

the United States as a member of its committee on the church and economic life.

The National Council of Churches is composed of 33 member Protestant and Orthodox Christian denominations, which in turn have an aggregate of 42 million members. I mention this merely to indicate what kind of organization the National Council of Churches is and not to imply that I am attempting to speak for all these denominations or their members. I am speaking on behalf of the general board of the National Council of Churches, which is its governing body. The general board is composed of representatives of the member denominations in proportion to their respective membership, selected by the denominations according to their own procedures. It numbers 255 members, and includes men and women, both clergy and laity.

The general board meets three times a year to set policy for the National Council of Churches. One way in which it sets policy is by acting on policy statements proposed after careful study by program units subsidiary to the general board but composed, like it, of denominational representatives of specialized competence.

It is in one of these, the committee on church and economic life, that the policy on which this testimony is based originated. For 2 years, a study committee of economists and other specialists worked on the subject of guaranteed income, and their recommendations formed the basis of the policy adopted by the general board after deliberation, debate, and amendment by the program board of the division of Christian life and mission, an intermediate representative body.

I cite this history to indicate that this policy was not arrived at hastily, impulsively, or inadvisedly. When finally acted upon by the general board, the vote was 107 for, one against, with two abstentions.

Madam Chairman, I think perhaps I will not read all of this. It is in your record. I would like rather to make some comments.

Representative GRIFFITHS. We shall be glad to have your comments, and your statement will be printed in the record in full.

Mr. TYSON. I note the question of values has been touched on by three of your speakers. In terms of specificity, the language of social ethics raises this question concerning guaranteed annual income: Why should a rich man's cat lap cream while a poor man's son suffers from malnutrition? Or why should the least advantaged in society function to stabilize the rate of inflation? Why should those persons be the safety valve of the economy?

Now, to raise this kind of a question is not an idle exercise in axiology. The answer is fraught with social and political consequences. It challenges our inherited values supporting our national economic policy.

I would like to limit my remarks to two major points. The first is that transfer payments must be seen as an investment in personality development and in household security. Very briefly, I will sketch a microanalysis of the value system of the ordinary household—that is, a family unit which produces motivated children who are capable of enjoying life, of exercising their social privileges, and of meeting their social obligations.

The fundamental proposition concerning the household is that its basic goal is a noneconomic function. Too often, we define these functions in terms of economy only, which then skews our analysis in terms