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Dear Jimmy:

I am extremely pleased with and proud of the success you are having in your campaign. Hopefully, you will be able to find time for a work interruption to spend some time at home with your family for Christmas. Best wishes for Christmas and for personal joy and satisfaction in 1976.

My work with Governor Busbee remains satisfying, and I again appreciate your getting me into this post initially. We've had some troubles with estimates this year, though
not as much as the outside believes. Significantly, the model problems we worked in 1971 proved solid in this recession and allowed major components to be gauged accurately. Yet, shortfalls in revenues from cigarette, malt beverage, liquor, motor vehicle license, and state taxes cumulated to about 43 million, an error of 2.7%. Since June, I've been heavily engaged in discovering the altered response patterns for these components, a matter made difficult by shortages of needed outside data.

Steve Stark of your Atlanta office contacted me in late fall
for my reaction to a proposal to have the Treasury issue its own dollars rather than borrowings.
I tried to explain that the advantages implicitly sought were already generated by present FRS-Treasury linkages. Anytime there are issues on which my response might be useful, do not hesitate to call on me.
I was pleased to receive your note of last summer & predictably pleased by your continuing study of economic fundamentals. Biased by my witness, I of course believe
that a grip of basic economic theory is demanded by your aspirations. Clearly, your objective approach will allow an easy and speedy reach to essentials.

The economy is following a conventional recovery path albeit with varying time sequences. Inflation is assumed to be a threat but I think that the process of mitrimplan needs careful specification. At base, inflation refers to an heterogeneous rather than a homogeneous phenomenon. Efforts to blend inflation
with output growth are seemingly more pressing than efforts to curb inflation of any form. The latter efforts are so unlikely to succeed anyway.

The New York City case highlights a pervasive policy problem, that of the role of state and local governments in a private economy. Fortunately, the theory to handle the problem has been developed.

Again, I am very proud of your success and your mature policy perspectives. I wish you the best. Cordially,

Hank.
MAY THE BEAUTY OF CHRISTMAS
BE AN INSPIRATION
TO YOU THROUGHOUT THE YEAR

Hand & HelsM Thomassen
& Family -
Thomasson
2709 E. Sudbury Ct
Atlanta, Ga 30340

PERSONAL

Mr. & Mrs. Jimmy Carter & Family
1 Woodland Dr
Plains, Georgia 31780
Mr. Richard Ben-Veniste
Suite 1100 K
1801 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Ben-Veniste:

Dr. Morris Benveniste forwarded to me your letter of June 23, 1976.

I would like to have you serve on our criminal justice task force and by a copy of this letter I am so informing Arnold Sagalyn, who is coordinating that task force in Washington, and Harry Schwartz our task force coordinator for the Campaign.

Your interest is very much appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Stuart E. Eizenstat
National Issues and Policy Director

SEE: dan
cc: Mr. Arnold Sagalyn
    Mr. Harry Schwartz
Dr. Morris Benveniste
3316 Piedmont Road, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia

Dear Dr. Benveniste:

I was interested to learn that you, among other distinguished Atlanta civic leaders, have endorsed Jimmy Carter's Presidential campaign. As I have heard very good things about you, your opinion of Governor Carter's candidacy is most reassuring.

On the basis of what I have learned, I would like to become involved in whatever way I can be helpful in Governor Carter's campaign. Perhaps you will be kind enough to apprise some appropriate officer in the Carter campaign effort of this fact so that he might contact me here in Washington.

With best personal wishes, and in the hope that we will some day soon have the opportunity to meet, I am

Very truly yours,

Richard Ben-Veniste

P.S. Are you also a product of the Toledo to Salonica to America emmigration?
July 13, 1976

Dear Mr. Eizenstat:

Since Mr. Ball is out of the country, I am taking the liberty of acknowledging your letter to him of July 7.

He is expected back in the office on August 5, but I am forwarding your letter, or copies of it, to several locations in Europe, where he is vacationing with his family.

With best wishes and high hopes for November.

Sincerely,

Helen T. Vahey
Assistant to Mr. Ball

Mr. Stuart E. Eizenstat
National Issues and Policy Director
Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign
Post Office Box 1976
Atlanta, Georgia 30301
May 10, 1976

Prof. Arpad von Lazar  
The Fletcher School of Law  
Tufts University  
Medford, Ma. 02155

Dear Prof. von Lazar,

Thank you for your letter. I'm sorry for your trouble in getting in touch with me. My telephone number is 404 897-7108.

We would be glad to receive a position paper on the Panama Canal and any material you have on U.S. policy toward developing countries.

Your help is very much appreciated and I look forward to hearing from you.

All the best,

Steven Stark  
Issues Coordinator

SS/cc
May 6, 1976

Mr. Steven Stark  
Issues Coordinator  
Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign  
P. O. Box 1976  
Atlanta, Georgia 30301

Dear Mr. Stark:

I have been trying to get in touch with you in the last few days but I was unable to locate a phone number. I wanted to check out if the Governor would be interested to see a position paper/think piece on the Panama Canal that is under preparation here by a colleague of mine and whether the Governor would like to see some additional materials on U. S. policy towards the less developed countries especially Africa and Latin America. Could you drop me a note or better yet please call me on my direct line (Area Code 617, 623-2527)? I am delighted with the Governor's success; it just makes me sick that he didn't do better in Massachusetts.

Hope to hear from you soon.

Best,

Arpad von Lazar  
Professor  
Programs in International Development and Energy

AvL/bf
May 7, 1976

Steve -

Perhaps someone on your staff could contact Congressman Mikva and get his advice on handling this issue.
May 7, 1976

Miss Gail K. Keane
107 Dabney Road
New Canaan, Conn. 06840

Dear Gail,

Thank you for your note of May 3rd. Either I or someone from the Atlanta staff will contact Congressman Mikva. I know this is an important issue and we will work to be sure that it is handled appropriately. Best wishes on the 11th.

Sincerely,

William J. vanden Heuvel

cc Steve Stark
107 Dabney Road  
New Canaan, Conn.  06840  
May 3, 1976

Mr. William vanden Heuvel  
Stroock & Stroock & Lavan  
61 Broadway  
New York, New York  10006

Dear Bill:

It was such a treat seeing you at lunch last week in Hartford!

Thought I would fill you in on the reaction we have had to Jimmy Carter's visit to New Canaan. Most of the response has been very favorable except in the area that we discussed, namely, his program on tax reform, specifically his answer to the question on deductions for home mortgages. Most people we have talked to interpreted his answer differently, and the press coverage of his answer varied considerably as well.

Bill, as you well know, this whole subject of tax reform is going to be a vital issue in the campaign and one that must be examined very carefully from all sides. For example, in Fairfield County most homeowners from the very modest to the most affluent live in mortgaged homes and this investment and the tax deduction thereby derived is extremely important.

I would like to suggest, Bill, that you get in touch with Ab Mikva at the House Office Building in Washington. Ab is an acknowledged and highly respected expert in the field of Tax Law and now sits on the House Ways & Means Committee. The subject of tax reform was a major issue in his campaign in the 10th Congressional District in Illinois two years ago, and I am sure he would be happy to share his expertise and discuss his experience with you.

We are all delighted at the results in Pennsylvania and Texas, and will look forward to seeing you and Governor Carter on the campaign trail in Connecticut soon again.

Best wishes,

Gail K. Keane

cc: Abner J. Mikva  
Member of Congress  
House Office Building  
Washington, D.C.  20515
April 3, 1976

Mr. C. R. Vosburgh
10 Fairmont Avenue
Batavia, N. Y. 14020

Dear Mr. Vosburgh:

Thank you for your letter of March 24. I appreciate receiving your article, and I have forwarded it to my Issues Staff for their review.

I am enclosing a copy of a short statement I have made on the Panama Canal issue. I would appreciate it if you would send additional material I might use directly to my Issues Staff.

If I may be of further assistance, please don't hesitate to write to me again.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter

JC:al

Enc.
Gov. Jimmie Carter  
2000 P Street N.W.  
Washington, D. C.  

Dear Gov. Carter:

I hope this reaches you personally because I think more than a quarter of a century in Panama teaching and writing and being close to many crises gives me a chance to be of assistance to you in your campaign.

The enclosed copy of a recent article I sold to a Rochester, New York paper will give you some indication of my thinking, which is moderately liberal in trying to get things done but moderately conservative in trying to preserve tested values.

The next time you are in the Rochester-Batavia-Buffalo area I should like 15 minutes of your time to present to you a solution (hopefully) of the Panama treaty. The Republic of Panama deserves a new treaty, but I think we can do the people of Panama and the people of the United States a better service than the one now being negotiated. I have interviewed Ambassador Bunker at the State Department and I have discussed some of my ideas with members of his staff. I think Dr. Kissinger is being too dogmatic.

I have taught international relations at the Canal Zone (Junior) College. Besides being an elected member of the Pacific Civic Council in the Canal Zone, I served two terms on the Executive Session of several civic councils. This Executive Session met with the Canal Zone Governor to discuss community matters.

I am now living in New York State, but I still write for a Panamanian newspaper. I know both sides of the Panama question, and I want to be fair to each. I don't expect you to remember me, but I did meet you after a press conference in Atlanta when you were Governor.

I think I can be of some help. Please let me know when you are going to be in this area.

Sincerely yours,

C. R. Vosburgh
To Sarah P. Vorl

Thank you.

Your explanation was helpful to me.

Jimmy
Dear Governor Carter:

After listening to your comments in response to questions on the economy on several occasions here in New Hampshire, I found myself somewhat bothered by the economic implications of two of your remarks. I have written up my views on these two areas: one, the problem of U.S. companies shifting production to overseas plants, and the other, the employment implications of various types of government spending. In addition, I have added a paragraph on the second paper on an idea that has appeared in the field of labor economics of why a given level of unemployment seems to be associated with a higher level of inflation now than was true formerly.

I should say however that while I am a Ph.D. candidate in economics, my fields are Labor, Economic Development and Trade & International Finance, and not Public Finance; and you should perhaps judge the two papers in that light.

It was a privilege and a pleasure to have Mrs. Carter stay with us here in Durham. John and I wish both of you the best of luck in Florida.

Sincerely,

Mrs. John Voll
A major concern of U.S. labor unions is a tendency of large corporations to shift some lines or stages of production overseas where wages are lower, with a consequent loss of jobs for American workers. American unions view these overseas plants as "runaways" and object to the U.S. tariff laws that encourage such a move. Under these laws, components can be manufactured in the United States, shipped abroad for assembly, and imported into the U.S. with a tariff being paid only on the value of the assembly process.

A study by Robert Stobaugh in 1971 indicates that contrary to union beliefs overseas investment by U.S. multinational corporations has created more jobs than it has destroyed. In general the investment flow is in response to basic changes in the relative costs of U.S. and foreign production. The move of assembly processes to overseas plants has saved jobs in the domestic component industry since moving the most expensive stage of production overseas (expensive given U.S. wage levels) has made it possible for the entire industry to remain competitive. The alternative to moving assembly plants overseas is losing the entire market to foreign imports or producing domestically behind tariff barriers high enough to offset the differences in U.S. and foreign production costs. Stobaugh estimated that approximately 600,000 U.S. jobs would have been lost if the overseas investment had not taken place.

In addition, the overseas assembly plants are of great importance to the countries in which they are located. In an era of declining foreign aid, private investment by multinational corporations has become a major factor in the development and industrialization of many Third World nations.


Sarah P. Voll
Durham, New Hampshire
education, it creates unemployment in military production and raises employment in the area of health and education. To the extent that there are personnel shortages in these areas already, wages will rise and health and education costs increase. In this case, since workers in military production cannot easily convert themselves into health and education workers, the shift in spending between sectors creates unemployment in one sector and inflation in the other. Shifts in business expenditures between one sector and another are generally more gradual and allow the labor market more time to adjust, so that the great increase in government rather than private spending may have contributed to the outward shift of the "Phillips Curve", the relation between the level of inflation and the level of unemployment, in the United States.

Sarah P. Voll
Durham, New Hampshire
March 4, 1976

William S. Verplanck
4605 Chickasaw Road
Knoxville, Tenn. 37919

Dear Mr. Verplanck:

Thank you for your letter. We must never again keep the evolution of our foreign policy a secret from the Congress and the American people. I have enclosed a copy of my foreign policy statement. I hope this interests you.

Please don't hesitate to write if you have any further ideas.

Sincerely,
Jimmy Carter

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100
WILLIAM S. VERPLANCK
4605 CHICKASAW ROAD
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37919

January 29, 1976

Senators Baker, Congressman Duncan Messrs. Kissinger,
Brock, Mansfield, Goldwater, Humphrey
Bush, Carter

Gentlemen;

In the absence of a national consensus on American foreign policy such as existed twenty years ago, it is essential to the national welfare that no secret enterprises such as support to "pro-American" forces in Angola be undertaken.

Until we are agreed on the goals, costs, and risks relative to our national welfare, full and open discussion must be undertaken before State Department or CIA enterprises be undertaken. Kissinger-Colby types of conditioned-reflex response to Russian actions steal from us control of our own future.

The closest Congressional surveillance must be maintained over CIA and other intelligence agencies. The quickness and completeness of CIA protest over "Congressional" leaks of the upcoming House report persuades me that the leaks come from CIA itself, in attempting to discredit responsible surveillance before it can be instituted. The dishonesty of such action is entirely consistent with the record of immorality and dishonesty that this agency has built up over the past fifteen years.

The Congress is to be congratulated for refusing funds for any of the factions in Angola. African history suggests that if the Russia-Cuba supported government wins, it will promptly and successfully work to get rid of the people who put them in office.

Sincerely,

William S. Verplanck
Mr. Moshe Aumann
Counselor (Information)
Embassy of Israel
Washington, D.C.

Sir;

February 4, 1976

It is tragic that the Rabin regime is following the Nixon policy of altering its public relation statements when the wisdom and honesty of its public policies are questioned. Policies, not propaganda, need to be reviewed.

What didn't work for Goebbels won't work for Counselor (Information). Bigger misrepresentation yields more tragic outcomes.

Pursue Rabin's policies of glossing over right-wing Zionist occupation of conquered territories with simple misstatements, continue to try to put the Palestinians under the "care" of Hussein, and you will be able to thank only yourselves for the consequences.

Victories by U.N. veto are defeats; they show the justice of the Palestinian cause, strengthen the PLO and exhibit the progressive international isolation that Israel is imposing on itself. Next time, Sweden and Britain will not abstain. American support, too, is running out, and money, and arms.

Very recent events in Lebanon, with the demonstration of a disciplined PLA, do not go unnoticed, whatever propaganda your government states. Palestinians, not Jordanians, brought peace. They have shown themselves to be responsible representatives of a responsible government-in-exile.

PLO rhetoric is no more extreme than your own. The more Rabin orates, the more rigid PLO becomes. It is time to confront the reality of PLO support among the Palestinians, the Arab world, and the rest of the world as well. Secret negotiations, direct negotiations, on a de facto basis, must be undertaken now.

cc. Mr. Ford Senators Baker
   Mr. Kissinger Mnsfield
   Mr. Carter Humphrey
   Mr. Abourezk Brock

Sincerely,

William S. Verplanck
December 19, 1975

William V. Vacca
Brockton Area Home Care Center, Inc.
170 Main Street
Brockton, Mass. 02401

Dear Mr. Vacca,

Thank you for the information concerning home care services for elderly citizens. As you well know I am concerned with the problem and your information was helpful and appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter
December 12, 1975

Mr. Jimmy Carter  
Presidential Campaign  
P. O. Box 1976  
Atlanta, Georgia 30301

Dear Mr. Carter,

Enclosed please find copy of a definition of Home Care Services for elderly citizens.

The Brockton Area Home Care Center is using Federal Funds to provide for an administrative staff which is the key to providing services to elderly people. The latest action by the Congress in passing House Bill 3922 is a positive step in the right direction because it insures continuation of proven mechanisms such as Home Care Centers in rendering services to the elderly. It provides for funds to be used for the care of the elderly at home with such services as heavy duty chore and winterization, homemaker service which is light housekeeping, escort and telephone reassurance as well as many other services such as counselling, legal aid, housing assistance and transportation, all of which make it possible for elderly people to maintain their dignity, live independently, and remain within their own community and own homes without unnecessary and premature institutionalization.

We hope that this will be helpful to you. Good luck and our very best to you.

Very truly yours,
BROCKTON AREA HOME CARE CENTER, INC.

William V. Vacca
Executive Director

"Home Care Centers = A Better Life for the Elderly"
FUNDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ELDER AFFAIRS & PARTICIPATING LOCAL COMMUNITIES
November, 1975

To Margaret Van de Water

Thank you for bringing the articles on the sales of U.S. planes and ships to the Soviet Union to my attention. Among Americans, there is broad support for continuing the policy of detente – but not at the expense of our allies or our own national security. I am studying the implications such sales have for our foreign policy. In the meanwhile, please keep me informed from your end on any new developments.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter

Margaret Van de Water
266 Monterey Rd.
Palm Beach, Florida 33480
Dear Governor Carter:

Please note the enclosed copy of an article in yesterday's Palm Beach Post, regarding the sale of U. S. ship plans to Russia.

What can be done about this situation?

My husband and I enjoyed meeting you and listening to you at the breakfast recently in West Palm Beach.

Sincerely yours,

Margaret Van de Water

Margaret Van de Water
(Mrs. Malcolm Van de Water)
Democratic State Committeewoman for Palm Beach County
July 3, 1976

Mr. C. R. Vosburgh
10 Fairmont Avenue
Batavia, New York 14020

Dear Mr. Vosburgh:

Governor Carter has asked that I respond to your very well thought out memo of May 8, 1976. We very much appreciate your suggestions on the Panama problem. Your ideas will be very useful to us in this area. Your concern for and help in the campaign is very much appreciated by me and Governor Carter.

Very truly yours,

Stuart E. Eizenstat
National Issues and Policy Director

SEE: dan
Mr. Peter J. Vellenga  
308 East Main Street  
Gaylord, Michigan 49735

Dear Peter:

Thank you for the information sent regarding the Michigan Constitutional Amendment restricting Terms of Office.

I have forwarded your letter and enclosure to the Issues Department for their information.

We are looking forward to a big win in Michigan and I was happy to see your willingness to assist us in this endeavor.

If I can be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate contacting me.

Yours very truly,

Tim S. Davis  
Great Lakes Delegate Coordinator

cc: Issues Department
April 12, 1976

Mr. Tim Davis
1795 Peachtree
Atlanta, Georgia

Dear Tim:

It was a pleasure talking to you on Friday. I have enclosed herein, a copy of the proposed constitutional amendment for the State of Michigan, in reference to limiting the terms in office of the State Senate and the State House.

I would appreciate your review and comments at the earliest possible time, and would appreciate your bringing this before your policy committee to see what position, if any, Jimmy Carter would be willing to take on this matter. I would recommend that you do your own poll on this matter in Michigan, I think you will find that could be a very valuable campaign issue for you.

I have reviewed the reference book and would appreciate being apprized of all additional policy statements released by Jimmy Carter. I am in agreement with Jimmy on most of these issues and feel privileged to be able to lend my support to his campaign at this time. I have indicated to Mr. Dave Olmstead, that I would be happy to carry out co-ordination and setting up an office for the Lower 11th Congressional District, in Northern Michigan. The 11th is the largest congressional district in Michigan and to attempt to produce good results in the entire 11th, out of one office, I think, is not feasible. We are located in the geographic center of the lower 11th and we also have a sign board space which I will make available on I-75, which has one of the highest traffic flows during the summer and with the campaign headquarters located on that property, there will be no problem with putting a major highway sign board on the property in question. I have made this recommendation to Mr. Olmstead, and also, have agreed to donate the office itself to the campaign, with the provisal that campaign assume the utilities and also, pick up the office expenses.

Very truly yours,

Peter J. Vellenga

Enclosure

Dear Peter:

Thank you for the information sent regarding the Michigan constitutional amendment restricting terms of office. I have forwarded your letter and enclosure to the Issues Department for their information.

We are looking forward to a big win in Michigan and I was happy to see your willingness to assist.
us in this endeavor.
If I can be of any further assistance to you please do not hesitate contacting me.

Yours very truly

Tim S. Davis
Great Lakes Delegate Coordinator
SENATORS, REPRESENTATIVES, NUMBER OF TERMS IN OFFICE. No person shall be elected to the Legislature of the State of Michigan as a Senator more than once, or as a Representative more than twice. But this section shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of Senator or Representative from continuing to serve the remainder of such term.

Provisions of existing constitution altered by such proposal if adopted.

ARTICLE IV

Sec. 2. The senate shall consist of 38 members to be elected from single member districts at the same election as the governor for four-year terms concurrent with the term of office of the governor.

Sec. 3. The house of representatives shall consist of 110 members elected for two year terms from single member districts apportioned on a basis of population as provided in this article...
May 5, 1976

George D. Tessier  
P.O. Box 13101  
New Orleans, La. 70185  

Dear Mr. Tessier,

Thank you for your interest in my campaign. I am sending along a copy of my plan for zero-based budgeting for your use. This should answer your question on the justification of federal departments.

I have also included a statement on full employment endorsing the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill.

My position on the current administration's foreign policy is outlined in the enclosed foreign policy speech delivered in Chicago.

My stand on deregulation of oil is in the included copy of an ad that appeared in the Des Moines Register in response to a questionnaire from the Energy Action Committee.

I am completely confident of my ability to deal with the complex problems that face our country and the world. If you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to write. I hope I never disappoint you.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter

P.O. Box 1976  Atlanta, Georgia 30301  404/897-7100
April 30, 1976

The Honorable James Carter  
Issues Department  
Box 1976  
Atlanta, Georgia 3031

Sir:

Could you be so kind as to state your position and intentions regarding a few questions I feel would help me decide to which man I will lend my support.

Will you initiate, at the federal level, a program causing all civil service departments and bureaus to justify their continuance and/or structure in terms of their effectiveness and efficacy at achieving the ends to which their mandate required?

If this or some variation of this program could gain your consideration, would you reasonably expect that the size, structure and practices of some or all of the departments would be altered significantly in economic terms?

If such a policy were in effect and caused a reduction of employment in the public sector, what method would you propose be used to ensure that this had no detrimental effects on the employment situation?

Do you intend to lend your support to a national job program? Would you support use of structures currently in existence such as the military to direct and implement the operations of such a program?

Do you favor decontrol of domestic oil prices? If so, over what time period?

How representative of your own intentions in Foreign Policy is Secretary of State Kissinger? Who would be your first choice as a replacement if you do not agree with his position?

Finally, do you truly believe that you will, in the face of so great an illusion, have the strength of faith and the humility which when genuinely found in a leader make the impossible possible?

Yours sincerely,

George D. Tessier
May 5th, 1976

Governor James E. Carter Jr.
1 Woodland Drive Plains
Georgia 31780

Dear Governor Carter:

Recognizing your concern about our foreign policy at a crucial period in our history, I think you might be interested in an understanding of the real status of our very important bilateral relations with China (which is of course intimately related to the triangular relationship including the Soviet Union). I believe we have in Dr. Harlan Cleveland one of the two real experts (the other is Nixon) either in or out of government on the China question at this tense juncture. Harlan was Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs and also NATO Ambassador under Kennedy and Johnson. Perhaps one might be interested in contacting Cleveland. His address is:

Dr. Harlan Cleveland
Director, Program in International Affairs
Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies
Rosedale Road, P.O. Box 2820
Princeton, N. J. 08540
(609-921-1141)

In any case I hope these off the record personal observations will be of interest.

With best regards.

Yours sincerely,

S. F. Tuan

S. F. Tuan
Member, Contemporary China
Study Group, Univ. of Hawaii
June 11, 1976

Mrs. J.H. Turner
Post Office Box 8143
Atlanta, GA 30306

Dear Mrs. Turner:

Thank you for your interest in the Carter campaign. Professor Brzezinski is one of Governor Carter's foreign policy advisors. However, Governor Carter has not considered a cabinet at this time. He is running hard to gain the nomination and unify his party.

If you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to write.

Sincerely,

Charles Cabot III
Issues Staff

CC/sc
Governor Jimmy Carter,
Campaign Headquarters,
1795 Peachtree Road, N.E.,
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Dear Gov. Carter:

Several publications have reported that should you become president that you plan to appoint Mr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, your present policy adviser, as Secretary of State.

I will appreciate your advising me in this regard.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. J.H. Owen
Mr. William P. Turk  
4742 North Dover Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60640  

Dear Mr. Turk:  

Governor Carter has referred your letter of June 24, 1976 to me for review.  

We have created a task force on human welfare and poverty, the jurisdiction of which includes the question of retirement benefits. I would appreciate it if you would forward any thoughts you would like to express on the subject to Mary Lewis, the Task Force Coordinator, at 505 Franklin Street, Alexandria, Virginia, 22314.  

Thank you for your thoughtful comments and interest.  

Sincerely,  

Orin Kramer  
National Task Force Director  

OK: dan  

cc: Mary Lewis
Governor Jimmy Carter
Candidate for President
Plains, Georgia 31780

Dear Governor Carter:

As a concerned citizen involved to a minor degree in the growing public concern regarding retirement benefits, including Social Security and the Pension Reform Act of 1974, I would like to offer the following recommendation.

If you have not already established a task force to make recommendations to you, may I suggest such a blue-ribbon group. I would recommend the panel be composed of those business leaders involved in retirement plans, unions, appropriate Congressional staffs and special interest groups. I am sure executives would contribute their expertise, since one of the major fears is that another bureaucratic system will be devised and decisions made which will create additional federal "red tape" and not answer the concerns of the people.

I would suggest that such a panel be established during your campaign and remain to finalize recommendations and alternatives into your first elected year. A specific date for conclusions should be established with enough lead time for you to review the recommendations and make decisions prior to announcing them at such gatherings as the AFL-CIO Convention, Association of Private Pension and Welfare Plans, Inc. annual National Conference, and other major platforms.

As public relations counsel for an actuarial firm, I have kept abreast of the confusion surrounding retirement benefits. Enclosed are some examples which demonstrate the growing concern people have regarding not only Social Security but retirement plans and other benefits.

Should there be any way I might be of assistance to your staff in offering some suggested names of executives who might participate, I would be happy to do so. There are several special interest groups involved. However, for one reason or another—probably because of the extensiveness and confusion created by so many laws—they have been unable to forcefully make their views heard. Thus even those who should be providing leadership are frustrated. It is my hope that as the problems of retirement benefits escalate, laws will not be enacted due to public pressure but when proper planning and recommendations from qualified people can be obtained and their input included in the major changes which will be neces-
sary during the next several years.

Congratulations on your exceptional primary campaigns and best of luck during this presidential campaign.

Sincerely,

William P. Turk

cc: Mr. Orin Kramer
National Coordinator of Task Forces
Carter-For-President Headquarters
Atlanta, Georgia
At the outset, let me say that I believe in ERISA. This profession of faith is not a truism, arising out of the fact that I had some responsibility for administering a significant part of the Act. It is not flag waving as part of an attempt, perhaps, to be on the side of the angels. As those who know me will testify, I am not so inclined.

No, I have, after much thought and experience, come to the conclusion that, given all of its incredible faults, lapses, unrealistic provisions and what-have-you, ERISA is a good law and it should be supported fully. Perhaps an analogy is the Charter of the United Nations — there are clearly unworkable aspects — but it is what we have — and most likely all we will have for some time — to maintain some degree of order and security in a disordered and insecure environment. Any critical comments made below should be read in this context.

The discussion which follows is an attempt to look at the total organizational framework within which
ERISA is developing. It is at best a blurry snapshot of a very youthful social program. Little mention is made of ERISA goals and the achievement of employee benefit protection to date. I assume that these positive aspects are well known.

The private sector

The post-enactment ERISA world presents a very interesting picture of organizational behavior and problem. We have all learned long ago that in the U.S.A. power in any specific situation rests very little with the people generally, somewhat more with the organizations, but mostly with the leaders of organizations. In the absence of effective private-sector organization and, especially, effective leadership of organizations, Congress will most likely do what it thinks is best in the public interest.

Employee benefit reform issues require unique organizations. As legislation developed in the late sixties, there was a constant searching for effective organizational structure within the groups that would be affected and the leadership to guide the decision-making. Very little developed. The reasons are no longer important. Organized pressure groups began to appear in the early seventies. However, by the time they began growing muscles, the major policy decisions had already been made. In fact, the scope of the proposed law grew tremendously, both in subject matter and coverage, between 1971 and 1974. Non-government sources had some effect in certain details; but the element of time (the magic cut-off date of September 2, 1974) had a greater impact. As compared with most laws, ERISA is clearly a legislative enactment (a special tip of the hat to Congressional and Administration staff).

The various interest groups have thus far followed traditional growth and activity lines. There are centers of strength, rivalries, strange-appearing alliances and all the rest. However, the organizational framework is not fixed: Some associations are very young; some are facing death; and some needed ones have not yet been formed. Of great significance is the fact that most of these special groups effectively do not pre-date ERISA. They have not fought in the legislative halls over the years, so that the Act does not represent their own compromises. Most are not organized for combat in the administrative arena and they certainly are not equipped to sponsor or to deal with new legislation. This is very different from most other major policy areas, such as consumer protection or environmental issues. In these, the sides and positions are well known, and the lobby game goes on as expected. (The above comments do not apply fully to the actuarial groups where battles have been fought and new lines are being formed. This is a special case within the ERISA world, worthy of separate analysis, including the implications of the federal enrollment of actuaries.)

From an organizational standpoint, the ERISA world is composed of equal parts of internal anarchy and external chaos. We are seeing the normal tendency to develop stable structures and a logical framework within which all parties can carry on their work. The difficulties are discussed below. For the present, there appears to be only one certainty: ERISA exists and will not be undone by legislation in the next two years. (Some recent court decisions may lead to legislative "corrective" activity.)

Still, the fact that legislative amendment is not regarded as a near-term possibility has a definite effect on the private organizational structure. It is extremely difficult for interest groups to gain strength if there is no immediate receptive source of power upon which influence can be brought to bear. Congress is just not buying "reform" of ERISA this year. There are other issues that occupy the political mind and may very well continue to do so for a good number of years. This means that many of the usual ways of achieving an organization's goals are not available: If Congress cannot be aroused by whatever pressure, then administrative agencies and policy-formation bodies in the Executive Branch are likely to be less responsive to outside influences.

One of the interesting aspects is that even though it's been 20 months since ERISA's passage, certain groups in the pension community are not effectively represented, or are not represented at all. Also, while identifiable associations representing specific constituencies do exist, none has demonstrated a consistently winning track-record. Further, the usual pro-and-con groups do not always exist — the fact that one group holds some position strongly does not mean that there is another group in opposition.

It may be that the law is so complex, and its implications so unclear, that it is just not possible for groups to take major policy stances which would evoke reaction. There is just no clear battleground for the outbreak of warfare. We have seen some effective mass reactions to administrative decisions (for example, the Battle of Four-Forty), but these are more like triumphs of knowledge over good intentions, than traditional organizational war games.

In part, the administrative machinery created by ERISA creates obstacles for those who would normally be establishing special organizations representing certain points of view. By allocating responsibilities among three prime agencies, Congress has made it hard for interest groups to focus on one agency as the place to bring pressure. In addition, the "allocating" is not all that clear. There are overlapping jurisdictions and indefinite boundaries. The separation of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation from the Department of Labor and from the authority of other major departments and offices is murky. The joint responsibilities of Labor and IRS means that interested parties must convince two sets of government officials. But these two agencies come at the law from different points of view, so that the same set of arguments may not be effective in dealing with both. And IRS looks to the Code. (Can it be
true that some District Offices hold the Pre-ERISA Code to be superior to ERISA? We also have learned that there is a vast distinction between a Department named Treasury and an Agency named The Internal Revenue Service.

The growth of pressure groups is also hampered by the language of ERISA. We just don’t know what certain combinations of words mean — and at times we’re afraid to ask. Without specific understanding it is hard to organize against this or that threat. There is a general community-wide, fairly loud murmur calling for quick interpretations and regulations. Yet each sector is

About the Employee Benefits Award recipient

Nearly two years ago, when the ink was still wet on the first copies of ERISA to come off the government printing presses, the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation was, at best, an idea whose only framework lay in the law itself. Yet, since that time, PBGC has evolved into a smooth-running agency, not only as the guarantor of pension benefits, but as a close coordinator with the private pension system. What the PBGC is today is a fine reflection of the person appointed its first executive director — Steven E. Schanes, Ph.D. Schanes brought to PBGC extensive experience in the pension area: as vice president of pension consultants Martin E. Segal Co., and as director of the New Jersey State Division of Pensions. He has also served as Special Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce and with the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration. Schanes has been Academic Dean, Professor of Political Science and Chairman of the Division of Economics and Business Administration at the University of San Diego. Since his resignation as executive director of PBGC this past February, Schanes has formed his own benefit consulting firm, Steven E. Schanes, Ltd., which will, in his own words, “help make ‘life with ERISA’ easier for all.”

In naming Schanes the recipient of the 1976 Employee Benefits Award, Pension World can only echo and reaffirm the words of former Secretary of Labor Dunlop when he appointed Schanes to PBGC: “We are fortunate to have Mr. Schanes’ pension expertise and administrative ability. His leadership during the formative period of PBGC contributed greatly to establishing the termination insurance program which will protect the pension benefits of millions of American workers.”

Schanes

Government and the private sector

But what about the administrative agencies themselves? How do they function in the absence of an orderly special interest world?

Generally speaking, ERISA and other laws related to its administration anticipate formal public participation in decisions. (An exception is the PBGC Advisory Committee, where the joy of negotiation is available.) Of course, the major policy guidance has already been given by Congress, with some terribly specific minor provisions also thrown in. Still the goldfish bowl creates a large problem for any regulatory agency. It is particularly difficult when a new program begins with immediate start-up dates (some retroactive provisions), set time deadlines, legislated detailed requirements and inconsistencies, and practically no trained staff. To the administrator faced with this situation, the thought of slow, burdensome formal public hearings and comments can be overwhelming. Yet advice through the informal private interest group route may be closed to him.

There are at least two other procedural ways to get advice. In the case of the Labor Department there are its Advisory Commission and Congressional hearings. The Commission is, by statute, representative and while it can, and does, give advice, the public nature of its proceedings would seem to hinder negotiation and compromise. Congressional hearings are not always the happiest ways of getting the public’s advice — usually strong organiz
tional positions are taken for the record.

An alternate to the seeking of advice is that of creating it internally — that is, by role-playing of various interests. This is not uncommon. The difficulty in the case of ERISA is that the actual has thus far differed widely from the predicted in a good many instances. The reaction of the various elements of the pension community to administrative determinations has produced some notable changes — obviously somebody guessed wrong.

This is not to say that an agency has to seek outside advice before proceeding. In ERISA's case there are many areas in which the outside experts are as confused as the government administrators and will settle for almost any decision — the single outside plea being: "Please keep it simple!" Also, when complaints are heard about such administrative decisions, these are usually about ERISA itself.

It is not the function of the administrative agencies to sponsor the formation of representative special interest groups. Economics will produce them. Most likely a full complement of such groups will flower in the fullness of ERISA's time. (I use the term "special interest" here as distinct from the professional activities of certain groups and individuals which are recognized under ERISA and are to be encouraged by the government.) My feeling is that DOL, IRS and PBGC do not contribute to the present private organizational chaos.

Further, I conclude that the three agencies function pretty well in the absence of the standard pressure group structure which we normally see. Some simplistic thoughts: PBGC, being new, inherited no political debts and the lack of pressure group warfare has made life easier than otherwise; DOL found the outside pressure for special treatment to be less than in other programs and has welcomed this unusual situation; IRS, while new to this much involvement in the people-business, takes little account of external battles anyway.

The external organizational chaos has not hampered the development of ERISA administration. Actually, the governmental agencies have been freer to make and maintain decisions than would normally have been anticipated.

Government

The internal anarchy within the federal government is another story. As a new mathematical political science rule, I would say any regulatory difficulty is tripled when two agencies are involved and tripled again when there are three. Thus, if there is one major problem confronting a single administrator in a decisional area, there are three problems when two administrators must agree and nine when three have jurisdiction. This progression may be greatly understated. On reflection of my own experience, the increasing amount of difficulty seems to have grown by magnitudes; ten times with two administrators and 100 times with three.

It is most likely true that without the split of on-going plan authority between DOL and IRS, ERISA would not have been enacted; and the setting up of PBGC as a separate insurance agency has logic. The result is a law without assigned leadership; over time the agencies have agreed on leadership roles for different purposes. However, this three-way spread is not the only organizational problem. There are other relationships which add greatly to administrative difficulty.

From first-hand knowledge, I am aware of the slowing-down effect of having to report to three departments. PBGC's Board of Directors consists of the Secretaries of Labor, Commerce and Treasury. All three Departments pass upon the major issues confronting the Corporation. Preparation for Board decisions means briefing the principals and their representatives. Sufficient advance time must be given for consideration of the issues. Budgetary questions may require a separate type of three-department review.

In addition, there are some special relationships to the Secretary of Labor, as Chairman of the Board; to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in the budgetary forms development processes and to the Treasury Department in the area of investment of premiums. Finally, there is the Presidential-appointed PBGC Advisory Committee and its sub-committees which have participated fully in the major decision process. Each of these takes its toll of administrative effort.

Some of the Department of Labor's organizational problems in the administration of ERISA are external. These include: developing joint forms with IRS, when DOL is subject to OMB review and IRS will not be so bound; sharing litigation questions with the Department of Justice; cooperating with HEW (Social Security) and the SEC. There are also internal problems to be anticipated in the creation of a new major function within a Department already heavily obligated with other responsibilities — the allocation of resources, the
sharing of services, the determination of lines of authority. Again, there is the need to work closely with a new Advisory Commission appointed by the Secretary.

The Internal Revenue Service's ERISA-related internal organizational problems are paralleled to those of DOL. The external ones include the problem of working on a day-to-day basis with agencies which are guided by considerations other than tax implications.

As an additional obstacle to administrative efficiency, while ERISA calls for inter-agency cooperation, the Act places certain special requirements on each of the agencies which are incompatible. Incredible amounts of staff effort have been spent in attempts to agree on interpretation, policies and procedures.

The program

Yet, despite the seeming unworkability of the statute, the individuals engaged in its administration are dedicated to making it a success. Overriding all of the complications has been their concern for the purposes of the Act and the people it protects.

The same can largely be said about the private sector. Organization after organization has, with great effort, put on seminars, training sessions, workshops and general education programs concerning ERISA. Recognizing that Government initially was in no position to do this job, those to be regulated undertook the task and have continued with it.

There is no way to measure the effect of ERISA and the achievements of the organizational structure. The answer does not lie in statistics — and they will be a long time in coming and even then the analyses of these figures will most likely indicate that one cannot really measure the impact of broad social legislation.

We do know that across the country participation and vesting standards are being liberalized, stricter funding schedules are being adopted, steps are being taken to protect the participants from possible misuse of assets, professional standards are being adopted and thousands of people are now receiving benefits which would have been lost. These and other achievements mean that the governmental and private organizational structure is working. Thus far, goodwill and hard work have overcome institutional insanity.

Disability payments total $2.7B in 1975

Americans received an estimated $2.7 billion in disability insurance benefits last year to help replace wages lost due to illness or injury, the Health Insurance Institute reported today.

This means American families were getting nearly $7.4 million daily to be used any way they saw fit.

However, inflation has been so sharp in recent years many people may find their benefits are far less then they actually need, said the Institute.

Medical costs continue rise

The rise in the cost of medical care will continue to outpace the rise in the general cost of living, according to a special study just completed by Chase Econometrics, the Bala Cynwyd-based economic forecasting firm.

According to this study, which has been included in the most recent quarterly forecast of the Chase Insurance Forecasting Service, the consumer price index for medical care will not dip significantly below 9 per cent for the next two years, while the general CPI Index is forecast to average 7 per cent.

"There are several reasons why medical costs will continue to climb at this rapid pace," said Don Dephamphilis, senior insurance economist at Chase Econometrics.

"Chief among the is the continued escalation of malpractice premiums, which will contribute in excess of 2 per cent yearly to the rate of rise of medical costs. It only takes from three to six months for these costs to be passed through to the consumer."

Dephamphilis then listed four other major factors: sharp increases in wage catch-up demands, especially among hospital workers, continued shift toward more expensive equipment and medical tests, further growth in demand for medical services, as the recovery leads to higher income and more employment, and higher costs of material, labor, and financing in the construction industry, which will show up as increased hospital service costs.
Pensions: A Mixed Picture
Confusion, Delay Persist 18 Months Into Reform

When we are discussing ERISA, we are not talking about a short, easily understood law, with limited employee protective and economic consequences.

James D. Hutchinson, Administrator of Pension and Welfare Benefits Programs
Department of Labor

"All the beneficiary wants to know is, 'Where is my money going, is it safe, and will there be money there on my retirement?" He doesn't want to read 8 or 13 reports."

Rep. John H. Dent, Chairman of the Pension Task Force,
House Subcommittee on Labor Standards

By Nancy L. Ross
Washington Post Staff Writer

At an oversight hearing last week on implementation of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, there was a lot of talk about trees—and branches and twigs and roots and bark—but very little about the forest. How is pension reform going more than a year and a half after it was enacted? Interviews and public statements of persons close to the subject reveal a mixed picture.

After years of hearings, during which it was conceded that the vast majority of private pension plan participants never received any benefits from them, ERISA became law on Labor Day 1974. The act, which was designed primarily to help pensioners of multiemployer and small, marginal plans get their due, included these principle provisions: disclosure requirements, maximum funding, uniform federal standards on the activities of pension fund managers, greater tax parity and termination insurance.

Last week's hearing, not coincidentally, was held on June 30, two days after many employers passed one of ERISA's key hurdles—filing summary descriptions of their pension plans with the Labor Department. That is, if they didn't take advantage of an extension offered to those whose plans needed additional modification or amending. Even if they didn't file, they had to send out letters to participants "generally" alerting participants to their as-not-yet completely defined rights, and telling them where to get further information.

If you are a plan participant are confused, take comfort in the fact you are not alone. In the past year and a half, the Labor Department has answered more than 350,000 inquiries from the public and professionals, including plan trustees and actuaries, and sent out more than 2 million pamphlets in plain English.

Still the confusion persists. "We didn't foresee all these problems when we were drafting the legislation," Dent sighed last week as he contemplated the need for more legislation to clear up the difficulties. Pension consultants, who try to keep one step ahead of everyone else in following changes, report business is booming. Around the country, seminars on ERISA, at several hundred dollars a head, attract administrative flies like honey.

To the confusion, add delay. Robert A. Georgine, chairman of the National Coordinating Committee for Multiemployer Plans, complained at the hearing that applications to the Labor Department that were filed seven and eight months ago still had not been acted on.

Hutchinson acknowledged the confusion, but defended long delays in nailing down the final provisions of ERISA by explaining that, when his office publishes a proposed regulation and seeks public input, "We really mean it." Hutchinson, who assumed his post in April 1975, takes credit for simplifying forms and cutting them down to one-third their original size, for exempting well over 600,000 small employer welfare plans from most reporting and disclosure requirements, and for waiving the requirement for an accountant's opinion for plans with fewer than 100 participants. The IRS also has simplified its reporting forms.

See PENSIONS, K2, Col. 1
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Hutchinson claims these and other modifications will save over $1 billion in the cost of implementing ERISA. Notwithstanding these “savings,” there is still strong criticism that ERISA’s administrative costs are onerous, especially for small plans. Prior to ERISA, the average cost of setting up a plan was about $750 plus $2 for each employee. Consultants say these costs are expected to double. (There are few complaints about the costs of vesting or benefits themselves. It is estimated that vesting over the long run will cost 7 per cent more, whereas the total amount of benefits, estimated at around $12 billion annually in 1975, could rise 5 to 10 per cent.)

Administrative costs plus the paperwork involved in filing information with participants and two government agencies—last week, the specter of a third was raised when a judge ruled some plans come under the securities laws—has caused some smaller employers to abandon their pension plans rather than put up with all that bother.

According to the Labor Department, slightly more than 5,000 termination notices were filed in 1975 compared with 1,300 in 1974. Most of the terminations came from plans with fewer than 100 participants.

Reasons given for dropping plans indicated adverse business conditions were responsible 60 per cent of the time. Only 23 per cent of the notices even mentioned ERISA as a factor, Hutchinson notes. Yet pension consultants dealing with small plans counter that ERISA-caused headaches are a factor in the majority of their terminations. Joel Korning of Deferred Compensation Plans, Inc., of Washington put the figure at 50 to 60 per cent.

Dallas consultant Donald K. Spies said, “Many employers don’t wish to admit an act dealing with employee ‘security’ is the reason, it would be bad for employee relations.”

Hutchinson insisted the termination figures have received undue emphasis.

Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp., agreed: “I have not great concern about terminated plans. PBGC picks up any losses.”

To date, PBGC has collected almost $2 billion in premiums from the 100,000 defined benefit plans it insures, or approximately $1 per worker per year. In the same period, it has granted $2.1 million to more than 7,000 participants whose plans folded without sufficient funds to pay benefits due them. More than half of the nearly 8,000 cases filed with PBGC remain to be resolved, however.

About one-third of the terminated plans will be replaced by new plans or other types of benefit structures. PBGC’s survey said. There is significant growth in individual retirement accounts. Those voluntary, tax-deferred plans, in quite a few instances allow workers to put aside more money than was possible under their previous plans. And legislation increasing the amount of contributions under IRA to $2,000 annually for a married couple is in the works.

Stanley H. Hackett, associate general counsel of the National Association of Pension Consultants and Administrators, warned last week that this incentive to retirement might backfire by encouraging employers to avoid setting up good, mandatory programs for their employees and leave them to the vagaries of voluntary, perhaps inferior, plans—or none at all.

Other trends relating to ERISA have been observed:

- Liberalized pension plans, those whose participation and vesting provisions exceed the minimums set by ERISA, are being cut back. A Bankers Trust survey of 100 companies showed that 40 per cent allowed employees to participate regardless of age before ERISA; yet four of those companies reduced their participation to conform to ERISA’s minimum age of 25 years and one year of service. Nine companies moved toward more stringent vesting. The moves were made now, apparently because companies fear they will not be able to fund them.

- Towers, Perrin, Forster & Crosby, an international consulting firm, predicts an increase in non-qualified pension plans that restore benefits promised by employers, but later banned by ERISA’s $75,000-a-year ceiling.

- More conservative investment policies by trustees are oriented toward stability of the investment rather than rate of return, to satisfy ERISA’s stricter funding requirements, and also to avoid running afoul of a more rigid interpretation of fiduciary responsibility. There is also an upgrading of fiduciary responsibilities from the board of directors to a new layer of authority within the company. There seems to be no shortage of trustees, as predicted, but their liability insurance premiums are climbing.

- There is also an increase in employer contingent liability insurance brought about by the power of PBGC to reach up to 30 per cent of a company’s net assets if its plan is terminated without sufficient funds. How to determine that 30 per cent is one of the major troublesome problems still facing PBGC.

Another pointed out by Patrick J. Regan in Financial Analysts Journal is the importance to the employer of whether he bears the full burden of the firm’s unfunded pension liability or no liability. Regan studied 40 major corporations and found their debt-to-equity ratio rose more than 50 per cent when unfunded vested pension liability was incorporated into their capital structure.

The amount that company pension fund assets must appreciate to fully fund vested benefits ranged from 14 per cent, for Eastman Kodak up to a whopping 170 per cent for Bethlehem Steel (based on 1974 data). In 1976, the value of corporate pension funds rose 28.7 per cent, which was still 9 per cent below Standard & Poor’s 600-stock index.

Other problems remaining include how to compute a year of service, a crucial question for multiemployer (mainly union) plans, and the cumbersome procedure for determining what transactions are prohibited to fund ad-
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To Les Therow,

The information you send me is very valuable to my campaign. It is going well, and I hope you will send me any advice on employment or the economy - or farm exports.

Your friend,

Jimmy
August 13, 1975

Jimmy Carter
Plains, Georgia 31780

Dear Mr. Carter:

Enclosed are the promised pages from the President's Automation Report. The relevant listing of possible jobs starts on page 35. While this listing was made in the mid-1960s the jobs that are listed have clearly not diminished.

The real problems in a guaranteed job program concern the wage payments that are to be made and the extent to which the guaranteed job is going to be used as a de-facto replacement for the minimum wage. The big unknown in estimating the costs of any guaranteed job program revolves around the number of workers in the private economy who dislike their current jobs so much that they would quit to take a government job, even if the government job paid lower wages.

I do not believe that this is a large group with the exception of domestic service workers. We know that the dislike of domestic service is so high that individuals will quit to take non-domestic jobs at lower wages.

To be effective, such a program could not be modeled after the current public service employment program. That has become a shell game where cities lay-off workers and then hire them back at federal expense. To be effective, the program would have to be an open-ended program designed to find some useful work and an associated wage for everyone who wished to work regardless of age, sex, credentials, or handicaps.

As I mentioned to John Bolles, I would be willing to be helpful on economic affairs whenever you have a problem.

Sincerely yours,

Lester C. Thurow
September 2, 1975

Dear Mr. Tucker:

Thank you for the material you gave me. I have asked my issues coordinator, Steven Stark, to get in touch with you. In the meantime, it might be helpful if you sent some of the same material to him.

Thank you for your continued advice.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter
Dear Governor Carter:

What did you think of my three articles (which I handed to you personally at your campaign appearance in Arlington, Virginia in July) on altering the conventional mortgage contract in order to ease the home financing burden for moderate income families? It still seems to me that this issue provides an excellent opportunity, an excellent example affecting millions of small families, for making the point that excessive government regulation is doing more harm than good. The savings and loan industry, under this blanket of regulation, is not permitted the flexibility to innovate to meet the needs of mortgage borrowers (or savers, for that matter) in periods of inflation, and even if the flexibility were there, they would not have the incentive to innovate. Some regulatory changes to permit them more flexibility and to subject them to more intense competitive pressures to improve or else go out of business would be of major value to young families wanting to buy homes and also to elderly savers who do not get an adequate interest return on their savings.

As a follow-on to the material I gave you before, I thought you might be interested in the enclosed further proposal of mine dealing with an alternative to the variable-rate mortgage. I believe this alternative would meet the needs of the savings institutions for a more stable financial structure while avoiding the objections that have been raised to the variable-rate mortgage. Although I did not mention this point in the attached statement, the fixed-rate mortgages that savings institutions would issue under this proposal would have to have graduated payment schedules in order to serve the needs of moderate-income borrowers.

I would be glad to discuss these issues further with you or your staff if you (or they) would find it useful.

Sincerely,

Donald P. Tucker
An alternative to the variable-rate mortgage:

Objective: To improve the financial stability of thrift institutions in such a way as to ensure that the thrifts will continue to function as major sources of mortgage lending, without using variable-rate loans.

Proposal: (a) Gradual increase of Reg. Q ceilings on long-term certificate deposits at thrifts, while continuing the regulatory differential between the rates thrifts are permitted to pay and the rate banks are permitted to pay on long-term deposits, and (b) relaxation of other regulatory constraints, especially the $1000 minimum denomination constraint, on long-term deposits.

Intended effect:
(a) To enable thrifts to increase the percentage of their deposits held in certificates of long maturity, if they wish to do so, as a way of avoiding the problems that have arisen in the past from "borrowing short and lending long,"
and
(b) To give thrifts a protected position in the financial markets as the primary providers of long-term savings deposits, which would ensure a continuing supply of mortgage money from thrifts.

Reg. Q ceilings - further details:
(a) The ceilings on long-term deposits should be raised gradually in order to avoid too rapid a shift from passbook deposits to higher-paying deposits.
(b) The ceilings on long-term deposits might ultimately be removed entirely for thrifts, but they should continue to be imposed on commercial banks at levels that limit their penetration into the long-term savings market.
(c) As long as ceilings remain in effect on long-term deposits at thrifts, they should be floating ceilings; that is, they should rise, at least modestly, when competing market rates rise, to provide the industry some flexibility to combat disintermediation.
(d) As the price for being given a permanent rate differential by regulation on the long-term deposits, thrifts might have to surrender the present rate differential on passbook deposits.

Consistency with financial institutions reform:
This proposal is fully consistent with the thrifts' desires for expanded loan and deposit powers, but it would provide them a way to reduce their portfolio risk before the expanded loan and deposit powers are granted. Then, when expanded loan and deposit powers are granted that increase the thrifts' flexibility to bid for inherently short-term consumer deposits and non-mortgage consumer loans, the power to attract substantial quantities of long-term deposits as well would be essential to enable them to continue as major suppliers of mortgage money through fixed-rate loans.
D. Tucker
4518 Lowell St. NW
Wash. D.C. 20016

Governor Jimmy Carter
Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign
Box 1976
Atlanta, Georgia 30301
Mr. Daniel Thomas  
New River Middle School  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33302

Dear Mr. Thomas:

I appreciate your interest in my candidacy and feel it is very important for students to become involved in the political system. I do not favor the federal government directly injecting itself between New York State and New York City. This would set an uncontrollable precedent and tend to perpetuate unsound fiscal management practices in local governments. I would favor a state and federal takeover of all welfare costs.

I have enclosed my positions on the other issues listed in your letter; if you have further questions, do not hesitate to write.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Enclosures
Mr. Jimmy Carter, presidential candidate
Political Headquarters
Atlanta, Georgia

Dear Mr. Carter:

I am writing this letter for my civics class and I need the response for a grade. I would like to know what you are going to do about the state of the economy. Please tell me what you are going to do about New York. What about the people who are unemployed? The issue of busing is of great importance to me. Please give your response to the above questions. Thank you!

respectfully yours
Daniel Thomas
August 1, 1975

Dear John:

I wanted to thank you again for your help yesterday on supplying information about the Helsinki agreements. I'll be in Cambridge in about two weeks and I hope we can get together then.

All the best,

Steven Stark
Issues Coordinator

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.
March 4, 1976

Roger Tresolini
National Taxpayers Union
325 Pennsylvania Ave., S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003

Dear Mr. Tresolini:

Thank you for your letter and the enclosed information on waste in government. As you are probably aware, this is a major concern of Gov. Carter. We would very much appreciate anything further you could send us on it. Again, thank you for your help and interest.

Sincerely,

Charles Cabot III
Issues
February 20, 1976

Charles Cabot III
Issues
Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign
PO Box 176
Atlanta, Georgia

Dear Mr. Cabot,

Thank you for your response regarding Mr. Carter's positions on zero budgeting and the B-1 bomber.

As you may know, Senator Muskie, chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, has introduced a bill, S. 2925, that would institute zero budgeting. The budget committee plans extensive hearings on the measure in May and June. Perhaps Mr. Carter is interested in testifying. This issue will be a priority for NTU this year.

We have many examples of useless federal programs that Mr. Carter may wish to cite in his campaigning. A few samples are enclosed, and I will forward more to you when I get the time.

Regarding the B-1 bomber issue, I can put your campaign in touch with groups around the country working on it, if you are interested.

Sincerely,

Roger Trlesolini

National Taxpayers Union
325 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003
(Area Code 202) 546-2085

August 18, 1975

Dear Professor Thurow:

Thanks again for taking the time to meet with me and the governor on our recent trips to Boston. I am looking forward to receiving that information from you.

Hope to see you on my next trip north.

All the best,

Steven D. Stark
Issues Coordinator
April 6, 1976

Dr. Donald J. Troy, Executive Director
The National Alliance for Family Life, Inc.
505 Fifth Street
Huntington Beach, California 92648

Dear Dr. Troy:

Thank you for your letter. Although (I believe) Governor Carter strongly supports the goals of the National Alliance for Family Life, it is impossible for him to endorse any specific group at this time.

We sincerely appreciate your interest and concern. Please don't hesitate to write if you have any questions or suggestions.

Sincerely,

CHARLES CABOT, III
Issues
THE NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR FAMILY LIFE, INC.

JAMES J. RUE, Ph.D.
National Director

DONALD J. TROY, Ph.D.
Executive Director

NATIONAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS:
Charles Croft, Ph.D.
Chairman
210 East Broad St.
Richmond, Virginia 23222

Harold J. Breedel, Ph.D.
Vice-Chairman
President, Central Region
2401 Oakland Blvd.
Fort Worth, Texas 76103

James J. Rue, Ph.D.
President, Southeast Region
10 East Huron
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Hugh D. Pates, Ph.D.
President, Central Region
341 West Church St.
Richmond, Virginia 23222

Charles H. Kramer, M.D.
President, Southwest Region
10734 Paramount Blvd., Suite 20
Downey, California 90241

Charles Crotty, Ph.D.
Chairman
2201 Holton Blvd.
Falls Church, Virginia 22046

Treasurer

Charles B. Silverman, Ph.D.
Vice-Chairman
President, Northeast Region
123 Gregory Avenue
West Orange, New Jersey 07052

William J. Johnson, Jr., MA
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February 24, 1976

Governor Jimmy Carter

2000 P St., Suite 415
Washington, D.C. 20036

c/o Carter for President

Dear Governor Carter,

In the name of NAFL's Board of Directors, Membership and
the families we serve, I write asking for your endorsement of
our call for a "Commission on the Family", and for your
response to our other family oriented legislative goals.

As a National Organization committed to strengthening
marriage and family life in America, we can support or oppose
your candidacy for President only in the light of your speci­
cfic proposals for strengthening family life.

NAFL's Resolution calling for a Presidential or Congress­
ional Commission on the Family is printed on the front page
of the enclosed NAFL News. There are many successful prece­
dents for such a commission, and the present plight of the
American Family makes this a pressing need. We must stop
offering band-aid solutions without accurately identifying
the problems.

Ideally this Commission on the Family would meet for as
long as necessary, draw upon the best available expertise,
accurately assess the present situation, propose a unified
approach for meeting the problems and make specific legislative
recommendations to the President and Congress.

NAFL believes strongly that this relatively simple step,
establishing a Commission on the Family, could contribute
enormously to strengthening marriage and family life in
America, could save the country billions of dollars in overl­
lapping or misdirected spending, and could inaugurate a well­
researched plan for the positive reform of legislation which
affects the family. We feel the idea deserves your support.

Please indicate your endorsement of our Resolution by
signing and returning the enclosed postcard. We hope you will
also make the Commission an issue in your campaign and will
proceed to establish it immediately upon your election.

While your endorsement of the Commission on the Family
is our primary concern, I also call your attention to the
"Other Suggested Campaign Issues" listed on page 3 of the
enclosed NAFL News. I urge you to read them thoroughly, as you will probably be confronted with some of them by our members. I hope that you can respond positively to all or most of them, and I invite you to use these also as campaign issues. They represent the well-thought-out expertise of our membership. Delegates drafted them at our Family Symposium in Washington, D.C. in 1974 as specific legislative proposals which could help strengthen family life in America.

I hope we will receive your endorsement of our Resolution and will be able to support your candidacy. I further hope that both during the campaign and in the future you will do all you can to accomplish NAFL's goal of strengthening marriage and family life in America.

I look forward to your reply.

Gratefully,

Donald J. Troy, Ph.D.
Executive Director

DJT:jh
Enclosures
Dear Mr. Thorstad:

Thank you for your letter.

Governor Carter is opposed to discrimination in all forms including sexual preference. As President he will work to eliminate it.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to write.

Sincerely,

Charles Cabot, III
Issues Staff
February 23, 1976

Dear Mr. Carter:

We are sure you will agree that all citizens should be guaranteed equal protection under the law. Homosexuals comprise a large segment of American society, and although the 14th Amendment should protect them from discrimination, it unfortunately does not.

We are canvassing all announced candidates of all parties for President of the United States regarding their views on the gay issue.

We respectfully ask you the following:

1) Would you if elected President sign an executive order ending discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in all areas of federal employment and housing, and within the military? Yes  No

2) Would you urge your party to include a plank in its 1976 election platform calling for repeal of all consensual sodomy statutes and for passage of legislation to ban discrimination on account of sexual orientation? Yes  No

3) Would you appoint openly gay persons as members of the Civil Rights Commission? Yes  No

Within a reasonable time, we will start to inform gay organizations throughout the country, as well as the public, of responses to this questionnaire. We would, therefore, appreciate your returning it as soon as possible. Failure to respond will have to be considered a negative reply.

We would be glad to answer any inquiries you may have. We thank you for your prompt attention to this letter, and look forward to an early response.

Sincerely yours,

David Thorstad, President
Gay Activists Alliance
5 Feb., 1976

Mr. Roger Tresolini
625 East Capitol St.
Washington, D.C. 20003

Dear Mr. Tresolini,

Please excuse the delay in answering your letter. Enclosed is a copy of Governor Carter's plan for zero based budgeting and a position paper on government growth and budgeting.

The Governor is opposed to the present B-1 bomber project.

Please don't hesitate to write if you need any further information. We appreciate your interest.

Sincerely,

Charles Cabot III
Issues
November 4, 1975

Jimmy Carter for President
PO Box 7667
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Dear Friends,

National Taxpayers Union is opposed to waste in government, wherever it is found. We believe that Mr. Carter shares this concern more sincerely than any of the other democratic candidates for the presidential nomination.

We are considering doing a story on Mr. Carter's views for our newsletter, and would like some information.

Can you please send us information on Mr. Carter's support of "zero based budgeting". We would also like his views on the costly B-1 Bomber and other military issues? Any additional information will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Roger Tresolini
Legislative Representative
31 January, 1976

Jean T. Trueblood
1089 Moraga Dr.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90049

Dear Ms. Trueblood,

Thank you for your letter. Please excuse the delay in getting back to you. Enclosed is a copy of my stand on abortion as well as my statement on women's rights.

Please don't hesitate to write me again if you need any further information. I appreciate your interest.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter

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.
Dear Mr. Carter:

Congratulations on the Iowa primary. I trust this is only the beginning of many victories.

I am not a johnny-come-lately to your campaign. Several months ago my husband and I sent a small contribution and again a few weeks ago. Both times we asked some questions about your stand on matters of concern to us. At no time have we had an acknowledgement of any kind!

One of the most important parts of your strategy is the assurance - and it is believable - that you will be honest. You can't be honest if you don't answer at all.

The subject of specific concern to me is your attitude on the right of a woman to choose whether or not to have an abortion to end an unwanted pregnancy. The Supreme Court decision of Jan.22, 1973 was significant in allowing women the right to reproductive freedom. It was also of importance because it took the matter out of the hands of predominantly male and pressure-sensitive legislatures.

You can take advantage of that
historic Decision. You can, if you wish, strongly support the women on both sides of the abortion issue if you will recognize that the right is one of freedom of choice. Although the Catholic church and the groups it has mobilized are very valuble and loud they are not the largest number. And I know from personal experience as an abortion counselor that when a woman becomes pregnant and had not planned to be and does not want to be — then she is very apt to leave her so-called "Pro-life" stand and decide to "terminate her pregnancy." (N.B. this phrase is much easier for some people to accept than the word abortion which still has strong negative connotations for many people.)

Perhaps most important — the abortion issue could be a take-off spot for you to express interest and concern and understanding for all women. (Remember they make up 53% of the population.) Many "pro-life" types are so because they were brought up in an era when having a family and nurturing it was socially approved.
They should be recognized for a job well done. That is not to say that motherhood and the family is a good platform to run on today. Pictures of the politician as a family man have been overdone. The public is much more ready to accept different life-styles and the politician's open recognition of this could be (can you believe the word?) endearing.

Some strong statements from you on the creative role women can play in the future of our country would be in order.

And in the field of international relations, some recognition of the plight of women in the developing countries would not be amiss if it was in terms of trying to help them. I would be glad to document any of the foregoing statements and write a platform plank for you. Surely, energy, big business, taxes, the power of government and detente are of exceeding great importance but the human issue of woman as she struggles to find herself and her place in home, politics, and the world should warrant some of your time and thought and public stand. Sincerely, Jean Trueblood
P.S. Since writing the foregoing statement I have done two things:

1) talked with the Carter for President office in Los Angeles. The woman who answered did not know your stand on the abortion issue but said she would send some material on women's rights. That is not enough.

2) talked with a friend just back from Washington D.C. who says there is confusion about your real stand regarding the right of freedom of choice. Make no mistake about it — the issue is not what your own personal feelings or morals are but rather... are you willing for others to have the right to exercise their own judgement and to follow their feelings and morals?

I hope you can answer this question honestly. It will effect your campaign and its outcome.
April 14, 1976

Mr. Thornton
704 Foxcroft Drive
Cinnaminson, N. J. 08077

Dear Mr. Thornton,

Thank you for your kind letter. I would appreciate any information you could send me on the Economy. Please don't hesitate to write me again.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter
Mr. Jimmy Carter  
Our Next President  
Plains, Georgia 31780

Dear Jimmy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb. '68</th>
<th>Feb. '72</th>
<th>Feb. '76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation (twelve months)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*price controlled

"America is STRONG! Do not listen to prophets of doom."

... President Ford, August 1974

"No one knew we would have the inflation and unemployment we experienced in recent months."

... President Ford, January 1975

"We didn't panic, we didn't lose our cool; we did what we thought was right and the net result has been an economic recovery better and more rapid than we ourselves predicted."

... President Ford, February 1976

I seriously question whether America can survive another term under the Nixon/Ford administration. (Insofar as the economy is concerned, the two are inseparable.)

The situation today is very similar to early 1972. Unemployment will subside to a point below the administration's forecasts, so that, by November, they will come out smelling like a rose.

However, the same forces are at work. Groundwork is being laid for a return to the same dreary, dismal performance we experienced at both midterms during the Nixon/Ford administration. NOW, though, we can identify those forces. We can point out to the voters in straight-forward and convincing terms what is happening. Just give the administration a couple of more months to solidify their position and then, during the heat of the campaign, we can tighten the noose. We just simply must bust up the veneer that surrounds the White House so our economy can get going again.

Economists have an annoying habit of trying to CREATE truth by superior reasoning - either mental or mechanical (computers). As a result, we have the 'Hoax of the Century!'

March 12, 1976

THORNTON ASSOCIATES

T. DALE THORNTON
MANAGEMENT ENGINEER

TELEPHONE. 609-829-4994

704 FOXCROFT DRIVE
CINNAMINSON, N. J. 08077

March 12, 1976

Mr. Jimmy Carter
Our Next President
Plains, Georgia 31780

Dear Jimmy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feb. '68</th>
<th>Feb. '72</th>
<th>Feb. '76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation (twelve months)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*price controlled

"America is STRONG! Do not listen to prophets of doom."

... President Ford, August 1974

"No one knew we would have the inflation and unemployment we experienced in recent months."

... President Ford, January 1975

"We didn't panic, we didn't lose our cool; we did what we thought was right and the net result has been an economic recovery better and more rapid than we ourselves predicted."

... President Ford, February 1976

I seriously question whether America can survive another term under the Nixon/Ford administration. (Insofar as the economy is concerned, the two are inseparable.)

The situation today is very similar to early 1972. Unemployment will subside to a point below the administration's forecasts, so that, by November, they will come out smelling like a rose.

However, the same forces are at work. Groundwork is being laid for a return to the same dreary, dismal performance we experienced at both midterms during the Nixon/Ford administration. NOW, though, we can identify those forces. We can point out to the voters in straight-forward and convincing terms what is happening. Just give the administration a couple of more months to solidify their position and then, during the heat of the campaign, we can tighten the noose. We just simply must bust up the veneer that surrounds the White House so our economy can get going again.

Economists have an annoying habit of trying to CREATE truth by superior reasoning - either mental or mechanical (computers). As a result, we have the 'Hoax of the Century!'
The Honorable Jimmy Carter  
Plains, Georgia  

March 12, 1976

Meanwhile, I have spent two years pulling together facts and analyzing them so that the truth can be known. I have a new, condensed report with charts that tell the story very clearly. I am looking for a solid base that we can plug it into so we can get going.

Personally, don't you think a blend of Georgia peanuts and Iowa corn is far superior to that sour mash we are getting now? Believe me, I can debunk all the stuff your competitors will fling at you with regard to the economy, and I can show the voters what caused the debacle we are in and why it is likely we will experience a repeat performance if the present administration survives in November.

You are staying "loose" on economic issues for the time being. Good! You have time now to plan a strong offensive later that will clinch your victory! I just know you will like what I have for you.

With every good wish to you and your staff.

Sincerely,

T. Dale Thornton

TDT/s
Dear Ms. Trafton,

Here is the article on zero-base budgeting I promised you. Please don't hesitate to write or call if you need any further information.

Yours,

Oliver Miller
Asst. to the Issues Coordinator
(export of technology to weapons, proliferating arms centers)
December 3, 1975

Dear Mr. Thomas:

Sorry for the delay in answering your requests. Enclosed you will find a copy of Governor Carter's foreign policy speech, as well as a copy of a short issues statement on nuclear weapons. We have also enclosed two of our direct mail letters.

If you have any further requests, please don't hesitate to write me.

All the best,

Steven Stark
Issues Coordinator
18 January, 1976

Larry W. Thomason
Attorney at Law
Decatur Federal Building
Box 2050
Decatur, Ga. 30031

Dear Mr. Thomason,

Please excuse the delay in answering your letter. As you probably know by now, we are in full agreement with the Common Cause Checklist and have expressed this view to Mr. Cohen on December 24, and to Mr. Scherer (at the Common Cause Atlanta office) on December 18.

All of us here at the office have been very impressed by the concern and persistence of Common Cause members in their scrutiny of the candidates. Keep up the good work!

Oliver Miller
Asst. to the Issues Coordinator
December 12, 1975

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

Dear Jimmy:

I am writing to you at the behest of David Cohen, who is the National President of Common Cause. I have taken on the position as Director of Common Cause's Campaign '76, and was recently reviewing the list of presidential candidates who had responded to John Gardner's recent request to each candidate. I observed to the Washington staff that in light of the fact that you and your wife are Common Cause members, I was positive that your response was forthcoming, and they simply asked that I remind you that it would be beneficial if this could be received prior to January 1, 1975, since the results of the responses will be disseminated to the news media by Common Cause in Washington sometime shortly thereafter.

Your tireless campaigning and the benefits you are receiving from your hard work are admirable. Good luck and best wishes in the very long days ahead.

Very cordially yours,

Larry W. Thomason

LWT: sw
January 20, 1976

Mr. Robert C. Tetro
12012 Aintree La.
Reston, Va.

Dear Mr. Tetro,

Thank you for your kind letter and paper on food problems. Any truly effective solution to our complex food problem will require a thorough understanding of all the issues involved. I appreciate the interest of such knowledgeable people as yourself. I hope you will continue to keep me informed.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter
Dear Jimmy,

For the first time, I am in a position to react positively to your "Please let me have the benefit of ....", a good line in a very good form letter. In that area, by the way, there was a slight goof somewhere, because the acknowledgment of my modest additional contribution wasn't copied fast enough to your follow-up unit from which I received a very pleasant call last Wednesday. That was partly my fault for having delayed my response, so I'm enclosing another $5 to cover the cost of that phone call!

Three other notes:

1. I am an ex civil servant, retiring on 1 February for the second time from a U.N. job in agriculture and food which has eased my transition from 20 years in foreign agriculture to a stateside berth. That transition was speeded up in part, although not aided, by our using a publicly leased home in Rome, Italy for a Humphrey-Muskie fund raiser. On retirement, both my wife and I will be free to act politically, ... whatever that is.

2. After retirement, I'm going to check again with Dave Gartner to see if H.H. will need any help this spring. That relationship goes back many years. If the answer is "No," I would be happy to put in some time in assisting your Virginia operation and also would expect to volunteer to help Joe Fisher for whom we worked (and met you) two years ago.

3. My basic field is agricultural economics with 20 years in Foreign Agriculture, where I once headed the FAS. I'm better than average on domestic agriculture and reasonably knowledgeable in economics generally. The enclosure may demonstrate the foregoing immodesty! If it's helpful, use it.

Keep up the good fight. As Confucius says, "Whatever Man do, it working"!

Sincerely yours,

Robert C. Tetro

Mr. Jimmy Carter
Presidential Campaign
P.O. Box 1976
Atlanta, Georgia 30301
April 21, 1976

Wayne Joseph Tetzlaff
11201 Maryland Ave. N.
Champlin, Mn. 55316

Dear Mr. Tetzlaff,

Thank you for your letter and I apologize for my delay in responding.

The time for (automatic) American intervention in the problems of other countries is over. There is no role for the United States to play on the Angolan Civil War. If we want the respect of other countries, of the African countries, if we want to limit Soviet involvement in this region, if we want to protect our interest in the natural resources of this region, it is in our best interest to stay out. I favor only the sending of humanitarian aid.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter
Gov. Carter,

I am a uncommitted Precinct Delegate at this point, but plan on choosing a candidate by March 20, our District Caucus. The majority of delegates in Minnesota are trying to draft Senator Humphrey. I'm not interested in that proposal. I am going to back a candidate who wants to be President.

I have seen you twice on Presidential Forum and have read a few articles about you, but I still would like to hear more on your views and proposals.

President Ford feels he didn't get his way in Angola and I read Senator Jackson would "...deal with the Communist." What is your feeling about involving the U.S. in this type of military action?

Thank-you!

Precinct Chairman,

Wayne Joseph Tetzlaff

Wayne Joseph Tetzlaff.
5 February, 1976

Jerry Thomas
Chairman, Florida Conservative Union
324 Datura St., Suite 214
West Palm Beach, Fla. 33401

Dear Mr. Thomas,

Enclosed are the answers to your questionnaire. Please excuse the delay in getting them to you.

As you will note, Governor Carter preferred to answer several of the questions with short paragraphs.

I hope you won't hesitate to call or write me if you have any further questions.

Yours,

Oliver Miller
Issues Staff
Terry,

Thanks for your letter. We don't have any jobs now, but I'll keep your application on file.

All the best,

Steve O. Smith

Terry D. Garcia
5801 Quantrell Ave. #409
Alexandria, Va.
22312
13 Jan 76

Mr. Steve Stark  
Carter for President Campaign  
Box 7667  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

Dear Mr. Stark:

I am writing to inquire as to the possibility of joining the Carter for President Campaign in some capacity. I enclose my resume for your perusal.

As indicated, I have approximately three years of legislative experience in the field of foreign policy. I began my work on the "Hill" as a research assistant for the United Nations Association in December 1972. I was appointed Research Director of UNA's Washington office in September 1973. In September 1974, I left UNA to become Legislative Director of World Federalists, USA. At this time I was also retained as a legislative consultant for the Planning Commission on New Directions and the National Student Association.

Thank you for your consideration and I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Terry D. Garcia

5801 Quantrell Ave. #409  
Alexandria, Va. 22312  
354-4531
RESUME

Terry Donato Garcia
5801 Quantrell Ave. Apt. 409
Alexandria, Va. 22312
703/354-4531 - Home
202/483-0550 - Office
Age - 23
Height - 6'1"
Weight - 165 lbs.
Marital Status - divorced

Education -
B.A. - International Relations and Policy Analysis
The American University School of International Service

Employment
9/74 to Present - Legislative Director of World Federalists, USA. Designed
and implemented the World Federalist political action
program and administered the legislative office. Served
also as Legislative Editor of the World Federalist newspaper,
"World Citizen/Federalist Letter". Activities included:
directing more than a dozen lobbying campaigns ranging from
foreign assistance to military spending; creating and
producing a bi-weekly newsletter on legislation affecting
US policy vis a vis the issues of global interdependence;
and designing and administering a legislative intern program
in conjunction with Georgetown University, American University,
University of California at Los Angles, and Michigan State
University.

1/75 to Present - Consultant to the Planning Commission on New Directions.
Assist in the design of the organization's legislative
program. (PCND is the board of a proposed "Common Cause"
of world affairs).

8/75 to Present - Consultant to the National Student Association. Serve as
advisor to NSA Food Desk on legislative matters.

9/73 to 9/74 - Director of Research for the Washington office of the
United Nations Association. Supervised a staff of six foreign
policy researchers examining various international economic
and legal issues. Served as Washington correspondent for
the UNA newspaper, "Inter Dependent". Co-authored two
research reports, Rhodesian Chrome and Law of the Sea and
directed a third, The Shame of the Sahel (summary published

5/73 to 9/73 - Research Assistant for the Washington office of the United
Nations Association. Researched various UN related matters.

Other Skills -
Languages spoken - German, Japanese and Spanish.
Hold an Advanced Amateur Radio License.

References - Furnished upon request.
March 27, 1976

Mr. Ken Temejun
Box 66
Plainfield, Vt. 05667

Dear Ken,

Thanks for your letter. I have enclosed a page on the Civil Disorders Unit. I hope it answers your questions.

Thank you for your support of Gov. Carter.

Sincerely,

David Moran
Issues Staff
March 4, 1976

Ken Temejyun
Box 66
Plainfield, VT
05667

Dear Campaign Committee,

I've just read a brief pamphlet about Jimmy Carter. Although I do not agree with everything and am unclear on the specifics I have a good feeling for this man. I do have one question and that is - what is meant by (Under What Jimmy Carter has done as Governor of Georgia - Criminal Justice) "established civil disorder units"? If this means spying on and disrupting so-called "radical" groups I'm against it and would like some clarification.

Sincerely,

Ken Temejyun
J. Edward Taylor, President
Solar Corporation of America
P.O. Box 399
Warrenton, VA  22186

Dear Mr. Taylor:

Thank you for your letter and the enclosed articles. I have long advocated a major shift to coal and solar energy. I am sending along a copy of excerpts from my speech on energy development for your use. I agree with you that solar energy will become increasingly important in heating our homes and buildings. Any specific proposals you may have in this area would be more than welcome.

I appreciate your support.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter
Dear Governor Carter:

Please consider the implications of the two clippings enclosed from many, many such recently published of a similar voice.

It is abundantly clear that taking a positive position for solar heating of homes and buildings is going to increasingly serve the public weal. I would be privileged to offer assistance to your staff in this matter should you have an interest.

As a friend of Governor Carter, I would welcome your views on this urgent matter. Our country is in grave need of your leadership on the energy problem.

Your servant,

J. Edward Taylor, P.E.
President
JET/b
Enclosure
Solar-Energy Planning Is Being Slighted
By Ford, Former Chief of Program Says

In essence, Mr. Teem said his proposals would have resulted in more government stimulation of the private sector for commercialization of solar energy than the White House and the budget of ice wanted.

President Ford's budget request for solar research and development programs in ERDA for fiscal 1977, as part of the ERDA budget, asked for a congressional authorization of $160 million, with projected outlays during the year of $116 million. Mr. Teem said that the ERDA had requested the budget office to ask for $335 million in budget authority and $201.6 million in outlays. In the current fiscal year, the ERDA has a budget authority for solar programs of $113 million and estimated outlays of $86 million. By contrast, the ERDA's requested budget outlays for nuclear programs for fiscal 1977 total $1.1 billion.

Mr. Teem said that solar work in heating and cooling of buildings and in agricultural and industrial processes is scientifically advanced enough so that demonstration programs "could proceed at a more rapid pace" than the budget request outlines. Mr. Teem says that those programs show the most short-term promise for solar energy use and that, "even within a constrained budget," they "could have been given more priority.

Programs Criticized

"Congress' O Ice of Technology Assessment similarly criticized the ERDA's solar programs in a report last October, saying too much emphasis was being put on long-term, space-age type solar research programs at the expense of areas that can become practical sooner.

Mr. Teem said that there is the view at the budget office and the White House that because of advances in solar technology, "the private sector is in a position to undertake more programs now" without government stimulus.

A solar research institute within the ERDA was authorized by a 1974 law to do technical and analytical work to support the agency's solar-energy programs. The National Academy of Sciences had recommended to the ERDA that the institute be given a wide research role, a staff of about 1,500 and an annual budget of about $30 million. ERDA sources said that a compromise had been reached with the budget office on the size and scope of the institute, which won't be on the scale envisioned by the NAS.

The sources said the institute will first only do studies, and that its actual laboratory research role will remain undefined for the first few years of operation.
Nuclear Power: The Ugly Facts

High over the floor of the U.S. Senate there is a windowless hearing room—an early architectural tribute to the needs of security—where there took place last week a confrontation more important than the one in New Hampshire.

On the one side were three men who had resigned their jobs because they honestly believed that what they were doing was too dangerous to their country to keep on doing.

On the other were 18 senators and representatives—members of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee who were facing up to their own fears and failings.

The testimony of the witnesses was dramatic and the kleig lights captured the drama for television news clips. But what they couldn’t capture was the history which must have been running through the minds of the congressmen and senators who sat there and listened. After 25 years, after lavish federal subsidies, after almost unanimous support from successive legislatures and Presidents, the promise of safe, reliable nuclear power—“power too cheap to meter”—it was once predicted—was going aglitter in the words coming out of the mouths of the witnesses.

“My reason for leaving the program,” said Gregory G. Minor, the General Electric Co.’s manager for advanced controls planning and implementation, “is my deep conviction that nuclear reactors and nuclear weapons now present a serious danger to the future of all life on this planet.”

Dale G. Bridenbaugh, General Electric’s manager for performance evaluation and improvement, testified as follows: “The magnitude of the risks, the uncertainty of the human factor and the genetic unknowns have led me to believe that there should be no nuclear power.”

And Richard B. Hubbard, General Electric’s manager for quality assurance, said this: “There is no way you can continue to build the nuclear plants and operate them without having an accident.”

Congressmen and senators asked questions. What they were thinking cannot be recorded. But the thoughts must have ranged from the wistful to the sad. Some of these men and their predecessors through the years built careers supporting nuclear power. They have advanced it as a self-satisfying prophecy. They have seen to it that nuclear power received 60 times more federal subsidy than its potential alternatives such as solar energy. And until recently, at least, they have all believed that they were presiding over the development of an energy supply that would make the nation independent, no longer a partial hostage to the oil-exporting countries.

Now they were facing reality, recited to them articulately, in dry and measured tones. It cannot have been pleasant.

They will probably flinch around for a while, which is what men usually do when confronted with ugly facts. They will try to find other experts who will try to cast doubt upon the doubts.

But the responsibility for continuing with a program which might lead to disaster is a very grave responsibility. As the testimony sinks in and the doubts grow, the responsibility will seem too great a burden to bear.

There is talk in the corridors now of abolishing the Joint Atomic Energy Committee in favor of a Joint Committee on Energy and of putting money into alternative programs. As energy expert Barry Commoner reported in a recent three-part New Yorker series on the country’s energy policies, “The entire nuclear program is headed for extinction.”
May 19, 1976

Ms. Brenda Tankersley  
Rt. 2, Box 389  
Sheridan, Ore. 97378

Dear Ms. Tankersley:

Thank you for your letter. I am sending along a summary of Governor Carter's position on many issues of importance. If you need any further information, please let me know. We appreciate your interest.

Sincerely,

Charles C. Cabot III  
Issues Staff
Dear Sir,

I am a high school senior at Sheridan High School, Sheridan, Oregon. I am involved in a model democratic convention which will be held in Portland and we will nominate a candidate, and if we agree with the actual convention's choice.

I am also a born-again christian and I will be voting in the national presidential election this year. I'm a concerned citizen and I want to vote for the best man, or woman as the case may be.

I'm interested in receiving some information as to where Jimmy Carter stands on different controversial issues. I would appreciate greatly if you could send me some.

Thank you,

Brenda Tontesley
Rt. 2 Box 389
Sheridan OR 97378
January 22, 1976

Dear Governor Carter,

I am very much interested in your candidacy for President of the United States. I like almost everything that I have read about you. The one exception is the report in the New York Times Magazine of December 15th that you approve the Supreme Court ruling that made abortion a private matter. Do you consider child abuse a private matter? Would you refrain from interfering if you saw
your next-door neighbor abuse and possibly kill her two-year-old, or two-month-old, or two-day-old child? Where would you draw the line? As I have learned of your compassion on questions of race and welfare, I have become convinced that your attitude on abortion is based on a lack of knowledge of the facts. Consequently, I had intended to send you some literature concerning the lessening of respect for life at many levels, which has come about since the Supreme Court decision of three years ago today. However, I have now read the syndicated column from my local
paper, which I am enclosing. It would appear from this column that you have had dialogue with others who feel as strongly as I do about abortion and euthanasia. You must have received from him not only information on the subjects, but also that this is the most important issue for those of us who believe in life. I would vote for someone with whom I disagreed on every other issue if he were pro-life; and I would vote against a person with whom I agreed on every other issue if he were not willing to stand up and defend life. After all, if we cannot
be guaranteed life, of what value are the promises of liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

You have much to offer this country, Governor Carter. Please take the time to study this issue, and I would be very happy to hear from you at some future time.

I will be away during the month of February, but any correspondence directed to the Maine Right to Life Committee, 113 Lisbon St., Lewiston, Me., would receive prompt attention.

Most sincerely,

Jane S. Tanton
CRESTON, Iowa — A recent whispered conversation in the basement of the Holy Spirit Church here explains how former Gov. Jimmy Carter of Georgia tried to pin down this state's critically important anti-abortion vote, thereby increasing the likelihood of victory in the Iowa Democratic caucuses essential to his presidential campaign.

Carter had just concluded a routine speech and uneventful question session in this central Iowa farm town where he was confronted by the local "pro-life" (anti-abortion) committee asking questions. Carter replied he considers abortion "morally wrong" but does not support their constitutional amendment permitting state option.

But would he support, a handsome young matron asked softly, a constitutional amendment uniformly applying to all states the anti-abortion ban in the Georgia statute struck down by the U.S. Supreme Court? Soft-spoken Jimmy Carter paused, then answered even more softly than usual: "Under certain circumstances, I would."

Ambiguous though it was, Carter's reply gave pro-life forces more than they get from other major Democratic contenders here. That is why Carter has an undercover edge on an undercover issue in Iowa. It also explains growing outrage among Carter's famous opponents here over the little peanut farmer from Plains, Ga., outsharking them by winning anti-abortion conservatives without losing pro-abortion liberals.

While all candidates agree with each other publicly on just about everything, none — Carter included — discusses abortion. Nevertheless, abortion vitally concerns this still exceptionally religious state among committed Christians, Catholic and Protestant alike, and is still blamed by Democratic politicians for their loss of the 1970 gubernatorial race.

The high intensity of the pro-life issue is magnified by the fact that at most 50,000 Democrats were expected at the precinct caucuses. And that magnified intensity hurts Carter's two principal opponents in Iowa, Sen. Birch Bayh of Indiana and Sargent Shriver.

As the only Catholic candidate and husband of a nationally known foe of abortion, Shriver would seem the natural beneficiary of Iowa's pro-life sentiment. On the contrary, to the dismay of his managers here, Shriver has alienated his natural constituency by bluntly ruling out any constitutional amendment.

Bayh, enjoying massive labor support in Iowa as elsewhere, is catching up on Carter's head start. Labor lawyer Harry Smith's well-oiled local machine gave Bayh an upset straw poll victory over Carter at last Sunday's candidates rally in Sioux City. But Bayh's progress is impeded by incessant "pro-life" views. The danger was underlined in Creston when a pro-life Catholic endangering his present broad support on the left and blamed by Democratic volunteers.

Nevertheless, even Hughes lost support on the left and among woman liberationists when he publicly joined the anti-abortion movement, which may explain why Carter-whispers his pro-life views. The danger was underlined in Creston when a pro-life Catholic candidate ran against Carter and was defeated by Bayh, enjoying massive labor support.

Disappointed by Shriver and appalled by Bayh, enemies of abortion here have quietly but clearly turned to Carter.

The pro-life Catholic organization in Dubuque lists Carter and Sen. Henry M. Jackson of Washington (no factor in Iowa) as most favored. A local pro-life leader was manpowering the Carter booth at the Sioux City rally. One politically active priest based in Des Moines is boosting Carter across the state. Anti-abortion women are volunteers for Carter throughout Iowa. One pro-life leader, Mrs. Jim Berthelsen of Sioux City, told us she and her husband back Carter not just because of abortion "but because he campaigns as a Christian."

Indeed, many Iowan's newly attracted to politics by Carter are fundamentalist Protestants who perceive Carter as a fellow Christian. The evangelical Dutch Reformed Church is honeycombed with Carter volunteers.

Carter's image here resembles former Sen. Harold Hughes, one of Iowa's most popular figures, Self-made man, devout Christian, and — what is new for Carter — foreign policy dove. That image has helped Carter build from scratch a coalition ranging from the progressive United Auto Workers to Iowa's most conservative Democrats.

Nevertheless, even Hughes lost support on the left and among woman liberationists when he publicly joined the anti-abortion movement, which may explain why Carter-whispers his pro-life views. The danger was underlined in Creston when a pro-life Catholic candidate ran against Carter and was defeated by Bayh, enjoying massive labor support. He is now behind in his own gubernatorial race. leader, Mrs. Jim Berthelsen of Sioux City, told us she and her husband back Carter not just because of abortion "but because he campaigns as a Christian."

Later in this endless campaign, Carter may have to clarify himself not only on abortion but busing, health insurance and tax reform — endangering his present broad but fuzzy base.

Later in this endless campaign, Carter may have to clarify himself not only on abortion but busing, health insurance and tax reform — endangering his present broad but fuzzy base.

But not before the caucuses where he needed a victory to propel him out of the pack. In that event, abortion, the issue that helped destroy George McGovern, could make Jimmy Carter a truly serious contender for the nomination.
"Starshine" is a love story accurately, a young inpetuous and time-worn affair of God and the simple life. The days of wartime—threatens the lives of those in Kentucky, the residents of a sleepy little town, the Yankee troops affects the lives of the simple life. "Starshine" is a story largely history books. It's a chapter of robust and humor to the theatrical as will. Russell Treyz is will with a cast that

**PLANNING COMMITTEE** — Pictured here are members of the planning committee for the St. Louis Winter Carnival teen dance. Members are, left to right, Rick Aube, Louise Potvin, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Gammon, advisors, and Marie Chabot. Absent when the picture was taken from 8 to 11 with music provided by invited to attend. (Sta"

**Engagements**

Mr. and Mrs. C. Manson Stetson of 24 Allen Ave., Lewiston, have announced the engagement and forthcoming marriage of their daughter, Charlene, to Gary G. Denette, son of Mr. and Mrs. Victor A. Denette of River Road, Walpole, N.H. Miss Stetson was graduated from Lewiston High School in 1970 and is employed as statement clerk at the Liberty Mutual Insurance Co. She is a Maine State official for swimming and serves as coach for the YMCA Pal Girls Swim Team. She also is a leader of a junior Girl Scout troop. Mr. Denette was graduated from the University of Maine, Portland-Gorham. Mr. Pontbriand have a wedding trip to Mountain are residing at

**Social Item**

Miss Polly Guy, dau of Mr. and Mrs. Real G. Green, pastor of and the Rev. Richard performed the wedding service.

A. Buchanan attended as maid of honor and acting as matron of honor were Miss Linda J. McFadden and Mrs. Thomas B. Pontbriand, son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Pontbriand have a wedding trip to Mountain are residing at

**Inventories Liquidation**

Now In Progress

**LEBLANC'S**

Morin's Bridal World
BEFORE BIRTH:

NO REASON REQUIRED

On January 22, 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that any pregnant woman could abort her unborn baby legally, on demand, until BIRTH. The consent of the baby’s father is not required whether the couple is married or not. The mother does not have to be informed about the trend to accept an ethic which allows utilitarian killing.

Unborn babies are not motionless blobs of tissue. 24 days after conception, the heart begins to beat, pumping its own blood through a body separate from its mother. Arms, legs, fingers and toes are fully formed at six weeks. By the third month of pregnancy, the baby will suck its thumb, swallow fluid, sleep and wake, pinch its fist, and kick vigorously. It will feel pain if injured. Unborn babies need nourishment, oxygen, and a safe warm place in which to develop strength. A few babies born prematurely weighing as little as one pound have survived. Most will live, with good medical care, if born after 28 weeks of pregnancy.

Abortion performed at 12 weeks or under tears the unborn child to pieces. Older babies undergo “saline” abortions, which poison the system and scald the tender skin. The baby is then born dead. Other methods produce early live birth through surgery or the administration of drugs. Liveborn aborted babies show signs of life, such as breathing, crying, muscle movement, heartbeat, and brain waves. It is usual for the attending nurses to be instructed to set the living child aside and allow it to die from neglect.

After birth, civil law protects a baby from being legally killed – or does it? Today, in some hospitals, parents are allowed to “choose” if they want their doctor to give medical care to newborn babies with birth defects. If the decision is “no”, the helpless child is denied any food or water, and dies of starvation. How is this legal? Physicians who order medical treatment to be “no nourishment” say that they have not killed the baby – nature has. Allowing a baby to die in this way is considered justifiable by people who think that having a “meaningful quality of life” is more important than life itself.

Physical or mental health are not the only criteria used to “justify” abortion or infanticide. Economic considerations, such as being born poor or one of many children, can be considered a “birth defect” by some doctors or hospitals. In some states, children are considered to be without value in the eyes of God.

Unborn babies do not possess the rights of adults, and may be dismissed as “no nourishment” to end the life of a person deemed unwanted, or otherwise alleged to be living a “meaningless” life.

AFTERT BIRTH:

“MEANINGFUL HUMANHOOD”

A Florida legislator has introduced a bill that would allow parents or legal guardians to request that medical care be withheld from sick retarded youngsters of any age. Allowing their early deaths would save taxpayers billions of dollars, he claims. Euthanasia advocates are working for laws that will allow doctors to commit acts that will deliberately end the life of a person deemed unwanted, or otherwise alleged to be living a “meaningless” life.

BAPTISTS FOR LIFE believe that no human life is considered to be without value in the eyes of God.

DURING STRESS:

HELP WANTED

Women undergoing abortions can suffer complications, regardless of whether the procedure is performed in a hospital, a clinic, a doctor’s office, or a so-called “back alley”. An abortion may cause her to be unable to carry a later pregnancy to a full term birth. Abortion is never a safe and simple act. BAPTISTS FOR LIFE are concerned about the woman who has nowhere to turn when “in trouble”. Many women abort their babies because no one cared enough to offer another solution. Pastors want to learn how to counsel effectively and sympathetically when a frightened woman seeks help. Wise Christian assistance recognizes the presence of two human beings – the mother and the baby – and works to aid both.

OUR CHRISTIAN CONCERN: ACTION...

Baptists, along with others, must speak out and resist the spread of the evils of abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia. To do so effectively, we must learn more about what is happening to these most helpless of God’s children ... and we must search for ways to help people afflicted with the problems that may lead them in desperation to break God’s law. As private citizens, we can inform our elected representatives that we oppose any further enactment of laws that will allow human life to be taken for the sake of convenience. And we can urge the passage of an Amendment to the U. S. Constitution that will restore the once-inalienable right to life to all human beings.

BAPTISTS FOR LIFE distributes timely reprints of topical literature on the life concerns issues; participates in seminars and workshops throughout the nation; publishes a monthly bulletin to members which informs them of current developments. The organization is growing rapidly as Baptists become better informed about the trend to accept an ethic which allows utilitarian killing.

Your support is needed! Don’t shrink from taking up your burden in the defense of a helpless and threatened life.

To receive your initial supply of informative literature, and to receive the monthly news bulletin for a full year, clip and mail the membership form NOW!
BAPTISTS FOR LIFE
P.O. BOX 394  Hallettsville, Texas 77964

MANIFESTING CHRISTIAN CONCERN FOR ALL HUMAN LIFE, WHETHER UNBORN, HANDICAPPED, OR AGED.

I want to support BAPTISTS FOR LIFE and its educational programs with my donation of:

☐ $0.00
☐ $5.00
☐ $10.00
☐ $25.00
☐ $50.00
☐ $100.00 or more

CLIP AND MAIL TO:
P.O. BOX 394
Hallettsville, Texas 77964

COORDINATOR
Bob Holbrook
Pastor, Hallettsville, Texas

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Edwin I. Armitage
Family Services, Cincinnati, Ohio

J. W. Buchanan, M.D.
Austin, Texas

Doug Chatham
Pastor, Decatur, Georgia

Mary Ellen Felps, Esq.
Attorney, Austin, Texas

Judith Fink
Educator, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Jesse Helms
United States Senator
Raleigh, North Carolina

Samuel Jeanes
Pastor, Merchantville, New Jersey

Norman Lamb
State Senator, Enid, Oklahoma

Hugo Lindquist
Pastor, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Morton Oliver
Pastor, Newport, Kentucky

Bruce Ray
Pastor, Wilmington, Delaware

M. O. Turner
Geologist, San Antonio, Texas

Charles Waugaman
Pastor, Harpswell, Maine

Harry H. Stephens, M.D.
San Antonio, Texas

BAPTISTS FOR LIFE
P.O. BOX 394  Hallettsville, Texas 77964

LOVE LIFE
DEFEND LIFE
RESPECT LIFE

Founded to Manifest
Christian Concern for
All Human Life, Whether
Unborn, Handicapped
or Aged......!
The Honorable Jimmy Carter

C/o Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign Comm.

P.O. Box 1976

Atlanta, Ga.
Mrs. Frederick G. Taintor
4 Bearce Avenue
Lewiston, Maine 04240
February 16, 1976

Mrs. Fredrick G. Taintor
4 Bearce Avenue
Lewiston, Maine 04240

Dear Mrs. Taintor:

Thank you for your letter. I am sending along a copy of my stand on abortion. I hope this answers your questions.

If you need any further information, please don't hesitate to write me. I appreciate your interest.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jimmy Carter

JC/al

enclosure
Mr. Tom Turner, Editor  
Not Man Apart  
Friends of the Earth  
529 Commercial  
San Francisco, Calif.  04111

Mr. Tom Turner, Editor  
Not Man Apart  
Friends of the Earth  
529 Commercial  
San Francisco, Calif.  94111

Dear Mr. Turner:

Thank you for your letter. Enclosed is a copy of my stand on nuclear power.

Please don't hesitate to write me again if you need any further information. I appreciate your interest.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter
January 20, 1976

Hon. Jimmy Carter  
Carter for President  
Atlanta, Georgia

Dear Mr. Carter:

    Congratulations on your fine showing in Iowa!

    I have been meaning to write you for some time to inquire your position on the growing controversy over the construction of nuclear power plants. I have seen here and there that you claim credentials as a nuclear scientist, so your opinion on commercial reactor development ought to carry some weight. (If only someone would design a power plant that would burn peanuts!)

    I look forward to your answer, and thank you.

    Sincerely,

    [Signature]

    Tom Turner, Editor  
    Not Man Apart
6 March, 1976

Mr. Bill Turner
#97, 4300 Riverside Drive
Punta Gorda, Fla. 33950

Dear Mr. Turner,

Thank you for your letter and the many valuable suggestions it contained. I am sending along my position paper on older Americans. I hope it convinces you of my sincere concern for one of our nation's most valuable and under-utilized groups.

Please don't hesitate to write again if you have any further suggestions or questions.

I hope I can continue to earn your support.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jimmy Carter

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.
Dear Jimmy:

Two hundred years ago Americans put their lives, fortunes and everything of value on the line to gain their—and our—freedom. When the Constitution was drafted with thirteen states, two senators and representatives dependent on population from each state made up the first Congress. With the addition of states throughout the years the formula has been followed and we now have a hundred senators—and their office staffs—and hundreds of representatives also with their staffs and appointees. May I suggest the time has come to reduce both Houses of Congress by 50%—what benefit is there to the taxpayer to have twice as many politicians haggling for their—and their constituents—selfish aims. Two hundred years ago we needed the number of senators and congressmen—today we only need half of them—to accomplish the same end much more efficiently.

2. All Federal, State and local pension programs—including the armed services—should be based as are private company pensions on the recipient receiving payment at age 62—reduced—or at age 65. This would eliminate the wide discrepancy presently whereby military men serve 30 years and collect a pension from the government but go to work in private industry thereby qualifying for and additional pension program as well as Social Security. New York City’s problems have been compounded from their pension programs such as garbage men receiving a pension of 50% of their last five years of work and retiring at 20 years of service. Compare this with my pension from a large private company of $300 a month after 38 years of service.

3. Call on ALL citizens to sacrifice as did the people in '76 by reducing all prices and all wages or benefits by 10%—over $10,000 annually—until inflation has been brought under control.

4. Only students with a grade level above 85% qualify for higher education but develop a vocational program for the ones below this level to learn a paying job. Simply being a member of a minority group does not qualify government funding of education for any individual.

These are only thoughts from a senior citizen who sincerely believes that enough "fat" exists in our present governments that by elimination would balance all the budgets within ten years. Your campaign should also encompass the "older" Americans who are being subjected to ever-increasing inflation and a planned "rip-off" by the AMA—the Medicare force is a prime example. Develop a sincere program for the people over 55—senior citizens—and they will place you or any qualified individual in the White House.

My best wishes for your success in your campaign and may I suggest that if you do get the Democratic nomination for president that you consider Fred Harris as your running mate.

Sincerely,

Bill Turner
Mr. Fred Taylor  
820 Royal Ann Lane  
Concord, Calif. 94518  

Dear Mr. Taylor:

Thank you for your interest in Governor Carter's campaign. I am enclosing two recent speeches the Governor made on foreign policy. If there is other information I can send, please write to National Headquarters in Atlanta.

Sincerely,

Robert Isaacson

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

Mr. Bill Turner
#97, 4300 Riverside Drive
Punta Gorda, Fla. 33950

Dear Mr. Turner,

Thank you for your letter and the many valuable suggestions it contained. I am sending along my position paper on older Americans. I hope it convinces you of my sincere concern for one of our nation's most valuable and under-utilized groups.

Please don't hesitate to write again if you have any further suggestions or questions.

I hope I can continue to earn your support.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jimmy Carter
Dear Jimmy:

Two hundred years ago Americans put their lives, fortunes and everything of value on the line to gain their—and our—freedom. When the Constitution was drafted with thirteen states, two senators and representatives dependant on population from each state made up the first Congress. With the addition of states throughout the years the formula has been followed and we now have a hundred senators—and their office staffs—plus hundreds of representatives also with their staffs and appointees. May I suggest the time has come to reduce both Houses of Congress by 50%—what benefit is there to the taxpayer to have twice as many politicians haggling for their—and their constituents—selfish aims. Two hundred years ago we needed the number of senators and congressmen—today we only need half of them—to accomplish the same end much more efficiently.

2. All Federal, State and local pension programs—including the armed services—should be based as are private company pensions on the recipient receiving payment at age 62—reduced—or at age 65. This would eliminate the wide discrepancy presently whereby military men serve 30 years and collect a pension from the government but go to work in private industry thereby qualifying for and additional pension program as well as Social Security. New York City’s problems have been compounded from their pension programs such as garbage men receiving a pension of 50% of their last five years of work and retiring at 20 years of service. Compare this with my pension from a large private company of $300 a month after 38 years of service.

3. Call on ALL citizens to sacrifice as did the people in ’76 by reducing all prices and all wages or benefits by 10%—over $10,000 annually—until inflation has been brought under control.

4. Only students with a grade level above 85% qualify for higher education but develop a vocational program for the ones below this level to learn a paying job. Simply being a member of a minority group does not qualify government funding of education for any individual. These are only thoughts from a senior citizen who sincerely believes that enough "fat" exists in our present governments that by elimination would balance all the budgets within ten years. Your campaign should also encompass the "older" Americans who are being subjected to ever-increasing inflation and a planned "rip-off" by the AMA—the Medicare farse is a prime example. Develop a sincere program for the people over 55—senior citizens—and they will place you or any qualified individual in the White House.

My best wishes for your success in your campaign and may I suggest that if you do get the Democratic nomination for president that you consider Fred Harris as your running mate.

Sincerely,

Bill Turner
15, 1976

Mr. Fred Taylor
820 Royal Ann Lane
Concord, Calif. 94518

Dear Mr. Taylor:

Thank you for your interest in Governor Carter's campaign. I am enclosing two recent speeches the Governor made on foreign policy. If there is other information I can send, please write to National Headquarters in Atlanta.

Sincerely,

Robert Isaacson

Robert Isaacson

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.
Dear Mr. Carter:

I am writing to each of the presidential candidates to find out what they think about the ideological struggle that is going on in the world.

This information will be shared with my high school class in history and with my teachers organization.

Hope to hear from you soon,

Sincerely,

Fred Taylor
Dear Sir:

As a teacher at Juvenile Hall in Martinez, California, I am making a survey of people in public office concerning their views about the ideological struggle that the world is in. I will have my students help me to tabulate the views of all the people who respond. Later this information will be shared with our teachers groups and with the media.

Some of the questions are to be answered, yes, no, or not sure. Other questions have to do with giving your opinion or reason.

1. Do you believe that we are in an ideological struggle against for cas that believe in Marxism-Leninism? yes no not sure

2. How serious do you consider this struggle to be (assuming you believe we are in a struggle)? not serious somewhat very serious extremely serious

3. Briefly, what do you consider the objectives of the Marxists-Leninists to be?

4. Which country do they believe is their chief enemy?

5. What reason do they give for this?

6. If people around the world, in all countries, believe in the teachings of Marx and Lenin, and are sincerely dedicated to implementing this teaching, what do you think we in the USA should do about this?

   1. Should the US have military strength greater than the Soviet Union? yes no

   2. Should we allow the Marxist-Leninists to do their "thing" in any country they choose, including our own? yes no not sure

   3. Should the US attempt to challenge the attempts of the Marxist-Leninists in the various countries? yes no not sure

   4. Should the FBI monitor and publicly expose the activities of revolutionary groups? yes no not sure

   5. Do the American people have the right to be fully informed about the goals and activities of organizations which are dedicated to the overthrow of the US government by force and violence? yes no not sure

6. Do you believe the US should have a national objective of turning back the growth of Communism? yes no not sure

7. Should the US help its allies defend themselves against Communist aggression and subversion? yes no not sure

8. Should the CIA be disbanded? yes no not sure

9. Should the CIA be limited to only intelligence gathering and not covert operations? yes, limit it no not sure

10. What suggestions do you have that the CIA could do to stop the Marxist-Leninist expansion?

11. Should our government do anything to help or assist the people who now live under Communism? yes no not sure

12. Should we do nothing for the people who live under Communism? yes no not sure

13. If you feel we should do something for them, what suggestions do you have?

14. If it came to a showdown between the Soviets and the US, and they were to invade Europe, but told us to leave them alone or face Nuclear War, do you think we should let them have Europe? yes no not sure

15. Should the US encourage free enterprise around the world? yes no

16. Should America protest and try to help the oppressed people who live under Communist and non-Communist dictatorships (minorities in Russia, Jehovah Witnesses in Malawi, Blacks in South Africa, whites in Uganda, etc)? yes no not sure

17. What other thoughts and comments would you like to make concerning the ideological struggle?

Sincerely,

Fred Taylor
Teacher, Contra Costa County Juvenile Hall, Martinez
April 21, 1976

Wayne Joseph Tetzlaff
11201 Maryland Ave. N.
Champlin, Mn. 55316

Dear Mr. Tetzlaff,

Thank you for your letter and I apologize for my delay in responding.

The time for (automatic) American intervention in the problems of other countries is over. There is no role for the United States to play on the Angolan Civil War. If we want the respect of other countries, of the African countries, if we want to limit Soviet involvement in this region, if we want to protect our interest in the natural resources of this region, it is in our best interest to stay out. I favor only the sending of humanitarian aid.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter

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.
Dear Jimmy:

I'd like to make an additional contribution now to your campaign to help you in the upcoming primaries. I will also try to send a contribution each month until the primaries end on July 8th.

Enclosed is my contribution of $---------.

Mrs. C. Taggart
444 W First Avenue
Chico, California 95926

Signature: [Signature]

Issues:

Please send her Jimmy's stand on amnesty and military spending.

00015773
P.S. Also I would like much stronger emphasis on military waste and the immorality of bombing people. I also for Altho I sent you 500 early in the campaign, I am not yet sure whom I desire for president. Probably one who needs finances more, such as Fred Harris. I have gotten a great many pieces of mail from your office, probably enough to have spent my 500.
May 19, 1976

Mrs. C. Taggart
444 W. First Avenue
Chico, California 95926

Dear Mrs. Taggart:

Thank you for your note. I am not in favor of blanket amnesty because that would equate defection from service with sacrificial service by those who did not believe in the war but went anyway.

I believe those who have been in exile for many years have been punished enough. I favor a pardon for them.

I am sending along my position papers on nuclear weapons and military defense for your use. If you need anything further, please don't hesitate to write. I appreciate your concern.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter

JC:al
Mr. Al Thompson, Esq.
c/o Carter Campaign
1795 Peach Tree Road N.E.
Atlanta, Ga. 30309

Dear Al,

You will recall our Philadelphia phone conversation and my letter to you of April 13, 1976 (enclosed).

I realize the name of the game which must now be played is "Get Elected".

And therefore I understand and accept that rhetoric and real intentions are not always mirror images of each other.

But against the possibility that both rhetoric and third party pressure might cause an unwitting and unwanted distortion of our perspective, I am sending you and Mr. Carter this follow-up question in the interest of helping us all to maintain our integrity by helping to keep our heads straight on a difficult and critical question: Our U.S. Constitution and Our U.S. Foreign Relations... Is it Either/Or?

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Mr. James Carter,
Democratic Candidate Apparent for the
Presidency of The United States of America

"Ethnic Purity" revisited.

Dear Mr. Carter:

You will recall my letter to you of April 9, 1976 in which I asked you to relate your position on "Ethnic Purity" to the foreign policy you would support as President of The United States of America.

Specifically I asked you to take your "Ethnic Purity" position which you qualified in this way, "To use the government itself to change the ethnic character of a neighborhood I think is improper..." and relate this position to U.S. foreign policy with particular focus on our relations in the Middle East.

We must pursue this question in light of the potential conflict between your several statements and between your statements and the Constitution.

On June 6, 1976 you spoke before Jewish leaders in New Jersey. And the New York Times of June 9, 1976 reported on your speech as follows: The survival of Israel "as a Jewish State" was called for by Mr. Carter, his previous formulation having been as "a viable and peaceful nation".

Now the excerpt from the Democratic Platform Committee reported in the N.Y. Times of June 18, 1976 expresses the U.S. policy which you will execute in the Middle East in this way: "The cornerstone of our policy is a firm commitment to the independence and security of the State of Israel".

Question one is: In light of your commitment to the survival of Israel "as a Jewish State", does the Platform Committee language really mean what you are saying? If so, then we would not expect you to object to that language being altered to read, "The cornerstone of our policy is a firm commitment to the independence and security of the State of Israel as a Jewish State."

Question two is: If you commit to the language and intent of this policy and effect the support of Israel as a Jewish State after you have taken the oath of office of the President of The United States, we question how you could, without contradiction, also honor your commitment to our Constitution's First Amendment which forbids our government to make and execute laws which advocate and support religion and its institutions.
Obviously you would not and could not support with federal policy, laws and material aid the State of Georgia "as a Southern Baptist State" or the Vatican "as a Roman Catholic State" or England "as an Episcopalian State" or Turkey "as an Islamic State".

The fact that we are here dealing with "a Jewish State" (and Israel's "Law of Return is religiously discriminatory as that State's First Principle in determining rights of citizenship... see Phila. Bulletin article of March 22, 1974 which is also enclosed) introduces a spurious emotional content which if allowed can only serve demagogues but which can never be the basis for a Constitutional exception to sanctify what you and others call "Our special relationship with Israel".

We would hope that reason and not mythology will structure our relations. Therefore we hope for a dialogue based upon principles, which are the building blocks of rational discourse and understanding.

And specifically we hope for rational discourse and understanding on those principles which are articulated in the U.S. Constitution. These principles were left in our stewardship and to our mind it is only our Constitution's principles and reasoning thereon which will form a legitimate structure to our foreign relations as well as of domestic relations. And it is only that kind of carefully nurtured Constitutional construction which has a hope of redeeming the promise of Freedom which our Fathers helped bring to birth here... 200 years ago.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Bennett.
A QUESTION FOR MR. CARTER... FOR US ALL

If I were a member of the Cherokee Nation, I would cringe with deep pain of old wounds.

Mr. Carter is prodding a very sore point in our body politic and our conscience when he says, "To use the government itself to change the ethnic character of a neighborhood I think is improper, but I would insist on the right of anyone who wants to move into that neighborhood on their own volition to have that right to do so."

I would ask Mr. Carter a question. Does this mean, Mr. Carter, that you would repeal the laws of Georgia which were judged unconstitutional by Justice John Marshall in 1832 in Worcester v. Georgia? You recall those laws destroyed the integrity of the Cherokee Nation, appropriated to Georgia the rights of the Cherokee people in violation of a solemn Treaty made by the Cherokee Nation and the U.S. Government. And you will recall the "Trail of Tears" over which Georgia forced the Cherokee Nation out of Georgia in order to have the Cherokee Land and Georgian ethnic purity. And would you repeal the laws of Georgia which imprisoned the Congregational Missionaries, Mr. Butler and Mr. Worcester? You will recall they were thrown in Georgia's prison because they went to live with the Cherokees.

Or would you maintain these laws in the U.S. in relation to the Cherokees? And would you carry over these same laws and their underlying attitudes in the conduct and structure of our foreign relations with Africa and the Middle East?
April 13, 1976.

Mr. Al Thompson, Esq.
C/O Carter Campaign
1795 Peachtree Rd. N.E.
Atlanta, Ga. 30309.

Dear Al,

In thinking over our phone conversation on the "Ethnic Purity Cherokee" question and opportunity to redeem something of value by refuting past offenses — and in consideration of the potential liability any correspondence with me may be to you and Mr. Carter's good efforts — I decided to send you the enclosed information about my lawsuit and protestings.

The connection to my "A QUESTION FOR MR. CARTER... FOR US ALL" is obvious. It is also obvious that there are risks for you in contacting me — in the spirit of fairness to you all. Sincerely,

Mike Bennett
July 7, 1976

Mr. Michael A. Taylor  
Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis  
140 Broadway  
New York, New York 10005

Dear Mr. Taylor:

I understand that you have an interest in assisting Governor Carter's campaign for the presidency.

I very much appreciate your expression of interest.

While we are not in a position to hire you at this time, I would very much appreciate your input during the campaign on any matters which you think could be of help.

Your concern and interest in the campaign are greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

Stuart E. Eizenstat  
National Issues and Policy Director

SEE: dan
July 20, 1976

Mr. Robert L. Thompson  
Suite 1209W  
7315 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20014

Dear Mr. Thompson:

Mr. Cocke has forwarded to me your paper on federal budget waste along with your letter to him of June 23, 1976.

I greatly appreciate your giving the Carter organization the benefit of your views on this matter and I will review it and get back to you. If we feel it useful, either for the campaign, or for afterwards, to have this viewpoint more fully developed.

As you know, this is an area where the Governor has been concerned for a long time at the state level and it is extremely useful to have the benefit of the experience of people such as yourself who have been intimately acquainted with it at the federal level as well.

Very truly yours,

Stuart E. Eizenstat  
National Issues & Policy  
Director
Mr. Erle Cocke, Jr.
1629 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

June 23, 1976

Dear Erle:

As we discussed, I am enclosing the attached paper on steps to control federal spending for forwarding to the Carter campaign. This paper is strictly a first cut and I would be happy to develop it in any directions that would be helpful to Mr. Carter. The paper is based largely on first-hand experience in over ten years consulting with virtually all the federal departments. Out of this, substantial breadth and depth can be developed as needed.

As you know, I was an early supporter of Mr. Carter and believe he is the only candidate with the judgment and wisdom to bring sound management to the vast federal bureaucracy. Please let me know how I can help.

Sincerely yours,

Bob

Robert L. Thompson

Encl.
THE WASTE IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET
AND HOW TO GET IT OUT

The size and cost of government, which we might think of as the national overhead, has simply gone beyond what most Americans can accept. The federal budget has quadrupled in but 10 years and now is the equivalent of over $7,000 per family. And the future outlook is even more bleak. If no new agencies or programs were authorized from this day forward, the federal budget would require another $100 billion within five years just to pay for the programs already on the books. To make matters worse, a private study commissioned by a New York bank concluded that, if present trends continue, within 50 years virtually every American worker will be employed directly or indirectly by the government.

This poses an issue on which the American people may not get a direct chance to vote at the polls -- the risk of waking up one day to discover that a "governmental takeover" is an accomplished fact.

This problem has not gone unnoticed, but it has not been squarely addressed. The last five administrations have in one way or another expressed grave concern about the size, complexity, sluggishness, and cost of government. But each has proved entirely unable to hold down government spending. For 40 years, programs, agencies, bureaus, and commissions have been added and permitted to grow with the result that -- to quote the federal government's own 831-page organization manual -- "Determining what the Government does and how it affects the individual may not be easy, but it should not be impossible". But it is nearly impossible. Numerous
state and local governments hire specialists to help them sort out the hundreds of agencies through which they may be eligible for funds. And few can be confident they've gotten what they were entitled to because of the sheer maze of programs emanating in Washington.

So why hasn't something been done? Why haven't past administrations simply cut back on budgets and staffing? Why doesn't the present administration stop talking about the problem and start doing something about it?

Basically, there are two reasons. First, the present administration seems confused and unable to find the waste, as the bureaucrats make every program appear necessary, if not outright vital. The present administration has not put together the talent and organization and given sufficient emphasis to budget streamlining. The second reason is that even modest cutback attempts raise howls of protest from the affected beneficiary groups who have grown dependent on the jobs and funds. The administration has not laid an effective groundwork of public acceptance for much budget cutting.

The waste is in fact hard to find. Our military forces struggle to stay apace of the forces that threaten us. Income supplements for the elderly are barely adequate to maintain a minimum standard of living. Aid to education is barely adequate to meet the expectations of parents for their children. Aid to housing is hardly sufficient, as an increasing percentage of families can no longer afford adequate housing. And so it is with most federal programs. At the same time, most bureaucrats are quick to point out that they really can't do the jobs expected of them until they are given more staff, money, and space. As a result, past administrations who have tried to find big items of waste in the federal budget -- like those who
hoped to streamline the government -- have come away with little practical effect.

So, how do we begin to cope with this problem? Specifically, how can government be made to better meet the legitimate needs of the people without taking an even-greater share of the national resources?

As a beginning, and recognizing that several years would be required to bring about dramatic results, the following approaches should be vigorously pursued.

1. CUTBACK THE PROGRAMS THAT AREN'T GETTING RESULTS

Numerous programs are presented to Congress and justified in terms of the severity of the problem, rather than the effectiveness of the solution. The scenario is familiar. A national problem is highlighted and dramatized. Then a program is formulated to "coordinate on-going efforts", "develop recommendations for the Secretary", "encourage development of plans", or "award block grants". Usually the more severe the problem, the heavier the funding.

A classic example of this was the formation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA). Clearly, crime and violence are growing national problems, but the assumption that the billions pumped through LEAA would have an impact has proven unjustified, according to a recent evaluation study.

At times, it appears that Congress and a majority of the people simply feel better if substantial funds are being spent on the major areas of concern, with the belief that surely some good will be accomplished. Perhaps this attitude will continue to be a factor, although the public mood is clearly shifting to a more austere use of tax dollars. In any event, agencies have not been realistic and
candid in making clear where they can get results and where they cannot. Regardless of the severity of the problem, any new program should be demonstrated on a pilot basis or otherwise proven out before it is given billions of dollars and implemented nationwide. Applying this approach retroactively to all existing programs would reveal many billions in unnecessary spending. The following are examples:

A. The U.S. Employment Service has not proven effective in moving people into jobs and needs to be overhauled.

B. The Aid to Families with Dependent Children has created a welfare treadmill and contributed to family breakdowns. This program will become vastly more expensive in the decades ahead unless it is overhauled to incentivize employment, education, and family planning, and otherwise invests in a solution to a problem rather than trying to keep a lid on it.

C. The Federal Energy Agency was given millions of dollars and hundreds of bureaucrats in order to somehow improve the national energy posture. No significant contribution has yet been identified.

D. The Amtrak program has spent billions to subsidize inter-city rail passenger service for which there is no economic demand now and none is in sight. In view of the excellent bus and air service now available across the country, the value of the Amtrak subsidy appears highly questionable.

A candidate for the next big unneeded program is the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA) proposal for the development of synthetic fuel. Private sector analysts have concluded that the synthetic fuel will be uneconomic and no private money is forthcoming. This program would cost a mere $100 billion through the years, (although it is being sold in $6 billion bites) on top of the $500 million annual ERDA research budget.
A multitude of other programs are of doubtful value and need to be rigorously evaluated and strengthened, overhauled, cut back, or eliminated. After all, there are hundreds of agencies awarding many billions in grants and contracts to thousands of groups and organizations. Zero-based budgeting will be a major step forward. Additionally, the office of Management and Budget must be equipped to penetrate the smokescreen of effectiveness created around many of the programs and to get out of the ivory tower and go down and direct improvements in the struggling programs. The budget examiners, who are mostly junior personnel, and the budget review process have proven to be highly inadequate.

Additionally, virtually every program and agency can be improved through reorganization, objective setting, and modern management processes.

2. CREATE A CLIMATE OF EQUAL AUSTERITY

Virtually every federal program has a group of beneficiaries (e.g. welfare recipients, defense contractors, local governments, etc.) and a group of federal employees who staff the program. Together, they have a strong vested interest in the continued funding of the program, and in its steady and consistent growth.

While aspersions are sometimes cast upon such special interest groups, virtually every American is formally or informally a member of at least one such group. Traditionally, such groups may support an overall federal budget cut, so long as it applies to other groups' programs. If a group's own program is threatened, it can be expected to use all its political and lobbying muscle to keep the funds flowing.

The sum of such special interest groups is the American public, which must accept any cutbacks in federal spending. Substantial cutbacks can be accomplished, politically, only if public opinion is further developed and welded into a climate of equal austerity.
is not to say that all programs would be cut equally; some may have to be increased, while others are frozen (thus, gradually reducing their percentage of federal resources). However, each would be brought to a point of equal austerity in terms of needs and results.

Much emphasis should be given to communicating the reasons underlying budget decisions to build and maintain full public confidence in the fairness and equality of the austerity. The growing magnitude of the federal claim on the national resources compels each individual to accept a more austere approach as a matter of patriotic duty. As throughout its history, the American public can be expected to stand up for the level of sacrifice necessary for the common good.

3. BUILD A PERFORMANCE ORIENTED BUREAUCRACY

The United States Civil Service was never set up for the performance levels now expected of it. The Civil Service was primarily a reaction to the spoils system and is intended to insure that the civil servant works honestly in the public trust and is isolated from undue political influence. Unfortunately, the civil servant is also isolated from an undue performance influence, and has little incentive for outstanding performance and reducing costs. Normally, the penalties for an unpopular action are far greater than the rewards for good results. In any event, the system is better designed for guarding a Fort Knox than moving millions of people out of poverty or solving the energy crisis.

Through the years, the various bureaucracies have developed self-interests of their own, divergent in varying degrees from the identifiable needs of the American people, (e.g. FBI under Hoover). Power and prestige is measured in terms of budget and staff, and the more successful at this game tend to build personal empires.
Because of this phenomenon, the bureaucracy has a huge built-in bias towards increased spending and the starting of new programs. Little in the way of lavish expenditures can be found (e.g. plush offices, entertainment, etc.), but much money is spent austerely on programs or program elements of little value.

The bureaucracy is not a particularly happy place to work, in part because of the lack of personal satisfaction due to the sheer difficulty of getting anything done and seeing important results achieved. Numerous civil servants seem to go through a three-phase career, characterized by:

Phase 1 - A hopeful, idealistic attitude and a dedication to working in the public interest and "helping people".

Phase 2 - A growing despair that the ideals are not to be realized and that one appears caught up in a mindless bureaucracy.

Phase 3 - Ceasing to care about the end result, giving more attention to outside interests, and looking forward to retirement.

The point is that there is a large number of good people in federal service who would like to work more productively towards national goals. This is a great under-utilized potential.

As a beginning, the following approaches should be undertaken:

A) Reorganize into Manageable Responsibility Centers

There is not a single federal government, but some 2,000 islands of virtually independent government scattered all over the executive office and cabinet level departments (e.g. there are over 600 anti-poverty programs spread over four cabinet departments and the executive office). Many go from year to year with no real presidential direction or accountability. These islands of government should be grouped together according to common purposes and objectives so that
accountability for progress and results can be established. In today's fragmented patchwork of programs, responsibility doesn't go much beyond spending the money on time and complying with federal regulations. Spending picks up in June of each year because any funds not obligated by June 30th go back to the Treasury and may be hard to justify the following year. There is little incentive for a bureaucrat to underspend his budget.

B) Recast the Bureaucratic Incentives

The average civil servant, like workers everywhere, will seek to maximize those areas of performance of greatest importance to the federal government and to his own career advancement. If sound management, program results, and cost reduction "trickle down" from the top with major emphasis, most civil servants can be expected to respond in time.

It would also be desirable to rotate civil servants among programs every two to three years to promote loyalty to the overall federal service and to minimize the empire building tendency. Hopefully, the average civil servant of the future can take over a unit for two or three years, strengthen the organization and management processes, reduce costs, and then look forward to a larger challenge.

C) Establish Clear-cut Priorities

A major leap forward would be achieved if each and every federal employee had agreed-on priorities he or she is to accomplish this year. And if he or she could believe the priorities are important, and could see how they fit into the overall structure of national priorities and needs. With this, and a feeling that "somebody cares", the civil service is capable of rising to great heights of achievement, as it did in mobilizing for WWII and in putting a man on the moon.
But at the present time with little effective leadership from the White House, much of the civil service is wallowing in a general malaise.

The problem of government size, cost, and ineffectiveness is approaching crisis proportions. Due to the vested interests in government spending and jobs, great courage and determination, along with several years of effort, will be required to tackle this problem head on. But the American people appear to be awakening to this problem and, with further communication of the facts, will likely stand up for the common good.
May 19, 1976

Mr. J. Thomas Uranker
P. O. Box 15503
Pittsburgh, PA 15244

Dear Mr. Uranker:

I am enclosing three position papers that I am sure you will find interesting. They deal with energy, welfare, and government inefficiency. I hope that they will answer your questions at least in a general way.

Please write again if you have any further questions about Governor Carter and his campaign.

Sincerely,

David E. Moran
Issues Staff

DEM:dlt

Enc.
May 19, 1976

Mr. J. Thomas Uranker
P. O. Box 15503
Pittsburgh, PN 15244

Dear Mr. Uranker:

In the fall of 1974 I met with the governors of the other twelve original states in Philadelphia. Exactly 200 years after the convening of the First Continental Congress we walked down the same streets, then turned left and entered a small building named Carpenter's Hall. There we heard exactly the same prayer and sat in the same chairs occupied in September of 1774 by Samuel Adams, John Jay, John Adams, Patrick Henry, George Washington, and about forty-five other strong and opinionated leaders.

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

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

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

I thank not.
We are equally capable of correcting our faults, overcoming difficulties, managing our own affairs and facing the future with justifiable confidence.

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

Our government can express the highest common ideals of human beings -- if we demand of it standards of excellence. It is now time to stop and to ask ourselves the question which my last commanding officer, Admiral Hyman Rickover, asked me and every other young naval officer who serves and has served in an atomic submarine.

For our nation -- for all of us -- that question is, "Why not the best?"

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter
Dear Governor Carter:

Attached is a copy of a letter sent to my U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania, Dick Schweiker, the 1st week of January 1976 pertaining to some issues of great concern to all American taxpayers.

Because this is a Presidential election year, your philosophies and attitudes on these issues are of deep concern to me. If you would take a few minutes of your time to expound on the seven (7) points of my letter to Senator Schweiker, I would appreciate it. Reprints of newspaper reports on your public stance on these issues are acceptable.

Remember, campaign funds come from concerned citizens. Your cooperation is appreciated. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

J. Thomas Uranker
Dear Senator Schweiker,

On the 200th anniversary of the founding of this Republic, we should re-evaluate the U.S. Constitution to see if our freedoms and rights have been diminished by centuries of needless violations of these truths by useless laws and interferences into the lives of every man, woman, and child in these United States of America, especially by both big government and big business who have done it for their own profit and edification.

Has the democratic form of government truly served "We the People" of this great Republic or has it been twisted and bent to serve the special interest groups at the suffering and burden of "We the People."

As a high school student some 20 years ago, my favorite class subjects were history and government, perhaps kindled by the zeal of a first-generation born history teacher of American-Italian descent by the name of Joseph Victor Scotti. Our theme was always how beautiful the U.S.A. is because of our rights and freedoms. I hope and pray that this concept will continue, but as I grow older my doubts increase as I see that concept of the government doing what is fair, just and right for each of us regressing to the ideal of what "Big Brother" (Big Government) thinks is right for us, should be right for us. Laws are passed, fines are imposed, and unless great sacrifices are made to exert pressure on government "We the People" are quite often burdened...
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with programs of no real need or use to us. It seems in modern times that the Democratic Party leans toward socialism, and the Republican Party leans toward Imperialism.

It seems elected officials have lost the concept of what the duties of a public servant are to be. Perhaps each elected official should be required to have an associate degree in the "Ethics of a Public Servant" which would include; a history of all past civilizations, what the democratic form of government in a republic should be, and related subjects to the duties of one elected to serve "We the People".

Senator Schweiker, your past performance and actions on behalf of "We the People" have always been praiseworthy as I feel you have a great public awareness of the needs and desires of all the people you represent. If more public officials had your form of empathy, I'm sure government in general would be more responsive to everyone's needs and less burdensome to every taxpayer's pocketbook.

The following items are some of the things which bother the average taxpayer who as an individual has very little voice in how they affect him:

ITEM I. The U.S. Postal Corporation

The U.S. Postal Corporation should be dissolved and Congress should once again control the U.S. Postal Department as a public service organization.

a) The Executives of the Postal Corporation have adopted a let the public be damned attitude and have expended monies in a less than prudent manner for self-convenience, padded the payroll with high paid cronies, and have initiated purchases of costly equipment to the detriment of an efficient operation.

b) The 65% first class rate increase since 1972 has kicked John Q. Public in the face and at the same time provided sub-standard service.

c) The proposed closing of a larger number of post offices are becoming a greater burden on both the average individual and many businesses who must rely on the Postal Service in their everyday business cycle.
1.) ex: The Moon Run, Pa. (15138) post office closed because of the loss of box patronage caused by highway construction, and in its place a branch (15244) of the Pittsburgh post office was established to service the business community of this area. The Moon Run post office had a Postmaster and apart-time clerk doing about $30,000 a year in postage sales; now the Pittsburgh branch (15244) is doing between $150,000 and $200,000 annually in postage sales, serving about 100 business establishments and the residents of the village of Moon Run and vicinity with one full-time clerk and sometimes one-part-time extra who are supervised by someone from another branch. With the volume at Pittsburgh branch (15244) there should be a full-time supervisor, one full-time clerk and when needed a part-time extra to properly serve the public. It wasn't bad enough for these people to lose their identity by closing Moon Run post office, but now there is a plan to close this branch, thus causing additional inconvenience on the people. Let's keep it open.

d) Eliminate crazy promotions with costly advertising gimmicks, posters, displays, etc. which are costing the postal patrons needless hundreds of thousands of dollars in rate increases.

e) Regional sorting facilities are causing delivery delays of 1 to 4 days depending on the area of the Country in which they are located. This operation is plain stupidity. Go back to railroad sorting cars.

The conservative attitude of running a big business corporation has yielded to the personal whims and self-serving purposes of the Executive Board of the U.S. Postal Corporation. Let's dissolve it. By all that's holy, save us from this monster.

Item II. Natural Gas Companies and Electric Utility Companies—
(Curtailment of Rate Increases)

Those companies are obtaining rate increases at an alarming rate of accelerated percentages to the sacrifice of the average user who can't conserve beyond a certain point, and has no other source of heating fuel.

a) On a few recent programs of WIIC-TV Channel 11 in Pittsburgh, Pa., Wgyne VanDine of Action Line has shown where natural gas companies in Western Pennsylvania have been negligent in repairing transmission gas lines for years, causing loss of our precious natural resources.
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b) Advertising expenses should not be considered as part of operating costs for natural gas companies or electric utility companies, so as not to be used in calculating rate increases. There is no need for utility companies who have a captive market to advertise, none whatsoever. The present campaign on television and in the newspapers of supposed public information advertising is pure propaganda. Watch it or read it and analyze it yourself. See certain subtle passages with double meanings.

Item - III Controls on Oil Companies

Oil companies should have controls enforced on them to curtail their expansive grab for the natural resources of coal, uranium, etc. We do not need a monopoly in this Country to strangle us in the domestic fuel market. When competition in the market place is eliminated in whatever fashion, it creates a hardship on the average citizen. Are we to be manipulated for the profit of a few who own control of these corporations?

Item - IV The $6.5 Billion energy development fund.

Make sure these funds don't get allocated to the gas and oil companies.

a) Develop solar energy
b) Devise new fuels from our technology of the known elements of the earth.

  c) Hydrogen is suppose to be the clean, cheap and safe fuel to operate our automobiles. Why is it not in production, or do the oil interest have it boxed-up?

Item - V The Social Security Fund

Programs other than those first warranted under the Social Security Law should be funded from other revenue sources. Supposedly my contributions are held in trust for my old age, but in essence this is a fallacy. This is a fraud of no lesser a degree than bank embezzlement. Social Security should be a voluntary entity insofar as one should have a choice of paying to the government for his old age or paying into a private certified fund of his own choosing, and my employer would match it at the rate of 5% on my salary. If a $1700 combined contribution was placed on an annual basis unto a fund at 5% per annum it would total $112,948 at the end of 30 years, and add to this the presently established practice of some large corporations having a private...
contributory pension plan at a rate of about 5%; this would total $225,896 at the age 65 years. If one figured an annuity for 20 years after retirement from this fund still collecting 5% on the decreasing balance, a person would have a retirement check of at least $1500 per month. Of course this fund would be larger as wages increased during the pay in period which would take care of inflation.

Item - VI (Welfare Reform)

1.) Re-establish the Works Progress Administration or a like organization to put people to work who are physically able to work.
   a) Establish nurseries for working mothers
   b) Get the people out of the ghettos and the free-loaders in public housing out to work by disbursing them throughout the Country to where man-power is needed for public projects. Those who are not willing to re-located to work for their pay, would receive no pay.
   c) Welfare checks are not a right, (as some would think) but a privilege extended to those less fortunate (and out of work or sick) by the working taxpaying public. Let's cut the welfare rolls and increase the number of taxpayers.

2.) Eliminate subsidies to large corporations whose mismanagement, greed, or mis-appropriations have caused them to default. If we have to operate them with public funds, let's make them public trust corporations with profits going into the public treasury until our investment is returned.

Item - VII (Taxes)

1.) Lets establish a maximum rate of 50% of one's personal income as the ceiling on the income tax one must pay.

2.) Lets tax earnings on Municipal bonds for a rate of return greater than 3% below the current bank deposit schedule. ex: Bank deposit interest is at 8% on a 5 year note — Municipal bonds to be exempt from income tax would have to be at a rate no greater than 5%, or tax would be paid on the fiscal difference.

Lets not give special advantages to the wealthy elite. This is not a class society supposedly, but then why do we have special privileges for the few. Why does the accident of birth or position dictate one's rights and freedoms.
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In this Bicentennial year Senator Schweiker, "We the People" will be watching the Congress and the government in general for signs of a new "Spirit of '76" on which to plan our future. We are hopeful the men of the Congress, the Courts, and the President himself will re-evaluate their stewardships in the year 1976 and go forth with the vigor and in the spirit of the Founding Fathers.

Very truly yours,

J. Thomas Uranker

P.S. If I had lived in the period of the Sons of Liberty in the 1770's, I would have been one of them, and it is in this light that I write you this letter; for I am hopeful that you and other dedicated men like you will be enkindled with the spirit of the Sons of Liberty and go forth to do what is fair, just, and right by all that is Holy and by the Constitution of the United States of America. God Save the Republic.
Dear Mr. Ussery:

Thank you for sending us your very impressive resume and your offer to be of assistance in the forthcoming campaign.

While at the present time the small group working on campaign issues is full, I would be glad to circulate your resume to other parts of the campaign organization, if you wish, and to keep it on file here in case further needs develop in the future.

Sincerely,

Stuart E. Eizenstat
National Issues & Policy Director
April 23, 1976

Mr. Norman Underwood
Executive Assistant
Office of the Governor
State Capitol
Atlanta, Georgia
30334

Dear Mr. Underwood:

Enclosed is a request from the Health Administration Press of the University of Michigan seeking permission to quote from the "present State of Georgia manual on zero-base budgeting." Apparently the publication is under the impression that Jimmy Carter is still Governor, and the request was directed to our campaign headquarters.

I would appreciate it if you could handle this request. I think the enclosed letter is self-explanatory.

Thank you for your help.

Very truly yours,

Robert S. Havely
Issues Staff

RSH: bh
enc.

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

Governor Jimmy Carter  
Executive Department  
State of Georgia  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Dear Governor Carter:

The Health Administration Press is planning to publish a third edition of The Financial Management of Hospitals, in which there will be a section on budgeting for hospitals. HAP is a not-for-profit press operated by The University of Michigan to supply needed text books which commercial firms have not been supplying.

One of the concepts which will be discussed will be zero-base budgeting used by the State of Georgia. In another text—Zero-Base Budgeting by Peter A. Pyhrr, published by John Wiley and Sons in 1973—the then current State of Georgia manual on zero-base budgeting was reproduced, at least in part.

Our Press would like to have permission to reproduce from text and charts of the present State of Georgia manual on zero-base budgeting. Full credit would be given to the State of Georgia and the Executive Department, as you might direct.

It will be a great favor to us to be able to use the State of Georgia as an example of a principal user of zero-base budgeting. We also should like to learn how we can obtain a copy of the latest edition of the manual.
I have enclosed a copy of the second edition of The Financial Management of Hospitals, to which the authors want to add a section on budgeting, featuring zero-base budgeting.

Yours very truly,

Nancy J. Moncrieff
Nancy J. Moncrieff
Assistant Editor
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