept new ideas of social change.
- 18 Treated staff personnel with respect.
- 18 Administered even-handed justice in treatment of staff personnel.
- 18 Was not easily led astray by others who wanted to make up Community Relations Service employees' minds.
- 17 Was not easily discouraged by adversity.
- 16 In the programs of the Community Relations Service, was able to shape new courses and adopt ongoing arrangements.
- 15 Was ready to push others into accepting new ideas of social change.
- 15 Was capable of immediate improvisations in crisis situations.
- 15 Was ready to assume responsibility for the success or failure of the Community Relations Service programs.
- 15 Gave clear instructions to subordinates.
- 14 Was skilled at building up support for the programs of the Community Relations Service.

TABLE 3--Continued

- 13 Was an administrator who ensured effective program performance with the minimum of political embarrassment.
- 13 Was skilled at choosing among competing interests and reconciling all parties to the outcome.
- 12 Was a policy formulator who was ready with possible strategies to meet the unknown.
- 12 Was responsive to public needs and a champion of public causes.
- 9 In crisis situations was slow to burn and quick to act.
- 9 Was able to command attention and stimulate subordinates.
- 7 Was intent on transforming some aspects of community life according to preconceived notions of the ideal society.

These represent the total number of yes responses that were given to each question in the questionnaire. Each scale value may range from one to eighteen, depending upon the number of yes responses given to each question in the questionnaire. The relationship of the attitude scale to the questionnaire may best be illustrated by way of an example.

If one looks at the first question in Group 1 of the questionnaire, which represents the social equity advocate role, he sees that the respondents were asked if they worked to redress the grievances faced by minorities. In constructing the attitude scale, this question was simply presented in the form of a statement (Worked to redress the grievances faced by minorities.) and transferred to the attitude scale. The number of respondents who answered yes to this first question was computed to be eighteen. This number was entered as the scale value for this particular item in the attitude scale. To complete the attitude scale, this process was repeated for each question in the questionnaire. Once all the yes responses were computed, the statements in the attitude scale were arranged in descending order.

From the attitude scale, one can see that the respondents answered yes to most of the items in the questionnaire. The high incidence of scale values of eighteen, seventeen, sixteen, and fifteen, and the low incidence of scale values below ten would seem to indicate that most of the respondents felt that they had engaged in behavior similar to that advocated by the new public administration roles, and if one

computes the average scale value for each of the new public administration roles, he finds that the average scale value for the social equity advocate role is 16.09; for the change agent role 14.50; for the representative bureaucrat role 13.60; for the advocacy administrator role 15.85; and for the non-consolidating bureaucrat role 14.11. From these data, it would indeed appear that the eighteen employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued roles similar to those advocated on behalf of minorities by the new public administration. However, one cannot rely solely on the number of yes responses to verify that this is the case. The data must be examined further.

To insure that the agency's employees in the Southeast Region did pursue roles similar to those of the new public administration, the chi square goodness of fit test was applied to the data. Hypotheses for each of the new public administration roles were formulated and then verified by means of the chi square test. The hypotheses for each role and the process of verification for each are presented in Table 4. From the data presented in Table 4, one can see that all the hypotheses were accepted because the chi square values for each were smaller than the critical values. If any one chi square value had been larger than the corresponding critical value, the particular hypothesis in question would have had to be rejected. The chi square test confirmed the findings of the attitude scale and the questionnaire. One can safely say that the employees of the

TABLE 4

CHI SQUARE GOODNESS OF FIT TEST APPLIED TO SOUTHEASTERN
REGION COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTIONS OF
NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ROLES PURSUED*

Social Equity Advocate

H_0 : Employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued behavior similar to that advocated by the social equity advocate role of the new public administration.

H_1 : Employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region did not pursue behavior similar to that advocated by the social equity advocate role of the new public administration.

Alpha=0.05

$$x^2 = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{(o_j - e_j)^2}{e_j}$$

x^2 is distributed with (k-1) degrees of freedom. In this case k=11, since there are eleven behavior characteristics of the social equity advocate role.

For alpha=0.05 and k-1=10 the critical value of x^2 for a 0.05 test is 18.3. Any sample value of x^2 larger than this would be so unusual as to cause us to reject H_0 .

$x^2=7.51$

Since our observed sample value of x^2 is smaller than the critical value, we accept the hypothesis that employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued behavior similar to that advocated by the social equity advocate role of the new public administration.

Change Agent

H_0 : Employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued behavior similar to that advocated by the change agent role of the new public administration.

TABLE 4--Continued

H₁: Employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region did not pursue behavior similar to that advocated by the change agent role of the new public administration.

Alpha=0.05

$$x^2 = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{(o_j - e_j)^2}{e_j}$$

X² is distributed with (k-1) degrees of freedom. In this case k=8, since there are eight behavior characteristics of the change agent role.

For alpha=0.05 and k-1=7 the critical value of X² for a 0.05 test is 14.1. Any sample value of X² larger than this would be so unusual as to cause us to reject H₀.

X²=10.42

Since our observed sample value of x²=10.42 is smaller than the critical value, we accept the hypothesis that employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued behavior similar to that advocated by the change agent role of the new public administration.

Representative Bureaucrat

H₀: Employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued behavior similar to that advocated by the representative bureaucrat role of the new public administration.

H₁: Employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region did not pursue behavior similar to that advocated by the representative bureaucrat role of the new public administration.

Alpha=0.05

$$x^2 = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{(o_j - e_j)^2}{e_j}$$

TABLE 4--Continued

χ^2 is distributed with $(k-1)$ degrees of freedom. In this case $k=5$, since there are five behavior characteristics of the representative bureaucrat role.

For $\alpha=0.05$ and $k-1=4$ the critical χ^2 for a 0.05 test is 9.49. Any sample value of χ^2 larger than this would be so unusual as to cause us to reject H_0 .

$$\chi^2=6.11$$

Since our observed sample value of $\chi^2=6.11$ is smaller than the critical value, we accept the hypothesis that employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued behavior similar to that advocated by the representative bureaucrat role of the new public administration.

Advocacy Administrator

H_0 : Employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued behavior similar to that advocated by the advocacy administrator role of the new public administration.

H_1 : Employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region did not pursue behavior similar to that advocated by the advocacy administrator role of the new public administration.

Alpha=0.05

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{(o_j - e_j)^2}{e_j}$$

χ^2 is distributed with $(k-1)$ degrees of freedom. In this case $k=7$, since there are seven behavior characteristics of the advocacy administrator role.

For $\alpha=0.05$ and $k-1=6$ the critical χ^2 for a 0.05 test is 12.6. Any sample of χ^2 larger than this would be so unusual as to cause us to reject H_0 .

$$\chi^2=3.62$$

Since our observed sample value of $\chi^2=3.62$ is smaller than the critical value, we accept the hypothesis that the employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued behavior similar to that advocated by the advocacy administrator role of the new public administration.

TABLE 4--Continued

Non-Consolidating Bureaucrat

H₀: Employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued behavior similar to that advocated by the non-consolidating role of the new public administration.

H₁: Employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region did not pursue behavior similar to that advocated by the non-consolidating bureaucrat role of the new public administration.

Alpha=0.05

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{(o_j - e_j)^2}{e_j}$$

χ^2 is distributed with (k-1) degrees of freedom. In this case k=18, since there are eighteen behavior characteristics of the non-consolidating bureaucrat role.

For alpha=0.05 and k-1=17 the critical value of χ^2 for a 0.05 test is 27.6. Any sample value of χ^2 larger than this would be so unusual as to cause us to reject H₀.

$\chi^2=25.67$

Since our observed sample value of $\chi^2=25.67$ is smaller than the critical value, we accept the hypothesis that the employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued behavior similar to that advocated by the non-consolidating bureaucrat role of the new public administration.

*The seven-step hypothesis testing procedure utilized for each role is based upon Gerald L. Ericksen, Scientific Inquiry in the Behavioral Sciences (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1970), pp. 91-101. Calculations of chi square values are presented in Appendix L.

Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued roles similar to those advocated by the major roles of the new public administration.

Having demonstrated that the employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region perceived themselves as pursuing roles similar to those advocated on behalf of minorities by the new public administration, the author's classification of new public administration roles pursued by the agency's personnel may now be compared with their perceptions of the roles which they pursued. It should be remembered that the author classified the activities of employees within each program, with the exception of the non-consolidating bureaucrat role, according to one role only for matters of simplification. The results of this comparison appear in Table 5. A positive (+) sign indicates that a certain role was pursued within a particular state; a negative (-) sign indicates that the particular role in question was not pursued.

In the author's classification, which is based upon Table 2, it can be seen that several of the roles were not pursued within each state. This results in part from the fact that there were only two or three programs in some states and in part from the fact that the author classified each program according to one new public administration role only. The non-consolidating bureaucrat role appears in each state in the author's classification because it was felt that this role permeated all of the agency's programs.

TABLE 5

AUTHOR'S CLASSIFICATION OF NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ROLES PURSUED BY COMMUNITY RELATIONS
SERVICE EMPLOYEES COMPARED WITH COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTIONS
OF NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION ROLES PURSUED

State and New PA Roles	Author's Classification: Did CRS Employees Pursue Roles?		Employees' Perceptions: Did CRS Employees Pursue Roles?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
<u>Alabama</u>				
Social Equity Advocate		-	+	
Change Agent	+		+	
Representative Bureaucrat		-	+	
Advocacy Administrator		-	+	
Non-Consolidating Bureaucrat	+		+	
<u>Florida</u>				
Social Equity Advocate	+		+	
Change Agent	+		+	
Representative Bureaucrat	+		+	
Advocacy Administrator		-	+	
Non-Consolidating Bureaucrat	+		+	
<u>Georgia</u>				
Social Equity Advocate	+		+	
Change Agent		-	+	
Representative Bureaucrat		-	+	
Advocacy Administrator		-	+	
Non-Consolidating Bureaucrat	+		+	

TABLE 5--Continued

State and New PA Roles	Author's Classification: Did CRS Employees Pursue Roles?		Employees' Perceptions: Did CRS Employees Pursue Roles?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
<u>Kentucky</u>				
Social Equity Advocate	+		+	
Change Agent		-		
Representative Bureaucrat		-		
Advocacy Administrator	+		+	
Non-Consolidating Bureaucrat	+		+	
<u>Mississippi</u>				
Social Equity Advocate			+	
Change Agent	+		+	
Representative Bureaucrat	+		+	
Advocacy Administrator		-	+	
Non-Consolidating Bureaucrat	+		+	
<u>North Carolina</u>				
Social Equity Advocate	+		+	
Change Agent		-		
Representative Bureaucrat	+		+	
Advocacy Administrator	+		+	
Non-Consolidating Bureaucrat	+		+	
<u>South Carolina</u>				
Social Equity Advocate	+		+	
Change Agent		-		
Representative Bureaucrat	+		+	
Advocacy Administrator	+		+	
Non-Consolidating Bureaucrat	+		+	

In the employees' perceptions of roles pursued, it can be seen that the employees of the Community Relations Service in the Southeast Region pursued not only the roles indicated in the author's classification but all of the new public administration roles. In fact, the employees within each of the seven states of the Southeast Region in which the agency's programs were operative, felt they had pursued the five major roles advocated on behalf of minorities by the new public administration. The author's classification was correct insofar as it went, and one can again see that the employees of the Community Relations Service pursued roles similar to those advocated by the new public administration.

Conclusion

This chapter has dealt with the principal assumption, the similarity between new public administration roles and behavior of Community Relations Service employees in the Southeast Region, which had to be proven prior to consideration of the study's major hypothesis. Behavior of Community Relations Service employees in each southeastern state program was classified according to the new public administration roles which it most closely approximated; reasons for this classification were explained; and, finally, it was demonstrated, by means of the questionnaire, the attitude scale, and the chi square goodness of fit test, that the employees of the Community Relations Service in the

Southeast Region had pursued the roles in the author's classification as well as all of the major roles advocated on behalf of minorities by the new public administration. Chapter V will consider the reasons for termination of the Community Relations Service's programmatic approach in 1973 in order to determine the type of political support that is required for the successful application of the roles advocated for administrators by the new public administration.

CHAPTER V

CUTBACKS IN THE PROGRAMMATIC ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Chapter IV demonstrated that the behavior of Community Relations Service employees in their program development and implementation is similar to the roles advocated for public administrators by the new public administration literature. Consequently, we may now move in this chapter to a consideration of the reasons why the agency was forced in 1973 to abandon its programmatic activities and return to its original mission of conflict resolution. Our major objective in examining the reasons for this abandonment will be to establish a basis for a determination of the type political support that is required for public administrators to pursue successfully roles advocated by the new public administration.

In determining the reasons for the cutbacks in the Community Relations Service's programmatic activities, we will examine four possible causes: 1) lack of executive (presidential) support; 2) lack of legislative (congressional) support; 3) possible duplication of or interference with programs administered by other federal agencies; and

4) possible opposition to the agency's programs by elected officials and clientele at the state and local levels. We shall begin with a consideration of the executive branch's attitude, i.e., the Nixon Administration's attitude, toward the programmatic activities of the Community Relations Service.

The Executive Branch and Community Relations Service Programs

Determination of the Nixon Administration's attitude toward the programs of the Community Relations Service was based upon personal interviews with Office of Management and Budget officials; consideration of the Fiscal Year 1974 Budget of the United States, analysis of appropriations and other congressional hearings dealing with cutbacks in the agency's programs; and examination of relevant newspaper articles. During the course of this examination, it was discovered that the Nixon Administration considered dismantling the agency entirely and in the end succeeded, through budgetary actions, in eliminating the agency's programmatic activities and reducing its personnel by two-thirds.

Since the Office of Management and Budget has responsibility for preparation of the executive budget and the Community Relations Service's programs were eliminated in Fiscal Year 1974, this fiscal period was the obvious place to begin an investigation into the reasons for the program cutbacks. The controversy and court actions surrounding the release of the Nixon presidential papers obviously indicated

that obtaining information from the Office of Management and Budget might perhaps be impossible, and at best difficult. An attempt was made to obtain memoranda from the Office of Management and Budget directly since such materials would not be considered presidential papers. This effort proved to be unproductive. Office of Management and Budget personnel indicated that they were unable to locate written documents indicating the Nixon Administration's attitude toward the programs of the Community Relations Service. They insisted that, due to the amount of time that had elapsed since preparation of the Fiscal Year 1974 Budget and the informality of the budgetary "negotiating process" between the Office of Management and Budget and federal agencies, such materials could not be found. Even if such documents could be located, they were uncertain of the propriety of making them public, because of the confidential nature of the executive budgetary process.

This route having proved unsuccessful, an attempt was made to obtain memoranda from the Washington office of the Community Relations Service with the hope that documents could be located which were prepared by Office of Management and Budget personnel and then submitted to the Community Relations Service explaining the reasons why the agency's programs were to be eliminated. This effort too proved to be a fruitless endeavor. Community Relations Service personnel indicated that no such memoranda were available. Two reasons were given: files on the agency's programs were

destroyed when they were phased out and there had been a change in directors since the programs were eliminated. In both instances, i.e., in the case of Office of Management and Budget and the Community Relations Service, the information that was given has to be accepted at face value. There, nevertheless, is doubt about the authenticity of this information because it is difficult to believe that government agencies do not maintain files that date back five years. This practice is particularly true of the Community Relations Service since this period was so crucial in its short history as an operative federal agency. There is apparently a reluctance on the part of federal agencies to reveal sensitive information of the type related to budgetary cuts and personnel reductions.

Though Office of Management and Budget officials were unable or unwilling to release documents revealing the reasons for the Community Relations Service program cutbacks, they were quite willing to talk openly about the cutbacks. Interviews were conducted with two such individuals.¹⁶² Both indicated that the Nixon Administration felt the Community Relations Service had exceeded its legislative mandate in 1970 when it adopted a programmatic approach.

¹⁶²The author acknowledges the assistance of Messrs. Malcolm Arnold and John Komoroske in graciously granting interviews to discuss the cutbacks in Community Relations Service programs. Mr. Arnold was employed by the Office of Management and Budget at the time of the cutbacks and Mr. Komoroske, though not employed by the Office of Management and Budget at the time, was familiar with the actions that had taken place.

The agency was established by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to conciliate racial disputes; the act says nothing about the agency developing and implementing programs designed to prevent racial disputes. Thus it was proper to eliminate the programmatic activities of the agency and have it return to its mission as outlined in the enabling legislation.

The first public evidence of President Nixon's intentions came in a New York Times article on January 8, 1973.¹⁶³ The article was attributed to White House sources and indicated that President Nixon planned to dismantle the agency entirely because he felt it to be ineffective. Further the agency was considered to be of little use. Few people had faith in its work and could see nothing that had been accomplished by it. The Office of Management and Budget was to be charged with dismantling the agency. It was simply to cut off the agency's funds, and most of its 300 employees were to be reassigned within the Justice Department and other federal agencies or to be terminated. President Nixon had not planned to reveal his intentions of dismantling the agency until his Fiscal Year 1974 Budget Message on January 29, 1973; however, the story was released and reported by the New York Times.

The President's planned cutbacks in the Community Relations Service were also reported in a January 13, 1973,

¹⁶³Paul Delaney, "Nixon Reported Planning to End the Community Relations Service, a Racial Mediation Agency," New York Times, 8 January 1973, sec. 15, p. 1.

Washington Post article.¹⁶⁴ This time reports of a total dismantling were denied, and emphasis was placed upon eliminating the agency's technical assistance programs. The White House and Office of Management and Budget were reported to be considering a plan under which the agency's technical assistance programs would be transferred to other federal agencies and some of its personnel would be reassigned within the Justice Department and other agencies or released. The report indicated that White House officials felt complete abolishment of the agency would, without congressional approval, be a violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

When the President did reveal his plans for the Community Relations Service in the Fiscal Year 1974 Budget, he did not call for its dissolution. Instead, he called for the discontinuation of the Service's technical assistance programs and a return to its conciliation functions as set forth in the 1964 act. Whether the story of a complete dismantling was released prematurely to make his actions called for in the 1974 Budget appear less severe or whether he changed his mind between the January 8th New York Times article and his January 29th Budget Message due to support voiced for the agency is not clear. Available evidence only indicates that he wanted to reduce the agency's operations in order to effectuate a reduction in federal spending.

The Community Relations Service was not mentioned per

¹⁶⁴Sanford J. Unger, "Budget Cuts Peril Racial Mediators," Washington Post, 13 January 1973, sec. 1, p. 4.

se in the President's January 29th Budget Message to the Congress. He alluded to the elimination of certain federal programs in order to reduce spending and to prevent increasing taxes:

There is, however, little room for the creation of new programs requiring additional outlays in 1975 and no room for the postponement of the reductions and terminations proposed in this budget.

Increased emphasis will be placed on program performance. Programs will be evaluated to identify those that must be redirected, reduced, or eliminated because they do not justify the taxes required to pay for them. Federal programs must meet their objectives and costs must be related to achievements.

My deep commitment to providing change that works is, and must be, matched by a total determination to identify and reform or eliminate programs that have not worked. It would be irresponsible to continue spending taxpayers' money for programs that have long since served their purpose, are not working at all, or are not working sufficiently to justify their costs.¹⁶⁵

In the Budget itself, the President did outline his reasons for desiring a reduction in the Community Relations Service's programs. The Special Analyses accompanying the Budget attributed the cut to improvements in the federal grants program and to a restructuring of the federal bureaucracy:

The Service will be able to discontinue its technical assistance program in the coming year at a savings of \$4.0 million. This is due to the continued streamlining of the Federal administrative process through grant simplification and other management improvements and to the better coordination of Federal activities through

¹⁶⁵Richard M. Nixon, "The Budget Message of the President," The Budget of the United States Government--Fiscal Year 1974 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), pp. 5, 12, 21. Italics indicated appear in the Budget Message.

Federal regional councils and decentralization of decisionmaking authority to State and local governments. In 1974, the Service will spend \$2.6 million to reduce racial tensions. This will permit an expansion in crisis resolution and State liaison activities of 41% over 1972 levels.¹⁶⁶

President Nixon did not single out the Community Relations Service to end its programs. The agency was one of many which the Nixon Administration planned to reduce in size or to eliminate in Fiscal Year 1974. In fact, the Budget's "most consistent theme [was] the elimination or reduction of social programs. Scores of such cuts [dominated] a list that alone [occupied] seven and a half pages of small type in the new Budget." The Budget proposed the "most sweeping structural realignment . . . at least since the Korean War."¹⁶⁷ For its size, the Community Relations Service was, however, to suffer one of the most drastic budget and personnel cuts of any agency mentioned in the Budget. Its funds were to be cut from \$6.7 million to \$2.8 million and its personnel from 341 to 103.¹⁶⁸

The President's announcement of drastic cutbacks in the Community Relations Service's budget naturally brought forth an outcry of opposition from the agency's supporters,

¹⁶⁶Special Analyses: Budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 1974 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 191.

¹⁶⁷Jack Rosenthal, "Large Social Cuts," New York Times, 30 January 1973, sec. 1, p. 5.

¹⁶⁸The Budget of the United States Government Fiscal Year 1974--Appendix (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 616.

and one such protest produced one of the few explanations from the Office of Management and Budget for the cutbacks. On January 10, 1973, John P. Adams, Director of the Department of Law, Justice, and Community Relations of the Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church, wrote to the Office of Management and Budget in response to the January 8th article appearing in the New York Times. He vehemently objected to the reported dismantling of the agency. Joseph Laitin, Assistant to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, responded to Adams' letter on February 14, 1973.

Laitin indicated that the reported dismantling was erroneous and explained Office of Management and Budget reasons for the proposed cutbacks. The reasons cited were almost identical to those appearing in the Special Analyses of the Fiscal Year 1974 Budget:

The expenditures requested for 1974 will permit the Service to expand its crisis resolution and State liaison activities by 41% over 1972 levels. At the same time, the Service will be able to discontinue its technical assistance program. This is due to the continued streamlining of Federal administrative processes through grant simplification and other management improvements, to the better coordination of Federal activities through Federal regional councils and decentralization of decisionmaking authority to State and local governments, and to strengthened monitoring of Federal civil rights activities by the executive branch.¹⁶⁹

Reference to the Nixon Administration's decision to

¹⁶⁹U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Budgetary Cuts in the Community Relations Service, Hearings before the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, pp. 34-35.

cut the technical assistance programs of the Community Relations Service can be found in congressional hearings. The Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary held hearings on the proposed cut-backs, and they were also considered in the Fiscal Year 1974 Budget hearings of the State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

During the House hearings, Alan A. Parker, Counsel to the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee, queried Ben Holman, Director of the Community Relations Service, on the process by which the decision was made to cut the technical assistance programs of the agency. He wanted to know if the agency had requested that its budget be cut from \$6.8 million to \$2.7 million in Fiscal Year 1974. In answering the question, Holman indicated that the agency had been afforded a budget hearing at the Justice Department level and at the Office of Management and Budget. The Community Relations Service requested \$6.8 million, and the Department of Justice supported this request. The decision to reduce the budget request to \$2.7 million was made at the Office of Management and Budget. Holman further indicated he had requested that the technical assistance programs of the agency be continued. The decision to terminate these programs through budget reductions was made by the Office of

Management and Budget and the White House.¹⁷⁰ Congressman Robert McClory of Illinois seemed to capture Holamn's attitude toward the proposed cuts when he observed, "Mr. Holman, you don't seem to have your heart in this reduction of activity in the Community Relations Service."¹⁷¹

In the Senate appropriations hearings of the State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, blame for the program cutbacks was placed squarely on the shoulders of the Nixon Administration. Senator John Pastore questioned Director Holman on the process by which the decision was made to eliminate the technical assistance programs of the agency. Again it was revealed that the agency requested to be funded at Fiscal Year 1973 levels. This request was reduced by the Office of Management and Budget after the Department of Justice had approved it. Senator Pastore summed up the mood of Director Holman toward the proposed cuts: "I won't press you any more. I think you are a little bit unhappy about it yourself."¹⁷²

The decision to eliminate the technical assistance

¹⁷⁰U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Budgetary Cuts in the Community Relations Service, Hearings before the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973. pp. 25-26.

¹⁷¹Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁷²U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1974, Hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, p. 689.

programs of the Community Relations Service was thus made by the Nixon Administration, with the process to be carried out by reduction of the agency's budget and termination of a large portion of its employees. The reasons given by the Administration were to lower federal spending and to prevent increases in federal taxes. Additionally, it was felt that the agency had exceeded its legislative mandate by embarking upon the development and implementation of programs to prevent racial disputes. Indications are also present that suggest the Administration simply felt the agency had been ineffective in its approach to solving racial problems, and its operations should therefore be drastically reduced. These appear to have been the major causes for the agency's program curtailments, but we must look beyond these to determine whether there were additional causes. Was there congressional opposition to the activities of the agency in addition to opposition from the Nixon Administration?

The Legislative Branch and Community Relations Service Programs

Activities of the Congress during the 1973 debate over the Community Relations Service indicate that there was some strong support for the agency within Congress, but not sufficient support to prevent the Administration from proceeding with its plans. Three sets of congressional hearings were involved in the debate over the proposed cutbacks. The Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary held hearings on the proposed

cutbacks on four different occasions: March 22d, April 11th, April 12th, and October 10th. The State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittees of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees considered the cutbacks in their debate of the Department of Justice's Fiscal Year 1974 Budget. In all of these hearings, support for the agency was voiced. Opposition to the agency was voiced in none of them, and the Administration's proposed cutbacks were questioned as constituting a violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee's hearings, Congressman Peter Rodino, Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, testified in support of the Community Relations Service. The agency, he stated, was not exceeding its legislative mandate. Instead, the Nixon Administration was determined to prevent the Community Relations Service from functioning as Congress had intended it to function under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. He insisted that the Administration was prohibited by law from dismantling the agency and cautioned that the "Administration must not now be allowed to achieve the same effect by simply cutting off funds."¹⁷³ He further urged that the role of the agency be strengthened in accordance with the 1964 act.

Congressman Robert Drinan of Massachusetts joined

¹⁷³U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Budgetary Cuts in the Community Relations Service, Hearings before the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, p. 3.

Rodino in support of the agency and insisted that the programs were being illegally dismantled without the consent of the Congress. "I think you are dismantling the organization illegally . . . You people are locking the Congress out. You are dismantling the agency . . . without the knowledge or advice of the Congress."¹⁷⁴ Congressman B. F. Fisk of California considered the Nixon Administration's cutbacks to be a "callous disregard for a program which [was] paying fine dividends . . . and another move by the President to cut back or eliminate programs which [were] designed to help the not so fortunate people in our country."¹⁷⁵

The State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee discussed the cutbacks in its consideration of the Justice Department's Fiscal Year 1974 Budget, but there was no opposition or support voiced in regard to the cutbacks. Members of the subcommittee only wanted to know how the decision had been made to eliminate the technical assistance programs. Again the finger was pointed at the Office of Management and Budget and the White House. In the companion Senate committee, the Community Relations Service received no opposition, but strong support for the agency was voiced by Senators Alan Cranston, Warren Magnuson, John Tunney, and John Pastore.

Senators Cranston, Magnuson, and Tunney submitted letters in support of the agency's activities. Cranston

¹⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 13-15.

¹⁷⁵Ibid., p. 81.

characterized the proposed cutbacks as "another example of this Administration's disregard for programs to help poor people and minorities"; Magnuson referred to the agency's "important role in resolving the Indian-Government confrontation at Wounded Knee, South Dakota"; and Tunney said that the proposed cutbacks went "beyond cutting to the bone. It cuts through the bone in a meat-axe amputation of the one federal agency charged with conciliating racial disputes. The Service which has shunned publicity, has been spectacularly successful in behind-the-scenes negotiations in preventing violence and settling conflicts."¹⁷⁶

Senator Pastore dwelt upon the elimination of the agency's technical programs and bemoaned the practice of impoundment which had been used by the Nixon Administration against this agency as well as other agencies within the federal establishment. He wanted to know exactly what was going to happen to the programs which were to be eliminated. Were they to be assumed by other agencies? He wanted to get the information correct because there was to be "quite a contested battle on the floor of the Senate. There is no question about it. We want to develop the record here because we want to do the right thing."¹⁷⁷

Opposition voiced by Democrats in the Civil Rights

¹⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 2225, 2520, 2526.

¹⁷⁷U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1974. Hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, p. 679.

Oversight Subcommittee's hearings was reported in the March 23, 1973 Washington Post. Congressmen Peter Rodino, Don Edwards, and Robert Drinan were identified as champions of the Community Relations Service against the budgetary plans of the Nixon Administration. Drinan and Edwards were reported as questioning the legality of the proposed cutbacks, and Rodino characterized the actions as one more evidence of the Nixon Administration's efforts to "renege on its civil rights responsibilities."¹⁷⁸

The voices of opposition to the proposed cutbacks were to no avail because, in the end, Congress approved the budget cutbacks in the Community Relations Service recommended by the Nixon Administration. The House Appropriations Committee approved the budget reduction from \$6.8 million to \$2.7 million; the Senate Appropriations Committee raised the Nixon figure to \$3.7 million; and it was again reduced to \$2.7 million in Conference Committee. The "contested battle on the floor" of Congress promised by Senator Pastore did not materialize. There was no debate in either the Senate or the House concerning the cutbacks in the agency's appropriations in the Fiscal Year 1974 Budget.

No one in the Congress vigorously supported the proposed cutbacks, and there was testimony to the effect that no one had come before the Congress to object to the manner in which the Community Relations Service was administering its

¹⁷⁸Richard L. Lyons, "Civil Rights Unit Cutback Criticized," Washington Post, 23 March 1973, sec. 1, p. 3.

programs. Yet, apparently, no one in the Congress was unduly disturbed by the cutbacks in the agency's programs because there was no debate of the matter in either chamber during consideration of the Fiscal Year 1974 Justice Department appropriations. Congress had not originated the idea of terminating the programs of the Community Relations Service, but it did not take any steps to prevent it either. If there is no evidence that the Congress aided the President in originating his decision to propose the cutbacks, could there possibly have been a duplication of program efforts between the Community Relations Service and other federal agencies which caused President Nixon to want to eliminate the technical assistance programs of the agency?

Other Federal Agencies and Community Relations Service Programs

Little evidence is available to suggest that the Community Relations Services' programs were eliminated because they duplicated programs administered by other federal agencies. Examination of the agency's files in the Southeast Regional Office revealed no correspondence which would indicate that other federal agencies were upset with the Community Relations Service. On the contrary, there was much evidence of cooperation between the Community Relations Service and other agencies within the federal establishment. It will be recalled from the discussion, in Chapter IV, of the agency's programs in the Southeast Region that several agencies, other than the Community Relations Service, were

involved in these programs--the Department of Housing and Urban Development; the Office of Minority Business Enterprise in the Department of Commerce, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in the Department of Justice, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It was one objective of the Community Relations Service to assist community groups in securing funding for programs from other federal agencies.

The only evidence that the Community Relations Service was duplicating programs of other federal agencies came from the Office of Management and Budget and from Ben Holman's testimony before congressional committees. In interviews with Office of Management and Budget officials, it was revealed that the Nixon Administration felt the agency had overstepped its legislative mandate and was becoming involved in areas such as housing, education, and economic development which came within the purview of other government agencies. This feeling appears to have been more of a rationalization for the proposed budget cuts than an actual fact. The programmatic approach of the agency was initiated toward the end of the Johnson Administration, but it was not actually put into full operation until Ben Holman, whom President Nixon nominated, became director of the agency. During 1969 and 1970, there was no opposition from the Nixon Administration to these programs. In fact, from 1969 to 1972 the Nixon Administration approved budget increases for the agency, and, even in 1973, the Department of Justice approved the agency's budget request. Arguments that the agency was duplicating

efforts of other agencies did not appear until the decision was made to reduce its budget.

After this decision was made, Ben Holman himself utilized the argument that the agency had been involved in activities that could properly be assumed by other agencies, though he never went so far as to say that the programs should be eliminated because they duplicated the efforts of other agencies. His arguments were revealed in congressional testimony. He insisted that the programs should be absorbed by other agencies rather than eliminated altogether.

In his testimony before the House Subcommittee on Civil Rights Oversight, Holman revealed his plan for "taking up the slack" left by curtailment of the Community Relations Service's programmatic activities. By "taking up the slack," he was referring to agencies which would "assume responsibility for providing the kinds of crisis prevention assistance to local communities which CRS [had] been providing." Particular emphasis was placed upon "those agencies which [had] decentralized operations and who [administered] programs of particular applicability to minority communities." He felt there were several agencies administering programs in the substantive area of Community Relations Service programs, but that only a few of them concentrated "on the problems of minorities, and, at the same time, [had] local offices in many of the communities where there [were] significant minority populations."¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁹U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary,

He identified five agencies which had program responsibilities of vital importance to minorities: the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. He felt that one of these agencies should be designated as a "lead agency" in each American city having a significant minority population. Each lead agency would be charged with assuring that "continuing, comprehensive assistance" was provided to "minority groups on a planned, coordinated basis." Lead agencies were to be designated by the "25 Federal executive boards, the 90 Federal executive associations, or the 10 Federal regional councils, depending upon what [was] appropriate for the local situation." Within each lead agency, one or more staff members was to have "full-time responsibility for ongoing technical assistance by Federal agencies to minority groups."¹⁸⁰

Holman also felt that state and local governments should play a greater role in providing assistance to minorities. With their increased independence of decision-making under general and specific revenue-sharing, these levels of government would have to "accept and assume greater

Budgetary Cuts in the Community Relations Service, Hearings before the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, p. 7.

¹⁸⁰Ibid., p. 8.

responsibility for establishing programs, priorities, and processes to eliminate discriminatory practices and to alleviate the adverse effect that such practices have heretofore produced."¹⁸¹

Not all of the members of the subcommittee were overly impressed with Holman's plan. For example, Congressman Robert Drinan of Massachusetts was disturbed that the plan made no provision for the participation of Congress in the designation of lead agencies. On the whole, however, members of the subcommittee appeared to be satisfied with Holman's proposal. Congressman Charles E. Wiggins seemed to express the mood of the subcommittee when he said:

. . . we can speculate that these agencies which are preoccupied with the day-to-day administration of Government programs ought to be more sensitive to needs of members of the community that have some quarrel with them. And perhaps by shifting a greater share of responsibility to them, they will develop the sensitivity which they ought to have. That may be a true observation as well, and only the future will tell whether or not, in fact, this move, if approved, is wise.¹⁸²

Congress as a whole appears to have been satisfied with the proposal because its members went along with the Nixon Administration's proposed cuts in the Community Relations Service's technical assistance programs, and as has been pointed out, there was no debate of the matter when the Fiscal Year 1974 appropriations for the Department of Justice were considered on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives.¹⁸³

¹⁸¹Ibid.

¹⁸²Ibid., p. 45.

¹⁸³The proposal suggested by Holman was never

After considering three possible causes for the cut-backs in the technical assistance programs of the Community Relations Service, lack of executive support, lack of congressional support, and duplication of programs administered by other federal agencies, we can see that they were eliminated through budgetary actions of the Office of Management and Budget. The conclusion must be, however, that there was not overwhelming congressional support for these programs, since nothing was done by the Congress to prevent their termination. One additional reason may have led the Nixon Administration to conclude that the programs of the Community Relations Service should be eliminated: criticism of the agency by local clientele and elected officials. We will now turn to a consideration of the presence or absence of local support for the agency's programs.

Local Clientele, Local Elected Officials, and Community Relations Service Programs

In looking at the attitudes of local clientele served by the Community Relations Service's programs and at the elected officials who worked with the agency in the development of these programs, an attempt was made to ascertain whether there was opposition to the agency from these groups which would have led the Nixon Administration to call for

implemented. According to Gil Pompa, Acting Director of the Community Relations Service, the programs of the Community Relations Service were never absorbed by other agencies within the federal establishment. When the budget cuts were made in Fiscal Year 1974, the technical assistance programs of the agency died and have not been revived either by the Community Relations Service itself or by any other agencies.

elimination of its technical assistance programs. Three methods were utilized to determine local attitudes toward the agency: 1) examination of congressional hearings dealing with cutbacks in the agency's programs; 2) a sample review of the major state papers in the southeastern states in which the agency programs were operative; and 3) interview of local clientele and elected officials by means of telephone.

Congressman Don Edwards of California summarized the evidence presented to congressional committees by local people when he said:

. . . nobody has come forth or been in communication with the subcommittee that has recommended that this cut be made. Nobody has come before this subcommittee and said that the job being done by the Community Relations Service is not appropriate, is not good.¹⁸⁴

Such was indeed the case. Nobody appeared before congressional committees in opposition to the Community Relations Service, but numerous statements from local citizens and elected officials supported the agency.

Johnny Ford, Mayor of Tuskegee, Alabama, and a former employee of the Community Relations Service, appeared before the House Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee to relate his experiences with the agency and voice his opposition to the proposed reductions in the agency's technical assistance programs. Mayor Ford insisted that he had not come before the

¹⁸⁴U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Budgetary Cuts in the Community Relations Service, Hearings before the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, p. 41

subcommittee to criticize the Nixon Administration, for he had, in fact, supported Nixon in the November, 1968 presidential election. He was, nevertheless, very disturbed by the fact that the Administration was proposing cutbacks in the agency's programs.

. . . I am not here to criticize the administration. I am here to share my real experience with the Community Relations Service. And I think that it is unfortunate that the administration, and I think some Members of Congress as well, are not sensitive to the great work that has been carried out by CRS . . . 185

Mayor Ford lamented the fact that the agency had not been more visible in its work. Of course, it was charged by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to conduct its activities without publicity, but, if more people knew of the work that had been done by the agency, there would have been a greater cry of opposition to the proposed cutbacks in its programs. Ford indicated that he would do all that he could to inform local people of the pending reductions and to encourage their opposition to the measure, because the Community Relations Service was "perhaps one of the most valuable organizations in the Federal Government and it certainly [needed] to be continued with adequate funding."¹⁸⁶

In hearings before the State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, evidence of local support for the Community Relations Service also appeared. Senator John Pastore entered letters into the record demonstrating local

¹⁸⁵Ibid., pp. 61-62.

¹⁸⁶Ibid., p. 63.

support from the States of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and New York. The statement of support from Alabama again came from Mayor Ford of Tuskegee. He repeated many of the concerns that had been expressed in his testimony before the House Subcommittee on Civil Rights Oversight, but he also made some interesting observations on the manner in which the program curtailments would affect the southeastern states:

I can visualize what will happen when the field offices in Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and North Carolina are closed and the regional staff is reduced. It will be an impossible task to try to assist communities.¹⁸⁷

Father Michael Raff, Executive Director of the Mississippi Council on Human Relations, made an "urgent request" that the programs of the Community Relations Service be preserved. He indicated that the agency had been instrumental in organizing the minority community in Jackson, Mississippi, and had succeeded in bringing about cooperation between the minority community and "establishment groups." Further, removal of the Community Relations Service from Jackson "would be a great loss to the poor and the blacks of this city" because the agency had "innovated programs that certainly [had] been instrumental in preventing the crisis situations that Jackson had so unfortunately" experienced in the past.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁷U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Appropriations, Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1974, Hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, p. 680.

¹⁸⁸Ibid., p. 681.

From the Bronx, New York, came a letter of support from Frank Garcia, Executive Director of the S.E.R.A. Phase IV Central Office. He felt that the Community Relations Service had been "a positive and effective force" within his community and had "provided its invaluable services time and time again." He further felt that the agency was "one of the few Federal agencies that maintains credibility in terms of providing much needed professional intervention between the minority community and established institutions."¹⁸⁹

Moon Landrieu, Mayor of New Orleans, wrote to Roy Ash, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, expressing his opposition to the proposed elimination of Community Relations Service programs. He urged that the cuts be restored and that the agency's full contingent of personnel be retained. He could not believe that the Nixon Administration would consider destroying an agency that was providing such a valuable service to state and local governments.

It seems quite incredulous that such a cutback should be affecting what is basically the only civil rights agency in the federal structure which maintains contacts in, seeks input from, and works directly with minority communities throughout the country. This activity is enhanced by the state liaison function whereby state and local governments are kept abreast of minority needs and concerns directly. More significant, is the Community Relations Service function of keeping open channels of communication and citizen participation in state and local agencies.¹⁹⁰

A letter from Oscar T. Blanks, Executive Director of the Lumbee Regional Development Association, Inc., indicated the assistance which had been rendered to the Lumbee Indians

¹⁸⁹Ibid., p. 682.

¹⁹⁰Ibid., p. 683.

and to all the people of the State of North Carolina. In fact, the agency was rendering "a valuable service and assistance to people, particularly minorities, throughout the United States." Of particular importance was the agency's role as a "Human Rights Agency," and there was "more need now, than ever before, for the valuable services that this Human Rights Agency [was] providing the people."¹⁹¹

Testimony before congressional hearings indicated only support for the Community Relations Service and opposition to the Nixon Administration in proposing reductions in the agency's programs. A sample survey of the major newspapers in the states of the Southeast Region was conducted to uncover any opposition to the agency that may have been publicly expressed by local officials and clientele. Due to the number of newspapers in these states, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina, two of the largest papers in each state were chosen for review. Issues of each were reviewed for the year 1973. Any opposition to the agency would have probably surfaced during this period because this was the time in which the budget cuts were being debated by the Congress and reported by the New York Times, Washington Post, and Christian Science Monitor.¹⁹²

¹⁹¹Ibid., p. 684.

¹⁹²The papers examined by state were: Alabama--Birmingham News, Montgomery Advertiser; Florida--Miami Herald, Tallahassee Democrat; Georgia--Atlanta Constitution, Macon Telegraph and News; Kentucky--Lexington Herald Leader, Louisville Courier Journal and Times; Mississippi--Biloxi Herald,

Analysis of these newspapers for the year 1973 showed no local opposition to the Community Relations Service. There were a few articles which reported the activities of the agency within these states. For example, the Atlanta Constitution carried several articles on the agency's work in desegregation cases within the State of Georgia, but no articles were found which dealt specifically with the proposed budget cuts in the agency. Neither were there articles which indicated a desire on the part of local officials or clientele to have the programs of the agency discontinued.

The fact that there were no articles dealing with abolishment of the agency's programs and only a small number dealing with its activities within the southeastern states is attributable to the agency's functioning in a "low key, behind-the-scenes" manner and intentionally attempting to avoid publicity. The agency was required by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to conduct its services without publicity. In light of these facts, the question might well be raised, why review newspapers for evidence of local opposition to the agency? The answer is, that, if the agency had functioned in such a manner to raise the ire of local officials, then this would probably appear in print, in spite of the agency's charge to avoid publicity.

To determine if there had been local opposition which was not reported in the news media, a sample survey was

Jackson Clarion Ledger; North Carolina--Greensboro Daily News, Raleigh News and Observer; South Carolina--Charleston News and Courier, Columbia State.

conducted of local officials and clientele who had participated in the agency's programs. Community Relations Service employees, and some former employees, who had worked in the development and implementation of the agency's programs in the southeast were asked for the names of individuals whom they felt would be aware of the reasons for the termination of the programs. Five such individuals were selected from each of the seven southeastern states in which the agency's programs were operative. A total of thirty-five individuals were interviewed by telephone to ascertain their attitudes toward the cutbacks in the Community Relations Service's programs.

These persons were asked to complete a statement in regard to termination of the agency's programmatic activities. Specifically, they were asked to complete the following statement:

The Programs of the Community Relations Service in the areas of administration of justice, communications, economic development, education, and housing were abandoned in 1973 because:

- 1) they did not have adequate presidential support;
- 2) they did not have adequate congressional support;
- 3) they duplicated or interfered with programs administered by other federal agencies;
- 4) they were opposed by elected officials at the state level;
- 5) they were opposed by elected officials at the local level (city or county);
- 6) they were opposed by community groups or clientele at the local level (city or county);

7) they were abandoned for some other reason.¹⁹³

The interviews yielded one response in regard to the programs. All of the thirty-five individuals felt that the programs of the Community Relations Service had been terminated because they lacked support from the Nixon Administration. Some of the persons interviewed had difficulty recalling the reasons why the Nixon Administration wanted to terminate the programs, but they had no difficulty in placing the responsibility upon the Nixon Administration. The respondents were also vociferous in their support for the Community Relations Service; they were not content to complete merely the statement in regard to termination of the programs. They were eager to express an opinion with respect to the "grave injustice" that had been "perpetrated" upon the only federal agency which was created solely for the purpose of aiding minorities.

The unanimity of response in the interviews creates doubt about the names supplied by the employees and former employees of the Community Relations Service. These names may have been composed of individuals known to be favorable to the agency, although an attempt was made to select a wide representation of the type persons with whom the agency's personnel had worked. In requesting the names of persons to be interviewed, the author indicated that a representative sample of individuals was needed. Perhaps the manner in

¹⁹³For the complete text of the questionnaire which was administered to local elected officials and clientele, see Appendix K.

which the interviews were conducted also contributed to the unanimous response. In some instances, the alternatives had to be repeated several times. If an individual had difficulty remembering the alternatives over the telephone, then he or she may have merely chosen the first alternative--lack of executive support. This difficulty in recalling alternatives would not, however, seem to have been the case in every instance.

Regardless of the reasons for the unanimous response, the interviews did indicate that local elected officials and clientele felt that the agency's programs had been terminated due to the actions of the Nixon Administration, and they indicated that the agency had substantial support from those persons with whom it had worked. The interviews augmented the review of state newspapers. The absence of articles dealing with the agency's programs led to the belief that there was a paucity of adverse feelings toward the agency at the local level; the expression of support for the agency by those persons interviewed indicated that this was the case. No evidence indicated that the Nixon Administration acted in response to adverse local feelings when the President proposed that the programmatic approach of the Community Relations Service be eliminated.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the reasons for termination of the Community Relations Service's programmatic approach in 1973. We examined four possible causes for the

termination of these programs: 1) lack of executive (presidential) support; 2) lack of legislative (congressional) support; 3) possible duplication of or interference with programs administered by other federal agencies; and 4) possible opposition to the agency's programs by elected officials and clientele at the state and local levels.

In examining these four possible causes, it was discovered that the agency's programs were terminated by the Nixon Administration. This was achieved through budgetary cuts by the Office of Management and Budget. The stated purpose for this action was to reduce federal spending and to prevent increases in federal taxes. It was demonstrated that the Nixon Administration felt that the agency had been ineffective and had exceeded its legislative mandate by embarking upon a programmatic approach to prevent the problems which lead to racial tension and strife.

Congressional actions during 1973 indicated that there was some vocal support for the programs of the Community Relations Service within Congress, but not of sufficient volume to prevent acceptance of the Nixon Administration's recommendations. Opposition to the proposed cutbacks in the agency's programs was voiced within Senate and House hearings, but the matter was not debated in either chamber. The Congress concurred in Nixon's recommended budget cuts, and the agency's programmatic approach was terminated. In concurring with these recommendations, the Congress must share

some of the responsibility because it did nothing to prevent the budget cuts.

Available evidence indicated that there was no duplication of effort by the Community Relations Service and other federal agencies. On the contrary, there was much evidence of cooperation between the Community Relations Service and other agencies within the federal establishment. The charge by the Nixon Administration that the agency's programs should be eliminated due to duplication of other federal programs appeared to be a rationalization for proposed budget cuts rather than an actual fact.

Congressional testimony, newspaper reviews, and telephone interviews with local clientele and elected officials, revealed that there was strong support for the Community Relations Service at the state and local levels. No adverse publicity was found in state newspapers in the Southeast Region, and the telephone interviews revealed strong support for the agency and a feeling that the programs of the agency had been eliminated by lack of support from the Nixon Administration.

Having examined the causes for the termination of the Community Relations Service's programmatic activities, we may now turn to a consideration of the type political support that is required for public administrators to pursue roles of the type that were pursued by the agency's personnel. We may, in the study's concluding section, consider the

implications of the Community Relations Service experience for the application of a normative-based public administration.

CONCLUSION

The Community Relations Service Experience: Implications for the Application of a Normative-Based Public Administration

The primary objective of this study was to determine the type of political support required for public administrators to pursue the roles advocated on behalf of minorities by the new public administration. This analysis was made in order to correct a serious weakness in the new public administration literature: the lack of practical application of the roles advocated. To achieve the study's primary objective, the major roles advocated on behalf of minorities were identified and studied within the context of the Community Relations Service.

The programmatic activities of the agency in the Southeast Region between 1970 and 1973 were examined to demonstrate that the behavior of the agency's employees in the development and implementation of programs in the areas of administration of justice, communications, economic development, education, and housing was similar to the roles advocated on behalf of minorities. The purpose in demonstrating this similarity was to establish the basis for an examination of the reasons for termination of the agency's programmatic activities by the Nixon Administration, which in turn could

be used as a model upon which to base a determination of the type of political support necessary for application of the minority advocacy roles of the new public administration. Let us then consider the implications of the Community Relations Service experience for the application of a normative-based public administration.

The first, and major, conclusion that can be drawn from the experience of the Community Relations Service is that the roles advocated by the new public administration (social equity advocate, change agent, representative bureaucrat, advocacy administrator, and non-consolidating bureaucrat) require a greater degree of political support for their application than do more traditional roles in public administration. It was argued that the roles advocated by the new public administration are not new in the sense that equity, representativeness, change, advocacy, and others are discussed in more traditional works on public administration. There is, however, something new about these concepts as discussed in the new public administration. Underlying each is the basic question: for whom? Public administrators are to advocate social equity for whom? seek representativeness for whom? advocate citizen participation for whom? The answer to each of these questions is that new public administrators are to pursue roles which will aid the poor, disadvantaged, and minority elements of society. They are, above all else, to pursue roles which will aid minorities. It is

the pursuit of these roles on behalf of minorities that requires a greater degree of political support.

The new public administrator cannot concern himself solely with the efficient and economical functioning of his organization's programs. He must have a high degree of political support for his programs to operate successfully and to survive in the political environment. Public administrators have always had to concern themselves with political support in order to be successful. This is, indeed, a true statement. Administrators of programs of a noncontroversial nature, however, generally need not concern themselves with political support beyond that which is necessary to ensure that their budget is renewed each year and, in some years, expanded.

The roles of the new public administration require support beyond what is required for most government programs. They require strong advocacy by the executive and legislative branches; they require administrators committed to bettering the position of minorities; they require greater participation by minorities within governmental bureaucracy; and, finally, they require a societal consensus with respect to the need and desirability of improving the position of minorities. The experience of the Community Relations Service demonstrates the necessity of each type support within the political environment.

The creation of the Community Relations Service and the operation and termination of its programmatic activities

illustrate the necessity of strong executive advocacy. The agency was created under the auspices of President Lyndon B. Johnson. He had pushed for the creation of such an agency when he was Senate Majority Leader, but he was unsuccessful in obtaining this goal until he became President after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, who also had advocated creation of the agency. In fact, prior to his death, Kennedy indicated that he would create such an agency by executive order until appropriate legislation creating it could be enacted.

The strong leadership of President Johnson led to passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which created the Community Relations Service. He was a true believer in the worth of the agency and guided it through its first days of operation. He established the National Citizens Committee on Community Relations to assist the agency and appointed his trusted friend LeRoy Collins to be its first director. He also created the activist civil rights atmosphere which encouraged employees of the Community Relations Service to implement the agency's programmatic approach in order to tackle the root causes of racial disturbances. He approved budget increases for the agency and publicly lauded its accomplishments. In essence, President Johnson set the tone in the area of federal implementation of civil rights that encouraged the development and growth of the agency and which encouraged the employees of the agency to seek an expanded role for it.

President Nixon also demonstrated the importance of executive advocacy for application of the new public administration roles. His position toward the Community Relations Service illustrated that the absence of executive support for roles of the new public administration variety will lead to their failure. When the Nixon Administration withdrew support for the programmatic activities of the Community Relations Service, they were terminated. There was a negative feeling toward civil rights and social programs designed to aid minorities and the poor in the Nixon Administration. Although his expressed motives, decreased federal spending to prevent tax increases, were admirable, his actions created an unfavorable climate for programs of the type administered by the Community Relations Service. This climate was the opposite of that which was present during the Johnson Administration. Under President Nixon, the roles pursued by the agency's employees withered and died; under President Johnson, these roles flourished in the warm sunshine of civil rights activism.

The Community Relations Service experience also illustrates the necessity of congressional advocacy, but this advocacy is not as crucial as executive advocacy. In both the Johnson Administration and the Nixon Administration, Congress followed the lead of the White House. This is not unusual, but it indicates that a normative-based public administration of the type practiced by the Community Relations Service is more dependent upon executive support than upon

legislative support. Legislative support is, however, essential to the pursuit of such roles. During the Johnson Administration, Congress augmented the efforts of the executive branch, and his recommendations toward expanding the role of the Community Relations Service were dependent upon congressional approval and financial support.

The lack of action on the part of Congress during the 1973 debate over the termination of the agency's programs indicated what the absence of legislative support can do to an agency. Congress could have prevented the curtailment of the agency's programs, but due to its inaction they were terminated as desired by President Nixon. To have continued in existence, the programmatic activities of the Community Relations Service would have had to have a sufficient number of congressional supporters to defeat the budget cuts recommended by the Nixon Administration. Congressional support is necessary, but it tends to lean in the direction in which the White House winds are blowing.

The programmatic approach of the Community Relations Service attests to the necessity of having administrators who are totally committed to the pursuit of new public administration roles if they are to be successfully applied in an organizational setting. As originally created, the Community Relations Service's only function was to mediate and conciliate racial disputes. This was the course of action followed by the agency from 1964 to 1968. The agency could have continued in this vein, but it did not due to the

actions of Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Director Roger Wilkins. These two individuals were responsible for initiation of the agency's programmatic approach. The direction did not come directly from the White House, although the climate created by the Johnson Administration was favorable to their actions.

The process begun by Clark and Wilkins was continued by Ben Holman once he became President Nixon's first director of the agency. Holman's actions in implementing the programmatic approach that was begun by Clark and Wilkins was a result of his own initiatives. The Nixon Administration did not take an active part in implementing the programmatic approach, although it did approve budgetary requests of the agency until 1973. The actions of these three individuals demonstrate that administrators committed to a certain policy direction are essential to successful implementation of the new public administration roles. These individuals were committed to redirecting the Community Relations Service. They were determined that it would do more than attempt to settle racial disputes once they had erupted; they were committed to directing the agency toward resolving the societal problems which place minorities at a distinct disadvantage.

Minority representation within the Community Relations Service was an asset in implementing its programmatic approach. Employees of the agency from the black, Indian, and Mexican-American segments of the American population knew the type problems faced by minorities. Many of them had

experienced these problems and had firsthand knowledge of the type programs that would help to alleviate them. The presence of a large minority representation on the agency's staff also enabled it to develop a working rapport in the minority communities of the country's largest cities and in the smallest rural towns. Possessed with a familiarity of the problems faced by minorities, the employees could more readily identify with their clientele. Communication was made easier, and program development and implementation were facilitated.

Finally, the experience of the Community Relations Service demonstrates the requirement for a societal consensus on the necessity to improve the position of minorities. In the decade of the 1960s, a strong feeling on the part of the American people developed that the black population of the United States had too long been isolated from the mainstream of the political system. There was strong support for voting rights, equal education and employment opportunities, and a general feeling that more should be done by government to uplift the black population. This support, or societal consensus, was an asset to President Johnson when he pushed for passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and it made his job all the more easier in selecting the membership of the National Citizens Committee on Community Relations. In short, the mood created by the civil rights movement, the assassinations of John and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, and the national reaction to

the treatment of blacks in the southern states produced a climate of public support for the type of behavior that was pursued by the employees of the Community Relations Service in their program development and implementation.

When President Nixon was recommending termination of the agency's programmatic activities, the societal consensus was no longer evident. The American public's attention was focused upon the Vietnam War and environmental pollution. Civil rights and other minority issues were less a focal point within American society. Nightly news broadcasts were devoted to combat casualties and the Paris Peace Talks. The Selma and Birmingham racial demonstrations and the Watts and Detroit riots no longer occupied the limelight. Could one expect a large public outcry over the elimination of programs in the small Community Relations Service? Although the evidence presented in Chapter V demonstrated substantial public support for the programs of the Community Relations Service, it was insufficient to prevent the Nixon Administration from eliminating the agency's programmatic activities. One can only speculate, but it is highly unlikely that the cuts made by President Nixon in the agency's programs would have been as easy during the height of the civil rights movement of the early 1960s.

The Community Relations Service is but one small agency within the federal bureaucracy, and the roles advocated for administrators on behalf of minorities are but one component of the new public administration. Yet the

experience of the Community Relations Service in pursuing programs designed to improve the position of minorities within American society reveals a great deal of information in regard to the type political support that is necessary for public administrators to apply successfully the roles advocated by the new public administration. It reveals that an agency whose employees pursue such roles needs to have strong backing from the executive branch; that congressional support, though not as crucial as presidential support, is also essential; that such an agency must have administrators committed to improving the position of minorities; that such an agency's personnel will be assisted in their endeavors if they have a substantial minority representation among their ranks; and that public support, or a societal consensus, in regard to the need and desirability of improving the status of minorities is essential. The experience of the Community Relations Service clearly demonstrates that the application of a normative-based public administration is feasible when the appropriate political support is available.

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CONFERENCE ON THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND THEIR AFFILIATED INSTITUTIONS

Stephen K. Bailey	Syracuse University
Lynton K. Caldwell	University of Indiana
James C. Charlesworth	University of Pennsylvania
Harlan Cleveland	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
G. Homer Durham	Arizona State University
Herbert Emmerich	University of Virginia
Harold B. Finger	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Bernard L. Gladieux	Knight and Gladieux, New York City
Albert Lepawsky	University of California, Berkeley
John W. Macy, Jr.	U.S. Civil Service Commission
Lennox L. Moak	Pennsylvania Economic League, Eastern Division
Arthur Naftalin	Minneapolis
Eugene H. Nickerson	Nassau County, New York
Herman G. Pope	Public Administration Clearing House, Chicago
Emmette S. Redford	University of Texas, Austin
Fred W. Riggs	University of Hawaii
Wallace S. Sayre	Columbia University
Harvey Sherman	New York Port Authority
Frank Smith	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Dwight Waldo	Syracuse University
York Willbern	University of Indiana

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANTS IN THE MINNOWBROOK CONFERENCE AND
THEIR AFFILIATED INSTITUTIONS

Robert P. Biller	University of California, Berkeley
Edward S. Brown	Syracuse University
Matthew Crenson	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
H. George Frederickson	Syracuse University
Edward Friedland	State University of New York, Stony Brook
Louis C. Gawthrop	State University of New York, Binghamton
Michael M. Harmon	Federal Executive Institute
Keith M. Henderson	New York University
S. B. Joedono	State University of New York, Albany
Kenneth Jowitt	University of California, Berkeley
Larry Kirkhart	University of Southern California
Philip S. Kronenberg	Indiana University
W. Henry Lambright	Syracuse University
Wilber F. LaPage	Syracuse University
Todd R. LaPorte	University of California, Berkeley
Frank McGee	Syracuse University
Frank Marini	Syracuse University
Michael Meriwether	Public Administration Service
Herman Mertins	Syracuse University
Albert F. Moncure	Department of Social Services, City of New York
Richard S. Page	University of Washington
David F. Parker	Division of the Budget, State of New York
John Paynter	University of Chicago
Ray D. Pethtel	American Society for Public Administration
David Porter	Syracuse University
Peter Rumsey	U.S. Bureau of the Budget
Peter Savage	University of New Hampshire
Joseph W. Scott	University of Toledo

Moshe Shani
Ira Sharkansky

Orion White, Jr.
Bob Zimring

Cornell University
University of Wisconsin,
Madison
University of Texas, Austin
University of Pennsylvania

APPENDIX C

SAVAGE STATEMENT ON THE MINNOWBROOK CONFERENCE

The ends of the conference are appropriately ambitious: basically we would like to identify and consider important and interesting problems and issues that have emerged or ought to emerge within the terrain of Public Administration, and to lay out promising plans of future inquiry into these matters. It would be good if we could, through the demonstration of a compelling manifest expertise, assert an authority of legitimacy and thereby influence the course of future inquiry and endeavor in Public Administration. To do this, we must contrive to stir some people with statements of manifest relevance about certain aspects of the state of our art and particularly with statements about or focused upon manageable substantive topics that would lead to further questions. Here, then, is a modest beginning of a prospective list of topics about which systematic statements could usefully be made by this conference:

1. What is the proper terrain of Public Administration? We need to separate the generally common areas of interest and concern from the peripheral areas, and to reach some agreement on the common referents of the term "Public Administration".

2. What are the logics of inquiry appropriate to the terrain? Different sorts of theories tend to accompany different sorts of definitions of the terrain. Thus, answers to the first question carry with them some answers to the appropriate logics of inquiry for description and analysis within the terrain.

3. Given some measure of agreement or concensus on this, what is the social relevance of knowledge in Public Administration? The creation and application of knowledge in Public Administration is not a socially neutral act, and this fact has consequences for our logics of inquiry. I have argued elsewhere that our concerns should be with: (a) What standards of decision do we use to select which questions ought to be studied and how we study them? (b) Who defines our questions and priorities for us? (c) To what extent are we aware of the social and moral implications of knowledge of Public Administration? (d) What are the uses of Public Administration as a social and political science? (e) Does Public Administration presently yield knowledge useful to certain institutions in society (usually the dominant ones) and not to others? (f) To whose advantage does Public

Administration work (to the dominant institutions of society or to those without power, like the Blacks)? and (g) What are the assumptions and consequences of teaching and research in Public Administration?

4. What is the normative and/or ethical substance of the terrain? I realize that I have spilled over into the question of normative and ethical substance: where the conditions within our terrain raise normative and ethical issues. Generally, we have ignored the ethical and normative problems inevitably involved in our concern with the purpose of administrative action. Indeed, whether we should or should not be concerned with normative aspects is a part of this question.

Source: Frank Marini, "Introduction: A New Public Administration?," in Toward a New Public Administration, ed. Frank Marini (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971), pp. 6-7.

APPENDIX D

TITLE I OF S. 499

Title I--Community Relations Service

Statement of Purpose

Sec. 101. The Congress recognizes that the requirements of the Constitution of the United States, and the laws enacted pursuant thereto, are giving rise, or may give rise, to disagreements in communities in the various States disruptive to peaceful relations among the citizens of such communities. The use of force in any manner as a means of trying to solve these disagreements not only fails to produce satisfactory solutions but also tends to aggravate the disagreements and to create new problems. Frequently the citizens who are involved in or affected by any such disagreement lack a satisfactory means of communicating with one another and of expressing their views directly to citizens of opposing views. As a result, a mutually satisfactory solution to the problems caused by the disagreement is made difficult, and sometimes impossible, of settlement. It is the purpose of this title to establish a Federal service which will be available to the citizens of the communities in the States to provide assistance in conciliating these disagreements and in eliminating the problems ensuing therefrom.

Community Relations Service; Duty and Function

Sec. 102. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency of the Government a Community Relations Service (hereafter in this title referred to as the "Service"). It shall be the duty of the Service, subject to the provisions of this title, to provide conciliation assistance in communities where (1) disagreements or difficulties regarding the laws or Constitution of the United States, or (2) disagreements or difficulties which affect or may affect interstate commerce, are disrupting, or are threatening to disrupt, peaceful relations among citizens of such communities.

(b) The activities of all officers and employees of the Service in providing assistance under this title shall be conducted in confidence and without publicity, and they shall not be obliged to disclose any information acquired in the regular course of performing their duties.

Cooperation with State, Local, and Private Agencies

Sec. 103. (a) The Service shall whenever possible in the course of providing conciliation assistance seek and utilize the cooperation of the agencies of the State or States, or local subdivisions thereof, in which is located the community which is affected by the differences which are the subject of such conciliation assistance.

(b) The Service may, in the course of providing conciliation assistance, seek and utilize the cooperation of any nonpublic agency which it believes may be helpful.

Officers and Employees

Sec. 104. (a) The Service shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall serve for a term of four years and until his successor is appointed and qualified. The Director shall receive compensation at a rate of \$20,000 per year.

(b) There shall be five Assistant Directors who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each Assistant Director shall serve for a term of four years and until his successor is appointed and qualified; except that of the members first appointed, one shall serve for a term of one year, one for a term of two years, one for a term of three years and two for a term of four years. Each Assistant Director shall receive compensation at a rate of \$17,000 per annum. Each Assistant Director shall perform such duties and functions as may be assigned to him, or delegated to him, by the Director. The Director is authorized to delegate to the Assistant Directors such of his powers and duties as he deems advisable.

(c) The Director is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation, in accordance with the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, of such technical, clerical, and other assistants as may be necessary to carry out the duties and functions of the Service under this title. The number of assistants to be appointed shall not exceed 100 at any time.

Principal Office: Regional Offices

Sec. 105. (a) The principal office of the Service shall be in the metropolitan area of Washington, but the Director may establish such regional offices, not to exceed five, as he deems necessary to carry out the duties and functions of the Service.

(b) Each regional office established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be headed by an Assistant Director.

Reports to Congress

Sec. 106. Subject to the provisions of section 102 (b), the Director shall, on or before January 31 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of the activities of the Service during the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall also contain information with respect to the internal administration of the Service and may contain recommendations for legislation necessary for improvements in such internal administration.

Appropriations

Sec. 107. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.

Sec. 108. This title may be cited as the "Community Relations Service Act."

Source: U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Civil Rights--1959. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. 86th Cong., 1st sess., 1959, pp. 3-5.

APPENDIX E

TITLE IV OF H.R. 7152, S. 1731, AND S. 7150

Title IV--Establishment of Community Relations Service

Sec. 401. There is hereby established a Community Relations Service (hereinafter referred to as the "Service"), which shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President. The Director shall receive compensation at a rate of \$20,000 per year. The Director is authorized to appoint such additional officers and employees as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

Sec. 402. It shall be the function of the Service to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which impair the rights of persons in such communities under the Constitution or laws of the United States or which affect or may affect interstate commerce. The Service may offer its services in cases of such disputes, disagreements, or difficulties whenever in its judgment peaceful relations among the citizens of the community involved are threatened thereby, and it may offer its services either upon its own motion or upon the request of an appropriate local official or other interested person.

Sec. 403. (a) The Service shall whenever possible in performing its functions under this title seek and utilize the cooperation of the appropriate State or local agencies and may seek and utilize the cooperation of any nonpublic agency which it believes may be helpful.

(b) The activities of all officers and employees of the Service in providing assistance under this title shall be conducted in confidence and without publicity, and the Service shall hold confidential any information acquired in the regular performance of its duties upon the understanding that it would be so held. No officer or employee of the Service shall engage in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for any department or agency in any litigation arising out of a dispute in which he acted on behalf of the Service.

Sec. 404. Subject to the provisions of section 403 (b), the Director shall, on or before January 31 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of the activities of the Service during the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall also contain information with respect to the internal administration of the Service and may contain recommendations for legislation necessary for improvement in such internal administration.

Source: U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Civil Rights. Hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary. 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, pp. 656-657.

APPENDIX F

ASHMORE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 7152

Title X--Establishment of a Community Relations Service

Sec. 1001. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce a Community Relations Service (hereinafter referred to as the 'Service'), which shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for a term of four years. The Director shall receive compensation at a rate of \$20,000 per year. The Director is authorized to appoint, subject to the civil service laws and regulations, such other personnel, not to exceed six in number, as may be necessary to enable the Service to carry out its functions and duties, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Director is further authorized to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55 (a)), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$75 per diem.

(b) Section 106 of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2205), is further amended by adding the following clause thereto: 'Director, Community Relations Service.'

Sec. 1002. It shall be the function of the Service to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which impair the rights of persons in such communities under the Constitution or laws of the United States or which affect or may effect interstate commerce. The Service may offer its services in cases of such disputes, disagreements, or difficulties whenever, in its judgment, peaceful relations among the citizens of the community involved are threatened thereby, and it may offer its services either upon its own motion or upon the request of an appropriate State or local official or other interested person.

Sec. 1003. The Service shall, whenever possible, in performing its functions under this title, seek and utilize the cooperation of the appropriate State or local agencies.

(b) The Service shall hold confidential any information acquired in the regular performance of its duties upon the understanding that it would be so held. No officer or employee of the Service shall engage in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions of any department or agency in any litigation arising out of a dispute in which he acted on behalf of the Service.

Sec. 1004. Subject to the provisions of section 1003 (b), the Director shall, on or before January 31 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of the activities of the Service during the preceding fiscal year.

Source: U.S., Congress, House, Representative Ashmore speaking for Amendment of the Proposed Civil Rights Act of 1964, H.R. 7152, 88th Cong., 2d sess., 10 February 1964, Congressional Record 110:2784-2785.

APPENDIX G

TITLE X, SENATE AMENDMENT NO. 656 TO H.R. 7152

Title X--Establishment of Community Relations Service

Sec. 1001. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce a Community Relations Service (hereinafter referred to as the "Service"), which shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for a term of four years. The Director is authorized to appoint, subject to the civil service laws and regulations, such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Service to carry out its functions and duties, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Director is further authorized to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55 (a)), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$75 per diem.

(b) Section 106 (a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2205 (a)), is further amended by adding the following clause thereto: "(52) Director, Community Relations Service."

Sec. 1002. It shall be the function of the Service to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which impair the rights of persons in such communities under the Constitution or laws of the United States or which affect or may affect interstate commerce. The Service may offer its services in cases of such disputes, disagreements, or difficulties whenever, in its judgment, peaceful relations among the citizens of the community involved are threatened thereby, and it may offer its services either upon its own motion or upon the request of an appropriate State or local official or other interested person.

Sec. 1003. (a) The Service shall, whenever possible, in performing its functions, seek and utilize the cooperation of appropriate State or local, public or private, agencies.

(b) The activities of all officers and employees of the Service in providing conciliation assistance shall be

conducted in confidence and without publicity, and the Service shall hold confidential any information acquired in the regular performance of its duties upon the understanding that it would be so held. No officer or employee of the Service shall engage in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions of any Department or agency in any litigation arising out of a dispute in which he acted on behalf of the Service. Any officer or other employee of the Service, who shall make public in any manner whatever any information in violation of this subsection, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year.

Sec. 1004. Subject to the provisions of sections 205 and 1003 (b), the Director shall, on or before January 31 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of the activities of the Service during the preceding fiscal year.

Source: U.S., Congress, Senate, Senator Dirksen speaking for Amendment of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1964, H.R. 7152, 88th Cong, 2d sess., 26 May 1964, Congressional Record 110:11934-11935.

APPENDIX H

TITLE X, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Title X--Establishment of Community Relations Service

Sec. 1001. (a) There is hereby established in and as a part of the Department of Commerce a Community Relations Service (hereinafter referred to as the "Service"), which shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for a term of four years. The Director is authorized to appoint, subject to the civil service laws and regulations, such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Service to carry out its functions and duties, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Director is further authorized to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55 (a)), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$75 per diem.

(b) Section 106 (a) of the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2005 (a)), is further amended by adding the following clause thereto: "(52) Director, Community Relations Service."

Sec. 1002. It shall be the function of the Service to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which impair the rights of persons in such communities under the Constitution or laws of the United States or which affect or may affect interstate commerce. The Service may offer its services in cases of such disputes, disagreements, or difficulties whenever, in its judgment, peaceful relations among the citizens of the community involved are threatened thereby, and it may offer its services either upon its own motion or upon the request of an appropriate State or local official or other interested person.

Sec. 1003. (a) The Service shall, whenever possible, in performing its functions, seek and utilize the cooperation of appropriate State or local, public, or private agencies.

(b) The activities of all officers and employees of the Service in providing conciliation assistance shall be conducted in confidence and without publicity, and the Service shall hold confidential any information acquired in the regular performance of its duties upon the understanding that it would be so held. No officer or employee of the Service shall engage in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions of any department or agency in any litigation arising out of a dispute in which he acted on behalf of the Service. Any officer or other employee of the Service, who shall make public in any manner whatever any information in violation of this subsection, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year.

Sec. 1004. Subject to the provisions of sections 205 and 1003 (b), the Director shall, on or before January 31 of each year, submit to the Congress a report of the activities of the Service during the preceding fiscal year.

Source: U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, 1964, 1968; Voting Rights Act of 1965; and Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970, 91st Cong., 2d sess., p. 41.

APPENDIX I

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1966

Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, February 10, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, 63 Stat. 203, as amended.*

Community Relations Service

Sec. 1. Transfer of the Service. Subject to the provisions of this reorganization plan, the Community Relations Service now existing in the Department of Commerce under the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Pub.L. No. 88-352, July 2, 1964), including the office of Director thereof, is hereby transferred to the Department of Justice.

Sec. 2. Transfer of functions. All functions of the Community Relations Service, and all functions of the Director of the Community Relations Service, together with all functions of the Secretary of Commerce and the Department of Commerce with respect thereto, are hereby transferred to the Attorney General.

Sec. 3. Incidental transfers. (a) Section 1 hereof shall be deemed to transfer to the Department of Justice the personnel, property, and records of the Community Relations Service and the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds available or to be made available to the Service.

(b) Such further measures and dispositions as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall deem to be necessary in order to effectuate the transfers referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall be carried out in such manner as he shall direct and by such agencies as he shall designate.

*Effective April 22, 1966, under the provisions of section 6 of the act; published pursuant to section 11 of the act (63 Stat. 203; 5 U.S.C. 133z).

Source: Code of Federal Regulations, Title 3, 1966-1970, p. 1020.

APPENDIX J

QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO
COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Instructions

As an employee, or former employee, of the Community Relations Service, you will recall that the agency from 1970-1973 worked to develop and implement programs in the areas of administration of justice, communications, economic development, education, and housing.

Below you will find five (5) groups of questions which attempt to measure the types of activity in which you engaged during your participation in the development and implementation of these programs. If you would answer these questions to the best of your recollection, I would be most appreciative.

If you feel that a question describes an activity in which you engaged, mark the yes column; if you did not engage in such activity, mark the no column; if you do not recall the answer to a particular question, mark the do not know column.

<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Do Not Know</u>
Did you work to redress the grievances faced by minorities?	—	—	—
Did you work to improve the political power and economic well-being of minorities?	—	—	—
Did you attempt to counter or eradicate the political inequalities in American society?	—	—	—
Did you ever seek to alter the organizational structure of CRS in order to more adequately serve minorities?	—	—	—
Did you work to improve the quality of life for all American citizens?	—	—	—

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Do Not Know</u>
In your work did you feel that you were an advocate of change?	—	—	—
Were you more concerned with serving the people than with fulfilling the wishes of your superiors within the agency?	—	—	—
Did you feel that the work that you were doing was for the public good or for the benefit of the American people in general?	—	—	—
Did you view your job as more than primarily a means of earning a living?	—	—	—
Did you become a CRS employee because of the values which you held?	—	—	—
Did you feel that your work at CRS was a reflection of your personal values?	—	—	—

Group 2

In regard to the people served by the CRS, did you ever attempt to transform feelings of political hopelessness and despair into political meaningfulness and relevance?	—	—	—
Did you ever engage in any activity which you would describe as collection of data for policy analysts?	—	—	—
Could the work you did be described as a link between centralized, comprehensive planning and decentralized administrative implementation?	—	—	—
Do you feel that you worked to develop effective, equitable, and relevant solutions to pressing technical, logistical, sociopolitical, and ethical problems?	—	—	—
In your work were you guided by a sense of social responsibility?	—	—	—
Would you say that social equity was a guiding principle in the work you personally did?	—	—	—

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Do Not Know</u>
Did you attempt to insure that social equity was a guiding principle in the work of other CRS employees?	---	---	---
Did you utilize the resources of CRS to strengthen the growth of intangible, subjectively defined values of the agency's clientele?	---	---	---
<u>Group 3</u>			
Did you attempt to make the federal bureaucracy and the state bureaucracy, in the state where you worked, representative of the component elements of society?	---	---	---
Did you attempt to improve the position of minority elements of society within the federal bureaucracy and the state bureaucracy, in the state in which you worked?	---	---	---
Did you feel that the ethnic background of individuals should be taken into consideration in filling governmental (civil service) positions?	---	---	---
Did you work to increase the number of minorities in governmental positions at the federal and state levels?	---	---	---
Did you seek to represent (speak for) groups not involved in the policy-making processes of government?	---	---	---
<u>Group 4</u>			
Do you feel that you used your professional skills and official standing on behalf of the least powerful and wealthy members of society?	---	---	---
Did you ever criticize the agency (CRS) in defense of the clientele group which you served?	---	---	---
In your work, were your actions based on a strong commitment to the poor?	---	---	---

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Do Not Know</u>
Did you encourage a wide range (different races and ethnic groups) of public participation in the programs in which you worked?	—	—	—
Did you especially encourage minority citizen participation in the programs with which you worked?	—	—	—
Did you encourage neighborhood control of publicly funded programs?	—	—	—
Did you work to protect minority rights?	—	—	—
<u>Group 5</u>			
Were you intent on transforming some aspects of community life according to pre-conceived notions of the ideal society?	—	—	—
Were you a policy formulator who was ready with possible strategies to meet the unknown?	—	—	—
Were you ready to accept new ideas of social change?	—	—	—
Were you ready to push others into accepting new ideas of social change?	—	—	—
In crisis situations, were you slow to burn but quick to act?	—	—	—
Were you capable of immediate improvisations in crisis situations?	—	—	—
In the programs with which you worked, were you able to shape new courses and adopt ongoing arrangements?	—	—	—
Did you treat staff personnel under you with respect?	—	—	—
Do you feel that you administered even-handed justice in your treatment of staff personnel?	—	—	—
Were you responsive to public needs and a champion of public causes?	—	—	—

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Do Not Know</u>
Did you feel that you were an administrator who ensured effective program performance with the minimum of political embarrassment?	—	—	—
Were you skilled at choosing among competing interests and reconciling all parties to the outcome?	—	—	—
Do you feel that you were skilled at building up public support for the programs with which you worked?	—	—	—
Were you ready to assume responsibility for the success or failure of the programs with which you worked?	—	—	—
Did you give clear instructions to the people who worked under you?	—	—	—
Was it difficult for others, who wanted to make up your mind for you, to lead you astray?	—	—	—
Did you avoid becoming discouraged by adversity?	—	—	—
Were you able to command attention and stimulate subordinates?	—	—	—

APPENDIX K

QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO
LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS AND CLIENTELE

Instructions

As one who worked with the Community Relations Service in the development of programs in the areas of administration of justice, communications, economic development, education, and housing, you will recall that the agency abandoned these programs in 1973.

Listed below are several possible reasons why the agency abandoned these programs. If you feel one of the alternatives listed is, indeed, the reason why they were abandoned, check the space provided. You may comment or elaborate upon any of the alternatives chosen in the space provided.

If you feel that the programs were abandoned for some reason other than one of the alternatives provided, please write in the reason in the space provided.

The programs of the Community Relations Service in the areas of administration of justice, communications, economic development, education, and housing were abandoned in 1973 because:

- a) they did not have adequate presidential support. ___

Comment:

- b) they did not have adequate congressional support. ___

Comment:

- c) they duplicated or interfered with programs carried on by other federal agencies. ___

Comment:

d) they were opposed by elected officials
at the state level. —

Comment:

e) they were opposed by elected officials
at the local level (city or county). —

Comment:

f) they were opposed by community groups or
clienteles at the local level (city or
county). —

Comment:

g) they were abandoned for some other reason. —

Comment:

APPENDIX L

CHI SQUARE CALCULATIONS FOR NEW PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION ROLES*

Social Equity Advocate

Statement	o	e	o-e	(o-e) ²	$\frac{(o-e)^2}{e}$
1	18	18	0	0	.00
2	18	18	0	0	.00
3	18	18	0	0	.00
4	18	18	0	0	.00
5	18	18	0	0	.00
6	17	18	-1	1	.06
7	17	18	-1	1	.06
8	16	18	-2	4	.22
9	16	18	-2	4	.22
10	13	18	-5	25	1.39
11	8	18	-10	100	5.56
					$\chi^2=7.51$

Change Agent

1	18	18	0	0	.00
2	18	18	0	0	.00
3	18	18	0	0	.00
4	17	18	-1	1	.06
5	14	18	-4	16	.06
6	12	18	-6	36	2.00
7	11	18	-7	49	2.70
8	8	18	-10	100	5.60
					$\chi^2=10.42$

Representative Bureaucrat

Statement	o	e	o-e	(o-e) ²	$\frac{(o-e)^2}{e}$
1	16	18	-2	4	.22
2	15	18	-3	9	.50
3	13	18	-5	25	1.39
4	12	18	-6	36	2.00
5	12	18	-6	36	2.00
					$\chi^2=6.11$

Advocacy Administrator

1	18	18	0	0	.00
2	17	18	-1	1	.06
3	17	18	-1	1	.06
4	17	18	-1	1	.06
5	16	18	-2	4	.22
6	15	18	-3	9	.50
7	11	18	-7	49	2.72
					$\chi^2=3.62$

Non-Consolidating Bureaucrat

1	18	18	0	0	.00
2	18	18	0	0	.00
3	18	18	0	0	.00
4	18	18	0	0	.00
5	17	18	-1	1	.06
6	16	18	-2	4	.22
7	15	18	-3	9	.50
8	15	18	-3	9	.50
9	15	18	-3	9	.50
10	15	18	-3	9	.50
11	14	18	-4	16	.89
12	13	18	-5	25	1.39
13	13	18	-5	25	1.39
14	12	18	-6	36	2.00
15	12	18	-6	36	2.00
16	9	18	-9	81	4.50
17	9	18	-9	81	4.50
18	7	18	-11	121	6.72
					$\chi^2=25.67$

*In calculating the chi square values, o equals the observed values in the attitude scale and e equals the expected value of each item in the attitude scale.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Altshuler, Alan A. Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities. New York: Pegasus, 1970.
- Berkley, George E. The Administrative Revolution: Notes on the Passing of Administrative Man. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Bailey, Stephen K. "Objectives of the Theory of Public Administration." In Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods, pp. 128-139. Edited by James C. Charlesworth. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968.
- Biddle, Bruce J. and Thomas, Edwin J., eds. Role Theory: Concepts and Research. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Caiden, Gerald E. The Dynamics of Public Administration: Guidelines to Current Transformations in Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971.
- Charlesworth, James C., ed. Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968.
- Dvorin, Eugene and Simmons, Robert. From Amoral to Humane Bureaucracy. San Francisco: Canfield Publishing Company, 1972.
- Elden, James M. "Radical Politics and the Future of Public Administration in the Postindustrial Society." In Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, pp. 19-42. Edited by Dwight Waldo. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.
- Ericksen, Gerald E. Scientific Inquiry in the Behavioral Sciences. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1970.
- Frederickson, H. George. "Toward a New Public Administration." In Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective, pp. 309-331. Edited by Frank Marini. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.

- Friedland, Edward I. "Turbulence and Technology: Public Administration and the Role of Information-Processing Technology." In Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, pp. 134-150. Edited by Dwight Waldo. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.
- Gawthrop, Louis C. Administrative Politics and Social Change. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.
- Gordon, P. "A Decisive Direction for a New Public Administration." Berkeley: Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of California, 1969.
- Gross, Neal; Mason, Ward S.; and McEachern, Alexander W. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Henderson, Keith M. Synthesis in American Public Administration. 2d ed. New York: Asia Publishing House, (forthcoming).
- Kingsley, J. Donald. Representative Bureaucracy. Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1944.
- Krislov, Samuel. Representative Bureaucracy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- LaPorte, Todd R. "The Recovery of Relevance in the Study of Public Organization." In Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective, pp. 17-48. Edited by Frank Marini. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.
- Mainzer, Louis C. Political Bureaucracy. Glenview, Ill: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1973.
- Marini, Frank, ed. Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.
- Meade, Marvin. "'Participative' Administration--Emerging Reality or Wishful Thinking?." In Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, pp. 169-187. Edited by Dwight Waldo. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.
- Mosher, Frederick C. "The Public Service in the Temporary Society." In Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, pp. 234-256. Edited by Dwight Waldo. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.
- _____, ed. American Public Administration: Past, Present, and Future. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1975.

- Murphy, Walter E. and Tanenhaus, Joseph. The Study of Public Law. New York: Random House, 1972.
- Naftalin, Arthur. "Conference Discussion on the Objectives of the Theory of Public Administration." In Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods, pp. 149-164. Edited by James C. Charlesworth. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968.
- Newcomb, Theodore; Turner, Ralph H.; and Converse, Philip E. Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.
- Redford, Emmette S. "Comment on Bailey's Paper." In Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods, pp. 145-148. Edited by James C. Charlesworth. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968.
- Schick, Allen. "The Trauma of Politics: Public Administration in the Sixties." In American Public Administration: Past, Present, and Future, pp. 142-180. Edited by Frederick C. Mosher. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1975.
- Shaw, Marvin E. and Wright, Jack M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Thompson, Victor. Bureaucracy and the Modern World. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1976.
- _____. Without Sympathy or Enthusiasm. University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1975.
- Waldo, Dwight. "Foreword." In Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective, pp. xiii-xix. Edited by Frank Marini. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.
- _____. "Scope of the Theory of Public Administration." In Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods, pp. 1-26. Edited by James C. Charlesworth. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968.
- _____. "Some Thoughts on Alternatives, Dilemmas, and Paradoxes in a Time of Turbulence." In Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence, pp. 257-285. Edited by Dwight Waldo. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.
- _____, ed. Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.

Zimring, Bob. "Empirical Theory and the New Public Administration." In Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective, pp. 225-233. Edited by Frank Marini. Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971.

Periodicals

- Banovetz, James M. "Needed: New Experiences in Public Administration." Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):321-324.
- Bjur, Wesley E. "What is the New Public Administration?." Public Administration Review 30 (March/April 1970): 202-203.
- Heady, Ferrell. "Higher Education for Public Service: Introductory Comment." Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):292-293.
- Honey, John C. "A Report: Higher Education for Public Service." Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):294-321.
- Miles, Rufus E., Jr. "The Search for Identity of Graduate Schools of Public Affairs." Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):343-356.
- Mosher, Frederick C. "The Universities and the Problems of the Cities." Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):325-328.
- Mulligan, J. Kenneth. "A View from Washington." Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):328-334.
- Najjar, George K. "Development Administration and 'New' Public Administration: A Convergence of Perspectives." Public Administration Review 34 (November/December 1974):584-587.
- Page, Richard S. "A New Public Administration?." Public Administration Review 29 (May/June 1969):303-304.
- Poynter, Henrietta and Nelson, eds. Congressional Quarterly Almanac 16 (1960):295, 19 (1963):334-358, 20 (1964): 338-380.
- Reining, Henry, Jr. "A Reversal of Emphasis." Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):334-337.
- Sherman, Harvey. "Some Questions About the Question." Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967):337-339.

- Sumek, Lyle J. and Reinow, Franklin D. "New Public Administration: For a Time of Crisis--In a Time of Change." Midwest Review of Public Administration 4 (August 1970):108-111.
- Van Riper, Paul R. "Hit 'Em Harder, John, Hit 'Em Harder!." Public Administration Review 27 (November 1967): 339-342.
- Waldo, Dwight. "Developments in Public Administration." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 404 (1972):217-245.
- _____. "Public Administration in a Time of Revolutions." Public Administration Review 28 (July/August 1968): 362-368.
- Wilcox, Robert F. "The New P.A.: Have Things Really Changed That Much?." Public Management 53 (March 1971):4-7.

Public Documents

- Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1966. Code of Federal Regulations, Title 3 (1966-1970).
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1966, Hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1967, Hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1968, Hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 90th Cong., 2d sess., 1968.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1969, Hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 91st Cong., 1st sess., 1969.

- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1970, Hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 91st Cong., 2d sess., 1970.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1971, Hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 92d Cong., 1st sess., 1971.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1972, Hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 92d Cong., 2d sess., 1972.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1973, Hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1974, Hearings before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 93d Cong., 2d sess., 1974.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Budgetary Cuts in the Community Relations Service, Hearings before the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Civil Rights. Hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary, 86th Cong., 1st sess., 1959.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Civil Rights. Hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963.
- U.S. Congress. House. Representative Randall speaking for the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1964. H.R. 7152, 88th Cong., 2d sess., 10 February 1964. Congressional Record, vol. 110.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, 1964, 1968; Voting Rights Act of 1965; and Voting Rights Act Amendments of 1970. 91st Cong., 2d sess., 1970.

- U.S. Congress. Senate. A Bill to Establish a Community Relations Service to Provide Conciliation Assistance in Communities Where Disagreements or Difficulties Among Citizens are Disrupting, or are Threatening to Disrupt, the Peaceful Life of the Community; to Extend the Commission on Civil Rights; to Provide Further Means of Securing and Protecting the Right to Vote; and for Other Purposes, S. 499, 86th Cong., 1st sess., 1959.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1966, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1967, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1968, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 90th Cong., 2d sess., 1968.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1969, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 91st Cong., 1st sess., 1969.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1970, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 91st Cong., 2d sess., 1970.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1971, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. 92d Cong., 1st sess., 1971.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1972, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 92d Cong., 2d sess., 1972.

- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1973, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Appropriations. Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations for 1974, Hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. 93d Cong., 2d sess., 1974.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Civil Rights--1959. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 86th Cong., 1st sess., 1959.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Civil Rights--The President's Program, 1963. Hearings before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Senator Dirksen speaking for amendment of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1964. H.R. 7152, 88th Cong., 2d sess., 26 May 1964, Congressional Record, vol. 110.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Senator Johnson speaking for the bill to establish a Community Relations Service. S. 499, 86th Cong., 1st sess., 20 January 1959, Congressional Record, vol. 105.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Community Relations Service. A New Community Resource: National Citizens Committee for Community Relations. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Community Relations Service. Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Secretary of Commerce, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1965.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Community Relations Service. National Citizens Committee Bulletin 4 (September 13, 1965).
- U.S. Department of Justice. Attorney General. Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1966.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Attorney General. Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1967.

- U.S. Department of Justice. Attorney General. Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1968.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Attorney General. Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1969.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Attorney General. Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1970.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Attorney General. Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1971.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Attorney General. Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1972.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Attorney General. Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1973.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Attorney General. Annual Report of the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1974.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Community Relations Service. Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1966.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Community Relations Service. Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1967.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Community Relations Service. Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1968.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Community Relations Service. Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1969.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Community Relations Service. Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1970.

- U.S. Department of Justice. Community Relations Service. Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1971.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Community Relations Service. Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1972.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Community Relations Service. Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1973.
- U.S. Department of Justice. Community Relations Service. Annual Report of the Director of the Community Relations Service to the Attorney General of the United States, for the Fiscal Year Ended 30 June 1974.
- U.S. President. Office of Management and Budget. The Budget of the United States Government--Fiscal Year 1974. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.
- U.S. President. Office of Management and Budget. Special Analyses: Budget of the United States Government--Fiscal Year 1974. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.
- U.S. President. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, 1961-John F. Kennedy, 1963.
- U.S. President. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, 1963-Lyndon B. Johnson, 1963.
- U.S. President. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, 1963-Lyndon B. Johnson, 1964.
- U.S. President. Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, 1963-Lyndon B. Johnson, 1965.

Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government. Civil Rights and Legal Wrongs. Quoted in U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Civil Rights. Hearings before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary, 88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963.

Newspapers

Delaney, Paul. "Nixon Reported Planning to End the Community Relations Service, a Racial Mediation Agency." New York Times, 8 January 1973, sec. 15, p. 1.

Lyons, Richard L. "Civil Rights Unit Cutback Criticized." Washington Post, 13 January 1973, sec. 1, p. 3.

Rosenthal, Jack. "Large Social Cuts." New York Times, 30 January 1973, sec. 1, p. 5.

Ungar, Sanford J. "Budget Cuts Peril Racial Mediators." Washington Post, 13 January 1973, sec. 1, p. 4.

Unpublished Materials

Frederickson, H. George. "Is the Minnowbrook Perspective Representative?" Paper presented to American Society for Public Administration annual conference, Miami, May, 1969.

_____. "The Case for Social Equity in New Public Administration." (Mimeographed).

Gawthrop, Louis C. "Toward a New Public Administration." Paper presented to American Society for Public Administration annual conference, Los Angeles, September, 1970.

White, Orion, Jr. and Marini, Frank. "Toward a New Public Administration--Theory and Politics." (Mimeographed).