

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS NBC RADIO AND
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "NBC's MEET THE PRESS."

M E E T T H E P R E S S

Produced by Betty Cole Dukert

SUNDAY, JULY 11, 1976

GUEST:

JIMMY CARTER - Presidential Candidate

MODERATOR AND EXECUTIVE PRODUCER:

Bill Monroe - NBC News

PANEL:

Lawrence E. Spivak - NBC News

James Hoge - Editor, Chicago Sun-Times

Gerald L. Warren - Editor, San Diego Union

Max Frankel - Associate Editor, The New York Times

- - -

- - -

This is a rush transcript provided for the information and convenience of the press. Accuracy is not guaranteed. In case of doubt, please check with

MEET THE PRESS

MR. MONROE: Our guest on this special edition of MEET THE PRESS is the former Governor of Georgia, Jimmy Carter. Mr. Carter accomplished the unusual feat of beating 11 other Democratic candidates in the 1976 primary elections and, in effect, winning the presidential nomination weeks before the party convention. He will be officially nominated by the Democratic National Convention, which opens tomorrow here in New York City. He will then indicate his choice of a vice-presidential runningmate.

We will have the first questions now from Lawrence E. Spivak of NBC News.

MR. SPIVAK: Governor, you once said, "I want the American people to understand my character, my weaknesses, the kind of person I am," and I'd like to direct my toward that end.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal charges that you seem much more preoccupied with getting to the White House than with what you hope to achieve after you get there.

Can you give us some idea of what you want to achieve as President?

MR. CARTER: Yes, I will try.

There are a lot of specific issues that affect the American people: jobs, inflation, energy policy, agricultural policy, education, health, fair taxes and many others and I intend to address them all. The Democratic Party platform does this very clearly and we had a major input into its exact wording and into the principles expressed therein.

There are three general issues that have been most important, I think, in the election and ones that I have very heavy on my shoulders as a responsibility.

One is whether or not our government, itself, can be competent, whether it can deliver services that our people expect and need.

Secondly, whether the government itself, particularly the President or the leaders, would be constantly sensitive to the need of people who are most deprived, who are most dependent on government to correct a problem in their lives or give them a chance to live a useful and a fruitful life and a third one is to restore the confidence of our people, the faith of our people in the government itself.

But I intend to start working immediately after the convention with leaders of Congress, with our staffs, with advisers, with my own staff members, to put together proposals that I will pursue during the general election and then when I am elected President, if I am successful this fall in the campaign, to start reorganizing the structure of our government, making it competent, dealing with health issues, welfare issues, tax reform and other matters of this kind.

So I am working very hard to express as a candidate, and, hopefully, as the next President, the ideals and aspirations

of the people and to correct their fears, prejudices and needs.

MR. SPIVAK: Governor, a great many important members of the press who have followed you still find it hard to understand their analysis of you runs from sensitive and compassionate through enigmatic to tough, and even ruthless. Why do you think there is such a wide variation of opinion about you?

MR. CARTER: Well, assuming that the price is completely unbiased, which is an assumption I have a hard time maintaining constantly, I would say that I am an average person; I am no more complicated or enigmatic or mysterious than other people. I have heavy responsibilities on me during the campaign. Sometimes I am quite cautious in making unguarded statements to 40 or 50, or sometimes more, news media representatives who are looking for every nuance of meaning in every word I say. I have been a little bit hesitant during the campaign to tell jokes or to make light of things because there might be one out of 40 news people who will accept it as a very serious statement, but I think in general the public has gotten to know me very well and I think there is more and more of a consensus now among the press, at least in the columns I read, about what kind of person I am, and I think I am sensitive, I am tough. I think I am a good planner, and I am still searching for answers to complicated questions.

I have always avoided trying to give simplistic answers just for political expediency and I have had another very unique opportunity, almost unique, in not having to respond to the pressures of special interest groups.

During the campaign itself, I have gone directly to the people because powerful political figures didn't have any confidence I might win, and these kind of characteristics of the campaign itself, I think, have caused some of the doubt about what kind of person I am.

MR. SPIVAK: May I be a bit more specific? Surveys by the New York Times and CBS News this year have shown time and time again that conservative voters tend to view you as a conservative modern and moderate liberals see you as liberal. Now, how do you explain that?

MR. CARTER: I think the American people resent being put in boxes and I have always avoided that myself.

Obviously, since the beginning of this calendar year, as the Iowa Caucus approached I have been heavily covered by the news media and it is not possible for me to make a different statement in Iowa than the one I make in New Hampshire or Florida.

I think that the difference would be, among our ideological categories of people that have been removed,

conservatives quite often in the past have been stigmatized by racism. That is no longer the case. I think many conservative people now are fully committed to the principles of human rights and civil rights and equality of opportunity.

On the other hand, many liberals who have been categorized in the past as eager to waste money or to have a complicated, over-bearing bureaucracy now see that services in which they are deeply interested, better health care, comprehensive welfare programs, can best be delivered with tough management.

I think many of the people in the South have always looked on the federal government as a legitimate part of our lives and we have never feared government as long as we felt we were controlling it. We don't like to see the government control us. So I think those sharp differences that used to exist between the liberal and conservative elements of our society have pretty well been removed so when I say I am going to manage the government in a tough, competent, businesslike way and also deal with the sensitive needs of our people on human rights, civil rights, good environmental quality, I don't believe it is as much alienation of groups as there was before.

MR. HOGE: Governor Carter, in a recent interview you were quoted as saying that the nation is best served by a strong, independent, aggressive President working with a strong and independent Congress. Now, there is great public doubt at the moment that Congress is or will be strong and there is also great public fear that during the last several administrations the presidency became so strong as to become a threat to democracy.

Why shouldn't people fear that an extension of that trend would occur under your leadership since you believe in an aggressive presidency, and, furthermore, you have won the nomination and might win the election without owing anything to those kinds of organized coalitions and interest groups that might act as a check on your intentions?

MR. CARTER: Is it alright with you if I complete the quote?

MR. HOGE: Surely.

MR. CARTER: I also said that the President and the Congress ought to deal with each other on that basis with mutual respect for a change, in the open for a change, and with close consultation for a change.

I have been a Governor, I have had to deal with a legislature in a very controversial and also very innovative administration, and the best way I know to restore the sometimes lost leadership capabilities of the White House and the Congress is to have a searching for mutuality of purpose. When we get ready to reorganize the structure of the federal government, there is no way I could do that without the

Congress and I want to be sure that the congressional leaders responsible work with me at the initial stages along with, by the way, governors, mayors and other officials of that kind.

When we get ready to put into effect a new welfare system or revise the tax programs, I want to be sure there is careful, long, detailed consultation between the White House and the Congress. But I am convinced that if this is done in the open so the American people know what is going on in the government, they would tend to prevent an abuse of strength and let the American people always have a voice in our deliberations as a government itself.

I think every time we have made a serious mistake in recent years in domestic or foreign affairs it has been because the American people have been excluded from the process. We have been held at arms length; we have been misled; sometimes we have been lied to, and I want to put an end to that and in that process I think we need a strong Congress and a strong President.

I don't believe there will necessarily follow abuses.

MR. HOGE: Well, Governor, you say that openness is a check against abuse and part of the process of openness is the press.

MR. CARTER: That is right.

MR. HOGE: At the time of the disclosure of the Pentagon Papers you counseled that there ought to be laws enforcing criminal liability against the press for publishing classified information and, indeed, some unclassified information.

My question is, if that were so, under certain circumstances, what would check the government's penchant to over-classify information to protect its own reputation rather than to protect the national security.

MR. CARTER: I don't believe that is an accurate statement of my position now or ever in the past.

MR. HOGE: Well, it is from the Atlanta Constitution

MR. CARTER: I understand that.

My preference is that the press be open. I personally feel that the Pentagon Papers should have been revealed by the New York Times and I would do everything I could to protect the right of the press to conceal its sources of information, and let the responsibility of the press be its major check on how it acted as it deals with sensitive material or with matters that might affect our own country.

I would have the strongest possible commitment as President to protect the independence and the autonomy and the right of the press to speak freely, and I favor strong sunshine laws. One of the first acts I intend to take if I am elected President is by executive order to open up as many of the deliberations of the Executive Branch of government as possible and I would join with the efforts that have been pursued by Senator Stone and Senator Lawton Chiles of Florida and others to pass a

1 comprehensive sunshine law for the whole federal government. 6
So everything I do as President will be designed within the
bounds of rationality, to open up the deliberations of govern-
ment to the people through the press.

MR. WARREN: In this regard, Governor, would you go as far as opening up your meetings with Congressional leaders to the press and to the public?

MR. CARTER: When I am the host of a meeting where decisions are made I would favor the meetings being open, but when an executive officer is trying to formulate decisions, I don't think that is a proper time for the public to be completely involved in the process. You have to have subordinates able to deal with their superiors and you have to have Congressional leaders able to deal with the President. in the formative stages of ideas or decisions without the press being present.

MR. WARREN: If you will forgive me, Governor, in the past that deliberative period has lasted quite a while, and most discussions between Presidents and Congressional leaders have been private for that reason. I am wondering if you would really be able to change that without a declaration or a resolution from the Congress?

MR. CARTER: Well, as you possibly know, a number of the states in this country, the ones that I know, Florida, Georgia, Arkansas, California, recently Massachusetts, and I am sure others, have comprehensive sunshine laws. That is what they are called quite often. And they have been honed down now by experience so that the things that have to be reserved for privacy, ones that I have just described, plus quasi-grand jury investigations of maybe unwarranted charges against people should be private; but whenever there was a doubt in my mind about whether a meeting should be open or closed, I would go with the open meeting.

MR. FRANKEL: Governor, just a couple more questions to find out who you are. You have probably studied the electorate in your path toward the nomination even more than the New York Times and CBS poll. Which of your political convictions, what things that you believe on the issues, have you found to be absolutely the most difficult politically to sell? That is, where do you find yourself different from the prevailing moods of the voters?

MR. CARTER: The one single issue that comes to mind with which I have had the most difficulty has been the amnesty question. I struggled with this a number of months before I finally arrived at a decision that suits me. It is the one that is expressed now in the Democratic party platform, which I favor. That is to pardon those who have defected from our nation during the Vietnamese war in violation of the draft laws, but to deal with deserters on an individual case basis. Now, this decision is not acceptable to a lot of American people, but it is what I intend to do. And I will begin the consummation of that promise the first week I am in the White House.

MR. FRANKEL: Will you, by the way, also pardon

the government officials who were involved in what you say was misleading or lying to the American public? That is that vast array of public servants who were involved in that policy? Are they available for duty in the Carter Administration?

MR. CARTER: Well, they are certainly available for duty. Whether I will call on them would be a matter of individual judgment again.

MR. FRANKEL: Some of them will get pardoned?

MR. CARTER: Perhaps.

MR. FRANKEL: Are there any other issues that you sense the mood of the people on, where you think you are going to have to lead and get out in front, where the mood is not right for something that you feel needs to be done, and where you are likely to take one of those Profiles in Courage and take a plunge?

MR. CARTER: Well, in many instances this would be the case. For instance, on the welfare program, there is no way to suit everyone. About 10 percent of our present welfare recipients are completely able to work full time. I would like to remove them from the welfare system altogether; place them under the responsibility of the Labor Department, the Education Department, give them job training, match them with a job and offer them a job. If they are offered a job and don't take it, I wouldn't want to pay them any more benefits.

The other 90 percent can't work. I would like to treat them with compassion and concern and let them have an adequate income to meet their needs. That is controversial with some people.

On tax reform, it is going to take a full year at least to go through a comprehensive analysis of what our tax laws shall be. When the final report is made and when I lend my weight as President, if I am elected, behind it, I am sure a lot of people will oppose what the changes might encompass.

MR. FRANKEL: Including most of the people in your own party in Congress?

MR. CARTER: Most?

MR. FRANKEL: Well, a lot of them who have been writing the tax laws for 20 years.

MR. CARTER: I think some of them might. I have already discussed this matter, though, with some of the leaders in Congress in both houses, and they have professed to me they are ready to see this comprehensive approach taken to the tax laws. They have been revised piecemeal now for 40 or 50 years. In most instances when you do a small section of the tax law at the time the special interest group that

gets a favor from that particular aspect of the law focused its full attention on that section to derive a continued benefit. The general public who might be cheated in the process has very little ability to understand what is going on. And I want to be sure that we have a comprehensive overall complete reformation of the tax laws. I am sure some people are going to get hurt. The ones that get hurt in my opinion, and if I am able to do what I am committed to, will be the ones who have been getting unfair advantage in the past.

We have other matters. For instance, in agriculture -- I happen to be a farmer -- I would favor full production. I don't favor any sort of price supports that would exceed the cost of production. I favor an aggressive sale of American products overseas, including agricultural products, once our own needs are met. Some people disagree with this.

In the field of transportation, we have seen a derogation of the quality of our railroads, inadequate attention given to mass transit. We have got too much blocking of streets unnecessarily because of inactivity or weakness on the part of local officials. We are spending enormous amounts of money putting in subways when just off-street parking and one-way streets might solve some of the problems. So I hope to be a strong and aggressive President if I am elected, and I would not fear making tough decisions if necessary. And I hope that I could persuade the doubters in the public, if I am right, that my position was advisable.

MR. MONROE: Governor Carter, could you see religion possibly becoming an issue in the campaign coming up, considering that some people have expressed uneasiness about what it would mean to have in the White House a southern Baptist, a "Born Again Christian," a man who is not hesitant to talk about his religious views in public?

MR. CARTER: Well, that, as you know, has been a focal point of some of the news reporters. I have never initiated any issue about religion, but I generally try to answer the questions frankly. And it was a hard thing for me to decide about, whether to respond truthfully about my own religious beliefs or to try to avoid that issue. I finally decided to respond truthfully, because I think the American people ought to know it.

We have had a Baptist in the White House before. His name was Harry Truman, and I think he was able to exemplify a compatibility between deep religious beliefs and also public service. I have never had any problem as governor maintaining my very deep and fervent and lifetime religious beliefs as a "Born Again Christian" with my objectivity in dealing with the needs of Georgia's people.

One of the basic tendencies about this church, in fact one of the reasons it was originally formed was an insistence absolutely on the separation of church and state. So I don't

think this would be an issue that would be very cutting or biting or detrimental to our campaign.

MR. MONROE: Chairman Robert Strauss of the Democratic party, meeting at breakfast with some newsmen this morning, said he felt there might be a potential problem in terms of your candidacy with Catholic voters. I don't know exactly what he had in mind. He may have noted that a Catholic archbishop attacked the Democratic party platform on abortion just a few days ago. Do you see yourself needing perhaps to address any uneasiness or any possible doubts among Catholic voters?

MR. CARTER: Yes, I do, and Protestant voters and non-believers and Jews. You know, there are doubts among all kinds of voters. I don't think you can categorize, though Catholics as one particular group of people to be addressed in a unique or strange way.

I personally would have expressed the Democratic platform plank on abortion a little bit differently. Under the Supreme Court ruling I will do everything I can as President to minimize the need for abortions. I think abortions are wrong, and I think we ought to have a comprehensive effort made by the President and the Congress, with a nationwide law, perhaps, adequately financed, to give sex instruction and access to contraceptives for those who believe in their use, better adoptive procedures, just to hold down the need for abortion.

I think abortions are patently and obviously a result of a failure of contraceptive techniques. So I don't believe there is anything that would divide myself and my campaign from Catholics who themselves, as you know, have a wide diversity of opinions on almost every conceivable issue, including abortion.

MR. MONROE: Do you think Mr. Strauss is worrying about that much when he says there is a potential problem among Catholic voters?

MR. CARTER: There is a potential problem among Catholic voters, but I think that we have met the same problem during the primary successfully, and I believe that you couldn't categorize Catholics as being any sort of uniform bloc, any more than you could Protestants or others. So I think we can deal with them on the issues of the nation, and I think they as they always have will respond favorably.

MR. SPIVAK: Governor, I hope I quote you accurately on this. You have said you are a conservative on spending but a liberal on human welfare. Is that correct?

MR. CARTER: Human rights, civil rights, yes, sir.

MR. SPIVAK: Now, I am not quite clear as to just what that means. How can you be liberal on human welfare, which requires the expenditure usually of a great deal of money, and conservative on spending? How are you going to reconcile the two?

MR. CARTER: I would certainly continue if I am elected

President with the same attitude toward government management as I did as governor. We maintained a balanced budget, we had strict budgeting rules that I initiated in Georgia, I think for the first time in any government; zero-based budgeting, where we automatically weeded out old and obsolescent programs. We established renewed priorities every year to make sure we spent the money or other resources on things that were of highest need in that particular year. We reorganized the structure of government to make it simple and manageable. We invested state funds on a competitive bid basis, and I think I ran the Georgia government as well as almost any corporate structure in this country is run, in personnel management, transportation, electronic data processing and so forth. At the same time, I think the best investment our nation can make of its resources is in human beings and not in buildings, not in construction. I think that when we spend money on better health care for our people, a better education for our people, that that is a legitimate and a very good investment for the future. But I would each year put into effect the principles of zero-based budgeting, where you reassess priorities on an annual basis. So where we did have a need it was met.

I would expect before my Administration would be over, or before the four-year period passed, that we would have a balanced budget, assuming normal economic circumstances, and that would be something that I would strive for.

So I think there is a good balance there, and I don't believe that you can meet human needs or root out injustice or give people a quality of life without a well managed government with the waste eliminated.

MR. SPIVAK: But Governor, your critics insist that your general rhetoric is anti-Washington, anti-big government, anti-big spending, but your specific social programs that you propose will result in bigger federal government and increased spending. How do you reconcile this? Are you going to spend more on education, more on transportation, more to the cities, more on welfare, more on health, more on housing, more on jobs, more on Social Security? How are you going to keep from getting bigger?

MR. CARTER: It would be ridiculous for me to say the government is going to be smaller at the end of the four year period than it was when I went into office. But I want to make sure when we do spend our nation's resources we spend on the things that are needed most, to give our people a good quality of life, to let our nation be adequately protected, to enhance the vision of our country within the nations of the world, and so that our people will feel responsible for and a part of their own government. And I have never claimed that at the end of a four-year period

we would have a smaller government than we have now. We will have a better one, closer to the people; so that when we do spend money or spend our nation's resources, it would be in an optimum fashion.

MR. HOGG: Governor Carter, a couple of questions about specifics in the Democratic platform, which as the nominee-presumptive you have endorsed, at least in general. One has to do with the Humphrey-Hawkins bill. The objectives of that bill have been incorporated in the platform. It would provide for federal job assistance to reduce the unemployment rate to about 3 percent within four years.

In a recent interview in Time magazine, June 28th, your chief economic advisor said -- Lawrence Kline: "This bill could become an albatross, but no bill goes through Congress without amendments, and I can envision 10 amendments that would make this a good bill."

Now my question is, is that a long way of saying that you don't consider it realistic to reach a three percent unemployment rate within four years, and at the same time reach your stated objective of an inflation rate of about 3 percent?

MR. CARTER: No. The principal expressions of the Democratic platform are those I expressed personally in a public news meeting in Philadelphia shortly before the Pennsylvania primary. It does include a 3 percent -- you left out one word -- "adult" unemployment, which is in the Democratic platform and also in my statement, and with the expectation that this would not result in high inflationary pressures, that with a normal 4 to 6 percent annual growth in our national product, which is slightly below what we are experiencing now, that we would have a balanced budget by 1979.

I think all those things would be achievable. I think that the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, which has never gotten out of either committee in the House or Senate so far, it first has too much of an emphasis on government jobs. I favor the orientation of government programs into encouraging private employment, not government jobs themselves; and I was concerned at first about how much influence or domination the federal government planners might have on the private sector. I believe in a free enterprise system with a minimum of federal regulation. But I think that the Humphrey-Hawkins bill is coming along in the right direction, and the principles expressed in the Democratic party platform are those on which I can run and run with enthusiasm.

(ANNOUNCEMENTS)

MR. WARREN: Governor, to explore a little further your position on the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill, even if you attack the adult unemployment and reach a three percent rate, which would be about 4.5 percent of the total unemployment, how are you going to avoid what some of your advisers have warned would be a 15 percent inflation? How are you going to keep the federal government out of being an employer of the last resort?

MR. CARTER: I have about ten economists who work closely with me and who have for a year or so. They represent a wide spectrum of basic economic philosophy from liberal to quite conservative, and there is a unanimous belief among them based on careful analysis, on econometric computer models and likewise that we can have down to three percent adult unemployment at the end of three years or four years with a minimum amount of inflationary pressures, still keep the inflation rate down to four or five percent, with proper government management. My own belief is that this is an accurate analysis. I am not an economist. But I think just common sense shows that one of the major inflationary pressures has been brought about by very high unemployment rates.

I have spent a lot of time in recent years studying the history of our country and almost invariably, when the employment rate is high, the inflation rate has been low.

One example that I remember specifically was when Harry Truman went out of office after seven years. We had an unemployment rate less than three percent, an inflation rate less than one percent and during his seven-year period we had an average surplus of I think \$2.4 billion rather than deficits and at the same time the interest rates were low too.

I think the FHA loan interest rate then was four percent. So I don't think there is any incompatibility between low unemployment and low inflation. I think in general they go together.

MR. WARREN: If you were President today, would you have vetoed the jobs bill that President Ford vetoed?

MR. CARTER: No, sir, I wouldn't. I think that was a very serious indication of President Ford's insensitivity to people's needs. We have got such a high unemployment rate, for instance, in the construction industry, I think about 14 percent on the average, I read an article in the newspaper this morning that showed among black young people we have an unemployment rate of about 40 percent. You have about \$20 billion that goes into extra welfare payments and unemployment payments that could be corrected to some degree by that. This would have provided, I think, about 600,000 jobs in our country, and when you put, for instance, construction workers back to work, there is a very great magnification effect. I think President Ford made a serious

mistake in vetoing that bill.

I might add one other thing. It was supported overwhelmingly and I think the veto will be overridden by very conservative members of the Congress. I think 80 or 90 percent of the members of the Senate voted for the bill, including the Senators of my own state who are quite conservative on economic affairs.

In addition to that, it was well within the budgetary limits that have been established by the Congress in both houses. It would not have exceeded the budget totals that have already been established by them as reasonable so I think he made a mistake in vetoing the bill. I would not have vetoed it.

MR. FRANKEL: Governor, still on jobs, we have discovered here in New York and in other big cities that what was probably the unwitting net effect of federal policies in creating jobs and in dealing with poverty and welfare issues has been to concentrate poverty. The jobs have been created by and large in America outside the big cities in our recent boom. The poverty and support burdens have been left to the cities. So much so that that in itself has become among policy discussions an issue. That is, do you keep poverty concentrated or should the net effect of federal policies be to disperse the poor among wealthier communities.

MR. CARTER: There is where a well-managed government can help, Mr. Frankel, and also a commitment to restore a proper relationship between the President, a governor and a mayor. And also to restore the proper relationship between the government, business, industry, agriculture, labor, science, education and other entities in our society.

There is no way now to predict what is going to happen next. That would help a great deal.

Another thing is we have got too many categorical grant programs. Everything is fragmented so finely that the administrative costs and the confusion and the lack of clear assignment of responsibility almost prevents even a good program from success.

Another point I would like to make is this: Even though the President and the Congress might have their hearts in the right place, they might provide a very good program designed for those who need it most, quite often the final delivery of services or opportunities don't get to the people in the ghetto areas and cities who do need the services most, because quite often those who put in applications, who organize, who speak, are much more socially prominent; they are much better organized, they are much more articulate.

The ones that need services most quite often are deprived of the very services offered them by Congress. Those things have got to be addressed, I think, in the next

administration and if I am President that would be a major responsibility that I would assume.

MR. FRANKEL: I think the reverse is also true, that in many places now the jobs exist and the poor can't get at them either because of transportation or zoning laws or ethnic cohesion or whatever the issue is. The question is, would you favor really consciously using federal incentive programs to disperse a larger number of the poor, both to relieve the pressure in the cities and to get people out to where the jobs are now being created?

MR. CARTER: I would have to say that wouldn't be my first preference. My first preference would be to orient the job opportunities where the poor people live. I will just take one example to abbreviate the answer: Housing programs, quite often have been envisioned to build homes where poor people live. A lot of the housing emphasis has gone out into the suburbs and that means that people who are carpenters, who are bricklayers, who are manual laborers who live in the downtown areas where housing renovations are most needed, have to go out to the more influential neighborhoods in the suburbs for their jobs and I think the federal government, working with the local governments particularly, could orient new manufacturing and factory jobs downtown more than they have in the past.

We have had too much of a carelessness in the past about putting new factories out in the beautiful outdoor suburban areas. As a farmer, I hate to see this land taken away from agricultural production in the first place, and I think it would be a good thing for the federal government, working with the local governments, to try to orient the jobs where the people live rather than to move the people away from where they are now out to where the jobs have been created inadvertently sometimes or inadvisedly.

MR. MONROE: Governor Carter, there has been some confusion or uncertainty about your attitudes over a period of time on Vietnam. Did you, like a lot of Americans and a good many political leaders, start out with one attitude toward that war and over a period of time change it?

MR. CARTER: Yes, I did. I think that the attitude of myself and almost everyone that I knew who lives in the South was fairly well expressed, for instance, by Senator Dick Russell and others, and I think there was a great compatibility. He always said, and I agreed -- although I was just a farmer, I didn't hold public office -- that we should never have been in Vietnam; that it was a mistake to get there; that it was a quagmire, that we ought to try to escape. But that, as long as we were there, we ought to bring a quick termination to the war, to back the federal government that had committed us to be involved, and, of course, all of us were misled to some degree by, I think, the misleading

statements that the Vietnamization Program was working, that the South Vietnamese favored our position, that they supported their own government; that this was an attack by communist forces from the north, that it was not really a civil war among the same people. We all were adversely affected in our judgment, I think, by these claims on the part of our own government in which we trusted. The first time that I spoke out openly to get out of Vietnam, whether we won or lost, was in March of 1971, just a month or two after I became Governor. But I think I was compatible with most of the American people who thought it was a mistake to get there, that we ought to get it over with and finally we said, well, let's get out whether we have won or lost.

MR. MONROE: What about your support in April of last year for one last final, huge appropriation of something like half a billion dollars for Saigon not long before Saigon fell? That appeared to some to make you ought to be a last-ditch hard-liner on Vietnam.

MR. CARTER: That was designed, and I think the Congress went along, to let us withdraw from Vietnam as we did, working jointly with our South Vietnamese allies who had fought with us, along with us, for 25 years. There were some who advocated our peremptory withdrawal from Vietnam, abandoning the 20 or 30,000 people who had worked very closely with us in leadership positions in Vietnam. I don't think we ever could have escaped from Vietnam without having the South Vietnamese turn on us had we abandoned them and taken a position we wanted to get the Americans out, but we don't want to get out of Vietnam those who have been our allies and friends and joint participants in the war. I favored at that time a quick withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam, completely.

(Announcements)

* * * * *

MR. SPIVAK: Governor, most, if not all of the southern states have right-to-work laws and your position on right-to-work laws has been somewhat in controversy. Can you tell us whether you believe in the principle behind right-to-work laws? Namely, that an American worker should not be compelled to join a union in order to hold his job?

MR. CARTER: I think in general that principle suits me fine if the states prefer it, but I have always taken the position that if the legislature changed the law, I would favor it. I have a hard time deciding, Mr. Spivak, about this particular principle. I grew up in a right-to-work state; I ran for Governor with a commitment to the labor leaders and others that I would be glad to sign a repeal of the right-to-work law in Georgia. I didn't want to see the federal government

make that decision for the state.

I have maintained that position all the way through, but I have now taken a position that I think is compatible that, as President, if the Congress repeals 14(b), that I would be glad to sign the repeal into law.

MR. SPIVAK: But why, if you approve of the principle and consider it important, why would you sign a law?

MR. CARTER: I don't see it as an important consideration. I have mixed emotions about it. If I deeply felt that, on one way or the other, I would not hesitate to take a strong position on it. I don't have any strong belief on one side or the other, and it is something about which I think there is much more of a litmus test on philosophy than there is a deep desire on the part of the labor people, the labor members to pursue. But it would suit me all right if the law stayed as it is now, but I just never have felt strongly about it one way or the other.

MR. SPIVAK: Governor, I don't like to pursue this too far, but since so many people, particularly -- your southerners --

MR. CARTER: Yes, I know.

MR. SPIVAK: -- think this is a very important issue, why shouldn't you, as leader, take a position and fight for that position, either to get people to go along with you or the other way?

MR. CARTER: Well, as I said, I would not object to the law staying the way it is. As you know, we have had some very strong and very aggressive presidents from other parts of the country. President Truman, President Kennedy and later President Johnson from Texas. 14(b) has never been repealed under their leadership.

I don't think they ever took a strong executive position that it ought to be repealed. I think their position has been basically the same as mine. If 14(b) is repealed by the Congress, representing all the states, that they would sign it into law, but I don't intend to take it on as a crusade because I don't believe deeply that it is a bad circumstance, nor do I have strong feelings on the other side. It is just one of those issues on which I think the argument is more important than the outcome, and I don't -- if I felt strongly about it, or if I become convinced 14(b) should be repealed I would fight to get it repealed. I just don't feel that way now.

MR. HOGE: Governor Carter, on the defense budget, in March of 1975 you were calling for cuts in the defense budget of about \$15 billion. By last November your figure was down to \$6 to 8 billion, and now I believe you are using a \$5 to-6 billion figure, which is what is in the Democratic platform.

If that kind of progression was to continue, by the time you got into office you might be favoring increases in the defense budget rather than cuts. I am wondering what evidence you can give now that this figure, a \$5\$5 billion cut in the defense budget is a meaningful one. In other words, where will the cuts come from?

MR. CARTER: Well, the position I have had ever since I have been a candidate has been consistent. That is to keep a strong defense, which I think is the first priority of any President, the first responsibility of any President, a defense adequate to guarantee the security of our country from the threat of a successful attack or blackmail, and to carry out a legitimate foreign policy.

At the same time I would eliminate as much as possible the waste that presently exists in the Defense Department. My estimate after a very careful analysis about a year and a half or more ago, is that this would involve a reduction of \$5 to 7 billion, which is about 5 percent. There is not much difference between \$6 billion and \$5 to 7 billion. I don't know the exact figure.

I think we have too many troops overseas, too many military bases overseas. I think we have too many big-shot military officers. I think it is a top-heavy personnel structure. I think we build too many military weapons that we don't need. I think the contractual arrangements with defense suppliers have been too loose. We have got too many instructors per student, we have less than two students per instructor in the military, and there has been too much of a spreading out of the Defense Department in areas that I think could best be handled by civilian agencies of government. So these changes that I have described to you would cut back waste equivalent to about 5 percent of the total defense budget, and at the same time give us a tougher, more muscular, more simple, well organized fighting force. I think the unique responsibility of the Defense Department ought to be the capability to fight if necessary, and with that capability I believe is the best possibility for peace. So ever since I have been a candidate my position has been what I have just described to you. I consider it to be consistent.

MR. HOGE: Governor, on another foreign policy-national security issue: In the event of renewed Middle East hostilities and a resulting Arab oil embargo, you have called for a tough counter-boycott this time, in essence restricting all Western goods and services to the Arab world.

MR. CARTER: That's right.

MR. HOGE: Such a posture was considered in 1973 but it was considered futile because there were so many other markets, East and West, to which Arab nations could turn.

I am wondering what makes you think such a tough line would be effective this time around, if there is another time.

MR. CARTER: Well, now, I think that is getting the cart before the horse. I think if we as a nation take the position ahead of time and the President expresses a position, which I have as a candidate, that if there is another embargo, if there is another attempt at blackmail, which was successful in 1973, that we would instantly consider it a declaration of economic war, and we would respond accordingly, with an embargo against the Arab countries who declared an embargo against us; and that we under those circumstances would not ship them any food, weapons, spare parts for weapons, oil drilling rigs, oil pipes or anything. I think that is the best way to prevent an attempt at blackmail or another oil embargo. I don't think the advisable thing would be to wait until an embargo occurred and then to respond. I would do it if I said I was going to. But I think this is a good way to prevent an embargo, and I would carry this out.

MR. WARREN: Another foreign policy statement you have made is that you would encourage better consultation with our allies overseas.

MR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. WARREN: Now, in the situation we have just been discussing, a potential oil embargo, would not our allies react the same way they did in 1973 and go their own way with the Arabs, and therefore would not our counter-embargo fail for that reason?

MR. CARTER: It may or may not. I have never tried to speak for all our allies on the response to an Arab embargo that I have just described. We can get along without oil from Arab nations in an emergency if we have to. Some of our allies cannot. Japan could not. They import about 98 percent of their total energy needs, and I would not try to make the allies be compatible with us by force or heavy persuasion. But I think it would be very good for them to know what our position would be if an embargo was declared against our country. This is a serious thing that I would like to avoid. We are now importing between 40 and 50 percent of our total oil needs. But that doesn't mean that all that import comes from Arab countries, and I think it would be good for us and for the Arabs as well to know it would be a very serious thing for them economically to declare another embargo against our country.

MR. MONROE: We have about two minutes.

MR. FRANKEL: Providing you control it, Governor, if you were President would you use the CIA for subversion abroad

to bring down a Communist government we didn't like?

MR. CARTER: No, I wouldn't. I think the proper role of the CIA is the role that was spelled out in the original legislation that set up the CIA as a source of information and intelligence. And I would try to have the CIA perform its functions effectively and efficiently and legally for a change, and I would be responsible to the American people for that performance. I would have no objection to Congressional oversight. I personally would favor a joint Congressional committee rather than independent committees of the two branches of Congress. But I don't see any reason for the CIA through covert means to try to overthrow governments.

MR. MONROE: Governor Carter, something you said at the Governors Conference, in a press conference a few days ago, suggested to me that you might be considering a trip abroad in the next few weeks. Is that a possibility?

MR. CARTER: No. I don't intend to go abroad until after the election in November.

MR. SPIVAK: Governor, you said the other day that your list of possible Vice Presidential choices has been narrowed to about seven. Have you been able to narrow it any further since then?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Spivak, I still have three other people that I am going to meet and interview. We have done the most careful possible preparation for a final decision, consulting with distinguished leaders all over the country who are not considered for Vice President, analyzing the voting records and past attitudes of these candidates, and then personal interviews by staff members representing me, and then personal interviews by me. And I have maintained an open mind deliberately until after all the interviews are over. The last interviews will be conducted tomorrow.

MR. SPIVAK: Will your choice still be from those mentioned, or have you added to your list, or do you feel free to add to your list?

MR. MONROE: In about five seconds.

MR. CARTER: The last two people with whom I will meet will be tomorrow, and then will be Senator Church and Senator Stevenson. I will be meeting with Congressman Rodino today, and as far as I know, the Vice President will come from one of those seven people.

MR. MONROE: Our time is up. Thank you, Governor Carter, for being with us today on MEET THE PRESS.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ANNOUNCEMENT SPEECH

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ANNOUNCING HIS CANDIDACY FOR THE 1976 DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TO THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

December 12, 1974

We Americans are a great and diverse people. We take full advantage of our right to develop wide-ranging interests and responsibilities. For instance, I am a farmer, an engineer, a businessman, a planner, a scientist, a governor and a Christian. Each of you is an individual and different from all the others.

Yet we Americans have shared one thing in common: a belief in the greatness of our Country.

We have dared to dream great dreams for our Nation. We have taken quite literally the promises of decency, equality, and freedom—of an honest and responsible government.

What has now become of these great dreams?

- That all Americans stand equal before the law;
- That we enjoy a right to pursue health, happiness and prosperity in privacy and safety;
- That government be controlled by its citizens and not the other way around;
- That this Country set a standard within the community of nations of courage, compassion, integrity, and dedication to basic human rights and freedoms.

Our commitment to these dreams has been sapped by debilitating compromise, acceptance of mediocrity, subservience to special interests, and an absence of executive vision and direction.

Having worked during the last twenty years in local, state and national affairs, I have learned a great deal about our people.

I tell you that their great dreams still live within the collective heart of this Nation.

Recently we have discovered that our trust has been betrayed. The veils of secrecy have seemed to thicken around Washington. The purposes and goals of our country are uncertain and sometimes even suspect.

Our people are understandably concerned about this lack of competence and integrity. The root of the problem is not so much that our people have lost con-

fidence in government, but that government has demonstrated time and again its lack of confidence in the people.

Our political leaders have simply underestimated the innate quality of our people.

With the shame of Watergate still with us and our 200th birthday just ahead, it is time for us to reaffirm and to strengthen our ethical and spiritual and political beliefs.

There must be no lowering of these standards, no acceptance of mediocrity in any aspect of our private or public lives.

In our homes or at worship we are ever reminded of what we ought to do and what we ought to be. Our government can and must represent the best and the highest ideals of those of us who voluntarily submit to its authority.

Politicians who seek to further their political careers through appeals to our doubts, fears and prejudices will be exposed and rejected.

For too long political leaders have been isolated from the people. They have made decisions from an ivory tower. Few have ever seen personally the direct impact of government programs involving welfare, prisons, mental institutions, unemployment, school busing or public housing. Our people feel that they have little access to the core of government and little influence with elected officials.

Now it is time for this chasm between people and government to be bridged, and for American citizens to join in shaping our Nation's future.

Now is the time for new leadership and new ideas to make a reality of these dreams, still held by our people.

To begin with, the confidence of people in our own government must be restored. But too many officials do not deserve that confidence.

There is a simple and effective way for public officials to regain public trust—be trustworthy!

But there are also specific steps that must be taken.

- We need an all-inclusive sunshine law in Washington so that special interests will not retain their exclusive access behind closed doors. Except in a few rare cases, there is no reason for secret meetings of regulatory agencies, other executive departments or congressional committees. Such meetings must be opened to the public, all votes recorded, and complete news media coverage authorized and encouraged.
- Absolutely no gifts of value should ever again be permitted to a public official.
- Complete revelation of all business and financial involvements of major officials should be required, and none should be continued which constitute a possible conflict with the public interest.
- Regulatory agencies must not be managed by representatives of the industry being regulated, and no personnel transfers between agency and the industry should be made within a period of four full years.
- Public financing of campaigns should be extended to members of Congress.
- The activities of lobbyists must be more thoroughly revealed and controlled.
- Minimum secrecy within government should be matched with maximum personal privacy for private citizens.
- All federal judges, diplomats and other major officials should be selected on a strict basis of merit.
- For many years in the State Department we have chosen from among almost 16,000 applicants about 110 of our Nation's finest young leaders to represent us in the international world. But we top this off with the disgraceful and counterproductive policy of appointing unqualified persons to major diplomatic posts as political payoffs. This must be stopped immediately.
- Every effort should be extended to encourage full participation by our people in their own governments' processes, including universal voter registration for elections.
- We must insure better public understanding of executive policy, and better exchange of ideas between the Congress and the White House. To do this, Cabinet members representing the President should meet in scheduled public interrogation sessions with the full bodies of Congress.
- All our citizens must know that they will be treated fairly.
- To quote from my own inauguration speech of four years ago: "The time for racial discrimination is over. Our people have already made this major and difficult decision, but we cannot underestimate the challenge of hundreds of minor decisions yet to be made. No poor, rural, weak or black person should ever have to bear the additional burden of being deprived of the opportunity of an education, a job or simple justice."

- We must meet this firm national commitment without equivocation or timidity in every aspect of private and public life.

As important as honesty and openness are—they are not enough. There must also be substance and logical direction in government.

The mechanism of our government should be understandable, efficient and economical . . . and it can be.

We must give top priority to a drastic and thorough revision of the federal bureaucracy, to its budgeting system and to the procedures for analyzing the effectiveness of its many varied services. Tight businesslike management and planning techniques must be instituted and maintained, utilizing the full authority and personal involvement of the President himself.

This is no job for the fainthearted. It will be met with violent opposition from those who now enjoy a special privilege, those who prefer to work in the dark, or those whose private fiefdoms are threatened.

In Georgia we met that opposition head on—and we won!

We abolished 278 of our 300 agencies.

We evolved clearly defined goals and policies in every part of government.

We developed and implemented a remarkably effective system of zero-base budgeting.

We instituted tough performance auditing to insure proper conduct and efficient delivery of services.

Steps like these can insure a full return on our hard-earned tax dollars. These procedures are working in state capitols around the Nation and in our successful businesses, both large and small.

They can and they will work in Washington.

Our Nation now has no understandable national purpose, no clearly defined goals, and no organizational mechanism to develop or achieve such purposes or goals. We move from one crisis to the next as if they were fads, even though the previous one hasn't been solved.

The Bible says: "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle." As a planner and a businessman, and a chief executive, I know from experience that uncertainty is also a devastating affliction in private life and in government. Coordination of different programs is impossible. There is no clear vision of what is to be accomplished, everyone struggles for temporary advantage, and there is no way to monitor how effectively services are delivered.

What is our national policy for the production, acquisition, distribution or consumption of energy in times of shortage or doubtful supply?

There is no policy!

What are our long-range goals in health care, transportation, land use, economic development, waste disposal or housing?

There are no goals!

The tremendous resources of our people and of our chosen leaders can be harnessed to devise effective, understandable and practical goals and policies in every realm of public life.

A government that is honest and competent, with clear purpose and strong leadership, can work with the American people to meet the challenges of the present and the future.

We can then face together the tough long-range solutions to our economic woes. Our people are ready to make personal sacrifices when clear national economic policies are devised and understood.

We are grossly wasting our energy resources and other precious raw materials as though their supply was infinite. We must even face the prospect of changing our basic ways of living. This change will either be made on our own initiative in a planned and rational way, or forced on us with chaos and suffering by the inexorable laws of nature.

Energy imports and consumption must be reduced, free competition enhanced by rigid enforcement of antitrust laws, and general monetary growth restrained. Pinpointed federal programs can ease the more acute pains of recession, such as now exist in the construction industry. We should consider extension of unemployment compensation, the stimulation of investments, public subsidizing of employment, and surtaxes on excess profits.

We are still floundering and equivocating about protection of our environment. Neither designers of automobiles, mayors of cities, power companies, farmers, nor those of us who simply have to breathe the air, love beauty, and would like to fish or swim in pure water have the slightest idea in God's world what is coming out of Washington next! What does come next must be a firm commitment to pure air, clean water and unspoiled land.

Almost twenty years after its conception we have not finished the basic interstate highway system. To many lobbyists who haunt the capitol buildings of the Nation, ground transportation still means only more highways and more automobiles—the bigger, the better. We must have a national commitment to transportation capabilities which will encourage the most efficient movement of American people and cargo.

Gross tax inequities are being perpetuated. The most surely taxed income is that which is derived from the sweat of manual labor. Carefully contrived loopholes let the total tax burden shift more and more toward the average wage earner. The largest corporations pay the lowest tax rates and some with very high profits pay no tax at all.

When a business executive can charge off a \$50 luncheon on a tax return and a truck driver cannot deduct his \$1.50 sandwich—when oil companies pay less than 5% on their earnings while employees of the company pay at least three times this rate—when many pay no taxes on incomes of more than \$100,000—then we need basic tax reform!

Every American has a right to expect that laws will be administered in an evenhanded manner, but it seems that something is wrong even with our system of justice. Defendants who are repeatedly out on bail commit more crimes. Aggravating trial delays and endless litigation are common.

Citizens without influence often bear the brunt of prosecution while violators of antitrust laws and other white collar criminals are ignored and go unpunished.

Following recent presidential elections, our U. S. Attorney General has replaced the Postmaster General as the chief political appointee; and we have recently witnessed the prostitution of this most important law enforcement office. Special prosecutors had to be appointed simply to insure enforcement of the law! The Attorney General should be removed from politics.

The vast bureaucracy of government often fails to deliver needed social services to our people. High ideals and good intentions are not matched with rational, businesslike administration. The predictable result is frustration and discouragement among dedicated employees, recipients of services, and the American taxpayers.

There are about 25 million Americans who are classified as poor, two-thirds of whom happen to be white and half of whom receive welfare benefits. At least 10% of these are able to work. A massive bureaucracy of 2 million employees at all levels of government is attempting to administer more than 100 different programs of bewildering complexity. Case workers shuffle papers in a morass of red tape. Often it is financially profitable not to work and even to have a family disrupted by forcing the father to leave home. Some combined welfare payments exceed the average working family's income, while other needy families have difficulty obtaining a bare subsistence.

The word "welfare" no longer signifies how much we care, but often arouses feelings of contempt and even hatred.

Is a simplified, fair and compassionate welfare program beyond the capacity of our American government? I think not.

The quality of health care in this Nation depends largely on economic status. It is often unavailable or costs too much. There is little commonality of effort between private and public health agencies or between physicians and other trained medical personnel. I expect the next Congress to pass a national health insurance law. But present government interest seems to be in merely shifting the costs of existing services to the federal taxpayer or to the employers. There is little interest in preventing the cripples and killers of our people and providing improved health care for those who still need it most.

Is a practical and comprehensive national health program beyond the capacity of our American government? I think not.

Federal education laws must be simplified to substitute education for paper-shuffling grantsmanship. Local systems need federal funds to supplement their programs for students where wealth and tax base are inadequate.

Is a comprehensive education program beyond the capacity of the American people? I think not.

As a farmer, I have been appalled at the maladministration of our Nation's agricultural economy. We have seen the elimination of our valuable food reserves,

which has contributed to wild fluctuations in commodity prices and wiped out dependable trade and export capabilities. Grain speculators and monopolistic processors have profited, while farmers are going bankrupt trying to produce food that consumers are going broke trying to buy:

I know this Nation can develop an agricultural policy which will insure a fair profit to our farmers and a fair price to consumers.

It is obvious that domestic and foreign affairs are directly interrelated. A necessary base for effective implementation of any foreign policy is to get our domestic house in order.

Coordination of effort among the leaders of our Nation should be established so that our farm production, industrial development, foreign trade, defense, energy and diplomatic policies are mutually supportive and not in conflict.

The time for American intervention in all the problems of the world is over. But we cannot retreat into isolationism. Ties of friendship and cooperation with our friends and neighbors must be strengthened. Our common interests must be understood and pursued. The integrity of Israel must be preserved. Highly personalized and narrowly focused diplomatic efforts, although sometimes successful, should be balanced with a more wide-ranging implementation of foreign policy by competent foreign service officers.

Our Nation's security is obviously of paramount importance, and everything must be done to insure adequate military preparedness. But there is no reason why our national defense establishment cannot also be efficient.

Waste and inefficiency are both costly to taxpayers and a danger to our own national existence. Strict management and budgetary control over the Pentagon should reduce the ratio of officers to men and of support forces to combat troops. I see no reason why the Chief of Naval Operations needs more Navy captains on his staff than we have serving on ships!

Misdirected efforts such as the construction of unnecessary pork-barrel projects by the Corps of Engineers must be terminated.

The biggest waste and danger of all is the unnecessary proliferation of atomic weapons throughout the world. Our ultimate goal should be the elimination of nuclear weapon capability among all nations. In the meantime, simple, careful and firm proposals to implement this mutual arms reduction should be pursued as a prime national purpose in all our negotiations with nuclear powers—present or potential.

Is the achievement of these and other goals beyond

the capacity of our American government? I think not.

Our people are hungry for integrity and competence in government. In this confused and fast-changing, technological world we still have within us the capability for national greatness.

About three months ago I met with the governors of the other twelve original states in Philadelphia. Exactly 200 years after the convening of the First Continental Congress we walked down the same streets, then turned left and entered a small building named Carpenter's Hall. There we heard exactly the same prayer and sat in the same chairs occupied in September of 1774 by Samuel Adams, John Jay, John Adams, Patrick Henry, George Washington, and about forty-five other strong and opinionated leaders.

They held widely divergent views and they debated for weeks. They and others who joined them for the Second Continental Congress avoided the production of timid compromise resolutions. They were somehow inspired, and they reached for greatness. Their written premises formed the basis on which our Nation was begun.

I don't know whose chair I occupied, but sitting there I thought soberly about their times and ours. Their people were also discouraged, disillusioned and confused. But these early leaders acted with purpose and conviction.

I wondered to myself: Were they more competent, more intelligent or better educated than we? Were they more courageous? Did they have more compassion or love for their neighbors? Did they have deeper religious convictions? Were they more concerned about the future of their children than we?

I think not.

We are equally capable of correcting our faults, overcoming difficulties, managing our own affairs and facing the future with justifiable confidence.

I am convinced that among us 200 million Americans there is a willingness—even eagerness—to restore in our Country what has been lost—if we have understandable purposes and goals and a modicum of bold and inspired leadership.

Our government can express the highest common ideals of human beings—if we demand of it standards of excellence.

It is now time to stop and to ask ourselves the question which my last commanding officer, Admiral Hyman Rickover, asked me and every other young naval officer who serves or has served in an atomic submarine.

For our Nation—for all of us—that question is,

"Why not the best?"

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

CITIES

URBAN POLICY FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

April 1, 1976 ✓

I believe that the future of America is directly dependent upon the good health and welfare of our nation's cities.

Our cities and metropolitan areas are the main staff of life for the majority of Americans. They provide entertainment, employment, and housing to millions of Americans. They are the repository of our nation's cultural institutions, art galleries and symphonies. They are the economic backbone for an increasingly urbanized nation.

But our cities are facing a crisis which can no longer be avoided. Many of our major cities are rapidly losing population to smaller communities and to surrounding suburbs. It is often the affluent who have fled, robbing cities of needed talent and depriving them of a needed tax base — leaving the poor, who are more heavily dependent on local government services. Just as people have left many of our urban areas, so too have businesses and jobs, thereby further eroding the municipal tax base, and making it more difficult for localities to provide for the increased demand in municipal services. New forms of revenue have not been made available to localities to replace their shrinking tax base. Crime and the fear of crime in our major urban areas keep people out of our cities and make our cities places of forboding rather than hope.

This disturbing but very real trend has come at a time of both tremendously escalating municipal costs and a rising demand for municipal services.

If our cities fail, so too will our country.

Yet in the face of these enormous problems, our nation's cities have been faced with eight years of self-styled "benign neglect" by the Nixon-Ford Administrations. In fact, the Republican policy toward our cities has been nothing short of conscious, willful indifference to the plight of urban America. They have promised new programs, such as Special and General Revenue Sharing, to supplement existing programs, and have instead used them to supplant current programs and to lower the level of assistance to cities. Two Republican presidents have purely and simply written off our cities. They have pitted our suburbs and rural areas against our major urban communities. Their policy has been divisive and disastrous. Rather than launch

an attack on our cities' problems, they have declared a war against the cities of America. Our cities have needed help and the Republicans have turned their backs. Our cities needed financial assistance and the Republicans have given them crumbs. Our cities needed attention and the Republicans have given them neglect.

Between 1972 and 1974 alone, the Republican Administration cut \$4.5 billion in urban programs and another \$7 billion in programs to aid the poor, the untrained, the unemployed, and the medically indigent, all at a time when municipalities lost \$3.3 billion in purchasing power.

Our country has no urban policy or defined urban goals, and so we have floundered from one ineffective and uncoordinated program to another. Hopes have been raised only to be dashed on the rocks of despair when promise after promise has been forgotten.

We need a coordinated urban policy from a federal government committed to develop a creative partnership with our cities for the survival of urban America in the balance of the twentieth century. This policy must recognize that our urban problems stem from a variety of factors, each of which must be dealt with directly and forcefully — problems of urban decay, declining tax base, crime, unemployment, lack of urban parks and open spaces.

1. *Human Needs and Unemployment*

We must begin our urban policy by recognizing the *human needs* of the individuals who live in our cities. The essential building block of our urban policy must be the provision of a job for each person capable of holding gainful employment. I believe every person has a right to a job.

But our urban unemployment rate is intolerable. This high level of unemployment means less tax revenue for cities, increased social tension, and higher crime rates.

Unemployment nationally is at 7.6% — at least twice the acceptable level. And yet this figure, to which the Republican Administration in Washington points with pride, is itself a gross understatement of the unemployment problem afflicting our major urban areas. According to the United

States Department of Labor, central city unemployment for 1975 was 9.6%, as opposed to 8% for non-metropolitan areas and 5.3% for the suburbs. For the poverty areas of cities that figure is 13.8%, and for blacks in these areas it is 17.6%. Overall, center city black unemployment is at the rate of 14.1%. In 1975, every fourth black worker was unemployed and the majority of them were ineligible for unemployment compensation. Teenage black unemployment in some areas of America approaches the staggering figure of 40%.

Indeed, even these figures are deceptive of the real problem, for they do not include the literally hundreds of thousands of people who have gotten completely out of the labor market due to their frustrating inability to find a job.

These are not simply figures. They represent the crushed dreams of millions of Americans ready and willing to work. The 9.6% unemployment rate in our central cities alone means 2.6 million people out of work.

To make dramatic improvement in the unacceptably high unemployment rate, I propose a creative, joint program of incentives to private employers and a public needs employment program funded by the federal government. Such programs will more than repay our investment, not simply in making taxpayers of those now on unemployment insurance or on welfare, and not simply in generating additional revenues to the federal, state and local governments—although each 1% decline in the unemployment rate will produce \$13 to \$16 billion in federal tax revenues; but rather in restoring the pride and self-respect of those too long ignored and cast aside.

These incentives to private industry should be geared directly toward the provision of jobs for the unemployed, and toward encouraging industry to locate new plants and offices in urban areas where unemployment is high.

Almost 85% of America's workers depend on private industry for jobs. Most of the unemployed will depend on recovery in the private sector for renewed job opportunities. We cannot afford to ignore well-designed, job-related incentives to private industry to help reduce unemployment. These should take the form of:

- assistance to local governments for urban economic planning and development and to help local governments encourage private industry to invest in our cities
- an expanded employment credit to give businesses benefits for each person they hire who had been previously unemployed
- as a further stimulant to private industry to hire the unemployed, the federal government should increase its commitment to fund the cost of on-the-job training by business
- encouragement by the federal government to private industry to prevent layoffs.

However, private industry cannot meet the task alone! The federal government has an obligation to provide funds for public employment of those who private business cannot and will not hire.

The Nixon-Ford Administration's priorities have been grossly misplaced. While adequate unemployment compensation is necessary to protect the unemployed, their best protection comes from jobs. It has been estimated by the

Joint Economic Committee of Congress that each 1% of excess unemployment adds at least \$4 to \$5 billion in direct costs for unemployment compensation, food stamps, and welfare.

It is an incredible misallocation of resources for the current Administration to spend between \$17 and \$20 billion dollars for unemployment compensation and an additional \$2 to \$3 billion on food stamps due to unemployment, and yet only \$2½ billion on public job programs.

Certainly, money is better spent in creating useful public service jobs to take people off of welfare, food stamps and unemployment compensation and make them tax contributors; yet we are asked to tolerate a policy adjusted to support an unacceptable status quo. Therefore, I propose the following program of public employment as an investment in human beings, an investment which will more than be repaid in uplifted lives, increased tax revenues, and decreased welfare, food stamp and unemployment compensation payments:

- *an expansion of the CETA program* (Comprehensive Education and Training Act) through which direct federal funds for municipal and other jobs have been provided, with administrative responsibility resting at the local level. This program was originally designed merely to combat structural unemployment in a period of mild recession. It cannot now deal with the cyclical unemployment caused by the severe recession we are in, without an expanded and strengthened role. It now provides only 300,000 jobs. It should produce at least twice this number of jobs. The 9.6% unemployment rate in our central cities could be markedly reduced by the provision of 600,000 to 700,000 public jobs to the unemployed for useful jobs near their homes, in the cities.

- *Passage of an accelerated public works program* which would help create new jobs, 80% in the private sector and many for our young people. Federal and state governments should also share responsibility for guaranteeing bonds for public works projects.

- *Funds for 800,000 summer youth jobs should be provided.*

- Perhaps the biggest single problem created for the poor who live in our cities is the current welfare system and *Welfare Reform* would be the single most important action we could take.

As currently constituted, it is a crazy quilt of regulations administered by a bloated bureaucracy. It is wasteful to the taxpayers of America, demeaning to the recipients, discourages work, and encourages the breakup of families. The system lumps together dissimilar categories of poor people, and differs greatly in its benefits and regulations from state to state. It is time that we broke the welfare and poverty cycle of our poor people. My recommendations are designed to satisfy the following goals: (a) we must recognize there are three distinct categories of poor people — the unemployable poor, the employable but jobless poor, and the working poor; (b) no person on welfare should receive more than the working poor can earn at their jobs; (c) strong work incentives, job creation and job training should be provided for those on welfare able to

work; (d) family stability should be encouraged by assuring that no family's financial situation will be harmed by the breadwinner remaining with his dependents; (e) efforts should be made to have fathers who abandon their family be forced to continue support; (f) the welfare system should be streamlined and simplified, with a small bureaucracy, less paperwork, fewer regulations, improved coordination and reduced local disparities; (g) persons who are legitimately on welfare should be treated with respect and dignity.

To achieve these goals, I propose a single, fair, uniform, national program of welfare benefits funded in substantial part by the federal government, with strong work and job incentives for the poor who are employable and with income supplementation for the working poor, and with earnings tied so as to encourage employment, so that it would never be more profitable to stay on welfare than to work. No one able to work, except mothers with preschool children, should be continued on the welfare rolls unless job training and a job were accepted. The welfare burden should be removed from a city such as New York City with all welfare costs being paid by the federal and state governments.

The programs I have proposed will be repaid by increased tax revenues generated by the reduction in unemployment from the jobs programs I have outlined. Their financing can be assisted by the \$5 billion to \$8 billion streamlining of the defense budget I have suggested.

2. *Assisting the Fiscal Needs of the Cities*

While we must concentrate on the human needs of those who live in our cities throughout the country, we cannot ignore the fiscal plight of our cities themselves. A recent, authoritative survey showed their plight dramatically. Of the cities and towns surveyed, a total of 122 began the last fiscal year with combined surpluses of \$340 million and ended the fiscal year with a combined \$40 million deficit. This has forced cities to raise local taxes an estimated total of \$1.5 billion, or to cut back on important municipal services. These local governments experiencing fiscal difficulties, which in no way are of their own making, had to eliminate 100,000 municipal positions last year alone. The deflationary adjustments state and local governments together were required to make removed \$8 billion from the economy last year.

To alleviate the suffering our cities are being put through by high inflation and continued recession, I propose the following:

— Counter-cyclical assistance to deal with the fiscal needs of cities particularly hard hit by the recession. The \$2 billion of counter-cyclical assistance recently vetoed by Mr. Ford is essential and affordable. In fact, it is within the budget resolutions adopted by Congress. This aid will go to create new jobs and to maintain current levels of service in hard-pressed cities. Without such aid cities like Detroit may have to cut back essential services.

— Extension of the Revenue Sharing program for five years, with an increase in the annual funding level to

compensate for inflation and with enforcement of the civil rights provisions of the bill to guarantee against discriminatory use of the funds. I will study whether the Revenue Sharing formula should be amended in the future to place greater emphasis on areas of high need. Moreover, I believe that all Revenue Sharing funds should go to the cities and that localities should be allowed to use these funds for defraying the costs of health, social services, and education, which they are currently forbidden to do.

— Study the creation of a Federal Municipalities Securities Insurance Corporation to assist localities in marketing their Bonds and in reducing interest levels now faced by municipalities, and to provide voluntary self-controls in municipal financial matters.

3. *Solving the Physical Needs of Our Cities*

The problems our cities are facing are compounded by their often deteriorating physical state.

Housing has deteriorated enormously and new housing is often unaffordable. 1975 was the worst this nation has had in 29 years in the number of housing units constructed. Although this nation in 1968 legislated a goal of 2½ million new housing units per year to meet current needs, last year witnessed the construction of barely 1 million units. At the same time, housing costs have risen so rapidly that only three in twenty (15%) of America's families can afford new housing. What is likewise appalling is that the government now has thousands upon thousands of abandoned and unused dwellings under its control and deteriorating due to bureaucratic inaction, while tens of thousands seek better shelter.

Likewise, our municipal transportation systems are faced with difficult times. For the last twenty years, more than \$230 billion has been spent at all levels of government for our highway system. From 1967 to 1975, expenditures from the Highway Trust Fund averaged about \$4 billion per year; the Administration's 1977 fiscal year budget outlay for highways reached \$7.1 billion. From the end of World War II until the middle sixties, no new major transit construction project was undertaken with public support. Cities were faced with deteriorating buses and subways and inadequate maintenance programs and schedules. Public transit ridership declined from almost 19 billion in 1946 to only 5.5 billion in 1973, reflecting the poor state of our municipal transit systems. By the end of 1974, operating deficits for existing public transit systems nationally were expected to have reached \$900 million. We cannot continue to allow our mass transit systems to languish and remain a stepchild. Mass transit, if properly supported, can serve as the means to encourage increased use of our cities as places of business, shopping, and entertainment; and can correspondingly enable urban workers to reach jobs located in the suburbs; all with less pollution and energy use than the present system of transportation.

To help solve the physical problems confronting our cities, I submit the following agenda on housing which will, in addition, put back to work hundreds of thousands of unemployed construction workers and fulfill our national

commitment to build 2½ million housing units per year:

- *direct federal subsidies and low interest loans to encourage the construction of low and middle class housing.*
- *expansion of the highly successful Section 202 housing program for the elderly, which utilizes direct federal subsidies.*

- *greatly increased emphasis on the rehabilitation of existing housing to rebuild our neighborhoods; certain of our publicly created jobs could be used to assist such rehabilitation. It is time for urban conservation instead of urban destruction.*

- *greater attention to the role of local communities under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.*

- *greater effort to direct mortgage money into the financing of private housing.*

- *prohibiting the practice of red-lining by federally sponsored savings and loan institutions and the FHA, which has had the effect of depriving certain areas of the necessary mortgage funds to upgrade themselves, and encouraging more loans for housing and rehabilitation to the poor.*

In tandem with this program, I propose to bolster our urban transportation system by:

- *substantially increasing the amount of money available from the Highway Trust Fund for public mass transportation;*

- *studying the feasibility of creating a total transportation fund for all modes of transportation;*

- *changing the current restrictive limits on the use of mass transit funds by localities so that greater amounts can be used as operating subsidies, and opposing the Administration's efforts to reduce federal operating subsidies.*

- *achieving better highway utilization through such means as reserved lanes for bus and car pools.*

- *reorganizing and revitalizing our nation's railroads.*

4. *Meeting the Total Needs of Our Cities: Crime Control, Parks, the Arts.*

Our cities can never be what we desire so long as they remain an undesirable environment in which to live and raise a family. Yet too frequently, the specter of crime destroys this environment and creates an atmosphere in which each person lives in fear of the actions of others. All Americans have the right to live free from the fear of crime.

Surveys indicate that large percentages of the American public fear to come into the cities or walk their neighborhood streets at night. Crime has now become a suburban and rural problem as well as an urban problem. Rising crime rates give reality to these fears. Figures show that one in every four American families will fall victim to crime within the year. A child born in a large American city and remaining in that city throughout his or her entire life stands a greater chance of meeting a violent death than did the average American soldier during World War II.

In order to restore order and tranquility to our cities, I propose:

- *a reform of our judicial system to ensure that swift, firm, and predictable punishment follows a criminal conviction.* I believe that crime is best deterred by the certainty of swift justice.

- *a revision in our system of sentencing eliminating much of the discretion now given to judges and probator*

officers, and insuring greater certainty in sentencing and confinement and a higher percentage of serious criminals being imprisoned.

- *reasonable restrictions on the purchase of handguns, including the prohibition on ownership of guns by certain persons with criminal records.*

- *upgrading of the rehabilitation programs available to criminals while in prison.*

- *a concerted attack on the drug traffic and organized criminal activity with which our cities are afflicted.*

- *federal assistance to the crime prevention programs of local governments with a minimum of federal regulations.*

- *an attack on unemployment, the root cause of much of our urban crime, through the programs I have mentioned previously. We should recognize that \$3 billion has been spent since 1967 by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in order to fight crime, with more than half of this amount going to the nation's police forces. This alone is not sufficient to reduce crime. We cannot seek cosmetic remedies while ignoring the base causes of crime.*

Moreover, our urban existence is often lived out in a sea of concrete. To make our cities more attractive and culturally viable, we should direct *greater emphasis on the establishment of parks in urban areas*, and we must also expand programs such as the Urban Walls Program and federal assistance to the arts.

5. *Partnership Between the President and the Mayors*

For too long, the doors of the White House have been shut to the needs of the cities and to the mayors who represent them.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, one of the prime movers behind the United States Conference of Mayors, recognized the need for a close partnership between the executive branch of the federal government and the mayors of America's cities.

As President, I shall develop close, personal and continuous working relationships with you. I will beef up the role and functions of the Domestic Policy Council to serve as a direct link to you. Moreover, I will have a high-level assistant at the White House to help coordinate programs related to cities between the various government departments, and to serve as the President's direct link to the mayors and other city officials. Mayors need a person at the White House with the President's ear to whom they can relate directly about city problems.

You are on the firing line every minute facing tough problems. I do not intend to let you stay there alone, without the full support of the President, nor disarmed, without the aid and resources to combat those problems.

You also have my assurance that the federal government itself will be pro-city. Too often the federal government has pursued policies which have encouraged urban decay, such as past procedures in the location of federal buildings and the construction of highways through urban neighborhoods. As President I intend to put a halt to such counter-productive policies.

I believe that together we can build an urban America which will be the envy of the rest of the world and, more importantly, a place where our citizens can live and play and work together as brothers in peace and harmony.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers 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