REHABILITATION ISSUES: NEW MISSIONS AND MANDATES

Dale C. Williamson Herbert Leibowitz

Severe disability . . . consumer involvement . . . accountability . . . comprehensive needs . . . affirmative action . . . cooperative programming . . . these are keynotes which provide the basis for a new orchestration of mission and mandate reflected in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and its amendments. These themes, which attempt to revitalize and refine the impact of the half-century-old rehabilitation program, have special meaning as we prepare to look at present aspects and future development of rehabilitation in Hawaii and the Pacific Basin.

It is particularly significant that Educational Perspectives, a scholarly journal, provides the forum for a sharing of ideas. If we are to provide meaningful services to the disabled citizens of Hawaii and the Pacific Basin, we must begin to explore and understand research and training issues unique to the area's cultures and geography.

The articles in this issue will describe current rehabilitation programming and training in Hawaii and the Pacific Basin. We would also like to raise some of the questions that remain unanswered, and which continue to challenge our desire to fulfill and expand rehabilitation's potential.

How accurate is our understanding of disability within the cultures of Hawaii and the Pacific Basin? What additional information is necessary to adequately define rehabilitation in these off-mainland settings? Is there a role for the extended family in the rehabilitation process?

What is the meaning of consumer involvement within the cultures and personalities of Hawaii and the Pacific Basin? What is the potential for home-based industry on the islands? What can we learn from and share with our Asian and Australian neighbors?

Can we develop new and creative approaches to the delivery of rehabilitation services in this rapidly-developing region? How can we create innovative and experimental training programs focused on fulfilling client needs? How can we best use the indigenous, supportive socio-cultural elements to enhance the rehabilitation process in Hawaii and the Pacific Basin?

These questions are just a few of the many that challenge our resourcefulness as we begin to plan effective ways to carry out the new mission of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.

Our questions and the Act's guidelines are closely intertwined. Answers to our questions will enable the most effective and meaningful implementation of the mandate in this unique geographic area. We must focus research, demonstration, and training activities on support of fruitful programs. Hopefully, this issue of Educational Perspectives will provide a foundation for mutual endeavor among the University, State and private rehabilitation agencies, and allied academic and research interests as we look toward the fullest development of rehabilitation potential in Hawaii and the Pacific Basin.

Dale C. Williamson is Director, Office of Rehabilitation
Services (Region IX), and has worked within the Department of
Health, Education and Welfare since 1964. Receiving his B.A.
in Psychology and M.A. in Counseling from the University of
California at Berkeley, with additional graduate study at the
London School of Economics, Mr. Williamson was previously
Vocational Advisor for the Veteran's Administration with the
California Department of Rehabilitation.

Herbert Leibowitz is Research and Training Consultant, Office of Rehabilitation Services (Region IX), Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Receiving his M.S.W. from the University of Southern California (1950), and his Doctorate in Education from Columbia (1961), Dr. Leibowitz, before joining HEW in 1971, was Regional Director, Peace Corps (Bombay, India); Lecturer and Head, Staff Development Program (U.C.-Berkeley); and Personnel Director, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers (New York City).