

could say it is physical to move a pencil across a page, and if a poet can find a market for his poems, that is work.

Mr. HAYES. That is what I am saying, that that kind of contribution will be increased in the future rather than the increase of the type of work that we usually refer to as labor. This is why I am agreeing with you, I think, in what you are saying.

Monsignor CORCORAN. I think that this designation of the term "work" grows out of the effort we were making to try to get it away from the original industrial revolution concept of work. And even in our society today, that "work" has a certain relationship to and is given a value in terms of its productivity of material goods. This attitude gives a lesser value to work such as the service categories.

Now, poets are not really considered of very much worth in our society. What I am just trying to do is trying to explain the reason why that statement was there.

Representative RUMSFELD. Well, what percentage of the people in the country are actually involved, personally, in producing something?

Monsignor CORCORAN. It is less and less, and that is the point. But at the same time, in the general attitude of people, this is still the primary value type of work in their minds.

In other words, we would not be saying that the other type is not work in the broad sense and that is the reason why I frequently speak of work in the broad sense, referring to all types of employment including the service categories and everything. But in the very technical sense work throughout the growth of our present economy was considered a production type of work. Even in my memory, someone who was going to some other type of thing, more of a service category, was not considered too high on the scale.

Representative RUMSFELD. As you talk and elaborate, I sense that possibly, we are not as far apart as it might have seemed as to what is going to come in future years. Notwithstanding that fact, I have to question why you relate that premise to this particular program. It seems to me the program would have to stand or fall on something apart from that, because I do not see anything about this program—maybe you can elaborate on this—that will offer any better substitute for what presently exists for having the society adjust and in fact recognize and reward new things that previously had a lower level of reward or recognition. If in fact there is an increasing need or desire for poems, to take something that is not work under your definition—it would be terribly hard for me—then I would suspect that the society would adjust and if there were a demand for poems and a desire for poems, there would be more books on poems and more people would become interested in writing poems and the reward for writing poems—fame, dollars, whatever it may be—would automatically adjust. Is this not true?

If your concern is matching people with the needs in a changing society, which is what I sensed you suggested was a problem today, and indeed it is, then I am asking what is a better substitute than what we have? What we have is not perfect. But to those who would suggest that it is not perfect, I guess, falls the responsibility to suggest what is better. I get the feeling you are suggesting this is better and I do not see what the relationship is.

Now, do not ask me to repeat that. I could never do it.