

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

The Economy

AN ECONOMIC POSITION PAPER FOR NOW AND TOMORROW

Released April 22, 1976

A. CURRENT ECONOMIC REALITIES

Under two Republican Administrations we have been faced with the twin evils of intolerably high unemployment and double-digit inflation. We have experienced the worst recession since the 1930's, and the second recession since 1968. Federal deficits reached unheard of peacetime levels.

For eight years we have seen strict wage and price controls suddenly imposed and just as suddenly lifted. We have witnessed two devaluations of our currency. We have had to live with the consequences of the disastrous 1972 grain giveaway to the Soviet Union. We have watched our petroleum prices increase four and five fold. We have seen overly restrictive monetary policies and high interest rates compound our recession and greatly restrict our construction and homebuilding industry.

While inflation has declined from its previous levels, it still remains unacceptably high. It must not be ignored, for it is a critical problem facing the American people.

The major economic problem, however, is unacceptably high unemployment.

The average unemployment rate in 1975 was 8.5 percent. In *no* other postwar year has it averaged as much as 7 percent. Today, unemployment nationally is 7.5 percent — above the annual unemployment rate of any year since the Great Depression, 60 percent higher than 1972 and over 70 percent higher than in 1973. And yet this figure is itself a gross understatement of the true unemployment problem affecting our country. According to the United States Department of Labor, central city unemployment for 1975 was 9.6 percent. In some major cities unemployment has recently run as high as 17 percent. In 1975, every fourth black worker was unemployed and the majority of them were ineligible for unemployment compensation. Teenage black unemployment in some areas approaches the stagger-

ing figure of 40 percent. Unemployment among construction workers is over 20 percent.

Even these figures are deceptive for they do not include the hundreds of thousands of people who have been left out of the labor market due to their frustrating inability to find a job.

These are not simply figures. They represent an incalculable cost both to the unemployed and the nation. They represent the crushed dreams of millions of Americans ready and willing to work. All Americans should be free to have a decent job.

Unemployment not only affects the unemployed, it affects all Americans.

It has been estimated by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress that each one percent of excess unemployment adds at least \$4 to \$5 billion in direct costs for unemployment compensation, food stamps and welfare.

The federal government is currently spending between \$17 and \$20 billion for unemployment compensation and an additional \$2 to \$3 billion on food stamps due to unemployment. The present rate of unemployment compensation due to the recession is now more than four times the cost of two years ago.

High levels of unemployment mean increased crime and violence, lost output, a lower level of productivity, and less investment in new capital.

B. GOALS FOR THE PRESENT AND FUTURE

1. We must develop a *sensible, steady, fair, humane, well-coordinated* national economic policy.

My economic policy will be based on the true complexities of the present economic picture and the time required for any government policy to work its will. It will

avoid the shocks and surprises, the on-again, off-again programs and rapid policy changes which have characterized the last 8 years. It must be geared to alleviating inequities in our economic system and avoiding the harsh and arbitrary actions which paralyze those in our society least able to help themselves.

2. We must give *highest priority to achieving a steady reduction of unemployment and achieving full employment* — a job for everyone who wishes one — as rapidly as possible, *while reducing inflation*.

3. We must insure a *better coordination between fiscal and monetary policy* and insure a closer working relationship between the Executive Branch and the Federal Reserve Board.

4. Given the present state of the economy, we must pursue an expansionary fiscal and monetary program in the near future, with some budget deficits if necessary, to reduce unemployment more rapidly. But with a progressively managed economy we can attain a *balanced budget within the context of full employment by 1979*, prior to the end of the first term of my Administration. A balanced budget can be achieved without reducing social expenditures, through the increased revenues which will be realized by higher incomes in a fully employed economy. Under my administration, economic growth will generate additional revenues, avoiding the need for recession-related expenditures, and insuring both budget stability and an adequate level of public spending. *I favor balanced budgets over the business cycle.*

5. We need *better economic coordination and planning* through an expanded role for the Council of Economic Advisors, to aid government, business, and industry in making intelligent decisions.

C. A NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

1. Rapid Reduction in Unemployment

I am committed to a dramatic reduction in unemployment, without reviving double-digit inflation, through the following means:

(a) We must have an expansionary fiscal and monetary policy for the coming fiscal year to stimulate demand and production. This should not mean spending simply for the sake of spending without specific aims and goals, but policy aimed at curbing both cyclical and structural unemployment, creating useful jobs, and solving national needs.

Such an expansionary policy can reduce unemployment without reigniting inflation, because our economy is presently performing so far under capacity.

(b) *Specific stimulation should be given to private industry to hire the unemployed* through — an increased commitment by the federal government to fund the cost of on-the-job training by business.

— encouragement by the federal government to employers to retain workers during cyclical downturns including reforming the unemployment compensation tax paid by employers.

— public programs to train people for work in private sector jobs.

— incentives specifically geared to encourage employment, including incentives to employers who employ young persons and persons with lengthy records of unemployment, and to those employers who provide flexible hours of employment and flexible jobs, to aid access by women to the market place.

(c) To *supplement our effort* to have private industry play a greater role, the *federal government* has an obligation to provide *funds for useful and productive public employment* of those whom private business cannot or will not hire. Therefore we should:

— create meaningful public jobs in the cities and neighborhoods of the unemployed adjusted to solving our national needs in construction, repair, maintenance, and rehabilitation of facilities such as railroad roadbeds, housing, and the environment.

— improve manpower training and vocational education programs to increase the employability of the hard-core unemployed.

— provide 800,000 summer youth jobs.

— pass an accelerated public works program targeted to areas of specific national needs.

— double the CETA (Comprehensive Educational Training Act) program from 300,000 to 600,000 jobs, and provide counter-cyclical aid to cities with high unemployment.

— develop more efficient employment services to provide better job counseling and to match openings to individuals, and consider establishment of special Youth Employment Services especially geared to finding jobs for our young people.

2. Curbing Inflation

There are far more humane and economically sound solutions to curbing inflation than enforced recession, unemployment, monetary restrictions and high interest rates. Much of the inflation we have experienced was not caused by excessive demand but rather by dollar devaluations, external factors such as the increasing oil prices, and by world-wide increases in food and basic material prices. Furthermore, high interest costs, and the final dismantling of the controls program in 1974 contributed to high inflation rates.

A constant effort to battle inflation must accompany our drive for full employment. This requires measures to:

— increase the productive capabilities of our economy, with increased attention to the *supply side* of our economy, now virtually ignored.

— insure a steady flow of jobs and output.

- increase productivity so that growth does not become overly inflationary.
- insure a better relationship between the availability of goods and the demand for them. In the agricultural area, the federal government should assume the primary responsibility for establishing reserves of key foodstuffs in the United States.
- reform those governmental regulations, such as the rule prohibiting a truck from carrying goods on its return haul, which unnecessarily add to prices.
- strictly enforce anti-trust and consumer protection legislation and increase free-market competition.
- adopt a monetary policy which encourages lower interest rates and the availability of investment capital at reasonable costs.
- effectively monitor excessive price and wage increases in specific sectors of the economy.

While I oppose across-the-board permanent wage and price controls, I favor standby controls which the President can apply selectively. I do *not* presently see the need for the use of such standby authority.

3. *Better Coordination Between Fiscal and Monetary Policy*

Fiscal policy covers generally the taxing and spending decisions of the federal government. Fiscal policy formulation is centered in the federal government in the Congress, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of the Treasury, and the Presidency. Monetary policy on the other hand, concerns decisions having to do with money supply, interest rates, and credit market conditions, with policy formulation centered in the Federal Reserve System, and to a lesser extent, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Congress.

We cannot expect to achieve balanced growth through stable, sensible, and fair economic policies if fiscal and monetary policy are not better coordinated.

I propose the following steps:

- While the Federal Reserve Board should maintain its independence from the Executive Branch, it is important that throughout a President's term he have a Chairman of the Federal Reserve whose economic views are compatible with his own. Currently the Chairman is appointed for a four year term but not necessarily coterminous with the President's term. To insure greater compatibility between the President and the Federal Reserve Chairman, I propose that, *subject to Senate confirmation, the President be given the power to appoint his own Chairman of the Federal Reserve who would serve a term coterminous with the President's.*

- To insure better planning both by government and private industry, the Federal Reserve Board through its Open Market Committee should be held responsible for stating its objectives more clearly and publicly.
- The Federal Reserve Board should be required to submit to Congress and the public a credit market report on past monetary conditions, together with a short term and a year's outlook. This report, included as part of the Economic Report of the President to Congress, should be a definitive annual statement about monetary affairs. It should be the joint responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to show in their consolidated report that their policies are mutually consistent and, if not, to demonstrate why they are not consistent.

4. *More Effective Budgeting*

The budget of the federal government should serve as an instrument of both economic and general governmental policy. It is a statement of the influences of governmental expenditures on the allocation of resources, an instrument for carrying out economic stabilization policy, and a demonstration of our nation's priorities. It should serve as a guide to and a means of encouraging efficient and economical functioning of government.

For the current fiscal year, an expansionary fiscal and monetary policy is necessary. Social needs and the need for economic stabilization may require from time to time unbalancing of the budget. But, we should strive toward budget balance, *within an environment of full employment*, over the long term. The surplus years should balance the deficits. *I therefore call for balanced budgets over the business cycle.* This can be achieved by 1979. At the present time, there is a clear need for stimulus in order to return the economy to full employment.

A vigorous employment policy will enlarge the revenue base and will likewise reduce recession-related expenditures and will therefore do much to reduce the present deficit. My commitment is to achieve and maintain a high level of real growth in the economy, which will permit us to have a balanced budget without reductions in important social programs and within the context of full employment.

Budget planning within the federal government is presently on a yearly basis. This *does not allow sufficient long-range planning.* Therefore, we should budget on a three year cycle, rolling forward three years at a time when the budget is prepared each year. The first year ahead in a three year cycle should be the usual budget, the next two would be only first approximations, in an initial attempt to smooth out the budgeting process. The budget for the two latter years will normally be revised in the next year when a new third year is added for an initial approximation. The long range budgeting practice will roll forward from year to year.

The three year rolling budget technique will permit businessmen and public officials to do a much better job in laying out their own plans, relying less on the need for more elaborate proposals of comprehensive planning. Moreover, as we did while I was Governor of Georgia, we should predict the costs of programs over a long period of time so that proper long-term budgeting can be done. Also, we should attempt to implement new approaches to government budgeting, such as zero-base budgeting, which insure that there is quality control over government programs and that these programs accomplish their intended end.

5. *Better Government Planning and Management*

I am a firm advocate of the private enterprise system. I am a businessman myself. I *oppose* the type of rigid, bureaucratic centralized planning characteristics of communist countries.

But better general economic planning by government is essential to insure a stable, sensible, fair, humane economic policy, without the roller-coaster dips and curves we have faced in the last eight years. Government must plan ahead just like any business. Planning is widely practiced in the private sector of the American economy.

I favor coordinated government planning to attack problems of structural unemployment, inflation, environmental deterioration, exaggeration of economic inequalities, natural resource limitations, and obstructions to the operation of the free market system.

I believe that this type of planning can be carried out without the creation of a new bureaucracy, but rather through well defined extensions of existing bodies and techniques. I propose that the role of the present Council of Economic Advisors, established under the Full Employment Act of 1946, be expanded to include this type of coordinated planning and to deal with long range problems of individual sectors fitted into an overall economic plan for the economy as a whole, as well as to deal with considerations of supply, distribution, and performance in individual industries.

Many of the economic shocks of the past eight years have come on the supply side of the economy. It is imperative that we study ways to anticipate problems rather than await their arrival and once again react with ill-conceived solutions in a crisis environment. Such detailed studies will be an important new task for the Council of Economic Advisors.

We have no discernible economic goals. Goals must be established and clearly enunciated, so that our programs can be developed within a planned, orderly context.

The techniques I have outlined can and will be carried out within the framework of our present private enterprise system, free market institutions and administrative structures.

D. CONCLUSION

We live in an interdependent world. Problems of inflation, unemployment, scarcity of resources, and economic stabilization cannot be accomplished without a coordinated effort with the rest of the world. We will cooperate with our allies and trading partners, and others to develop long-term solutions to our common problems.

Beware of the person who promises economic wonders of high prosperity, with no problems of inflation, unemployment, or maldistribution of income. This country faces serious economic problems, but they can be dealt with in an honest, sensible way if we set our sights on a steady path towards full employment, wary of inflationary pressures, and geared towards meeting national needs. Exhortation and gimmickry are not going to be very helpful in meeting the economic challenges, but good, sensible policies are. Straightforward, uncomplicated programs aiming at expanding production, getting all segments of the unemployed back to work, insuring the smooth working of our private enterprise system, and introducing reforms in the spirit of more economic equity are the kinds of policies this country needs.

It will be my responsibility as President to insure that this nation has a coherent, coordinated, short and long term economic policy, geared to achieve full employment, low rates of inflation, and cyclically balanced budgets. To these I am committed. These goals will be achieved.

JIMMY CARTER'S ECONOMIC TASK FORCE

LAWRENCE R. KLEIN, President-elect American Economic Association; Benjamin Franklin Professor of Economics and Finance, University of Pennsylvania

CAROLYN SHAW BELL, Katherine Coman Professor of Economics, Wellesley College; Executive Committee, American Economic Association

RICHARD COOPER, Professor of Economics and former Provost, Yale University; former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State

JULIUS EDELSTEIN, Dean, City University of New York; Dean of Urban Policy and Programs, Graduate Center, City University of New York

MARTIN FELDSTEIN, Professor of Economics, Harvard University

ALBERT T. SOMERS, Vice President and Chief Economist, The Conference Board

LESTER THUROW, Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

MICHAEL WACHTER, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Pennsylvania

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

Energy

TO THE WASHINGTON PRESS CLUB

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 11, 1975

A year and a half after the humiliating Arab oil embargo, with its devastating and continuing consequences for our economy, we still have the same national energy policy, developed and maintained by the oil and electric power companies:

"Use more and more energy and pay higher and higher prices for it."

Misleading presidential statements about "Project Independence" merely lulled our people into a false sense of continued trust in inept and timid leaders—while our dependence on foreign oil lunged upward. Our foreign oil bill is now a staggering \$25 billion per year, compared to 1/10th of this amount in 1970. We may have to import 60% of our petroleum needs by 1985, compared to about 40% now and only 25% in 1973.

We have bowed quietly and subserviently to the Arab nations who tried to blackmail our great country just a few months ago. Apparently we are now prepared to continue this obeisance as a permanent and increasingly mandatory national posture.

The political leadership of this country has failed to fulfill its responsibilities to the American people. The U.S. Congress has been unable to arouse itself from lethargy and devise a meaningful alternative to President Ford's disastrous energy proposal. The administration's energy policy is easy to describe—a large and sudden increase in the price of oil.

If the Gerald Ford/oil industry policy is implemented:

—It will add from 3% to 4% to the nation's inflation rate;

—It will cost us consumers more than \$30 billion annually, draining this purchasing power away from

other parts of the floundering economy and increasing already disgraceful levels of unemployment;

—It will encourage additional O.P.E.C. oil price hikes;

—It will aggravate fuel distribution inequities and further damage New England and other areas which are especially dependent on declining oil sources;

—It will not result in decreased consumption equivalent to price increases because of inelastic demand for certain petroleum products;

—It will punish those with low and middle incomes, while the rich continue to waste all the fuel they want;

—It will continue a callous disregard for environmental quality.

In short, the Ford/oil industry energy policy is merely another example of letting the average American pay for the politicians' mistakes.

Our nation must act! Neither the world economy nor the American economy can withstand a continuation of present circumstances and trends. In effect, the O.P.E.C. cartel has levied a \$60 billion annual excise tax on the rest of the world, an amount more than equal to the stock value of all international oil companies in the world. By 1980, the liquid capital of oil exporting nations will comprise more than half the world's monetary reserves, creating the potential for devastating world economic damage or threats of damage.

The economies of weak developing countries with no major exportable products are being destroyed, and all major oil importing nations are in effect operating on credit to the oil producing countries. The lives of developed nations depend on adequate energy

supplies, and any drastic reduction in fuel consumption could not be tolerated.

The private oil industry, primarily U.S. companies, has lost control of its former supplies and transmission systems in the Persian Gulf area. The O.P.E.C. nations now unilaterally set prices and export quotas and determine the identity of customers.

So long as the oil cartel remains intact, there is little likelihood of any voluntary price reduction for petroleum. These countries recognize their present strategic advantages and have no intention of relinquishing them.

The oil exporting countries do have a major investment in the soundness of the worldwide economic system. They also see more clearly the importance of close ties to the free nations of the world.

Recognizing these facts, it is imperative that we move boldly toward a goal of reasonable national energy self-sufficiency.

"Project Independence" is a farce.

No substantive steps have been taken to assure that we will be independent of doubtful foreign oil supplies any time in the foreseeable future.

We have no long-range national energy policy.

We are forming no binding alliances with other consuming nations to coordinate research and development efforts or to share future oil shortages.

Our foreign policy toward the O.P.E.C. countries is not designed to force reasonable price reductions.

We have begun no new concerted effort to develop additional types of energy supplies.

There is no major energy conservation program in this country.

No substantial increase in stockpiling facilities is under way.

One of the greatest failures of national leadership in recent history is the failure to convince the American people of the urgency of our energy problems. Americans are willing to make sacrifices if they understand the reason for them and if they believe the sacrifices are fairly distributed. Right now, they think the working people are making the sacrifices while the big shots get richer. They are right.

Imports of oil from foreign countries should be kept at manageable levels. Increasing amounts of oil from remaining domestic and foreign sources should then be channeled into permanent storage facilities until we have accumulated at least an additional thirty-day reserve supply.

If it becomes necessary, petroleum supplies available for consumption should be allocated by the Federal Energy Agency to the individual states, using the basic formula developed through experience during the winter of the oil embargo. The fifty state energy offices have been preparing for the past year and a half to distribute oil locally to meet greatest needs.

If patriotic appeals and strict conservation measures prove to be inadequate to control consumption, standby excise taxes should be available to the President for selective imposition on petroleum products.

The price of all domestic oil should be kept below that of O.P.E.C. oil.

We should place the importation of oil under government authority to allow strict control of purchases and the auctioning of purchase orders.

To insure maximum protection for our consumers during the coming years of increasing energy shortages, antitrust laws must be rigidly enforced. Maximum disclosure of data on reserve supplies and production must be required.

Utility rates are up more than 40% in two years, while electric power plants operate at about 35% efficiency. Electric power companies demand that their present customers finance huge construction projects while less than half of their present capacity is utilized. Some of their projections for annual power consumption increases are double even those of the Federal Energy Agency administrator!

Unnecessary electrical power plant construction should be stopped.

Advertising at consumers' expense to encourage increased consumption of electricity should be prohibited.

Rate structures which discourage total consumption and peak power demand should be established.

Additional major reductions in oil and natural gas consumption must be planned. Recently, government geologists slashed estimates of our off-shore oil reserves by 80% and cut total national reserve estimates by 50%! We have at most a 35-year supply of oil in the world at present rates of consumption.

In a few years, oil and gas will be too valuable to be used for heating buildings or for generating electricity. Almost all of our dwindling supplies will be required for the production of fertilizer and petrochemicals and for transportation.

We must act now to reduce the enormous waste of these valuable products by legal mandate, patriotic appeals, and improved technology. If we do not, the inevitable pressures of rising prices and dwindling sup-

plies will continue to disrupt our economy and punish those who can least afford it.

The potential for dramatic energy conservation remains untapped. Our energy waste in transportation is 85%, in generating electricity 65%. Overall, 50% of our energy is wasted.

When we had to cut our own wood to burn on the farm, we did not waste it.

We need:

- Mandated motor vehicle efficiency standards;
- Rigid enforcement of speed laws;
- Efficiency standards and labeling for electrical appliances;
- Mandatory improvements in building insulation;
- Regulatory agency decisions that reduce fuel consumption;
- And similar conservation measures.

The federal government with all its agencies should set a national example in the conservation and proper use of energy.

In spite of growing dependence on other sources of power, fossil fuels will still be our main source of energy in the year 2000 A.D., with fusion power still in the developmental stage.

A major immediate need is to derive maximum energy from coal, while preserving environmental quality. We have at least a 200-year supply of clean and accessible coal. Power companies and industries must shift to this source of energy, and we must invest in improved mining efficiency, cleaner combustion technology, and a better transportation system for moving coal to its end users.

Substantial increases in coal production and utilization will only come with a stable regulatory climate. The recent veto of the strip mining bill merely prolonged the present climate of uncertainty.

We must also exploit the potential of solar energy in the construction of new homes and offices.

During the past few years, two-thirds of all federal research and development funds went for atomic power, primarily for the liquid metal fast breeder reactor (LMFBR). Since this potential source of energy will not be economically feasible until the price of natural uranium increases several times over, since England, France and the U.S.S.R. have design experience with the LMFBR, and because of the mounting costs and environmental problems, our excessive emphasis on this project should be severely reduced and converted to a long-term, possibly multinational effort.

Our atomic plants use light water with enriched uranium. Some countries, such as Canada, use heavy water with more plentiful natural uranium. Our government's fuel enrichment plants can produce adequate enriched uranium for the next decade. A shift away from sustained production of atomic weapons or toward heavy water reactors can extend this time of adequate supply.

The private commercial production of enriched nuclear fuel should be approached with extreme caution.

In addition to the physical damage and human suffering which would result from a nuclear disaster, the economic, psychological and political consequences to our energy supply system would be more devastating than a total Middle East oil embargo. It is imperative that such an accident be prevented. We must maintain the strictest possible safety standards for our atomic power plants, and be completely honest with our people concerning any problems or dangers.

For instance, nuclear reactors should be located below ground level. The power plants should be housed in sealed buildings within which permanent heavy vacuums are maintained. Plants should be located in sparsely populated areas and only after consultation with state and local officials. Designs should be standardized. And a full-time federal employee, with full authority to shut down the plant in case of any operational abnormality, should always be present in control rooms.

An international conference on energy research and development would benefit all nations. It is ridiculous for each of us to go our own separate way and replicate research projects which are being completed in other nations. There is certainly enough challenge and responsibility to go around in energy fields involving: Thermonuclear reaction containment; liquefaction and gassification of coal; use of solid wastes; breeder reactors; electric propulsion and rail development; building insulation and design; heating, cooling and electrical power generation from solar energy; electric power transmission; industrial plant efficiency; automobile engine design; coal mining techniques; efficiency of petroleum extraction from the ground; materials recycling; long-range benefit:cost ratio for energy sources; and nuclear waste disposal. Of course, private industry will be expected to continue research in many of these and other fields of interest, often in cooperation with government.

It is unlikely that we will be totally "independent" of oil imports during this century. Our present trend is still toward increasing dependence on oil supplies from overseas.

Although our country is still the world's largest pro-

ducer of oil, domestic production is decreasing inexorably by about 6% annually—despite a substantial increase in exploration efforts.

It is certainly not possible or necessary for us to be energy independent by 1985, but we should be free from possible blackmail or economic disaster which might be caused by another boycott. Our reserves should be developed, imports reduced to manageable levels, standby rationing procedures evolved and authorized, and aggressive economic reprisals should await any boycotting oil supplier.

With proper national planning and determined execution of those plans, energy conservation can be completely compatible with environmental quality and

with economic well-being. Lower energy consumption inherently reduces world pollution levels. The elimination of waste and technological advances into new energy fields can result in enhanced employment opportunities without any reduction in the quality of our economic lives.

Unless we conserve energy drastically, make a major shift to coal, and substantially increase our use of solar energy, we will have no alternative to greatly increased dependence on nuclear power. As one who is intimately familiar with the problems and potential of nuclear energy, I believe we must make every effort to keep that dependence to a minimum.

We need strong leadership, and we need it now!

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

LAW DAY

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GA

May 4, 1974

Senator Kennedy, distinguished fellow Georgians, friends of the Law School of Georgia and personal friends of mine:

Sometimes even a distinguished jurist on the Supreme Court doesn't know all of the background on acceptances of invitations. As a matter of fact, my wife was influential in this particular acceptance, but my son was even more influential. This was really an acceptance to repair my ego. There was established in 1969 the L.Q.C. Lamar Society. I was involved in the establishment of it, and I think a lot of it. As Governor of Georgia I was invited this year, along with two distinguished Americans, to make a speech at the annual meeting which is going on now.

I found out when the program was prepared that Senator Kennedy was to speak last night. They charged \$10 to attend the occasion. Senator William Brock from Tennessee is speaking to the Lamar Society at noon today. I found out that they charged \$7.50 for this occasion. I spoke yesterday at noon, and I asked the Lamar Society officials, at the last moment, how much they were charging to come to the luncheon yesterday. They said they weren't charging anything. I said, "You mean they don't even have to pay for the lunch?" They said, "No, we're providing the lunch free."

So, when my son Jack came and said, "Daddy, I think more of you than you thought I did; I'm paying \$7.00 for two tickets to the luncheon," I figured that a \$3.50 lunch ticket would salvage part of my ego and that's really why I'm here today.

I'm not qualified to talk to you about law, because in addition to being a peanut farmer, I'm an engineer and a nuclear physicist, not a lawyer. I was planning, really, to talk to you more today about politics and the interrelationship of political affairs and law, than about what I'm actually going to speak on. But after Senator Kennedy's delightful and very fine response to political questions during his speech, and after his analysis of the Watergate problems, I stopped at a room on the way, while he had his press conference, and I changed my speech notes.

My own interest in the criminal justice system is very deep and heartfelt. Not having studied law, I've had to learn the hard way. I read a lot and listen a lot. One of the sources for my understanding about the proper application of criminal justice and the system of equity is from reading Reinhold Niebuhr, one of his books that Bill Gunter gave me quite a number of years

ago. The other source of my understanding about what's right and wrong in this society is from a friend of mine, a poet named Bob Dylan. After listening to his records about "The Ballad of Hattie Carol" and "Like a Rolling Stone" and "The Times, They Are A Changing," I've learned to appreciate the dynamism of change in a modern society.

I grew up as a landowner's son. But, I don't think I ever realized the proper interrelationship between the landowner and those who worked on a farm until I heard Dylan's record, "I Ain't Gonna Work on Maggie's Farm No More." So I come here speaking to you today about your subject with a base for my information founded on Reinhold Niebuhr and Bob Dylan.

One of the things that Niebuhr says is that the sad duty of the political system is to establish justice in a sinful world. He goes on to say that there's no way to establish or maintain justice without law; that the laws are constantly changing to stabilize the social equilibrium of the forces and counterforces of a dynamic society, and that the law in its totality is an expression of the structure of government.

Well, as a farmer who has now been in office for three years, I've seen firsthand the inadequacy of my own comprehension of what government ought to do for its people. I've had a constant learning process, sometimes from lawyers, sometimes from practical experience, sometimes from failures and mistakes that have been pointed out to me after they were made.

I had lunch this week with the members of the Judicial Selection Committee, and they were talking about a consent search warrant. I said I didn't know what a consent search warrant was. They said, "Well, that's when two policemen go to a house. One of them goes to the front door and knocks on it, and the other one runs around to the back door and yells 'come in'." I have to admit that as Governor, quite often I search for ways to bring about my own hopes; not quite so stringently testing the law as that, but with a similar motivation.

I would like to talk to you for a few moments about some of the practical aspects of being a governor who is still deeply concerned about the inadequacies of a system of which it is obvious that you're so patently proud.

I have refrained completely from making any judicial appointments on the basis of political support or other factors, and have chosen, in every instance, Superior Court judges, quite often State judges, Appellate Court

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100

A copy of our report is filed with the Federal Election Commission and is available for purchase from the Federal Election Commission, Washington, D.C.

judges, on the basis of merit analysis by a highly competent, open, qualified group of distinguished Georgians. I'm proud of this.

We've now established in the Georgia Constitution a qualifications commission, which for the first time can hear complaints from average citizens about the performance in office of judges and can investigate those complaints and with the status and the force of the Georgia Constitution behind them can remove a judge from office or take other corrective steps.

We've now passed a Constitutional amendment, which is waiting for the citizenry to approve, that establishes a uniform Criminal Justice Court System in this state so that the affairs of the judiciary can be more orderly structured, so that work loads can be balanced and so that over a period of time there might be an additional factor of equity, which quite often does not exist now because of the wide disparity among the different courts of Georgia.

We passed this year a judge sentencing bill for non-capital cases with a review procedure. I've had presented to me, by members of the Pardons and Paroles Board, an analysis of some of the sentences given to people by the Superior Court judges of this state, which grieved me deeply and shocked me as a layman. I believe that over a period of time, the fact that a group of other judges can review and comment on the sentences meted out in the different portions of Georgia will bring some more equity to the system.

We have finally eliminated the unsworn statement law in Georgia—the last state to do it.

This year, we analyzed in depth the structure of the drug penalties in this state. I believe in the future there will be a clear understanding of the seriousness of different crimes relating to drugs. We've finally been able to get through the legislature a law that removes alcoholism or drunkenness as a criminal offense. When this law goes into effect next year, I think it will create a new sense of compassion and concern and justice for the roughly 150,000 alcoholics in Georgia, many of whom escape the consequences of what has been a crime because of some social or economic prominence, and will remove a very heavy load from the criminal justice system.

In our prisons, which in the past have been a disgrace to Georgia, we've tried to make substantive changes in the quality of those who administer them and to put a new realm of understanding and hope and compassion into the administration of that portion of the system of justice. Ninety-five percent of those who are presently incarcerated in prisons will be returned to be our neighbors. And now the thrust of the entire program, as initiated under Ellis MacDougall and now continued under Dr. Ault, is to try to discern in the soul of each convicted and sentenced person redeeming features that can be enhanced. We plan a career for that person to be pursued while he is in prison. I believe that the early data that we have on recidivism rates indicates the efficacy of what we've done.

The GBI, which was formerly a matter of great concern to all those who were interested in law enforcement, has now been substantially changed—for the better. I would put it up now in quality against the FBI, the Secret Service or any other crime control organization in this Nation.

Well, does that mean that everything is all right?

It doesn't to me.

I don't know exactly how to say this, but I was thinking just a few moments ago about some of the things that are of deep concern to me as Governor. As a scientist, I was working constantly, along with almost everyone who professes that dedication of life, to probe, probe every day of my life for constant change for the better. It's completely anachronistic in the makeup of a nuclear physicist or an engineer or scientist to be satisfied with what we've got, or to rest on the laurels of past accomplishments. It's the nature of the profession.

As a farmer, the same motivation persists. Every farmer that I know of, who is worth his salt or who's just average, is ahead of the experiment stations and the research agronomist in finding better ways, changing ways to plant, cultivate, utilize herbicides, gather, cure, sell farm products. The competition for innovation is tremendous, equivalent to the realm of nuclear physics even.

In my opinion, it's different in the case of lawyers. And maybe this is a circumstance that is so inherently true that it can't be changed.

I'm a Sunday School teacher, and I've always known that the structure of law is founded on the Christian ethic that you shall love the Lord your God and your neighbor as yourself—a very high and perfect standard. We all know the fallibility of man, and the contentions in society, as described by Reinhold Niebuhr and many others, don't permit us to achieve perfection. We do strive for equality, but not with a fervent and daily commitment. In general, the powerful and the influential in our society shape the laws and have a great influence on the legislature or the Congress. This creates a reluctance to change because the powerful and the influential have carved out for themselves or have inherited a privileged position in society, of wealth or social prominence or higher education or opportunity for the future. Quite often, those circumstances are circumvented at a very early age because college students, particularly undergraduates, don't have any commitment to the preservation of the way things are. But later, as their interrelationship with the present circumstances grows, they also become committed to approaching change very, very slowly and very, very cautiously, and there's a commitment to the status quo.

I remember when I was a child, I lived on a farm about three miles from Plains, and we didn't have electricity or running water. We lived on the railroad—Seaboard Coastline railroad. Like all farm boys I had a flip, a sling shot. They had stabilized the railroad bed with little white round rocks, which I used for ammunition. I would go out frequently to the railroad and gather the most perfectly shaped rocks of proper size. I always had a few in my pockets, and I had others cached away around the farm, so that they would be convenient if I ran out of my pocket supply.

One day I was leaving the railroad track with my pockets full of rocks and hands full of rocks, and my mother came out on the front porch—this is not a very interesting story but it illustrates a point—and she had in her hands a plate full of cookies that she had just baked for me. She called me, I am sure with love in her heart, and said, "Jimmy, I've baked some cookies for

you." I remember very distinctly walking up to her and standing there for 15 or 20 seconds, in honest doubt about whether I should drop those rocks which were worthless and take the cookies that my mother had prepared for me, which between her and me were very valuable.

Quite often, we have the same inclination in our everyday lives. We don't recognize that change can sometimes be very beneficial, although we fear it. Any one who lives in the South looks back on the last 15 to 20 years with some degree of embarrassment, including myself. To think about going back to a county unit system, which deliberately cheated for generations certain white voters of this state, is almost inconceivable. To revert back or to forego the one man, one vote principle, we would now consider to be a horrible violation of the basic principles of justice and equality and fairness and equity.

The first speech I ever made in the Georgia Senate, representing the most conservative district in Georgia, was concerning the abolition of 30 questions that we had so proudly evolved as a subterfuge to keep black citizens from voting and which we used with a great deal of smirking and pride for decades or generations ever since the War between the States—questions that nobody could answer in this room, but which were applied to every black citizen that came to the Sumter County Courthouse or Webster County Courthouse and said, "I want to vote." I spoke in that chamber, fearful of the news media reporting it back home, but overwhelmed with a commitment to the abolition of that artificial barrier to the rights of an American citizen. I remember the thing that I used in my speech, that a black pencil salesman on the outer door of the Sumter County Courthouse could make a better judgment about who ought to be sheriff than two highly educated professors at Georgia Southwestern College.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who was perhaps despised by many in this room because he shook up our social structure that benefited us, and demanded simply that black citizens be treated the same as white citizens, wasn't greeted with approbation and accolades by the Georgia Bar Association or the Alabama Bar Association. He was greeted with horror. Still, once that change was made, a very simple but difficult change, no one in his right mind would want to go back to circumstances prior to that juncture in the development of our Nation's society.

I don't want to go on and on, I'm part of it. But, the point I want to make to you is that we still have a long way to go. In every age or every year, we have a tendency to believe that we've come so far now, that there's no way to improve the present system. I'm sure when the Wright Brothers flew at Kitty Hawk, they felt that was the ultimate in transportation. When the first atomic bomb was exploded, that was the ultimate development in nuclear physics, and so forth.

Well, we haven't reached the ultimate. But who's going to search the heart and the soul of an organization like yours or a law school or state or nation and say, "What can we still do to restore equity and justice or to preserve it or to enhance it in this society?"

You know, I'm not afraid to make the change. I don't have anything to lose. But, as a farmer I'm not qualified to assess the characteristics of the 91 hundred inmates

in the Georgia prisons, 50% of whom ought not to be there. They ought to be on probation or under some other supervision and assess what the results of previous court rulings might bring to bear on their lives.

I was in the Governor's Mansion for two years, enjoying the services of a very fine cook, who was a prisoner—a woman. One day she came to me, after she got over her two years of timidity, and said, "Governor, I would like to borrow \$250.00 from you."

I said, "I'm not sure that a lawyer would be worth that much."

She said, "I don't want to hire a lawyer, I want to pay the judge."

I thought it was a ridiculous statement for her; I felt that she was ignorant. But I found out she wasn't. She had been sentenced by a Superior Court judge in the state, who still serves, to seven years or \$750. She had raised, early in her prison career, \$500. I didn't lend her the money, but I had Bill Harper, my legal aide, look into it. He found the circumstances were true. She was quickly released under a recent court ruling that had come down in the last few years.

I was down on the coast this weekend. I was approached by a woman who asked me to come by her home. I went by, and she showed me documents that indicated that her illiterate mother, who had a son in jail, had gone to the County Surveyor in that region and had borrowed \$225 to get her son out of jail. She had a letter from the Justice of the Peace that showed that her mother had made a mark on a blank sheet of paper. They paid off the \$225, and she has the receipts to show it. Then they started a 5-year program trying to get back the paper she signed, without success. They went to court. The lawyer that had originally advised her to sign the paper showed up as the attorney for the surveyor. She had put up 50 acres of land near the county seat as security. When she got to court she found that instead of signing a security deed, that she had signed a warranty deed. That case has already been appealed to the Supreme Court, and she lost.

Well, I know that the technicalities of the law that would permit that are probably justifiable. She didn't have a good lawyer. My heart feels and cries out that something ought to be analyzed, not just about the structure of government, judicial qualification councils and judicial appointment committees and eliminating the unsworn statement—those things are important. But they don't reach the crux of the point—that now we assign punishment to fit the criminal and not the crime.

You can go in the prisons of Georgia, and I don't know, it may be that poor people are the only ones who commit crimes, but I do know they are the only ones who serve prison sentences. When Ellis MacDougall first went to Reidsville, he found people that had been in solitary confinement for ten years. We now have 500 misdemeanants in the Georgia prison system.

Well, I don't know the theory of law, but there is one other point I want to make, just for your own consideration. I think we've made great progress in the Pardons and Paroles Board since I've been in office and since we've reorganized the government. We have five very enlightened people there now. And on occasion they go out to the prison system to interview the inmates, to decide whether or not they are worthy to be released after they serve one-third of their sentence. I think

most jurors and most judges feel that, when they give the sentence, they know that after a third of the sentence has gone by, they will be eligible for careful consideration. Just think for a moment about your own son or your own father or your own daughter being in prison, having served seven years of a lifetime term and being considered for a release. Don't you think that they ought to be examined and that the Pardons and Paroles Board ought to look them in the eye and ask them a question and, if they are turned down, ought to give them some substantive reason why they are not released and what they can do to correct their defect?

I do.

I think it's just as important at their time for consideration of early release as it is even when they are sentenced. But, I don't know how to bring about that change.

We had an ethics bill in the State Legislature this year. Half of it passed—to require an accounting for contributions during a campaign—but the part that applied to people after the campaign failed. We couldn't get through a requirement for revelation of payments or gifts to officeholders after they are in office.

The largest force against that ethics bill was the lawyers.

Some of you here tried to help get a consumer protection package passed without success.

The regulatory agencies in Washington are made up, not of people to regulate industries, but of representatives of the industries that are regulated. Is that fair and right and equitable? I don't think so.

I'm only going to serve four years as governor, as you know. I think that's enough. I enjoy it, but I think I've done all I can in the Governor's office. I see the lobbyists in the State Capitol filling the halls on occasions. Good people, competent people, the most pleasant, personable, extroverted citizens of Georgia. Those are the characteristics that are required for a lobbyist. They represent good folks. But I tell you that when a lobbyist goes to represent the Peanut Warehousemen's Association of the Southeast, which I belong to, which I helped to organize, they go there to represent the peanut warehouseman. They don't go there to represent the customers of the peanut warehouseman.

When the State Chamber of Commerce lobbyists go there, they go there to represent the businessman of Georgia. They don't go there to represent the customers of the businessman of Georgia.

When your own organization is interested in some legislation there in the Capitol, they're interested in the welfare or prerogatives or authority of the lawyers. They are not there to represent in any sort of exclusive way the client of the lawyers.

The American Medical Association and its Georgia equivalent—they represent the doctors, who are fine people. But they certainly don't represent the patients of a doctor.

As an elected governor, I feel that responsibility; but I also know that my qualifications are slight compared to the doctors or the lawyers or the teachers, to determine what's best for the client or the patient or the school child.

This bothers me; and I know that if there was a commitment on the part of the cumulative group of attorneys in this State, to search with a degree of commit-

ment and fervency, to eliminate many of the inequities that I've just described that I thought of this morning, our state could be transformed in the attitude of its people toward the government.

Senator Kennedy described the malaise that exists in this Nation, and it does.

In closing, I'd like to just illustrate the point by something that came to mind this morning when I was talking to Senator Kennedy about his trip to Russia.

When I was about 12 years old, I liked to read, and I had a school principal, named Miss Julia Coleman, Judge Marshall knows her. She forced me pretty much to read, read, read, classical books. She would give me a gold star when I read ten and a silver star when I read five.

One day, she called me in and she said, "Jimmy, I think it's time for you to read **War and Peace**." I was completely relieved because I thought it was a book about cowboys and Indians.

Well, I went to the library and checked it out, and it was 1,415 pages thick, I think, written by Tolstoy, as you know, about Napoleon's entry into Russia in the 1812-1815 era. He had never been defeated and he was sure he could win, but he underestimated the severity of the Russian winter and the peasants' love for their land.

To make a long story short, the next spring he retreated in defeat. The course of history was changed; it probably affected our own lives.

The point of the book is, and what Tolstoy points out in the epilogue is, that he didn't write the book about Napoleon or the Czar of Russia or even the generals, except in a rare occasion. He wrote it about the students and the housewives and the barbers and the farmers and the privates in the Army. And the point of the book is that the course of human events, even the greatest historical events, are not determined by the leaders of a nation or a state, like presidents or governors or senators. They are controlled by the combined wisdom and courage and commitment and discernment and unselfishness and compassion and love and idealism of the common ordinary people. If that was true in the case of Russia where they had a czar or France where they had an emperor, how much more true is it in our own case where the Constitution charges us with a direct responsibility for determining what our government is and ought to be?

Well, I've read parts of the embarrassing transcripts, and I've seen the proud statement of a former attorney general, who protected his boss, and now brags on the fact that he tiptoed through a mine field and came out "clean." I can't imagine somebody like Thomas Jefferson tiptoeing through a mine field on the technicalities of the law, and then bragging about being clean afterwards.

I think our people demand more than that. I believe that everyone in this room who is in a position of responsibility as a preserver of the law in its purest form ought to remember the oath that Thomas Jefferson and others took when they practically signed their own death warrant, writing the Declaration of Independence—to preserve justice and equity and freedom and fairness, they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

Thank you very much.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER AT THE Martin Luther King Hospital LOS ANGELES

June 1, 1976

We are here today to honor a man with a dream.

We are here to honor a man who lived and died for the cause of human brotherhood.

Martin Luther King, Jr. was the conscience of his generation.

He was a doctor to a sick society.

He was a prophet of a new and better America.

He was a Southerner, a black man, who in his too-short life stood with Presidents and Kings, and was honored around the world, but who never forgot the poor people, the oppressed people, who were his brothers and sisters and from whom he drew his strength.

He was the man, more than any other of this generation, who gazed upon the great wall of segregation and saw that it could be destroyed by the power of love.

I sometimes think that a Southerner of my generation can most fully understand the meaning and the impact of Martin Luther King's life.

He and I grew up in the same South, he the son of a clergyman, I the son of a farmer. We both knew, from opposite sides, the invisible wall of racial segregation.

The official rule then was "separate but equal," but in truth we were neither—not separate, not equal.

When I was a boy, almost all my playmates were black. We worked in the fields together, and hunted and fished and swam together, but when it was time for church or for school, we went our separate ways, without really understanding why.

Our lives were dominated by unspoken, unwritten, but powerful rules, rules that were almost never challenged.

A few people challenged them, not in politics, but in the way they lived their lives. My mother was one of those people. She was a nurse. She would work twelve hours a day and then come home and care for her family and minister to the people of our little community, both black and white.

My mother knew no color line. Her black friends were just as welcome in her home as her white friends, a fact that shocked some people, sometimes even my father, who was very conventional in his views on race.

I left Georgia in 1943 and went off to the Navy and by the time I returned home ten years later, the South and the nation had begun to change.

The change was slow and painful. After the Supreme Court outlawed school segregation, the wrong kind of politicians stirred up angry resistance, and little towns like mine were torn apart by fear and resentment.

Yet the change was coming. Across the South, courageous young black students demanded service at segregated lunch counters. And in the end they prevailed.

In Montgomery, a woman named Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of the bus, a young clergyman named Martin Luther King joined the protest, and a movement had found its leader.

In 1961, we had a new president, John Kennedy, who responded to the demands of the civil rights movement, and who used the power of his office to enforce court orders at the University of Alabama and the University of Mississippi, and who by the last year of his life was giving moral leadership in the struggle for equal rights.

In August of 1963 Martin Luther King stood on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington and told a quarter of a million people of his dream for America.

"I have a dream," he said. "I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, sons of former slaves and sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood."

"I have a dream," he said, "that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream."

And so the dream was born. The challenge was made. The rest was up to America.

Three months after Dr. King's speech, President Kennedy was dead, and we had a new president, a Texan, a man whom many black people distrusted. But soon Lyndon Johnson stood before the Congress of the United States and promised, "We shall overcome!"

Lyndon Johnson carried forward the dream of equality. He used his political genius to pass the Voting Rights Bill, a bill that was the best thing that happened to the

South in my lifetime. The Voting Rights Act did not just guarantee the vote for black people. It liberated the South, both black and white. It made it possible for the South to come out of the past and into the mainstream of American politics.

It made it possible for a Southerner to stand before you this evening as a serious candidate for President of the United States.

But war came, and destroyed Lyndon Johnson's great society. Martin Luther King spoke out against that war. There were those who told him to keep silent, who told him he would undercut his prestige if he opposed the war, but he followed his conscience and spoke his mind.

Then, in the spring of 1968, he went to Memphis to help the garbage workers get a decent wage, to help the men who did the dirtiest job for the lowest pay, and while he was there he was shot and killed.

But his dream lives on.

Perhaps some of you remember the night of Dr. King's death. Robert Kennedy was in Indianapolis, running for president, speaking before a black audience. At that point, on that awful night, Robert Kennedy was perhaps the only white politician in America who could have spoken to black people and been listened to.

Let me tell you what he said.

He said, "What we need in the United States is not division, what we need in the United States is not hatred, what we need in the United States is not violence and lawlessness, but love and wisdom and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or whether they be black."

Those words are still true today.

We lost Martin Luther King.

We lost Robert Kennedy.

We lost the election that year to men who governed without love or laughter, to men who promised law and order and gave us crime and oppression.

But the dream lived on.

It could be slowed, but never stopped.

In Atlanta, a young man named Andrew Young, who had been Martin Luther King's strong right hand, was elected to the Congress of the United States.

All over America, black men and women were carrying the dream forward into politics.

In Georgia, when I was governor, we appointed black people to jobs and judgeships they had never held before, and one day we hung a portrait of Martin Luther King, Jr., in our State Capitol.

There were protests, but they didn't matter. Inside our State Capitol, Coretta King and Daddy King and Andy Young and I and hundreds of others joined hands and sang "We Shall Overcome."

And we shall.

I stand before you, a candidate for President, a man whose life has been lifted, as yours have been, by the dream of Martin Luther King.

When I started to run for President, there were those who said I would fail, because I am from the South.

But I thought they were wrong. I thought the South was changing and America was changing, I thought the dream was taking hold.

And I ran for President throughout our nation.

We have won in the South, and we have won in the North, and now we come to the West and we ask your help.

For all our progress, we still live in a land held back by oppression and injustice.

The few who are rich and powerful still make the decisions, and the many who are poor and weak must suffer the consequences. If those in power make mistakes, it is not they or their families who lose their jobs or go on welfare or lack medical care or go to jail.

We still have poverty in the midst of plenty.

We still have far to go. We must give our government back to our people. The road will not be easy.

But we still have the dream, Martin Luther King's dream and your dream and my dream. The America we long for is still out there, somewhere ahead of us, waiting for us to find her.

I see an America poised not only at the brink of a new century, but at the dawn of a new era of honest, compassionate, responsive government.

I see an American government that has turned away from scandals and corruption and official cynicism and finally become as decent as our people.

I see an America with a tax system that does not steal from the poor and give to the rich.

I see an America with a job for every man and woman who can work, and a decent standard of living for those who cannot.

I see an America in which my child and your child and every child receives an education second to none in the world.

I see an American government that does not spy on its citizens or harass its citizens, but respects your dignity and your privacy and your right to be let alone.

I see an American foreign policy that is firm and consistent and generous, and that once again is a beacon for the hopes of the world.

I see an American President who does not govern by vetoes and negativism, but with vigor and vision and affirmative leadership, a President who is not isolated from our people, but feels their pain and shares their dreams and takes his strength from them.

I see an America in which Martin Luther King's dream is our national dream.

I see an America on the move again, united, its wounds healed, its head high, a diverse and vital nation, moving into its third century with confidence and competence and compassion, an America that lives up to the majesty of its constitution and the simple decency of its people.

This is the America that I see, and that I am committed to as I run for President.

I ask your help.

You will always have mine.

Thank you.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE ON Education



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

February 6, 1976

The Honorable Jimmy Carter
Jimmy Carter for President
P.O. Box 1976
Atlanta, Georgia 30301

Dear Governor Carter:

Increasingly the 1.8 million teacher-members of the National Education Association are involved in political activities supporting candidates for local, state, and federal office. The NEA has a procedure whereby the delegates to our annual Representative Assembly, the Association's supreme policy-making body, may vote to endorse a candidate for President of the United States, thus throwing the Association's financial and personnel resources behind the candidate judged by teachers to be most supportive of education and other national issues in which teachers are vitally interested.

Our procedure calls for careful evaluation of candidates' views and positions on these issues. We want to provide to our members as much information as possible on each candidate's position on matters of concern to NEA.

Enclosed is a questionnaire raising several of those issues. We are most interested in your responses. I would appreciate it if you would give us your reactions by March 1. The answers you provide will be used to inform our members about your stands and help us to assess your commitment to education.

Another aspect of our evaluation of candidates is a personal interview. We will be contacting you to set up an interview sometime in late spring. A small screening committee and I will want to talk with you about the issues and your positions and give you an opportunity to clarify any matter you wish. These interviews will be videotaped for use by the National Education Association Political Action Committee (NEA-PAC), the group which has the responsibility for recommending an endorsement. Bob Harman of our NEA Government Relations office will be in touch with your staff to arrange this interview.

I look forward to receiving your response to the questionnaire and to interviewing you later this year.

Sincerely,

John Ryor, President
National Education Association

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100

1. *If elected President, what steps would you take and/or what measures would you initiate to improve the quality of American public education?*

A major overhaul of the revenue sharing concept is needed. Funds for local governments should be greatly increased, and the ~~prohibition~~ against using these funds for education should be eliminated.

The regressive and haphazard method of financing education across the nation produces severe disparities among states and within a single state. As Governor, I successfully sponsored major reform for education financing in Georgia, based on the relative wealth of the area in which a child lives, to help eliminate such disparities.

The federal share of public education costs was 10% in 1974. If existing inequalities are to be eliminated and American teachers provided with a decent standard of living, the portion must be increased.

The return from federal expenditures can be greatly enhanced by simplification of laws and regulations to substitute education for paper-shuffling grantsmanship.

As President, I will initiate as a major and early priority a comprehensive attack upon the basic problems of education in America with particular emphasis on the obviously inadequate system of financing. This program will include specific and substantive proposals for implementation by the President, the Congress, and the states. I will not be hesitant to propose and support basic changes.

In addition to the items already mentioned, such a program would assure the following:

- The proper relationship between private and public education.
- Expanded vocational and career opportunities. (By 1980, 80% of all jobs are expected to require education beyond high school but less than a four-year degree.)
- The educational rights of the handicapped.
- The proper consideration of private philanthropy in education as decisions on basic tax reform proposals are made.

A piecemeal approach will not solve the problem. A comprehensive program and the political courage to see it implemented are required.

2. *In developing your Administration's education policies with whom would you consult? What role do you see NEA teacher-leaders playing in your Administration?*

I will consult with NEA on matters of policy and before making educational appointments. I will seek out experts in every field of education, including NEA teacher-leaders.

3. *What specific qualifications would you look for in your appointments of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; the Commissioner of Edu-*

cation; the HEW Assistant Secretary for Education; and Director of the National Institute of Education? What is your position on establishing a separate Cabinet level Department of Education?

I will make all appointments on a strict basis of merit. I am in favor of creating a separate Cabinet level Department of Education. Generally, I am opposed to the proliferation of federal agencies, now numbering some 1900, which I believe should be reduced to 200. But the Department of Education would consolidate the grant programs, job training, early childhood education, literacy training, and many other functions currently scattered throughout the government. The result would be a stronger voice for education at the federal level.

4. *What budgetary priority do you place on public education in relation to the many other concerns of the federal government?*

I believe public education is a top budgetary priority.

5. *What measures would your Administration take to insure that state and local governments can provide educational equity and a comprehensive education for all Americans? Would your Administration take steps to see that the federal government's share of public education expenses increases, say up to one-third of all funds needed? What do you see as an appropriate level of funding at the end of your four-year term as President?*

I have discussed these questions in number one; I also stated that the level of federal funding should be raised.

6. *What is your position on the use of public funds to support church-related or other nonpublic schools? Would you support legislation to provide tax credits for tuition to nonpublic schools? What is the responsibility of the federal government in providing financial support for post-secondary education institutions? What form(s) should such assistance take?*

I will uphold the rulings of the Supreme Court on the use of public funds to support church-related schools.

I believe the federal government has a creative role to play in higher education. For example, parents whose children go to private colleges understandably complain of unfair treatment. They must support public colleges and universities through taxation as well as pay high tuition fees. During my years as Governor of Georgia, voters authorized grants of \$400 per year for each student attending private college, still a smaller cost to taxpayers than if these students en-

rolled in public institutions. Such legislation should be encouraged elsewhere. Also basic tax reform proposals should give proper consideration of private philanthropy in education.

7. *Do you support a federal statute to grant teachers and other public employees collective bargaining rights? Do you support the right of public employees to strike? If you don't favor the right to strike or place a limitation on that right, what alternative do you propose?*

I support the right of public employees to organize and bargain collectively. I would prefer binding arbitration for public safety employees. Under normal circumstances, I would not consider teachers in this category and would not interfere with their right to strike.

8. *Would you support a federal-state program to guarantee the right of teachers during their working years to substantially carry their retirement benefits with them from state to state?*

Yes, I would recommend and sign into law a measure which would allow teachers to transfer earned retirement benefits from one retirement system to another.

9. *Do you believe that teachers and university researchers should have a limited exemption under the copyright laws?*

I understand the intricacies of this question. I am studying this situation and will formulate legislation that is fair to both teachers and publishers.

10. *What is your position regarding the enactment of a universal, comprehensive national health security program that is supported through the tax system and is not based on the ability to pay?*

I support the concept of national health insurance. I favor a system of comprehensive national health insurance which guarantees every person as a right as much care as he or she needs, with minimum or no deductibles or coinsurance, and with cost and quality controls.

11. *What initiatives would your Administration take to maintain the guarantees of the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, and amendments to them, despite attempts to water down these statutes? Would you insist upon strict enforcement of all civil rights laws and court mandates?*

The best thing that ever happened to the South in my lifetime was the Civil Rights Act and other related court decisions.

Guarantees of equal participation in the political process similar to those provided in the Voting Rights Act should be extended to all parts of the nation where minority representation and participation are clearly inadequate. We as a nation must act affirmatively and aggressively to compensate for decades of racial discrimination. This includes a commitment to increase minority representation in public jobs and policy-making positions, a principle upon which I acted as Governor. I have been an enthusiastic supporter of the ERA and affirmative action efforts to end discrimination against women.

I support postcard registration for voting. To make registration more available to young people, I, while Governor, filed and succeeded in having passed a bill to designate all high school principals as deputy voting registrars. This program significantly increased registration among the young, particularly in minority groups.

12. *What initiatives would you and your Administration take to eliminate sex discrimination, specifically to eradicate inequality in the world of work, leadership in our institutions and participation in politics and our educational system?*

As President, I would ensure that 1) laws prohibiting sex discrimination in employment, advancement, education, training, credit, and housing be strictly enforced; 2) strong efforts be made to create federal legislation and guidelines to eliminate sex discrimination in health and disability insurance plans; 3) Social Security laws be revised so that women would no longer be penalized; 4) women have equal access to health care systems and voluntary family planning programs; 5) adequate child care be made available to all parents who need such care for their children.

EEOC has been justly criticized at times for not properly emphasizing the enforcement of sex discrimination laws. I would support legislation to increase the number of employees at EEOC, specifically assigned to enforce our laws to eliminate sex discrimination.

13. *What are your major aims and objectives as President?*

I have many goals and objectives for our government. The two questions I hear again and again across this country are, "Can our government be competent? Can our government be decent and honest and open?" I have to tell you that a majority of our people would say no. But we don't have to be pessimists. I want to restore faith in the efficiency, effectiveness, competence and honesty of our federal government.

I have run the Georgia government in a tough, businesslike way. As a scientist, as a businessman, as a planner, as a farmer, I've managed it tightly and

brought about some dramatic changes in its costs, in its long-range planning and budgeting techniques, and in its organizational structure. We cut administrative costs by more than fifty percent in Georgia. We abolished 278 of 300 agencies and departments. So I know it is possible to run an efficient government.

We ought not lower our standards in government. Our government in Washington ought to be an inspiration to us all and not a source of shame.

These are the two major goals I have as a candidate for President. I will work to make our government efficient and competent; and I will make our government one that all our people can be proud of.

14. If you are chosen your party's nominee, why should teachers support you for President?

My personal commitment to education is reflected in my career as a public official. My first position was the chairmanship of a local school board. I ran for the State Senate because of my concern for public education in Georgia and successfully sponsored there our first overhaul of education financing. Ten years later, during my term as Governor, a second even broader reform was successfully completed after two years of hard work. As President, my priorities will not change; I will remain committed to quality education for all our citizens.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER

To the National Governors' Conference

July 6, 1976

I.

Since 1945, when President Roosevelt died, no former Governor served in the White House.

In the thirty years following President Roosevelt's death, we have seen a steady expansion of the role of the federal government. It has been an era of some good beginnings, and of some great national triumphs—in education, health care and social services for the indigent and elderly, and civil rights. It was an era in which the federal government broadened the opportunities for millions of Americans. We can be proud of those achievements, although a great deal remains to be done.

But it was not a great era for federal-state relations, nor was it a great period for the states themselves. As the federal government assumed important new responsibilities, too often programs were enacted which denied the diversity of American life, which created a growing bureaucracy, and which robbed state and local governments of flexibility in responding to local problems.

Too often, the states were caught in a financial squeeze as the federal government cut back on funds for vital programs which the federal government itself had created.

We will never know whether a gubernatorial viewpoint would have alerted a President to the erosion in the role of the states. But there is a new humility today about the federal government's ability to legislate problems away. There is a new understanding that often the machinery of government impedes our common objectives.

The states need a compassionate partner in Washington—a partner that will provide predictable, adequate assistance to enable states to meet their legitimate needs. But they also need an efficient partner in Washington—a partner that understands the virtues of forbearance, a partner that knows what the states **can** do as well as what they cannot.

No assembly of men and women in America understands more clearly than you do the defects of the present relationship, and nobody wants more than you to forge a new balanced partnership.

I know, because I have shared your experiences and your frustrations—but, most importantly, I have also shared your dreams.

I promise you that, if I am fortunate enough to be nominated and elected as President, I will not preside over an administration which ignores the lessons of my own personal experience. Last week I made a similar pledge to the mayors and today, as part of that same programmatic approach to government reform, I pledge to you, if elected, a sensitive ally in the White House, and I pledge to work with you to bring about a restoration of true federalism.

Historically, the states have been the laboratories of public policy. They have pioneered management, economic, labor and social programs which have been models for later federal programs. The states should serve as fifty independent experiments, each with its distinctive qualities and conditions, each providing a unique experience upon which federal and other state officials can draw. Instead, they are trapped between the federal bureaucracy and the state and local bureaucracies which you have been forced to create to cope with all the federal programs.

For too long, Woodrow Wilson's prescription that the states be "laboratories for experimentation" has failed to be a consistent objective of federal policy. For too long, federal programs have put the states in a straitjacket which has hampered local initiative. Yet, states in recent years have been the most creative segment of government.

The national government might have seen earlier the virtues of regional compacts, sunshine and sunset laws, zero-base budgeting and other reforms recently initiated by many of you at the state level, and only now being considered in Washington.

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100

A copy of our report is filed with the Federal Election Commission and is available for purchase from the Federal Election Commission, Washington, D.C.

For too long, the maze of restrictive federal programs has denied the diversity of life in this nation. Instead of rejoicing in pluralism, the federal bureaucracy in effect negated it with programs which were written as if the entire United States were less diverse than the State of Pennsylvania.

I see state governments not as impediments, but as effective instruments in achieving the objectives we share.

After eighteen months of campaigning, the instincts with which I began this campaign have been reinforced, and I have no intention of rejecting my own experience now. The most important commitment I can make to you is a simple one. If I am elected President, I will review every appointment, examine every program, to build an attitude of respect for the role of state government into the highest levels of the federal bureaucracy.

We will have a government structure that encourages rather than stifles local flexibility. I believe it is time that the federal government recognized that states and localities retain a special knowledge of local problems, and that responsive and flexible state and local leadership is essential to representative government in this nation.

II.

The first requirement is to improve the coordination of federal activities as they relate to each state.

The structure and missions of the various federal agencies and programs are often overlapping and uncoordinated, making it difficult for private citizens and public officials alike to resolve an individual or a community's problems.

If elected President, I intend first to upgrade the role of regional councils representing the federal government to assist state and local officials, as well as private citizens, in dealing with federal agencies on any matter involving a federal question that might arise. Those offices will be empowered to review conflicts among the various federal agencies and will have speedy access to the highest levels of the federal government.

Second, I will establish a system in the Executive Office of the President which enables the President to keep abreast of local initiatives, and which permits state and local officials to consult with the highest levels of the federal government on the full range of their concerns. I seek your assistance and advice in designing a machinery to meet that need, and to insure that consultations occur regularly.

Third, to the extent possible, we have to begin centralizing federal activities within each city in one location. The outposts of the federal government should be accessible to ordinary citizens when they need

assistance, so that "one stop" federal service is available.

III.

Not only will we try to improve the relationship of the separate states to the federal government, but the federal government needs to make it easier for states to develop cooperative mechanisms to deal with regional problems.

The states have already begun to look beyond their borders to solve common regional problems. They have done this around the country in the Midwest, in the Great Lakes Commission which has recently emphasized the cleanup of that great natural resource; in the western states the Interstate Nuclear Board has been working on the problems of the development of nuclear power for the region; in the South there is the Southern Growth Policies Board working for regional economic growth. These are only a few examples. Most recently there is the coalition of northeastern governors trying to meet the problems of revitalizing the economy of that region.

But there is still more that might be done. The use of the natural resources of one region for the benefit of the nation can leave that region with the permanent negative impacts of that exploitation. The federal government and the affected region must find ways to see that those consequences are avoided, and that the hidden costs of seeing to it are equitably shared. If the coal beds of the country are used, the results of that process should return the land for other uses—for future generations. And the costs should not be only a local problem.

The place to start with these solutions is the administrative reform which we must accomplish in Washington.

A balanced national partnership must, to the greatest degree possible, grant to the local governments the administrative freedom needed for innovative, creative programming.

Between the mid-1950's and this year, the number of categorical grant programs grew from 150 to more than 1600, each with its own administrative bureaucracy, its own restrictive conditions, individual application procedures, review conditions and funding priorities.

These categorical grants can often serve important functions. On a program of national dimensions, such grants can maximize local involvement in confronting national problems.

In practice, however, the proliferation of grants has built an irrational structure, which has often limited local initiative and fragmented local efforts toward sound fiscal planning.

It is important to attach conditions to programs which ensure that funds are directed toward the beneficiaries intended by Congress and the President. But too often programs designed for the ghetto families have been shifted to further benefit affluent families whose political influence can prevail.

To achieve a balanced national partnership, I intend to undertake a review, beginning this year and involving full consultation with you as governors and with local officials and congressional leaders, to determine in which instances consolidation of categorical grants would be desirable.

That process of consolidation will insure that the federal structure is organized to allow localities maximum flexibility in delivering services within the framework of national standards. Consolidation must not and will not be an excuse to reduce needed federal assistance, or to change the distribution of benefits so as to discriminate against those individuals with the greatest need.

If a balanced partnership is to prevail, it is necessary that governors and mayors be involved, not only in the review of categorical grants, but in the formulation of legislation and the promulgation of regulations as well. Usually, state officials receive their first notice of proposed rules when they are printed in the Federal Register. It is time that we recognized that we have become a government of regulations rather than laws; reform will be empty unless it is accompanied by a comprehensive review of existing regulations and the implementation of procedures to assure future state and local involvement in the early drafting of rules and regulations.

I do not underestimate the difficulties we will face in achieving regulatory reform, but we must persevere. The cost of excessive regulation goes beyond higher consumer price. Federal regulatory requirements have bureaucratized the private sector itself. Only large businesses can afford the cost of the internal bureaucracies that they must maintain to meet complex federal standards. The federal regulatory environment must be comprehensively reviewed to assure that it does not stimulate increased concentration of private economic power in a few hands.

Finally, federal budget policy must become more predictable. Predicting state revenues with accuracy is difficult under any circumstances, but the federal government can at least carry its burden by assuring that it meets commitments that it has previously made. Three-year federal budgeting will permit more effective planning by the states. A lawsuit has just successfully challenged the arbitrary food stamp cutbacks proposed by the Ford Administration. With an administration committed to predictable and compassionate policy-making, three-year budgeting and long-term planning, such litigation should not be necessary.

There is no simple rule to follow in determining the proper role of the federal government in addressing a problem. In some areas, such as welfare reform, the federal government must assume increased responsibility. In establishing regional alliances, federal, state and local government should serve as equal partners. In other areas, such as transportation, where some of the categorical grant programs are too restrictive, state and local discretion must be increased. What we are seeking is not a wholesale cutback of federal programs but a judicious consolidation and reorganization which allows states to meet their needs without undermining legitimate national objectives.

IV.

A major item on your agenda is welfare reform. Throughout my campaign, I have stressed the urgent need for a complete overhaul of our nation's welfare system.

Our present system is a failure deplored alike by those who pay for it, those who administer it, and those who supposedly benefit from it.

We all know of the need to remove from our welfare rolls those individuals who are ineligible for, or are not in need of, assistance. We have all read about the deplorable inefficiency which permeates our welfare systems. We know of the inequities which characterize many of our welfare programs; we know, for example, that where one lives is often more important than what one needs in getting assistance. We also know that working for a living and staying with one's family can sometimes deprive that person's family of benefits otherwise available.

You here also understand, perhaps better than most, how the present system is bankrupting both our cities and our states. As your welfare reform task force report points out, in fiscal year 1977, combined federal, state and local costs of public assistance are projected to be about \$25 billion. Medical assistance costs and food stamps raise this figure to almost double—\$47 billion. Because of existing federal laws and standards, this burden is not equally distributed among states. In some counties, more than 50% of county revenue goes toward welfare purposes.

Continuing increases in costs are denying states and local areas the flexibility they need to meet the needs of our people.

This must be changed.

I am particularly pleased by the work of the National Governors' Conference in this area and of your interest in joining with other governmental units, the Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the Conference of State Legislators, to develop a common position on welfare reform. I hope to work closely

with you in this effort and to begin discussions with you and other groups as part of a development of a specific welfare reform proposal. What I want to share with you today are the basic principles which I believe should form the framework for welfare reform.

About 10% of those on welfare are able to work full time and they should be offered job training and jobs. Any such person who refuses training or employment should not receive further welfare benefits.

The other 90% of the people on welfare are children, persons with dependent children, old people, handicapped people, or persons otherwise unable to work full time. They should be treated with compassion and respect.

We should have a simpler national welfare program, with one fairly uniform standard of payment, adjusted to the extent feasible for cost of living differences by areas and with strong work incentives built in. In no

case should the level of benefits make not working more attractive than working. And we should have welfare rules that strengthen families rather than divide families. Local governments should not be burdened with the cost of welfare and my goal would also include the phased reduction of the states' share as soon as that is financially feasible.

Simultaneously with welfare reform, there needs to be a major restructuring of state employment offices, existing job training and job creation programs in order to insure that all those who want to work can work. The federal welfare reform proposal should be developed in the context of reform of other related programs.

I believe we are competent enough to create a welfare program that is both efficient and compassionate.

These goals, programs and reforms are not impossible. Indeed, with your help, we can realize them all. I ask your cooperation. You shall have mine.



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