

ing perfectly legal procedures and still treat citizens unfairly because its monopolist position enables it to ignore individual complaints.

The Institute for Local Self Government has concluded and we have so reported in its research for the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, that the social tensions and disturbances which beset our times will not be alleviated simply by improving mechanisms for the redress of grievances. Many of the ills of our time, of which the alienation of citizens from the governments meant to serve them is but a symptom, call for solutions which are essentially political. This committee's deliberations should proceed with the full understanding that neither improved grievance procedures, nor legal services or information and referral agencies can be expected to cope with basic social disorders. Profound social and economic dislocations call for political solutions. While we who deal with citizens' perplexities and grievances may be able at times to identify the underlying causes of distrust and discontent, such identification will not erase the main imperfections in contemporary America. My point, sir, is that both the political solutions and the improvement of complaint machinery must proceed simultaneously, both are essential if we are to make progress in the long struggle of mankind to convert the polls of the Greek city-State into cosmopolis—the state neither of the Athenians or the Romans, but of the human race; the state in which men at last may resolve the eternal riddle of liberty under law.

This committee's opinions and recommendations concerning the utility of an ombudsman on a selective basis with reference to specific Federal agencies can be supported by those of us who may be considered ombudsmaniacs. It is fully in line with the suggestions of the report of the 32d American Assembly held at Arden House in New York, 3 months ago. In preparing that report, "The Ombudsman," a very distinguished group of Americans debated ombudsmanic ideas for 3 days and agreed to "* * * Recommend that application of the concept be undertaken at the Federal level." I am certain that this committee has had access to the report and that the list of over 50 truly outstanding participants in its preparation lends sanction to the highest magnitude to the discussions here this morning.

Senator LONG. If the witness would pardon an interruption at this time, I would like to place in the record the report of the American Assembly that you referred to. Without objection it will be done.

(Report referred to above follows:)

THE OMBUDSMAN—The American Assembly, Columbia University

(Report of the Thirty-Second American Assembly, October 26-29, 1967,
Arden House, Harriman, New York)

PREFACE

On October 26, 1967, the Thirty-second American Assembly—on *The Ombudsman*—opened at Arden House, on the Harriman (New York) campus of Columbia University. There were 72 participants from the worlds of business, education, communications, labor, and government; and from the clerical, legal and military professions.

For three days, in small discussion groups, they considered in depth various aspects of citizen grievance and redress vis-à-vis government (local, state, and federal); and on the fourth day in plenary session they reviewed and approved the report contained in these pages.