

000080

*Marvin
Bronken*

*Julie Haber
Miss Minnesota*

REMARKS

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

FOURTH OF JULY SPEECH, 1970

✓ Bob Berglund

Mayor Sundrud

Murphy

*✓ Lowell Sanderson
Model T.*

In Washington last week, a special committee met behind closed doors at the White House with President Nixon in attendance. Their task was to consider the future population growth in the United States.

According to the magazine "U. S. News and World Report" this was their conclusion: "No amount of money or other federal help can reverse or stop the decline of the small towns in rural America." Furthermore, one of the members reported that "efforts to revive the declining farm communities tend to have the opposite effect. For example, these areas often need better schools, but when they get them they discover that better education results in more young people leaving them for

the cities. Subsidies mostly attract low wage industries that tend to produce a lower quality of life."

I say that is bunk. This committee advising the President ought properly be called "The Ghost Town Committee" for that is what it will produce in America. It proposes a policy of non-benign neglect for Americans who live in rural and small-town areas.

A great myth has grown up recently in the United States. It is that we Americans are predominately big-city dwellers. That is simply not so. Only about 16% of all Americans live in cities of more than half a million -- one in every six. Only about 36% of all Americans live in cities of over 50,000 -- about one in three. But two out of three Americans live in either rural areas or towns of less than 50,000.

000082

Of these, about 30% of the population lives in "rural areas" -- in the countryside or in towns of less than 2,500 -- towns like Oklee and Maynard that I am privileged to visit today, and towns like Forest Lake which according to the 1970 Census is now just over the 2,500 mark: 3,198 to be exact.

↳ Yet, apparently, the federal government is preparing to write off these towns. ↳ America expects an additional 75 to 100 million people in the next 30 years. What does this administration propose to do about it? ~~Apparently nothing.~~ And if we do nothing these new Americans will jam up in the turbulent big city areas.

↳ This nation always has had a population policy. Not many years after the first Fourth of July, the President and Congress passed legislation giving land grants in the unsettled areas of the U.S. as payment to veterans of the Revolutionary War. ↳ This

effectively led the people out of the big cities and into the countryside.

We need a population policy in America today just as urgently as we needed it after the Revolutionary War. We need a population policy that enriches rural America, not one that rejects it. This means help for housing for young couples, for families and for the elderly. It means that government contracts and new government facilities should go out to small towns. The government is the largest employer in the nation and relocation of government facilities in the 1970's can do for rural America in the 1970's what the Homestead Act did for rural America in earlier years. It means that state and national governments must help small towns develop elementary, secondary higher education. It means government help to

Agrie Policy

*Health
Hospitals
Recreation*

000084

develop airports and hospitals. It means incentives to bring out business.

All this and much more must be done in the 1970's if America is to grow intelligently in the years ahead. There is a good, decent, prosperous, and creative life to be lived in the small towns of rural America, if only we are wise enough to encourage it.

#####

Rural

Speech

March 5, 1970

MEMORANDUM

FOR: Caryl Conner

FROM: HHH

I have looked over the attached speech. It has some good material, but it's not sufficiently substantive. Orville Freeman wrote an excellent article for the Minnesota Law Review on the urban-rural balance as he called it. It's this sort of material that's what I have in mind, plus what's here. Then, too, the ad copy -- full page -- of the NRECA had about a 10 or 12 point program for rural America which Bob Partridge has failed to take note of -- for example, including a special office of community development in the Federal government.

So we better tune this speech up a bit. It can either be used as a speech or an article. I'd like to have it in reserve.

MEMORANDUM

TO : HHH

FROM : CC

SUBJECT: General Speech on Problems of Rural America

A while ago you suggested that I ask Bob Partridge to help with a speech draft along the lines of the Rural Coop ad. I did, and he has.

I'm going to do some more work on it -- jazz it up a bit -- but before I do so, I'd appreciate having you read it and note any additional points you think should be included.

For example: I think it might be well -- even for rural audiences -- to hit on pollution, on schools (rural schools are often in worse shape than inner city schools) and on inflation to a greater extent.

What do you think?

yes
- Schools
- Health Services

Attachment:

As stated

*We need to take a look at Orville
Freeman's Minor Law Review article
on the Urban-Rural Balance*

Notes for Hubert H. Humphrey

RECOGNIZING NEEDS IN RURAL AMERICA

At a time when so many anguished voices cry out for help in our crowded cities, who speaks for rural America? And how do we go about securing priorities which will look to the future of the whole nation, rather than just of those localities where the concentration of votes appears promising?

There was a time -- just 50 years ago -- when our nation was half rural, half urban. The farm families and rural communities had problems in those days, just as they have problems today -- but they also had more resources to fight for their rights and fulfill their needs.

The scene has changed in recent years. As we enter the decade of the 1970s, the needs of rural America are almost hidden in the shadow of urban needs. We know that over-crowded cities, with all the frustrations of smog, noise, traffic jams, inadequate housing, increasing crime, deteriorated education, and eroded tax base -- all of these -- and the poverty of spirit that goes hand in hand with economic poverty -- all are the product of problems which beset the countryside.

The bright lights of the city promised much that was lacking on the farms and in the small towns. At the top of all expectations was the lure of jobs, of higher income.

When opportunity failed to materialize for people who came to the city ill-equipped for urban life, this nation's economic

and social ills compounded at both ends of the population shift.

Now, 70 percent of our people are crammed onto just one percent of the land -- while abandoned farmhouses and boarded-up stores are left behind in rural America. Is this the good life? Is this the best use we can make of the nation's resources?

We must decide -- and time is almost run out -- we must decide if we want to go on piling more and more people into the fetid city slums. Or are we ready to seek a better balance of opportunity, recognizing that city problems have their origins in the rural problems we have not fully solved!

Anything we do for people who live in the countryside and in towns and crossroads communities helps to relieve pressure at the city center.

The first item on the agenda for strengthening rural America will have to be a wider recognition that every person, wherever he lives, has a stake in what happens to the rural economy and rural living conditions. Some of the farm organizations espouse this point of view. It is a recurring theme in the action program of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. A few observers who write for the mass media have taken heed of this broader approach to people's needs. A few Congressmen and Senators acknowledge the need for a rural agenda in tackling the ~~laundry~~ list of demands for legislation to relieve our economic and social ills.

Last month's Housing Act is a significant step in the effort to replace substandard shelter for rural families. It can be the beginning of a program which must provide decent housing for more than 4 million farm and small town families -- mostly poor and a large proportion of them elderly. A recent survey conducted by the NRECA revealed that 1.6 million, or about 40 percent, of the substandard dwellings in rural areas are occupied by members of the nation's rural electric systems. This is an important finding. Here is the reason why:

The rural electrics are independent, home-grown enterprises providing service in 2,578 of the nation's 3,072 counties. Since they are owned and controlled by the members they serve, they have a very special interest in helping to implement any program that promises better housing. Boards of directors of the rural electric cooperatives, and managers of these systems, know that good legislation has little meaning unless it is interpreted and publicized at the local level and put to work where it is needed.

Rural electrification became reality because local leaders put REA loans to work. They can do this again to upgrade rural housing, urging their members and organizing their neighbors to use financing that will be available through Farmers Home Administration. There is a new Section 524 to Title 5 of the basic Housing Act which authorizes Farmers Home Administration to make loans to local nonprofit associations or corporations to buy and develop land as home sites for families in the lower income brackets.

Financing for homes on these sites then can be obtained from Farmers Home Administration or from Federal Housing Administration. Here, it appears, is an area where rural electric cooperatives can apply their specialized knowledge and resources to help make rural living more attractive, more meaningful.

A somewhat similar opportunity exists in the present lack of community facilities throughout rural America. The last figures I have seen estimate that nearly 30,000 small towns and rural communities are without adequate water systems. Even more communities lack sewers and sewage disposal systems.

These shortcomings in rural America should be placed high on the agenda of any program for local and national attention. In view of our concern for reducing the pollution crisis, we need to give immediate attention to water supply and sewage treatment in rural areas. Again, rural electric cooperatives in many localities have been working with town and county officials and have succeeded in establishing such community services in some localities.

Rural people in the United States have less access to health services and medical care than city people have. Figures from 1966 reported by the Economic Research Service in the Department of Agriculture show urban areas having 54 percent more physicians per population unit than rural areas have. Worse still, specialists such as surgeons and psychiatrists are usually located in cities, where incomes are higher.

If we are serious about recognizing the basic needs of rural America, it might be well to start with the most fundamental problem of all -- jobs and job training. Total agricultural employment declined in almost every year since the end of World War II. The decline in two decades from 1945 to 1965 cut jobs in agriculture by almost half. For nonfarm rural residents the unemployment rate was higher in 1960 than it was for people in cities. A recent report by the Department of Agriculture reveals a change in this discouraging trend. The study shows an increase in employment from 1962 to 1967, amounting to 5.2 percent annually for rural areas compared with a rate of 4 percent for cities.

The lack of job opportunities in rural America holds down income averages and is responsible for the higher ratio of poverty found in the countryside and small towns. In 1960, rural people comprised about 30 percent of the nation's population, but 46 percent of the nation's families with incomes below the \$3,000 level lived in the rural areas. For farm families, median money income was only 57 percent of the U.S. median family income at that time.

While a great effort has been launched in the last decade to provide jobs and job training in rural locations, the need continues to be great.

Here again, rural electric systems are in the forefront among those who are seeking economic development of rural America. In a

7-year period, the REA borrowers helped start 3,300 new businesses and industries in the counties where they serve, creating some 247,000 new jobs.

I am not going to attempt a complete catalog of rural problems we have to solve, but at least one more deserves special listing on the agenda for priority attention. This is the need for low-cost credit. The effects of high interest are most sharply felt in the small towns and rural communities where there is a chronic shortage of capital for housing, for industrial growth, and for such community facilities as water and waste disposal, medical centers, libraries, schools, and recreational centers. Even the rural electric cooperatives and the rural telephone cooperatives are finding themselves hard-pressed for enough capital to keep up with the increasing service demands of their members and of new families and enterprises which are beginning to locate in rural locations.

Low-cost capital may be the key to opening up the wide spaces of rural America to relieve our overcrowded cities. Greatly needed right now is a commitment by officials in Washington and particularly in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. We need their support and their cooperation with local leadership in solving major problems for stimulating growth and achieving prosperity in rural areas along with urban centers. The alternative is to permit intensification of crisis in our cities.



THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

The attached information is forwarded in response to your recent inquiry. We hope it meets your needs in this matter.

Please do not hesitate to call on us for further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lester S. Jayson".

Lester S. Jayson
Director

Towards a National Policy on Balanced Communities

Orville L. Freeman*

During my service as Secretary of Agriculture, the need for nationwide action to correct detrimental trends in domestic population distribution (settlement patterns) became dramatically clear. What I call rural-urban balance—an easy relationship of people, land (space) and economic opportunity, with all the social consequences this involves—had been destroyed in much of the nation. Virtually every aspect of the urban crisis—poverty and welfare, employment, crime, housing and health—could be linked to a migration from rural America that resulted in too many people on too little space.

The cities, their municipal hands full with just the natural increase in their indigenous population, had been thrown off balance by this influx from the countryside, and they have never recovered. Similarly, renewed focus on the unheralded desperation of rural poverty¹ revealed the grim consequences of ignoring the waste and hardship of unplanned and unattended urban migration. Though the shift might be deemed desirable under some economic theory,² the economic pressure which forced people away from the land of their birth and the ultimate negative impact on the rural people who stayed wrote a record of deprivation that was no less cruel than the markings on the wall of the urban ghetto.

At the beginning of the 1960's, no level of government and few Americans in the private sector had shown either understanding or the capacity to anticipate the impact of gross population movements. Historically, this is understandable, since basic to the tensions and frustrations of the latter one-third of the 20th Century has been our failure as a nation, during the first two-thirds of the century, to grasp the implications of the

* Former Secretary of Agriculture.

1. THE PEOPLE LEFT BEHIND. A REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON RURAL POVERTY (1967).

2. This is illustrated, for example, by the insistence of some spokesmen that the farm program will be dismantled so that the free play of market forces will drive "uneconomic" farmers out. This position gives little weight to economic hardships, social costs and the secondary consequences of rapid technological change, a modern expression of the human despoliation described in Goldsmith's *Deserted Village*.

unprecedented technological and productive forces and the resulting change in population patterns that we unleashed. In the short period since World War II, our population has grown by 55 million—37 per cent. The value of goods and services we produce each year has increased from \$280 billion to more than \$800 billion. Three million farms have disappeared in a technological revolution that is still sweeping through agriculture. More than 20 million persons have abandoned the farms and small towns for the city.³ One-third of the population has left the city for the suburbs.

We have been aware that our society is changing, of course, but there has never been any national recognition of what this pell-mell change meant in terms of stresses on our communities, schools, governments, homes, churches, neighborhoods, and on ourselves.⁴ Just as untrammelled laissez-faire economics has long since proven inadequate to regulate the national economy, so have do-nothing policies regarding living space proven inadequate to meet 20th Century human needs. We have failed to plan for change—to develop public and private institutions and attitudes that would shape and control the technological revolution to serve the needs of society. The result has been a national crisis of environment—the relationship between the people and the land—and from this crisis others have erupted all around us.

Seventy per cent of our people now are crowded onto less than two per cent of the land; 30 per cent occupy all the rest, many of them in lonely decline while their city cousins live in overcrowded disorder.

In terms of ability and training, the migrants from rural America to the metropolis have been primarily the best and the worst. The departure of the best sapped the strength and dulled the potential of rural America. The arrival of the worst compounded the problems of cities already sorely tried by problems of growth.⁵

3. U.S. DEP'T OF AGRICULTURE, ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE, C. BEALE, V. BANKS, & G. BOWLES, *TRENDS AND OUTLOOK FOR RURAL MIGRATION* (1966).

4. W. COHEN, *TOWARD A SOCIAL REPORT: REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT* (1969) (from Sec'y of HEW). The report contains recommendations with respect to the establishment of an annual "Social Report" similar to the annual "Economic Report" submitted to the President by his Council of Economic Advisers.

5. *THE PEOPLE LEFT BEHIND. A REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON RURAL POVERTY* (1967).

This imbalance between land and people is evident in the creeping decay in the countryside where communities have lost the economic base to support good schools, doctors, churches, and social services.⁶ It is evident in the congestion, pollution, civic disorder and proliferating ghettos of the metropolis, and in the leap-frog spread of suburbia, paving over the countryside, choking the inner city. It is evident in the unrest and dissatisfaction that spreads across our land like a blight and threatens the very fiber of our nation. Violence has occurred in our colleges and high schools, with young people breaking the law and attacking our national leaders and institutions with vulgar obscenities. Freedom of speech, the most vital requirement of the democratic process itself, is on the defensive. A Presidential Commission⁷ reports that this nation faces the serious danger of a segmented society, one segment white and one black, and a year later finds no progress in dissipating that danger.⁸ Crime has climbed to epidemic proportions—threatening the personal safety of more Americans than ever before in our history.

These conditions are all related. Each feeds the other, and if the trend to megalopolis continues for the next 30 years, 100 million more Americans will be stacked onto the 140 million already living in our cities and suburbs.⁹ The result could be catastrophic. Two editorials from prominent newspapers highlight what is happening. The *New York Times*, on July 28, 1967, editorialized:

... Any man condemned to spend his days and nights without end on East 103rd Street would be likely to "blow his cool" sooner or later, or give up. Men without education or skills haven't much choice.

It will not be enough to patch up old dwellings or build new ones in the more deteriorated city areas. It will be necessary to reshape the total urban environment to make the cities livable for all who work and dwell there. This means restoring the purity of air and water, reducing noise, relieving congestion, creating more parks and recreation areas, improving transportation, enriching the artistic and cultural environment.¹⁰

The *Washington Post* made the following statement regard-

6. U.S. DEP'T OF AGRICULTURE, ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE, *RURAL PEOPLE IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY*, AER 101 (1966).

7. REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS (Mar. 1, 1968) (Kerner Commission Report).

8. KERNER COMMISSION REPORT, FOLLOW-UP (Feb. 27, 1969).

9. U.S. DEP'T OF AGRICULTURE, ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE, *U.S. Population Shift* (unpublished report). See also *Now 200 Million Americans—How Population Explosion Has Changed*, *U.S. News & World Report*, Nov. 6, 1967, at 46.

10. *New York Times*, July 28, 1967, at 30, col. 2.

ing the work of Edward T. Hall, the anthropologist, on the "human space bubble" defined by Hall as a "sacred bit of space, a bit of mobile territoriality which only a few other organisms are allowed to penetrate and then for only short periods of time."¹¹

What Mr. Hall has done is to relate [stress produced by overcrowding] in a very pointed way to human beings. . . . If the human space bubble is repeatedly subjected to battering by outside forces such as overcrowded housing or freeways, the occupant may be thrown into aggressive relationships with those he finds around him, for, according to Mr. Hall:

If man's space bubble is crushed, or dented, or pushed out of shape, he suffers virtually as much damage as though his body were crushed, or dented, or pushed out of shape. The only difference is that the effects take longer to make themselves evident.

The fact is, we have been madly building cities in recent decades with virtually no thought of man's vital need for living space. It should now be apparent that this need is no less acute than the requirements of food, shelter, and transportation. . . . The "space bubble" is not merely a frill or amenity. Nor is its importance primarily aesthetic. It . . . is directly related to the survival of our civilization.

Clearly there is cause for alarm. It is understandable that we are perplexed and frustrated as individuals and as a nation by what is going on around us. No nation in history has ever been so productive or so wealthy. Nearly 180 million Americans out of 200 million are living better than any people in history—more jobs at higher wages, climbing profits, unparalleled economic security, more leisure, better health, better education, better homes and food, more automobiles, more T.V. sets, more electrical appliances and telephones than would have been predicted in our wildest dreams at the end of World War II, only 25 years ago. Yet many Americans fear we have lost our way. The fact that 20 million Americans live in poverty stares us in the face. We can no longer ignore it; modern communications media drums it into our senses. Our conscience is agonized by the knowledge that we have the resources to wipe out poverty and discrimination. Millions of Americans cannot enjoy luxury while others suffer extreme privation. The crisis of the environment also burdens our conscience. Everywhere about us we can see first-hand evidence of how we have despoiled our rivers, lakes, and lands, and polluted the air in our large cities.

Our pangs of conscience as a nation bite deep because we know it need not have happened this way. We could have fol-

11. Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1967, at A22, col. 2.

lowed a sensible people-space policy and shaped our society with consideration for resources, people and space, demanding quality as well as quantity. Instead, we have persisted in piling more and more people in less and less space on economic grounds that have been rendered obsolete by modern transportation and communication. We have been slaves to historic forces that are no longer rational. I do not believe, as do some, that the exodus to megalopolis that has taken place in the last 50 years is inevitable for the future. Certainly, a nation that has successfully explored outer space for 10 years and will soon land a man on the moon has the creative energy and technology to create a life on earth that offers opportunity and something of grace for all—a life of quality to match the quantity that this same energy and technology has produced in such abundant measure.

The first step is recognition of the fact that rural-urban balance is a nationwide challenge. It cannot be met by concentrating on city, suburb, or countryside alone, but only by moving on all three at once, and in the context of the whole nation.¹² That means our planning must be based on nationwide physical, economic, social and cultural geography, not just political geography. We have space to spare if we use it. But we cannot use it properly if, in our planning, this space is constrained by the city limits, the county line or the state border. We need a national settlement policy on the geographic distribution of economic opportunity, jobs and people.

Until we have such a national policy the problems of city and countryside will remain insoluble. The interaction between them will continue to compound the problem of each. Only a common national policy with complementary efforts in city, suburb, and countryside can restore balance to America. It is past time that we recognize these facts and create a national plan which will coordinate a total national effort, designed to use the combined resources of government, business and industry—and 200 million-plus people—to erase the undesirable effects of 50 years of unplanned growth, and to create a new land where Americans can live at ease with each other and with their environment.

I repeat: To do this will take a total national effort with participation at every level of government, the private sector of

12. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, URBAN AND RURAL AMERICA: POLICIES FOR FUTURE GROWTH (1968).

our economy, the professions, and individual men and women and young people everywhere. Only the President of the United States can launch such a national effort. He should do it promptly. Ideally, it would have been done long ago, but public opinion was not ready. Now the people are looking for leadership and action. They recognize intuitively that we cannot continue our unplanned, undirected, helter-skelter course without a national explosion. The American people know we are making grave mistakes, abusing our limited natural resources, and failing to meet the minimum needs of millions of Americans. And they know too, that we have more wealth and know-how than ever before. Growth in the social sciences, management techniques, data retrieval, computer science, automation—all these combined with unprecedented wealth—make it possible to accomplish what was impossible a few years ago.

The average person may not articulate this paradox, but he senses very clearly that as a nation we are falling far short of our potential. The evidence that he is becoming more frustrated and dissatisfied increases every day. Clearly the time has come for a total national effort. The first goal of that effort should be the participation of every American citizen.

If the President of the United States would launch a total national planning effort, new hope and new spirit would quicken the people and the institutions across the nation. Americans still have confidence in themselves and their institutions. They still believe this is the land of progress, that there is no limit to what we can do as a people. Our history justifies that confidence. But lately, characteristic American optimism has been tempered. Increasingly, the question is heard—"have we gotten too big?" "Is it all so complicated that I don't count, that no one person really matters anymore?" A total grassroots challenge to develop a national plan to build a new and better quality America which protects and husbands our natural resources and provides opportunity for all Americans will restore hope by setting accomplishment targets, and with hope comes confidence.¹³

To do this will be to mount a revolution—not the violent

13. This happened in Great Britain after World War II. Much of London was bombed out. The people suffered gravely from the housing shortage. Morale was low. Then a national housing and redevelopment plan was agreed upon. The fact that there was a plan, and with it the assurance that housing was forthcoming, even though the people had to wait a long time, restored confidence and morale at a critical time.

kind, but one just as far-reaching, comprehensive, and pervasive as that of 1776, or the Jacksonian revolution of the last century, or the social revolution of the Thirties. John Fischer described it when he wrote in *Harper's*:

... It may be a time when we find a new national purpose: to resettle the deserted hinterland, to discover ways of moving people and jobs away from megalopolis before it becomes both uninhabitable and ungovernable. It may be a period when we invent new ways to govern the modern state, as we invented the machinery for settling and governing an empty continent 200 years ago.

*Certainly it will be a period of political realignment—possibly more drastic than anything yet imagined either by the despairing youngsters of the New Left or the frightened oldsters of the Extreme Right.*¹⁴

The perimeters of such a national planning effort should be set out by the nation's most able leaders, led by the President of the United States himself. They will want to take into consideration, in developing the "planning plan," what has been done and what has been discussed and proposed to date to restore rural-urban balance to make proper use of the great resource of living space and to rebuild a quality U.S.A.

Considerable machinery has been put in place in the past eight years to restore and create opportunity in town and country America. At the present time, Technical Action Panels serve more than 3,000 rural counties. These panels are made up of government officials—federal, state, and in some cases local—whose primary function is to advise local people on where and how to organize and to plan, and how to get assistance in improving their own communities.

Hundreds of voluntary groups representing multicounty regions are already forming a base for action. At least 30 states have named multicounty regions, many of them primarily rural, with the aim of establishing programs to encourage areawide planning and development. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 provides extensive funds for planning and housing and gives HUD and the Department of Agriculture authority to provide matching funds for comprehensive planning grants in rural areas for multicounty comprehensive planning. Federal support for housing, education, health, and community facilities has been doubled, tripled, and in some cases more than quadrupled in recent years. New and dynamic local leadership is emerging in countless ways all over the nation.

14. Fisher, *A Shipload of Doomed Men*, HARPER'S MAGAZINE, Jan., 1968, at 9, 12 (emphasis added).

Heartening as these developments are, they are but the first of many steps that must be taken, and taken immediately within the framework of a plan for the nation as a whole. To tie together and implement action of local people, regional institutes—located in connection with existing universities outside core cities—might be created to provide research, training of professional planners, and consultant services, each tailored especially for the region in which it is located.

There is a serious lack of research data on population and resource shifts and their impact on communities and regions. There is also a great shortage of trained planners to guide economic and social adjustments and the development of local and regional plans. These institutes should be funded, initially at least, by the federal government because their benefits will cross state lines. Each regional institute would bring together the cooperative efforts of the several states of the region plus assistance from the federal government in a consortium. Research, teaching and training at the consortium would be coordinated with other university efforts in research, training and consulting on community problems.

Such a cooperative effort would provide a focus for regional development and research that can coordinate and intensify the work now in progress; it will increase and upgrade the quality of research and training; it will increase the number and quality of planners familiar with multicounty planning and planning in areas of low population density; and it will make available to local planning groups the talents of experts who are familiar with problems peculiar to that locale. The result would be to provide both more talent and better information to local people who make the short-term development decisions that eventually become long-term development—or chaos.

These institutes, tuned to both national and local planning, could be the vehicles to make the necessary links between the various levels of planning—national to regional, regional to state, state to county, city, suburban and rural. Through such institutions, it should be possible to break the barriers of political boundaries—local, county and state—that stifle the orderly development of the cities and suburbs and choke off the development of town and country America.

Too often there is confusion between jurisdictions of means and ends which constricts the planning necessary to set the course for people who in reality are joined by the same social

and economic circumstances but separated by political boundaries. *We have, as a nation, wasted more political energy arguing about states' rights, local rights, private domains, and federal prerogatives than we can afford. The issue today should be responsibility—not local jurisdictional rights.*

We are today—in the matter of jurisdictional differences in the political structure of the United States—in a position somewhat analogous to that of the men who founded this nation, except that their differences were more profound—differences of heritage, culture and origin. As John Adams wrote in 1755: "The characters of the gentlemen of the four New England Colonies differ from those in the others . . . as much as several distinct nations almost." Then he said this of the difference: "Without the utmost caution on both sides and the most considerate forbearance with one another and prudent condescension on both sides, they certainly will be fatal." That warning, that call to cooperation, is just as timely today—and the consequences of ignoring it will be just as fatal as they would have been during the deliberations of 1775 and 1776.

Under our Constitution, the federal, state and local governments are interrelated parts of a single governmental system. Modern transportation and communication make that much more so today than when the Constitution was written. As our population increases and as our society progresses, the need for government services of increased quantity and quality grows in more than equal proportion. We have reached the point where no single level of government can assume the burden. Each level—federal, state, county, city—must do what it can do best, and as a nation we must determine what each can do best. When it costs twice as much to put another person or automobile in a crowded metropolitan area than in the countryside, the simple arithmetic of the cost-benefit ratio makes it vividly clear that everyone would be better off if both person and car could be located accordingly. The regional institutes will help us to do that.

But plans and expertise are worth nothing without action. Action to develop rural America will require money. Therefore, a special financial institution which could, with the help of the federal government, help develop non-urban, town and country districts should be considered. Such a special Town and Country Development Bank for rural America, similar to the National Urban Development Bank that has been suggested

by many, could be financed through subscription of private funds. Federal underwriting of the unusual risk elements which will be involved in meeting development challenges would provide such a bank with the borrowing and lending authority to do the job. It will take billions of dollars each year.

An appropriation of federal funds would get the bank started. The balance of the funds would come from bonds guaranteed by the federal government, to be sold by the bank to private investors. It would provide for equity participation in the bank's operations. Town and Country Bank funds would be available to both public and private borrowers for programs that cannot be financed through any other means, but which are essential to community development. These banks could:

- a. Fund non-profit community development corporations;
- b. Guarantee loans, made through private lenders, for community and district-wide development;
- c. Offer loans to small businessmen whose contribution to the economy of their communities is limited by lack of financing;
- d. Fund semi-public housing development corporations; and
- e. Provide technical management help in local planning and development.

Such banks, with an assured source of funds, would encourage long-range planning for area development—planning which now is discouraged because the resources to carry out the plans are not available. The boards of these banks would include representatives of local, state, and federal government and private citizens of the community, who would be encouraged to invest in the banks. Essentially, this would be a program of federal underwriting of loans. It could turn loose the powerful engine of credit which can stimulate private initiative to exciting and productive levels.

These, then, would be the basic tools for recreating rural America and restoring rural-urban balance—regional population and planning institutes, to help give direction to local initiative and to coordinate nationwide efforts to take the pressure off urban America, and Town and Country Banks to provide the necessary funds. There are some additional specific questions which also need to be examined. What specifically can be done to give people the chance to live and work outside the city—where the polls show more than 50 per cent want to live if they could find a decent job?

There are eight key elements in a total town and country development program. The first is obvious—jobs created by

rural industrialization. National tax incentives and other means such as special location subsidies and assistance will help attract industry to the countryside. Clean air, clear water, elbow room and a willing work force, which already are there, can be powerful additional inducements. Increasing numbers of industrialists, weary of fighting urban problems,¹⁵ have moved into town and country America, usually in response to the overtures of local communities—those with dynamic local leaders who know what they have to offer and sell it.

The share of new jobs in America that is created in the countryside is increasing. This is an encouraging trend. It does not hurt the big cities. Rather it helps them as it relieves pressure and the galloping costs of meeting the needs of more and more people in less and less space. Future job growth in the cities should come in the commercial and service sectors of the economy rather than from industry. But our national plan must recognize that haphazard industrialization of rural America, to the point where the countryside is just one string of factories, would be to repeat the mistakes that, by inaction, we allowed to happen in our cities and suburbs.

Instead, to achieve our objective of cancelling out our mistakes and building anew, we must insist everywhere on a balanced environment. We cannot afford to pollute the streams which remain, or to deface the beauty of our open spaces, vast as they may seem now. Careful, thoughtful comprehensive local planning on a multicounty basis must be made a national mandate.

The second force for reviving town and country is completely in the hands of the federal government. It lies in the location of Government installations and in the awarding of federal procurement contracts. Federal agencies should take the lead in decentralizing many of their operations to less congested areas. It should be the policy of every department of the federal government, as it has been of the Department of Agriculture since February, 1967:

[T]o locate facilities, offices, and laboratories in areas of lower density population, in preference to higher density population areas, and in areas of persistent or substantial labor surplus,

15. Mr. L.B. Murphy, President of Campbell Soup Company, spoke on this subject before the Detroit Economic Club in 1966. He urged his fellow business colleagues and industrialists to help establish a "Rural-Urban Balance" in America by locating a greater share of their new plants in rural areas.

wherever this can be done without sacrificing essential program objectives and with due consideration being given to the efficient and economical administration of the Department's programs.

In addition, the federal government should use its buying power and its contracting responsibilities to promote the development of nonmetropolitan growth centers as a part of a total national plan of quality development.¹⁶

The third incentive rural America has is the use of the great outdoors—beautiful scenery and the unfrenetic life of the countryside which will promote growing tourism, thus providing income and generating attractive jobs that will keep its people and attract others.

Fourth, the anchor for the well-being of rural America must remain agriculture, which in truth is not only the anchor for the rural economy but vital to the well being of industrial, metropolitan America as well. The basic concept of our current farm program is sound. They should be strengthened and improved by adding meaningful farm bargaining power, a grain reserve, and more efficient integration of feeding programs for poor people to strengthen demand and maintain adequate farm prices.

The fifth element basic to a revitalized town and country is education. The 1960 census showed that more than 19 million rural people had failed to complete high school; more than three million were classified as functional illiterates. Rural education has improved, but proportionately more rural than city youngsters drop out before completing high school and fewer of those who complete high school go to college.¹⁷

Schools in rural areas still lag behind those in the cities in facilities, budgets and teacher pay. The percentage of urban teachers holding Masters degrees is about three times that of rural teachers.¹⁸

This rural educational gap not only handicaps millions of our young people in learning how to live successfully as human beings, but nearly ruins their ability to win the better jobs in a

16. *Regional Growth and Development and Rural Areas*, speech by John H. Southern, Economic Research Service, U.S. Dep't of Agriculture, before the 42d Annual Agricultural Outlook Conference, Nov. 17, 1964.

17. *Education in Rural America—Are We Doing the Job?*, speech by Robert M. Isenberg, Director, Rural Services, Nat'l Educ. Ass'n, before National Outlook Conference on Rural Youth, Oct. 23-26, 1967, Washington, D.C.

society where skills are at a premium. They are denied a chance to choose where to live and work because they are denied a chance to develop their full potential as human beings. No community can grow in this modern world without well-educated people with marketable skills.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Teacher Corps were major steps toward equalizing educational opportunity throughout the nation, but we must go further. Existing federal programs, including the manpower development and training activities of the Labor Department, must be fully funded and fully oriented to the problems and needs of rural communities as well as of urban centers. It is necessary to develop capacity in every nonmetropolitan area to provide a permanent, basic education, as well as training and counseling service for all. A number of states have pioneered the concept of community two-year colleges and training institutes where young people can get more education, make up deficiencies or prepare for jobs requiring special skills. The concept has been proven—the program to carry it out must reach all of rural America. A cooperative federal-state program to establish community colleges accessible to all people living outside the larger cities should be a basic facet of a program to renew town and country communities and restore rural-urban balance.

But more than an educated, stable work force is required to attract industry to rural America. This is the sixth requisite for rural renewal: an adequate supply of physical facilities and services. It will take government loan assistance to provide rural communities with such things as basic central water and waste disposal systems and recreation areas. Without these no area can hope to attract industries or the people to work in them. Some 33,000 rural areas now lack modern central water systems, and 43,000 lack adequate waste disposal systems.¹⁹ They need financial and technical help to develop the public facilities and services they must have before they can even begin to plan for economic growth. The federal government can help in this area. It can also help extend electric power and efficient telephone service to those areas that would require prohibitive sums

18. *Status of Education & Training of Rural Youth: The Impact of Social-Economic Change*, speech by Dr. M. L. Cushman, Dean of School of Education, Univ. of No. Dak., before National Outlook Conference on Rural Youth, Oct. 23-26, 1967, Washington, D.C.

19. STATUS OF WATER AND SEWAGE FACILITIES IN COMMUNITIES WITHOUT PUBLIC SYSTEMS, ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE REPORT 143 (1968).

of private capital to reach. It can expand its program of helping local people develop and use natural resources wisely through watershed and resource conservation and development projects.

While working with and for existing communities in developing opportunity in rural America, our planners should consider moving ahead on the seventh concept for a new America: that of new towns. Columbia, Maryland, is such a town. Planned from the outset as a completely new city to accommodate some 100,000 people, it was designed for people and to serve people's needs. The natural landscape carefully preserved can be enjoyed by all. The basic public facilities are in place. Provisions have been made for schools, churches, libraries, theaters, hotels, medical services, shopping, and jobs. When completed, Columbia will consist of a series of interrelated neighborhoods and villages, each served by centrally located facilities of its own, and the whole city served by a town center where department stores, a concert hall, college, hospital and other appropriate facilities and institutions will be located.

There is room for many of these new towns in the new America, essentially self-contained communities linked to the larger centers by the high speed transit that we have the technology to develop if we will. Our planners might start out by considering where 12 such new towns might be located along the length of Appalachia. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 provides technical assistance and generous federal guarantees for such new towns. They should play a key role in the new plan for America.

These proposals are by no means exclusive. These and other creative ideas should be aimed at the future by our national planners to restore the balance of land and people by putting commerce, industry and agriculture in rural America on a sound footing. If we do that, tens of millions more Americans will be able to find the jobs they need so they can choose where they really want to live.

This a major part of the battle, but another part remains. I would refer one final point to our national planners. There are hundreds of thousands of men and women in rural America who need help now. Unprepared and untrained, unemployed or underemployed, many hungry, they cannot wait for actions that will help them in a few months or longer. They must have interim help now, immediately. For these people, needs are

basic and urgent. This means an all-out effort to provide all Americans in need the basic necessities of food, clothing, shelter and health care. It means giving them access to training that will build their skills and, most important, give them hope, without which no development, community or human, is possible. It means an investment in humanity.

Experience has shown again and again that, beyond simple humanitarianism, rehabilitation of the poor and destitute is an investment with a payoff as high or higher than any other we can make. The recipients go off the relief rolls, onto the tax rolls and into the mainstream of the American economy for a full and productive life. The initial investment in the short run reduces the public burden and adds to the public product in the long run.

What I have set forth is but a rough outline of the course we must take if we are to restore rural-urban balance and cease being pawns of our own progress and slaves of our own technology. There are no simple responses to the problems that beset us, but I believe that the purposeful, planned use of the space and the resources of America, for the people and on a total national basis, holds the solution to the problems of our nation. To provide the jobs, the opportunities, the chance for a choice that the American people are demanding—in the knowledge that we have both the resources and the know-how to meet these demands—we must have balanced community development.

A balanced community, large or small, with an adequate economic base can maintain the requirements needed to keep itself viable. In somewhat simplified terms, this means that adequate education, health care, cultural facilities and community facilities maintain a citizenry capable of working, and working well. In turn, such a work force attracts an economic and tax base that can support education, health, cultural and other community services. A positive cycle is thereby created for the good of the whole people.

Again, most of our problems can be traced in the last analysis to community imbalance and faulty use of resources. At one extreme, we have cities so impacted with population that they cannot catch up on servicing that population. Their costs are climbing so fast that city after city is declaring itself virtually bankrupt. To put another person or another car in the city will cost twice as much as in the countryside. At the other extreme we have rural poverty where the economic base is too

weak to support services that will equip the population for anything but menial jobs that continue to disappear in the onrush of technology.

This perpetuates a cycle of increasing depopulation as the rural poor are forced to the cities, increasing impactation as they arrive. This vicious circle can be cut. But it will take a total national effort. Everyone must participate. Only the President of the United States can successfully call this nation to such an effort. I hope he will do it soon.

Radio
Process
Instituti

Glen O.

As
present
mounte
ministre
ates the
for ado
critical
change,
operatio

Marie

"nothing is
comment is
it is an en
subject of
frequency s
there have
the problem
There have
posals for ch
and effective
make more
Indeed, for t

* Assoc

This artic
tional Associa
tion is gratef
dependent one
necessarily rep
dustry. Any
dulgently nurt
thanks the coo
Office of Tele
nell, as well a
Kenneth A. Co
formation on th
tive and FCC i
they are not re
of the opinions



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org