Jimmy Carter, 11/84, by Vision Associates for Museum

Folder Citation: Collection: Jimmy Carter Oral History Collection; Series: Carter Center Oral History Project; Folder: Jimmy Carter, 11/84, by Vision Associates for Museum

To See Complete Finding Aid:
http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/oralhist.phtml#family

VISION ASSOCIATES

Production 825

President

Sound rolls 1A - 15A
(13A done previously)

Recorded November 1984
in Plains, GA

Vision Associates - Prod 825, President, SR 1A - 11/1/1984

Jimmy Carter Interview - CR 14 A & B - Sound 1

[question]

Well I think the office, as conceived by the founding fathers was a very wise definition because there was enough flexibility built into it to expand the role of the presidency as our nation expanded from a few states to 50, even spanning part of the ocean. And also from a small tiny nation tbe newest on earth, with its future very doubtful into one that was pre-eminent in shaping the policies of other nations as well as being a guarantor of world peace. So the office of the presidency itself has tremendously expanded, even though the constitution of the United States still generally defined the relationship among the president, the Congress and the Supreme Court. Also the presidency had been tremendously exalted in the minds of the American people as a repository for power and influence for the decisions to be made, and for shaping and preserving the moral and ethical standards of our country. So compared to the time when Washington was president to the time that I was president, there was a great expansion of both authority, power, prestige, and world attention focussed on the White HOuse and the that was in it.

[question]

I was surprised to...find that the powers of the presidency in domestic affairs, economic and financial affairs, were smaller than I had anticipated. Because the President plays a relatively

minor role, not any greater than the Federal Reserve Bank, or the Congress, perhaps not quite as great, and the free enterprise system of our nation is a pre-eminent factor in economic and financial charac-... characteristics of our country. But in the...in the area of [clear throat] in the area of foreign policy, and defense matters, I found that the President's authority was adequate. And in some ways still undefined, unrestrained in dealing with the new emergencies or crises that might arise. Most of the laws and procedures...are written or established after an emergency comes up, and the President acts boldly and with force and there's some after assessment which sometimes leads to restraing on the President's power. But in dealing with new crises and even those that have been experienced before, like the threat of war, in my judgment the President's power is adequate, and this was not a surprise to me because I was familiar with the crises that'd been faced by others, even including times of combat.

[question]

The most serious threat to our country in a non-belligerent way, when I became President, was that of the energy crisis, where our nation had become extraordinarily dependent on a very uncertain source of supply of oil from the mid east and Persian Gulf region. The answer to this was not in foreign policy, but in domestic legislation, and so it was a very difficult challenge for me to change the habits and the laws and procedures for the consumption and

production of energy in our country to reduce our overdependence on this uncertain supply of oil. This required the full 4 years of my term. It was politically debilitating and often discouraging because I had to induce the Congress to take action that I knew was absolutely necessary to remove this threat to our nation's very security, but it could only be done by changing the laws of our nation. On the one hand, you had the oil producing states, with all their representatives in the House and Senate; on the other hand, you had very strong and vocal consumer groups who wanted to get energy as cheap as possible and didn't want to have competition that might reduce the waste of energy. So this was one example of how the Presidency was constrained, in dealing with a threat to our very security, primarily because it was a domestic nature and required the cooperation of a very divided and sometimes uncertain Congress. On the other hand, in dealing with international matters of...of importance to our country, the President has very strong authority and power. I felt that it was important for us, for instance, to normalize relations with China. And to establish an element of stability in the western Pacific which had been the source of the second world war in the Pacific, the Korean war and then the Vietnam war. And I believed that this was a very important thing for us to do. Here the President has a unilateral authority to recognize a foreign nation or to withdraw recognition and diplomatic relations with a foreign country. So after a long and sometimes tedious negotiation with the Chinese leaders, I made the decision, on my own, to bring about this dramatic change in our country's relationship with the largest nation on earth, whose population

comprises about one fourth the population of the world. This will be a very great benefit to our country in the future in insuring stability and also, I believe, peace in the western Pacific. Another, much more difficult issue concerned the enhancement of human rights on earth. I felt very strongly that our nation, the repository of democratic principles and freedom, ought to do what we could, in a legitimate and proper way, to promote democracy and freedom elsewhere, and to guarantee the human rights of people who were persecuted unnecessarily, imprisoned without trial, or tortured while in prison, and even murdered by their own government. And using the foundation of international laws and agreements, treaties that had been signed by those oppressive regimes...I exposed what they were doing in contravention of basic moral principles, and in specific cases tried to secure the release or alleviate suffering. There...there was a kind of a cooperation between me and the Congress. I had to convince the Congress that my human rights policies were justifiable, they were good for our nation; and then call upon the Congress to implement through law, some of the more permanent elements of protecting human rights.

[question]

CR 15 A & B - Sound 2

[question]

Well, the Presidency as such, as an office, has remarkable

flexibility. And I think this has been proven as we've gone from Washington through the War between the States and through the 1st and 2nd world war, the Korean war and...and the Vietnam war. In each case, our presidents were faced with a different set of circumstances, a different set of challenges. And in almost every case earlier, the Congress and the President jointly decide...decided to react to a predictable challenge to our nation's security, or our nation's integrity. In the case of the Vietnam war, though, we had a change that brought about a reassessment and it resulted in the war powers act, where the Congress said, President Johnson has gone too far...we have in effect been mis-led. Now we're going to require consultation by the president before he takes unilateral action that involves military forces. Well, since President Johnson...his successors, including me, have had to live with those restraints. But I haven't found those restraints to be excessively onerous. Because even the war powers act which does limit the President's authority, gives an incumbent president the ability to act in an emergency. And I think it's probably better in our democracy for a President, in taking such action, to realize that he must be accountable in the very near future, after the crisis has been exposed or analyzed, for what he has done. So in addition to having almost boundless authority in dealing with a crisis, or in dealing with international policy, the President must also have a sense of responsibility that's going to be very shortly demanded from him to the Congress and to the

American people. This in itself I think is...is necessary and also, I believe, is an adequate restraint. I never did feel, when I was President, that the Congress was overly intruding on my ability to act in a state of crisis. And I tried to consult with the military and political leaders in our country before I made an evolutionary decision where I could assess all the factors. As a matter of fact, in the four years that I served as President, there was never any occasion of any significance when the Congress either refused or materially modified a decision that I had made, or proposal that I put to them. So I think this showed that in adequate consultation, there was...there was an ability of a President to act in conjunction with Congress. In time of an emergency or when I didn't have time to consult with the Congress, I felt that I had enough authority under existing laws.

[question]

Well, there's a sharp difference between foreign policy and domestic policy. In foreign policy the President has enough authority to act. But in domestic policy I was very...much surprised and disappointed at the lethargy of the Congress, the reluctance of Congress to act...the multitude of special interest groups that could constrain the Congress and through various means induce the Congress to oppose legislation that would change the status quo if it interfered with the prerogatives of special interest groups. And...there were two notable examples of that that come to mind right now. One was

dealing with energy, where you had a sharp division within the Congress and the oil oompanies wanted to preserve their prerogatives, the consumers wanted to preserve their own, and they were in direct conflict. And the other was in the field of deregulating the free enterprise system of our country, which had been overly protected by long standing government rules and regulations to the detriment of the wellbeing of the American people. As soon as we started trying to get the government's nose out of the business of railroads and the trucking industry, banks and finance, the communications industry,the airline industry, and so forth, immediately the leaders in those areas of...commercial life said, don't do anything to change the law.. We like this so-called regulation, which was really a protection in the prevention of competition. But here the Congress listened to the industrial leaders and their tremendously powerful lobbyists, and I had to go directly to the American people and marshal their support for a change in those laws. Eventually, in a fairly dramatic total achievement, we were able to deregulate all those elements of American free enterprise and...here...and in the case of energy, although we eventually triumphed, in changing the legislation, it was a tedious and onerous and somtimes disheartening and unpopular task.

[question]

Well obviously, you know, when Washington and Adams and (2) Jefferson were in office, their voice would only be heard by the

American people several weeks after a decision was made because you had to physically carry their message to distant places. And now of course, with instantaneous communication on television, a decision by the American President can be known by the people that same day or even sometimes within the same hour. So this has greatly exalted the ability of a president to go directly to the American people, even on the spur of the moment to marshal support for a decision that hasn't yet been understood or that might be highly controversial.

And the Congress, on the other hand, speaks with a fragmented and divided voice. There is no way for the Congress as such to match a President in the presentation of an opinion to the American people, if those opinions are conflicting. The President also, over a period of time, has become...the innovator. In the early stages of our ~~history~~ country's history, the laws were proposed within the Congress. They were carefully considered within the breast of the House and Senate. And only after they reached the final stages of becoming a law did the president get actively involved. Now that's changed so dramatically that in almost every case now, major legislation originates in the White House, with the President and his staff. And the Congress, in effect, when a crisis comes up or a need or a changing time precipitates a new issue, will ordinarily and habitually come to the President and say, we need some new legislation on this matter, and they sit back and wait until the President proposes the legislation to the Congress, maybe to both the House

and Senate, and then the Congressional committees go to work and amend or approve what the President has proposed and then bring it back to him. So now the President is not only the final factor in vetoing or approving legislation, but he's also the originator of almost every piece of legislation that has any nationwide major import. This is a dramatic change in what it was in the early stages of our country.

[question]

###

Vision Associates - Prod. 825, President - SR 2A - 11/1/1984

CR 16A & B, Sound 3

[question]

Well, there's something much larger in the Presidency than just the legal definition of what the office is. As a matter of fact, I think that in recent years, or even generations, the Presidency has been shaped much more by the personality and inclination of the incumbent in the office than it has by the laws and constitutional provisions, and even external factors. There's a dramatic change, sometimes in what the Presidency, as an office, is, just depending on who's in that office. And this...this is a change that quite often is revolutionary in nature as one president leaves the White House and another one moves in on inauguration day. The...the legal definition of the office only changes in a very slow and evolutionary fashion over a period of decades or even generations. But the... how the Presidency is handled, what's done with the power, how does... how one circumscribes or evades the restrictions, is determined by the personality of the President who's there. Some quite positive and dynamic in approach, some quite reticent and cautious in approach, some innovative, exploring new ideas and new ways to exert American power and influence around the world or protect our nation's interests, others very careful about making any change concerning what the predecessor did. So I think in general that the office is shaped much more dramatically and much more deeply by the attitude of the

incumbent, than it is by any laws or constitutional provisions.

[question]

Well, our country is the strongest on earth...militarily, politically and economically. But it's potentially also the strongest on earth morally and ethically. The principles that have evolved that epitomize what our nation is, what its purposes are, the ideals and ambitions and goals and aspirations of our...of our people... that's what a country is, as well as its military strength, or its ecnomic power or its political influence. And the President personifies that element. As well as his legal duties, he has a responsibility to enhance, in my judgment, what makes a country a great one. He has to decide how that tremendous power and influence should be used. Should it be used for the benefit of world peace? Or should it be used to exert a belligerent force and show our military strength? Should it be used for bringing people to the negotiating table where diplomacy can prevail and eliminate the threat of war? Or should it be used to show that our nation is always ready for war if necessary, and we have no aversion to using military force. Should it be used to enhance human rights...fr eedom, democracy, the alleviation of suffering on the one hand. Or should it be used just to enhance the wellbeing of the American people themselves? So I think that the moral standards and ideals of a country are much more directly and vividly shaped by the President than it could possibly be by the Congress with its heterogeneity or its writing of specific

laws, or even the rulings of the Supreme Court. The President can, with his own attitudes, put forward the basic elements that make us proud of this country. Or, with a serious mistake or an element of unself...an element of...or with a serious mistake or an element of selfishness or greed, make us sometimes even ashamed of our own Government.

[question]

Yes, the...the President has two basic tasks. One is to carry out his legal duties and responsibilities and to abide by the constitution of the United States, and not to violate the laws of our country. That's a very important but somewhat sterile definition of the President's duties. The other part is equally as important and sometimes more important. And that is to provide an element of inspiration, an element of...influence on other people around the world...the putting forward of the best elements of our nation's essence...freedom and democracy, and equality of opportunity, peace, nuclear arms control, human rights...a quality of life, the opportunity for every human being to expand one's own...self...development...mind and heart, and to find some element of human dignity and security. So these kinds of...of moral, and...very human attributes, can also either be shriveled or greatly expanded, depending on how the President sees the influence of our nation and how it ought to be used.

[question]

I saw these...issues or these goals as being truly representative of what I consider to be the greatness of our country. And because they were complex, and because they were controversial and because they were difficult, there had been an inclination to postpone specific decisions about them. Obviously, all Americans want peace for ourselves, and an avoidance of war between us and the Soviet Union, but also saw the necessity to try to bring peace to other regions of the world by inducing the potential combattants or those who were already fighting, to come to the negotiating table, to share their grievances, to communicate with one another and find some common ground for the alleviation of tension or hatred or even war. And we tried to do this, for instance, in the case of the middle east, and to deal with the root causes of a dispute there, and to seek a comprehensive peace, not just a dampening of flames once they had erupted, with...actual bloodshed. This was an extremely complicated issue, and one that brought great political debate into the forefront and a lot of condemnation of our efforts, because you had to look at both sides. And you had to realize that for an agreement to be reached, the agreement had to be both voluntary and also unanimous. And to look at the problems of the...the Arabs, the Israelis and the Palestinians was not an easy or convenient thing to do. In the case of arms control, the simplistic approach to weaponry is to say that our nation must be superior to all other countries on earth in every element of

military strength. And this is a very popular thing also because Americans want to know that our nation is dominant and that we can exert through military force our...our will on others.

CR 17 A & B - Sound 4

[question]

Well, I felt that those things could be changed for the better with persistence and with some element of political courage and a willingness to face criticism. And they're the kind of issues that can't be permanently and totally resolved, but obviously the progress that is made toward ultimate goals can be very beneficial, even though the ultimate goal may not be reached. In the case of peace, we've had some accomplishments in the Middle East with the Camp David accords and the treaty between Israel and Egypt. But obviously there was a long way to go. In the case of arms control, we tried to engender a sense that the constant escalation of military power was not the best goal for this nation. We can't hope to become absolutely superior in every element of weaponry. And even if we were, we couldn't use that tremendous military might to force our will on others, if our judgment is erroneous, or if the root of our desires is one of selfishness at the expense of others. And so our approach to arms control was to recognize that this was a threat to world peace and stability. It arouses tremendous fear in the minds and hearts of people all over the earth to see constantlybuilding

nuclear aresenals. And the presumption was that both the Soviet people and the American people want peace. Neither wants a confrontation between the super powers that would lead to a nuclear holocaust. So although you can't expect in one administration to be totally successful in elminating nuclear weapons from the face of the earth, there was a desire on our part to conclude a major agreement that turned out to be SALT 2, and to recognize that limiting nuclear arsenals and reducing them a slight degree was a first and necessary step to major progress in the future. In addition to that, the search for nuclear arms control provides an element of communication between the Soviet Union and the United States that's beneficial in itself. It helps to eliminate the potential explosive effect of the inevitable areas of competition that are always going to take place around the world between the two superpowers. And therefore eliminate the...the possibility of those regional conflicts exploding into a world wide war. So, nuclear arms control, reduction of weaponry in general, was a major goal of ours. We made progress with the SALT 2 treaty, the treaty...although has not been[?[ratified, was observed in its basic terms by the Soviet Union and the United States and provides a constant basis for additional progress in the future. As far as human rights are concerned, here our nation enjoys the privileges of liberty and freedom, and the protection of our people from the Bill of Rights and from derivative laws that've come from the constitutional prohibitions against government

abuse of citizens. But I saw this as a...as a necessity for me and for our country to promote human rights among others who don't have those constitutional protections and who don't have the history of freedom, liberty, and the right to choose one's own leaders and to shape one's own government policies. Legally we were on sound ground. Because in the charter of the United Nations and Organization of American States, in the Helsinki Agreement and many other international agreements that've been signed by a large number of countries, including oppressor regimes, they pledged themselves to other countries on earth to protect the interests of their own citizens, to permit family reunification, to permit the exodus of people who desire to leave an ~~xxxxx~~ oppressive country. And also to...to seek justice as described by international fora like the United...United Nations. So when there was severe oppression, as in El Salvador or Argentina, and under the Communist regimes in Cuba and the Soviet Union, I felt it was my duty to express American principles in the most forceful and persistent way. We were not successful in eliminating persecution all over the earth, but I think thousands of lives were saved ...there were tens of thousands of people released from prison who had been there...in an unjustified way. And I think every leader on the face of the earth was required by our human rights policy to ...to ask each day how does the world look on my human rights policy andhow do I...my own people assess my human rights policy. And this ...and this reminder I think, helped to enhance the elemnts of

freedom and...human rights democracy throughout the earth. And I think this was putting our nation's best foot forward, to raise high the banner of human rights. Because in the face of persecution, the thing that is most feared by those who suffer is silence...from the rest of the world. This is what's desired by those who oppress. It's what's feared by those who suffer. This was the case inEurope under Hitler, when the world was silent as 6 million Jews perished. And this was the greatest threat to the people who were taken in their homes at night, placed in prison in Argentina...many of whom would never be seen again. And I tried not to be silent, when our voice ought to be heard, because if the United States is silent, there is no other voice on earth that can be expected to be effective.

[question]

Well, in the early days of our republic, the restraints were also there. And the restraints were accepted in a surprisingly quiescent way by the early presidents who served. They saw the Congress as being dominant in many areas of life, compared to present circumstances when the President is obviously the pre-eminent voice in those same areas. The early leaders, our forefathers, saw the UnitedStates as playing a minor, almost non-existent role in shaping events throughout the earth. Now, the Presidents naturally feel that we represent many peoples outside our own borders and that our voice and our strength and our influence can shape world affairs. So as far as the attitude of the early Presidents and more recent

Presidents is concerned, the recent Presidents have a much more strong and dynamic and aggressive, and certain confident voice in shaping both domestic and international affairs, compared to the early Presidents who...saw the Presidency itself as very limited by law, and it was only over a period of history that subse...that subsequent presidents, one by one, expanded the role of the Presidency itself. There're still limits there. And this is a hard thing for the American people to accept. There are limits on what the president can do; the people expect too much from us; and there are also limits on what our nation can do. We cannot impose our will on...on the people in nations all over the world. Either by using our economic strength, our political power or military threats. And this is...doesn't mean that our country is not great. It doesn't mean that we're not even the greatest nation on earth. It just means that we should use our influence wisely, not overextend our interests or our desires at the expense of others, and recognize that quite often there are 2 sides to a question...our own opinion, and those in a region who are directly affected by parochial events. And this is the essence of...of diplomacy, of negotiation...is to recognize that your adversaries are human beings.

###

Vision Associates - Prod. 826, President - SR 3A 11/1/1984

CR A & B sound 5

[question]

I think that the most important thing that a President must do is to let the people of this country realize that the utmost measure of a nation's strength is not just the size of its military arsenal, it's not just how much we can threaten other people, it's not just how much we can actually use our military forces to carry out our own goals around the world. Our nation's strength can best be used through peaceful means. Because in peaceful competition with our potential adversaries, the Soviet Union, for instance, we have all the advantages. Our country has a government that has the admiration of most people on earth. We have freedom, we have the people's rights protected, we have great economic benefits, almost unequaled among any people in the world. We have a degree of religious liberty that is very important to most of the nations on earth, whereas the Soviet's an atheistic nation, we have no desire to intrude on an existing government and to impose our will on a people when our nation is exhibiting...its best moral and ethical standards; whereas the Soviets are known by everyone to try to dominate others...if they're given one foot in the door...they'll soon be inside running a country or taking it over. So in every element of peaceful competition we have the advantage. And it's only when we put our nation's moral and ethical standards in the forefront that our

tremendous potential strength can be recognized outside the military realm. The first responsibility of any president, of course, is to make sure that our military strength is adequate, to protect our nation's interests, the interests of our allies, and to protect our nation's security. But that doesn't mean that we have to be dominant and that we have to be superior to all other nations on earth. That with a proper approach to the military question, there can be generated a desire on earth for the peaceful resolution of differences. And if our country's influence can be used for that purpose, that's when our strength is most...utilized and is more likely to be prevalent. People react adversely to military threats, to the intrusion of American armed forces into the internal affairs of other countries, but they respond more favorably, and we're likely to achieve our goals most quickly and thoroughly if we try to get at the root causes of dissension, bring people to the negotiating table, and use our strength for...in a peaceful way.

[question]

Well, I think in the modern era, certainly in the last few decades, there has been no question that our nation is the strongest on earth militarily. And I think that we must maintain a level of military strength at all times so that no potential challengers would be seduced into a suicidal attack on us. And this applies not only to conventional forces but also to nuclear forces. But that doesn't mean that we can't have a mutual effort with our potential adversaries

to lower the level of armaments, and particularly to reduce the threat of...of a nuclear holocaust. In addition to that, with the rapid evolution of technological capabilities in the developing world, among non-nuclear nations,, in many regions now there are powers who are able to produce nuclear explosives that might be used on a regional basis that would precipitate a wider war, and also that might fall into the hands of terrorists or others who could use nuclear weapons that would also destabilize world peace. So, we need to set an example for those who are tempted to join the nuclear power..club, and say, we are doing our best to lower the level of nuclear arsenals. Any obstacle that arises to this limitation or reduction is not in Washington, but in Moscow. And we encourage the non nuclear nations not to attempt to seek prestige or influence by developing nuclear explosives yourself. So that non proliferation element of American foreign policy is also a responsibility of a president who, through peaceful pursuits, can enhance our own nation's best interests.

[question]

There's no way that a President can ever have enough power in his office to dominate the decisions made by other leaders,particularly the leaders [clear throat] particularly the among our allies, for instance, in Europe. They're the primary ones who, for instance, are willing to sell nuclear technology to the developing world...for economic benefit. When I first became President,

we had a major confrontation with, for instance, Brazil and Argentina, who were trying to develop a nuclear explosive capability. The confrontation extended quite immediately to Germany, France and Switzerland, who were very eager to sell this technology and provide it for the Latin American countries. My role, as a President, was to do everything possible to obstruct these sales and to convince the leaders in the supplying nations and also the developing nations, that this is...a counterproductive effort, that it would destabilize Latin America, that it would...bring about the possibility of a nuclear war that would adversely affect the European countries who wanted to sell their equipment and technology. And I tried to arouse world opinion as best I could to supplement the influence that I used in a private and diplomatic way. So I think we did have a great restraining force on...the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and...my hope is that our foreign influence, as a great nation, will always be used in this fashion.

[question]

I think my special interest in human rights was developed to ① a great degree by seeing the tremendous benefits that came to my region of the country, the South, wit h the implementation of civil rigfhts for black people. The...millstone of racial segregation that was around our neck which pulled the South down for so many generations, was removed. And the benefits came, not only to the oppressed black people, but to the oppressors during those decades

who were the white people. Who were convinced at the time that they were doing what was right and proper in accordance with the laws of God and also in accordance with the constitution of our country. But when the changes came, the benefits were surprisingly vast and important to every human being who lived in the southeastern part of our country. When I got...got to be President, this experience and memory of mine made it almost mandatory for me to pursue human rights on a world wide basis. And I wanted, not only to...publicize the oppression that existed in the world, but also to make certain that the emphasis that I placed on this subject, was not a transient commitment of our country. So we established, within the StateDepartment, an official position, the Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, and we also deputized, or directly instructed every ambassador on earth, to be a focal po int for understanding human rights abuses within the country that they served. And they became, in effect, my agent...

CR 19 A & B - sound 6

Another thing that I did to...embed our human rights policy in the bureaucracy so it'd be more permanent and more effective was to deputize every ambassador that we had in any nation on earth as a personal representative for me in promoting human rights. So that within that country, it was known among the people that if they had a serious human rights abuse, they could go to the American

embassy and relay their story, to seek help...the Ambassador would be directly in contact with the White House through the State Department. So this was done very effectively. And in countries where thousands of people were disappearing and going into prison like in Argentina, it very quickly became known that the American embassy was a haven that they could find...and a listening post for information about those who had disappeared. So, periodically, I would have a specific list of hundreds, sometimes more than a thousand people who had disappeared in Argentina, relayed to me from my embassy in Buenos Aires. And I would contact the military leaders and say, we know that these people have disappeared...they are imprisoned by you ...I would like to be kept informed about the status of their case. In many instances, instead of those people being murdered, which they would have been, they were either released or driven into exile. And many of those people now...have contacted me or others in our administration to tell their story and to express their deep thanks for our nation's human rights policy. This is a..kind of a personal example of what went on, not only in Argentina but in many places on earth, and sometimes even in the most oppressive countries like Paraguay, the military dictator of Paraguay would, on occasion, send me a message saying, we have released 500 political prisoners and we want President Carter to know about this, that we are honoring human rights in our country. On one occasion in Indonesia, more than 10,000 political prisoners were released simultaneously because of this human rights

effort. And I think it gave hope to people who were in prison, to know that they were not forgotten...and to know that the most powerful nation on earth was speaking for them. And so I didn't want this to be a singular voice from the White House, but I wanted the Congress and the StateDepartment...and every embassy on earth to be identified in the people's minds as...as exemplifying what I consider to be one of the finest characteristics or attributes of our nation... a search for peace, a search for human justice...and a recognition of the rights of human beings for dignity and the preservation of life and freedom.

[question]

Sure...there's nothing in the law that says that the President of the United States is a human rights officer of this country. And I have to say with some degree of disappointment and sorrow that there are presidents in our country who've paid no attention to the enhancement of human rights...who have, in effect, quite often been kind of a silent partner with the most oppressive regimes...to the detriment of people who were suffering horribly. Buttin general, when this kind of issue is publicized, when the American people know about the opportunity we have to promote human rights, then the President can prevail. There again, as in many other areas of...national and international life, the President is the one who can pretty well shape what his office is. He can be a champion of human rights, or he can look the other way. He can be a promoter of peace, or he

promote the use of armed force and belligerence. He can seek to enhance the quality of life on earth, or he can just commit himself to the simplistic goal of making Americans richer...or more self satisfied at the expense of others. So a President can shape not only the legal elements of his duties, but also the much broader and perhaps even more important...ethical commitments of his office.

[question]

Yes, the President can do this through direct action or through private diplomacy, through very sharp public ocmmentsor through seeking legislation to...make more permanent the decisions that our nation has made about human rights or peace or environmental quality. So there's a wide diversity of opportunities for a president to pursue his goals in these areas. One of the additional important things that a President must realize is that when ...an issue gets to his desk, it inherently complex and difficult to resolve. Because if a matter is simple or easy to solve, it's done at the local level, in a city hall or a county courthouse. If it's a little more complicated, maybe in a state legislature or the governor 's office.. But if they can't handle it, it comes to the President's desk. And that's why I kept, within the Oval Office, Harry Truman's sign, The Buck Stops Here. T o remind myself that there's one voice in this nation that can speak for all the people, and that is the President's voice. And that there's no way to...to slough off or to avoid responsibility for difficult or complex

issue, even unpopular issue...if it's in the interests of our country. That the President must assume that responsibility. And not try to put the blame or the duty on another...legal entity because there is no other legal entity that can take the place of the President.

[question]

My understanding of George Washington's attitudes is that he was more concerned about the President having too much power than not having enough. Because he was such a popular and a powerful political and military leader that he wanted deliberately to not exalt himself, not to create, in effect, a royalty in the President's office, and to make sure that he delegated to a relatively weak Congress and the Supreme Court, a maximum element of the decision making process in our country. So I don't think that Washington was looking for more power when he was president. I think he was being overly cautious in setting a precedent for the Presidency that it not be too powerful.

[question]

I'm in favor of a strong Presidency.And I'd use the full power of the office whenever I thought it was necessary, within the bounds of constitutional limits and within the bounds of American law. I never was reticent about expanding the role of the President into areas that hadn't been explored or established by custom before I went to the White House. And I believe that the President must be the leader of this country. And must assess as meticulously

as possible the challenges to our nation and the opportunities for its further progress. And for the pursuing of those goals which epitomize our nation's interests and the interests...of other countries on earth. So I think the President's got an obligation to use his office to a maximum degree in educating the American people, convincing the Congress of the rightness of his own positions, and...and letting our own nation's greatness be used for the proper causes.

###

Vision Associates - Prod 825, President, Sound roll 4A 11/1/84

CR 20 A & B Sound 7

[question]

Well, I don't think a strong president is necessarily one that oversimplifies complicated issues or presents easy and false solutions to the Ammerican people. Or tries to use our nation's power for the selfish benefits of our own people at the expense of others. Or who substitutes military force for diplomacy or negotiations or peaceful resolution of differences. Or who abuses the privileges of his office or violates the...proprieties or laws of our country. Without doing any of those things, a president can be strong and and forceful in preserving this nation's interests and working harmoniously with others around the world who may differ with us in assessing the needs of our own people and eliminating discrimination, in promoting the quality of life of...of Americans and giving opportunity to those who may be deprived of equality. So...I think to lift up those who are weak or defenseless, or poor or inarticulate or different, is an element of strength and greatness. Not just to deal with the strong and powerful as equals, and...and forget the requirements of...of the promotion of human beings commensurate with their own ambition and capabilities. There is a temptation also to circumvent the law and to mislead the American people, to abuse the tremendous power of the office by excessive secrecy about what

is going on within the White House or within the administration. We saw the worst example of this in Watergate, when the power of the Presidency was ~~xyx~~ abused. And that's always a temptation for a President who...puts a major investment in power alone, or military strength alone...to the detriment of the resolution of issues on their own merits with a semblance of equality among those who dispute. So I think that the power of the Presidency, the strength of the Presidencycan obviously be abused. And in my judgment, a bully is ...is not exemplifying ~~the~~ true strength.

[question]

I think a strong President should use the power of his office in a very...cautious and proper fashion, assessing, after great consideration, and...consultation, the needs of his country, and perhaps even the needs of the world...assessing what we have to offer, the bounds of our influence, and the interests of others. And then to promote goals of peace, human rights, nuclear arms control, environmental quality...economic progress...in a way that is...derived from American...American power. It's...it's a matter of both shaping proper American goals, marshaling the support of the American people and the Congress and other interests to support those worthy goals, and in using America's influence, not to the de...disadvantage or detriment of others, but in a way that provides common benefits to those Americans and also to those with whom we deal.

[question]

Well, I would be the last one to claim that these complicated issues of peace, and human rights, nuclear arms control, environmental quality are easy to resolve, or are going to have a definite and early total answer that would remove that challenge from the White House forever. These kinds of problems...are always going to be with us. And what a president can do is to try to alleviate suffering, to remove the threat to world peace,, to establish the benefits of communication, consultation, negotiation, to prevent an explosive... world wide confrontation that might grow out of a local original dispute. And also to assure that the people of our country and other nations have at least the potential of enhancing the quality of their own lives. But none of these things are easy to define...they're not easy to describe, and the problems are not easy to solve. I think anybody who thinks that is...is sadly disill...is going to be sadly disillusioned.

[question]

I think quite often the American people think that the President can provide immediate and instant and total and simple answers to problems and challenges that are inherently complex and not possible to resolve unilaterally even by the exercise of America's enormous steength. There has to be a realization that ~~a combination~~ accommodation is sometimes necessary, that we can't consider just American benefits or ambitions but, but we have to consider the benefits and ambitions of others. And that when these come into conflict, the conflict

can't be resolved by the use of American weapons...or threats...or pressures. They have to be...resolved by...by consultation and accommodation. And in this way, I think that both the American and other ambitions can be realized.. But not by American abusiveness. But by the exertion of American power and influence in a humane and generous, sometimes even unselfish way.

[question]

The American people exaggerate the power of the President to deal with matters concerning economics, finance, taxation, the passage of laws, and don't realize that the system of checks and balances that were instituted by our forefathers are still there. One of the important trusims in politics is that it's easy to obstruct a change...it's very difficult to consummate or conclude a change. So that when new legislation is required to deal with taxation or environmental health or education or matters of that kind, there has to be an agreement reached ultimately between the President and the Congress, the private enterprise system of our country, and perhaps even the Federal reserve Bank, and this accommodation...means that the president himself is not all-powerful, that through persuasion and through consultation, through accommodation and sometimes even compromise, the President can reach a goal, and when he sees himself stymied, then his only basic recourse is to go over the heads of all those other...obstructions, directly to the American people, convince the people that he is right, and then let the American people

convince his political opponents that they should modify their position to accommodate the President. And if a President is right, and can present his case in a strong and forceful and adequate fashion, in most cases he can prevail. But there has to be a recognition of the tremendous power of special influence in Washington.

CR 21 A & B - sound 8

[question]

Well, the two obvious ways of course ar e major speeches to the Congress and other large groups. And the other is public press conferences. But there are many other ways that a President can communicate directly with the American people or at least indirectly. One is through private conversations with leading journalists who write columns in newspapers and who are looked upon, quite often accurately, as being objective and fair and non-partisan about a controversial issue. The other is much more difficult and requires a great deal of investment of the President's time and staff capabilities. For instance, when we were trying to induce 2 thirds of the members of the Senate to ratify the highly unpopular Panama Canal treaties, in each case we would get the member of the Senate who knew the treaties ought to be ratified, but who feared the political consequences in his home state, to give us a list of a couple of hundred of the most influential people in West Virginia or Nebraska or Florida or Tennesses, and so forth. We would then invite those people to

come into the White House, and I would issue the invitation myself. They would come to the White House almost invariably without an excuse and without reticence. And then we would present them the same information that the Senator himself had had. And we would have not only me and the Secretary of State and National Security Advisor, but also the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the general in charge of security for the Panama Canal Zone. We convinced most of these leaders that our position was right, and asked them, when they got back to West Virginia or or Tennessee or whatever, to use their influence on the public there to convince the public in that state to support the Senator's proper position, that is that the Panama Canal treaties ought to be ratified. These were the leaders of...some of the veterans groups and newspaper publishers, directors of television news programs,, presidents of colleges and universities, the head of women's groups, garden clubs, Junior Chamber of Commerce Lions clubs, Rotary, Kiwanis, people of all kinds who had some position of leadership. And they would go back home, ordinarily complying with our request, and tell the folks in their home state that the Panama Canal treaties were needed. So this was an indirect but a very effective way to change public opinion, at least adequately, in a state, to let the members of the Congress do what they knew ought to be done to begin with.

[question]

Well, sometimes I shared with...with other heads of state my desire for temporary dictatorship, where we could write the headlines and forge the thrust of the evening news commentaries and still voices that opposed our positions. But of course that's not possible in a democracy and ought not to be. So the only thing you had to do was to meet them right on the field of public opinion battle. And you can't do it ordinarily just by persuasion or domination of a news media or the public information means. There has to be some basis ...of substantiality or conviction or proof on your side. And then of course you can marshal what evidence you might bring to bear. But one of the most effective means that we had to convince people on that particular issue, was to invite the members of the Senate to go down to Panama and to meet with the Panamanian leaders, to meet with the Americans who lived in the Zone, and let them see at first hand what the conflicts were there, let them hear both sides of the issue and make up their own mind. And then they did come back to our country, they could tell their own constituents...I've been there, I know what's going on in Panama, and even though you may disagree with me in my judgment, after having investigated personally, I think that I'm right. Another very good means that a President can often use is to recruit his...fellow heads of state to speak up foreefully on behalf of a particularly difficult issue. For instance, when I would meet with the leaders of the industrialized democracies, sometimes I would ask them to make public statements in support of the

more difficult issues that we were pursuing. For instance, the SALT 2 treaty, and...and the Panama Canal treaty, normalization of relations with China, sometimes human rights policy. And to hear an independent voice coming from London or Bonn or Paris or Tokyo or Rome, was quite often quite convincing to the American public as it supplemented the same theses or opinions that I was putting forward.

[question]

Well, there's no doubt that the first step in the process is to learn the facts. And...if you're inclined to do so. Not all Presidents are inclined to do so. And then, once you know as much as you can about a subject, to try to get disparate, sometimes conflicting opinions expressed to you by people in in whom you have confidence or whose judgment you trust. And then to try to formulate a...sometimes even a compromise position that would address the issue effectively...the optimum position which may not be always perfect, of course. And then once that process is done, you've become immersed in the subject. You've also acquired an element of confidence that your judgment is correct. And you al...also...in most cases, have assessed the political consequences of your decision. Sometimes it might be quite popular, sometimes it might be neutral, sometimes it might be predictably quite unpopular. If it is unpopular, you try to devise your arguments ahead of time to alleviate that unpopularity by saying this is not something that appeals to all of our people, there'll begroups that oppose it, but in the best interests of my nation, I have taken this stand, and these are the reasons for it. So in the

evolution of a definitive policy that you're ready to implement, you almost invariably become, first of all, familiar with it; secondly immersed in it; and third, convinced that you're right.

[question]

At that point you speak effectively and also you're prepared for the cross examination and, in effect, the public debate that is inevitable on a controversial issue.

[question]

That's right, you can't speak for all the people because it'd be almost impossible to get unanimity in a country like this, particularly among those issues that finally get to the President that are inherently controversial, difficult and complex. But you...sometimes just have to take a stand that you know is not popular with half the people; that indeed is unpopular with a majority of the people. The most vivid example of that was the Panama Canal treaties. It was apparent to Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford and me that the Panama Canal treaty as it stood, was not right, it was not fair, it was creating increasing dissension...the possibility of even war in Central America, and could be modified to our nation's advantage. But when I was elected, I studied a public opinion poll that showed that only 8% of the American people wanted to change the treaty. 78% did not want to see any change. But after understanding the issue better, I saw that the treaties ought to be modified in a way that was acknowledged to be unpopular, but the results of which

would ultimately be popular and well accepted. So that's the premise on which we entered this difficult process. And then...the most difficult stage was not negotiating the treaty with the Panamanians,but negotiating the treaty with the U.S. Senate. Because we had to have a 2 thirds majority to ratify the treaties. So there...that's where the challenge came in. And I think that in the entire history of our country this is the most courageous action ever taken by the U.S. Congress. For instance, of the 20 senators in 1978 who voted to ratify the treaty, who were then up for re-election, of those 20, only 7 came back to the Senate the following year. But even those that were defeated knew they did what was right.

###

Vision Associates - Prod. 825, President - Sound roll 5A 11/1/1984

CR 22 A & B - sound 9

]question]

Well...there is no doubt that in our nation, only one person has been elected by all the people in the country, and that's the President. Congress is comprised of a multitude of voices, each one of whom has as a pre-eminent consideration being re-elected by a very small constituency group, one state at the most, and in some cases just a few hundred thousand people. So I think the President does...is the focal point, not only for a wide diversity of voices representing special interests of different kinds, some quite benevolent in nature, but the President and his staff are the only ones that can merge all these multiple voices together, make an assessment of what is the right thing to do for the entire country, and act accordingly. And I think the American people in general recognize this fact. When they hear a member of Congress speak, even though that speaker is forceful and attractive and eloquent, there's a general sense, well, that is a parochial voice, that is not a national voice. That member of Congress doesn't necessarily represent my best interests, but only the interests of the people in his own district.]

[question]

If a decision is made for a nation...particularly if the issue is controversial, complex, and possibly unpopular, there is no alternative to the President's voice. And this was an ever-present

realization that I had. If I didn't speak with courage and forcefulness, then no one would speak...there is no other possibility. So this is one of the inherent duties of a President...to speak for our country with...[clear throat]...this is one of the inherent duties of a President, to speak for the country with a strong, forceful voice, recognizing that yours is the only one that might be heard on that subject in a definitive way.

[question]

Quite often the...the issue itself has arisen because of a broad national concern about that subject...in a local community, in a state or in several states. And in sometimes an effective way, sometimes a fumbling way, the local and state governments have addressed that particular question. Eventually there comes a need to have uniformity of a decision throughout our country, not just have one state with strong laws, another state, that might be adjacent to it, with no laws. So the Congress and the President and the people in the news media eventually become aware of the fact that there's a real problem at hand. It might be, for instance, toxic waste sites where poisons have been deposited near inhabited communities for years and now this poison is beginning to threaten the lives or health of a large number of people. And the local and state officals can't adequately address it. Well then...in that case, in modern times at least, the Congress is much more likely to say to the President, this is a problem we've got, how do you think we ought to address it.

And the President and his staff, his cabinet officers, with multiple advisors including some members of the Congress who have a particular interest, will get together and try to assess different avenues by which, or through which, this problem can be resolved or this question can be answered. And then the president proposes to the Congress a law. In the last year that I was in office, we finally evolved such a law, for instance, called the Superfund Act, ~~which~~ where the chemical manufacturers had to pay into a kind of an insurance fund a small amount of money for each ton of poison that they manufactured. And then out of that fund, these toxic waste sites are supposed to be cleaned up. But the point is that the president then has the...the innate advantage of a...of a real problem existing, and an acceptance of a proposition that some solution needs to be found. And the President puts forward, sometimes at the urging of the Congress, his best solution. The Congress then addresses this matter, makes amendments or modification, holds public hearings on the subject, and there has to be some element of flexibility and compromise between the President on the one hand and the Congress on the other, about the final product. So the president does have this role of leadership but in a case of, like I've just described, in a domestic issue, there has to be some give and take, some cooperation between the President and the cogress. And that's not any reflection on the forcefulness of the incumbent president. It's not a reflection of weakness of the office of the President at all. This is the way our constitution was

evolved, this is the way our forefathers envisioned the relationship and it still works.

[question]

Well, of course, the first step is to try to convince the members of Congress. There is a tiny element of party loyalty...not very significant, unfortunately. And then beyond that is the appeal that a president has to make to individual members of Congress. And I spent hundreds of hours meeting with 1 or 2 or small groups of members of the Congress in the House and Senate, to convince them that this was thebest thing to do for our country, any alternative they might put forward was not as good. And seeking their advice and making modifications if necessary to get a few votes here and a few votes there. If that seems to be a fruitless effort, you can't quite get a majority in the House and the Senate, then the next phase is to go over the members of the Congress, directly to the people of this country, through the news media, through pbblic speeches and through other means, as well. And then in that case, sometimes you fail, but most of the time you succeed. And we had a very good batting average with the Congress, even on matters of high controvery and difficulty. But sometimes it took 2, 3, as many as 4 years to finally prevail.

[question]

(8) The most persistent and frustrating and aggravating, but most important issue was on the energy question, where it was necessary

to dergulate the artificially low prices for oil, natural gas and other energy sources, in order to encourage conservation, and also to initiate some mandatory and permanent legislation that would eliminate the waste of energy. This was contrary to the natural inclinations of people. They want to be able to waste energy as though it would never give out, and they want to have extremely low price energy rather than paying what it's really worth. So here we had to negotiate not only with the Members of Congress, but with consumer groups... and with special people in our nation who used a lot of energy like the automobile manufacturers on the one hand, to use...facilities in manufacturing plants, the steel industry, the industr y to produce electric power and so forth. And of course the people in the oil and gas business wanted much greater capability to set their own prices than I or the Congress were willing to give. So you had to...there had to be some balancing of all those factors.. We finally did prevail, and those laws that we passed are permanent, in spite of subsequent efforts to amend them...they have stood the test of time. And they've resulted in a tremendous reduction in the waste of energy and have led to very great benefits for our country economically in that the price of energy has now been stabilized. There's an adequate supply of energy, there's an increased production of energy in our own country and a much reduced dependence on overseas supplies for energy that even threatened the security of our country.

[question]

CR 23 A & B, sound 10

[question]

(1) Well, in almost every White House Press conference that I had I would lead off with the subject that was most important to me. In the case of the energy legislation, which was most complex, and involved the most money and most directly threatened our nation's security, and was most difficult...I gave a series of fireside chats or evening television speeches to the American public and over a period of time built up support for position. On one occasion I remember that we went on vacation, Rose and I decided to take a trip down the Mississippi River on the stern wheeler, the Delta Queen. And on that trip, I made 48 different speeches within a week, to people on the banks of the Mississippi River over a loudspeaker system, about our energy policy. And I think the people in Minnesota and Ohio and Missouri and other states along the river, heard my voice nder extraordinary memorable circumstances, and they relayed their concerns to the members of the Congress. And although it was a long and difficult process, those kinds of approaches directly to the American people eventually prevailed. Another thing that happens is that when you do have an occasion to make a speech from the bridge of a Mississippi sternwheeler to a group on the shore, the national news media look upon this as a very newsworthy item. So even though they may be tired of hearing about energy conservation, they do report the circumstances and therefore you get your ideas across.

[question]

You do. Sometimes, almost ad nauseam...the people get sick of it and you can tell through examination of public opinion polls, when a different approach is necessary. And when you're pursuing a particular issue excessively. But in this case we had 2 or 3 years of investment in the Congress in bringing the members almost to the point of approving the energy package, and it was too valuable...a circumstance to surrender easily. So we just pushed on...maybe...at the time it seemed excessively, and eventually prevailed. The last piece of energy legislation by the way, did not pass the Congress until after I had been defeated for...for re-election, and during the so called lame duck session.

[question]

In modern times at least, most of the initiates come from the White House. The innovative ideas pour in to the president from various sources, sometimes even from the Congress itself. And then the President makes a proposal after careful consideration. The checks and balances come in in that there has to be a consensus between the President and the Congress, and also obviously, between the House and Senate. And this results in a myriad of compromises that eventually result in a common package. Sometimes the package is only one page, sometimes it's 800 pages of law, which then become a permanent element of American society. If...all the facets of administration or implementation of those laws can't be encompassed in written form,

which is almost always the case, then in the implementation of that law through administrative decisions and orders from...from the White House and the cabinet officers, there come contests or disputes about whether the person has gone too far. In that case, the federal courts come into the picture and the Federal courts ultimately rule that this is in compliance with the law, or this stretches the law too much, or this is in contradiction to the law. So the checks and balances is mostly a negative thing, a restraint. And it's very easy for any one of those entities, the executive, legislative or the judicial branch of government, to block action or to maintain the status quo. The difficulty comes in changing the status quo for the benefit of our nation. And this almost always entails the taking away of a special privilege from some powerful group or groups in our country, and they bitterly oppose losing that privilege, even for the common good. And they have all kinds of political persuasions and rationales for not disturbing their advantage.

[question]

① I think in domestic affairs, the Congress has too much power ...or a better way to express it is, the Congress is too amenable to the pressure of powerful lobbying groups...the military industrial complex, the manufacturers of weapons are almost always able to prevail in the Congress, even over the opposition of a President. And I think President Eisenhower expressed his deep concern about this as he left office, a military man himself. In addition to that,

there are certain groups that strangely go together. For instance, the tobacco industry and the American Medical Association, the organization of doctors, they joined forces quite often to protect their own interests in the Congress...when everyone knows that the smoking of cigarettes is one of the most serious dangers to American health. And with the ability to make...large campaign contributions to individual members of Congress, the ability to pay a large honorarium for making speeches to conventions of those special interest groups and other means...they're able to block legislation. Sometimes legislation can be killed in a tiny subcommittee of the Congress, if a majority of that small subcommittee, which may only be 5 or 6 people, out of a total of more than 450 in the House of Representatives, are convinced that they want to kill it legislation, then you can't get it out of that subcommittee to go to the main committee and then go to the floor of the House so they can let it go to the Senate. So this checks and balances, I think, has been distorted over a period of time and because of the makeup of the Congress and multiplicity of comittees, the fragmentation of responsibility, the Congress is too lethargic...it 's too much an anchor or an impediment to progress. And this is one of the great frustrations that I felt when I was President.

[question]

We tried to deal...we tried to deal with the problem of... excessive Congressional...involvement... We tried to deal with the

problem of excessive lethargy in the Congress, or obstructionism, by passing an ethics legislation bill, which attempted to limit the financial contributions that could go to individual members of Congress, and also to require the publication or revelation of the financial interrelationships between lobbying groups and the members of the Congress. This legislation was quite beneficial. It didn't go quite far enough. But after I left office...through various means, some of the more important elements of this legislation were repealed, by members of the Congress, and the restraints...[clear throat] the restraints on contributions or honorariums that could be paid for the...to the members of Congress, were removed. Another thing that can be done, in my judgment, is to re-form the Congress, and to have a smaller number of major committees, with...and to remove some of the...capability of tiny subcommittees to obstruct legislation, or at least the consideration of legislation. But in my judgment this will only come about when a crisis develops that will be embarrassing to the members of Congress...when legal...chaos becomes so abused that the public is aroused in revulsion and demands a change. Because now it's kind of a well kept secret how pervasive is the influence of a relatively small group of powerful Americans through their lobbying groups, and through campaign contributions.

# # #

Vision Associates - Prod. 825, President - Sound roll 6A

CR 24 A & B sound 11

[question]

No, I don't think so...[question] I don't think...no I don't think that we need to make the president more powerful or change the basic relationship between the President and the Congress. There's one defect in the Constitution that ought to be changed and that is the requirement that 2 thirds of the members of the Congress or the Senate have to ratify an international agreement that's already been made by the President. This is a ridiculous requirement. It ought to be that 2 thirds of the Senators have to disagree with the president in order to undo what he has done. This means, quite often in our country, that international agreements that have been made concerning nuclear arms control, or treaties concerning the use of the oceans or to prohibit genocide, or to promote human rights, are never addressed by the Senators, because they know that they can't get 2 thirds majority to ratify the treaties or the agreements. But in general the present relationship which is quite ancient in nature ...between the President and the Congress, with the courts looking over the whole situation, ..that relationship is adequate.. And I wouldn't want to make any basic changes in it.

[question]

Well we were down to the prospect of losing the treaties by 3 or 4 votes, which in my opinion would've been a devastating blow

to the wellbeing of this nation, and would probably have precipitated combat in CentralAmerica...and would have damaged or destroyed our beneficial influence throughout this hemisphere. So it was a matter of great importance to me and an overwhelming portion of the members of the Senate knew that I was right and that the treaties ought to be ratified, but they were still some of 'em, the more timid ones, reticent about voting for the treaties because it was not a popular thing to do. So in effect, we had to negotiate with the last 3 or 4 senators to make sure that they knew what the treaties would involve and so that we could encourage their constituents back home to give them support and in some cases, even to get their religious leaders to change their position enough to give some flexibility to the members of the Senate to support the treaties themselves. In one case, a Senator was concerned because of the editorial policy of the newspaper that permeated his state. And so we called the editor of the newspaper and got that editor to agree to write a complimentary editorial if the Senator did indeed support the treaties. So this was the kind of thing that we had to do...was primary[sic] take the...the threat of adverse political consequences from a member of the Congress in order for that member to vote in a way that he knew was best for our country.. It was a very interesting procedure, and one that I would not want to go through very many times in my life.

[question] [It did...we got it that close] [question]

(1) Well, we finally prevailed on the treaty vote and only had one vote to spare. And we had to change the votes of 20 or 30

members in the Senate who had earlier professed the opposition to the new treaties. As a matter of fact, on my visits to Panama since I left office, it's obvious, from the reports of the Panamanians and the American military and civilian personnel who are there in the Zone, that it's one of the best things that ever happened to our country. There's a close relationship between us and the Panamanians, the Panama Canal is being operated in a very efficient way. We are still there to protect the interests of the United States in the canal in perpetuity, even after the year 2000, to defend the Canal against any external threats, and also to have our ships go to the head of the line in an emergency, as we could if we owned the Canals outright. So this was the kind of prospect that we had to put before the members of the Senate. They agreed with the facts as they existed, but their reticence was fear of adverse political consequences or condemnation from within their own state if they voted their conscience or if they voted the facts..

[question]

In a matter of great controversy or difficulty or complexity... the forces against change can prevail and a President can't artifically marshal enomrous public interest in a problem enough to win a legislative battle unless the public sees the issue as being in a crisis stage. So I would say that unless there is a demonstrable crisis that could adversely affect the wellbeing of American citizens or endanger our own security, the President would have a very difficult time

marshalingenough public interest to prevail over the special groups and lobbyists on the other side.

[Question]

A president is powerful almost in direct proportion to the degree of crisis that prevails. When our nation is endangered, clearly, from anm external threat, the President can act in almost any way and the American people will give the President their support. And the Congress, even though they might disagree with the President, would be quite reticent trying to overthrow a change, a decision the President has made. So...there's no doubt that in a crisis, as did exist during the War between the States or the 1st and 2nd World War and so forth, the President prevailed, and as you...as you well know, Abraham Lincoln made some decisions that were bordering on illegality in order to try to stop subversion and to...and in effect take away some of the civil liberties of theAmerican people. Bugt he was not condemned for it. The Congress did not try to change his position because they knew that the existence of our country itself was threatened. So I think in...in all cases when there is a clear threat or a clear crisis, the President's strength in both domestic and foeeign policy is greatly enhanced, and nothing can stand before the President's power in this country, and his influence...if he has reason and justification for his actions.

[question]

Well, as far as the party leader of the Democratic party is

concerned, you really haven't got very much to lead. The disorganization and lack of basic loyalty within the Democratic party is well known by any President who's served in the White House who is a Democrat. And you almost always have to ignore the potential strength of partisan support, and deal with even members of the Democratic party in the Congress on an individual basis. I think, on the other hand, the Republicans do have much more cohesiveness, and much more inherent party loyalty than...than do theDemocrats. I wish the Democratic party had more loyalty, but yoy have to remember that the umbrella is so broad, in effect, and unfortunately the Democratic party is kind of a conglomeration of special interest groups who come together every 4 years in the nominating process, primarily to support their own pet project, some of...and some of the conventioneer or delegates have very little interest in who is actually going to be elected President in the coming election. I found, in my own political campaigns that I was much more effective when I was a lonely candidate walking the streets or appearing on the public television or or radio, saying I need your help to be elected. Once I got the nomination, and had the trappings of the party around my shoulders, I felt a handicap rather than a new strength. So there's no doubt that there's a...that the party organization is necessary to...to produce a nominee and to let the internecine warfare be fought out within certain rules and within certain boundaries. But once a President is elected, or even after a nominee is chosen, the benefits to a Democrat of the

party organization are minimal at best.

[question]

CR 25 A & B sound 12

[question]

(2) Well after I'd been in office for 6 months...I was voluntarily inundated with a wide range of tasks that I had undertaken...energy l;egislation, environmental legislation...middle east peace,SALT, negotiations with the Soviet Union, questions concerning the Panama Canal treaties, matters of this kind. And I was thrilled and gratified, exhilarated, challenged, and sobered. So in the process I had also learned a great deal in the first 6 months about how to deal with the Congress...the patience and persistence that was required to carry out my duties and in an effective way. I had cemented good relationships with most of the leaders in the western democracies and had initiated a human rights policy. We were trying to deal with the countries in Africa on a new basis. So when I look back on it now, it's...both surprising and gratifying to see the wide range of...of tasks that we had undertaken. I think one of the criticisms that has been made after I was defeated in 1980, was based on the fact that we tried to do too much too quickly. And so I think that that's another lesson to be learnedfrom a political point of view; that is to concentrate the president's attention on a relatively few major issues at one time, because a multitude of...messages going out

simultaneously from the White House become quite confusing to the American public...and weaken the President's voice on any one particular issue...that might be of paramount importance.

[question]

Yes, that's one of the limitations, not to undertake too many issues at once, and to try to...and to concentrate the President's attention and his communications with the public on a few carefully chosen subjects of...of greatest importance, and the more controversial and complex an issue is, the greater proportion of the President's time and attention has to be focused on it in preaching to or educating the American public.

[question]

Well you have to learn, in effect, to pick and to choose. A lot of the strength of this country is inherent and the modification that can be implemented on the basic patterns of American life by a President are quite limited. The President doesn't need to become involved in every facet of American life because the families, the local and state communities, the financial and economic leaders of this country, the free enterprise system as such, commerce and trade with foreign nations, that all goes on. And unless there is a real need, the President ought to leave it alone. And one of the phrases that's been used is "if it ain't fixed, don't... One of the phrases used "if it ain't broke don't fix it." But when things are obviously not working well, and when there is a new challenge or a new circumstance,

that hasn't yet been adequately addressed either within the American law, within the American consciousness, or among American habits, then the President has to take a leadership role there, to guide and lead the nation, to persuade the Congress, and in effect to establish some guidance on the path to be followed into the years ahead.

[question]

That's right. In a time of..of rapid change, when a new subject arises that hasn't in the past been adequately addressed...the President can sometimes act unilaterally to deal with that issue. But if...and if his actions or decisions are worthy of permanence, then the President has an additional responsibility to embed those policies or those decisions in law. So they can provide a guide, not only for his successor in the White House, and the Federal government establish...establishment, but also for the other elements of power and influence in our country...in the free enterprise system and also in local and state governmments. So to deal with an unfor eseen issue is something that a President must do. He learns in the process, he can discern the proper avenue for the country in the future, embed that...that premise or those decisions into law and let them be a guide for all in the future.

11/2/1984 - Sound 13 [2nd sticks]

[question]

② After a nominee is chosen by the party, he automatically becomes a leader of the party, and responsible for its proper functioning, able to call upon the Democratic leaders to help him in difficult times or or with...the Congress. At the same time, the President is the one who has to shape the basic attitude of the party itself. There's no structure that's coherent enough within a political party to define what a nation is, the trends that are taking place, the political changes that are inevitable, or the top priorities that the government or the nation must address.. So in this case the President is the one who takes the leadership role, as he identifies what the nation ought to be, where it's going in the future, and it's his responsibility to make sure that the party adopts these policies and moves in harmony with him.

[question]

① Well, unfortunately, the Democratic party is not a coherent body even under the strongest leadership from the President. It's kind of a conglomeration of people who have a special interest in environmental quality or education or wages for working families...things of this kind. And so you can't depend upon any basic Democratic loyalty ...just because one is in the White House, having been elected by the Democratic party. Even in the Congress, the members of the House and Senate, have their primary obligation to the people in their own

state or own district.. And there has to be a personal persuasion by the president or conviction on the part of the members of Congress that what the President asks is best for them, their political future and their people back home. This...is not quite so noticeable within the Republican party. There's a much narrower constituency there and therefore loyalty within the Republican party...Republican party to an incumbent president, both from members of the Congress and also from the business and other groups who basically support the Republican policies..

[question]

# # #

Vision Associates - Prod 825, President - Sound roll 7A

CR 26 A & B Sound 14

The President's in the thick of things. He's intimately involved in shaping domestic and foreign policy, constantly observing what's going on in this country and around the world, and is able to discern, perhaps bettee than anyone else, certainly within the party structure, what is going to happen next, what the trends are, the attitudes of the American people, what appeals to them politically. So the President has a natural obligation, as the leader of the party to shape its basic platform and to prepare, if appropriate, for the next election. In the off-years when the members of Congress are chosen, then of course that kind of policy, those kinds of appeals and emphases and priorities become the basic thrust of a nationwide Democratic party presentation. Each member of Congress of course is a candidate...are the candidates for Congress. Of course each candidate for Congress in his or her own district or state tailors that basic thrust to suit the local constituency.

[question]

Well, I think the public...I think the public probably overestimates greatly the role of the party within the electrion process for Democrats. It's not a monolithic structure that's very carefully designed with plenty of money and a clear concept of what each candidate ought to do to become elected or re-elected. It's primarily a relatively small...ill-financed group of people who have a basic loyalty

at least at the top levels to the incumbent Presidnet, and are there as a service organization to help with small amounts of money for candidates where the races are very close, and also in the time of a Presidential...year, to provide the mechanism or the structure or the procedure by which nominees are chosen, primarily now...nowadays through the primary election process.

[question] [discussion]

Well...the chairman of the party is often, and almost always, chosen at the recommendation of the nominee of the party. The incumbent president therefore has a chairman with whom he can work during his term in office. Ordinarily, in the years when there is no election going on, that chairman only has a small staff in Washington that can have a direct mail campaign, call upon a few leading Democrats around the nation to come to Washington to help with particular issues, give advice on occasion concerning potential appointees to positions of...sometimes important, sometimes relatively insignificant positions in the government, things of that kind. But there's no major interrelationship or responsibility or dynamism between the President and the Democratic party, except when an election process is actually taking place.

[question]

Well, a President doesn't have any... A President doesn't have any direct overwhelming control of the party mechanism because as the convention approaches, during a Presidential election year,

the delegates are chosen on a local basis as supporters of a particular candidate for the nomination. And those delegates have their own..very carefully guarded independence. So some of them are amenable to suggestions from the President, sometimes, they're not. Even when a President is seeking re-election, and has an assured place on the ticket in the next year, there 's still a tremendous amount of independence among delegates to a Democratic convention. They seek those delegate posts from their own initiative...they have a very special motivation or goal to achieve. That goal may be women's rights, it may be nuclear arms control or freeze, it may be the rights of gays, it may be gun control, it may be agriculture or education or environmental quality. So they come to the convention ostensibly supporting candidates, but quite often many of them are only champions of their particular interest or cause. So, even an incumbent president can not dominate a convention. There must be some flexibility there... some acknowledgement of the independence and autonomy of the delegates themselves on a particular issue. The President can make suggestions and, I would say 80 to 90% of his suggesitons are likely to be adopted if he's running for re-election. But when there's no incumbent Democrat, and you have a multitude of candidates running for the nomination itself, then those divisions are so severe within the party that the outcome of the platform committee work and the actual thrust or goals of the Democratic party organisation are shaped substantially by the delegates themselves. When I was nominated both

in 1976 and and 1980 for instance, following the platform committee decisions by the Democratic convention, I had to call a press conference to enumerate the items in the platform with which I disagreed and which I would not carry out if I should become elected.

[question] [discussion]

...you know, a new SALT agreement...we wouldn't get 2 inches in the Washington Post...nobody gives a damn what he says, there's nothing there. The only time the party becomes alive or significant at all is in the early stages of the Presidential primary campaign, before the leading candidates are identified.. But once a Mondale and a Hart and a Jesse Jackson are identified as the 3 leading candidates, then the Democratic party, in effect, is those 3 candidates.

[question]

So there's nothing really there...and then the only time the party comes into a position of importance is...again is when the convention actually takes place. And an incumbent president like I was in 1980, I could...I could exert my will to some degree, but the... but the Kennedy forces, for instance, who challenged me, had...had probably a third of the delegates. And they put some things in the party that I couldn't adopt. So I just had to...

[discussion]

So I just called a press converence and said I'm not going to agree with these particular items.

[wild track]

One thing the movement did for instance was to

have the Democratic party in 1980 adopt a resolution saying that no Democratic party funds could be spent for a candidate in a state that had not adopted the Equal Rights Amendment. Well, you know, that was a ridiculous thing to do because you automatically cut off all funds for candidates in Georgia, even though the candidate themself, or herself might be a strong proponent of ERA. It was a ridiculous thing. And there are a lot of ridiculous things passed by the Democratic party. The Republican party, though, is different. They met in Dallas this time and the right ring people consulting with Jerry Falwell and all, wrote a platform. Nobody ever questioned it. It just sailed right through. And at the end of the conventions, Democratic and Republican, nobody ever pays any attention at all to the platform. [wild track]

(1) ...the role of the political parties is greatly exaggerated, in the minds of the American people. You know, you don't depend upon the party to relay the President's views to the public. The public listens to the President himself, not to party officials who are interpreting what the President thinks.

[question]

No, you spend very little time dealing with party affairs until the time for the convention rolls around and then the president gives his advice, but he doesn't play any major role, nor does he desire to, in the internal party mechanism.

Sound 15 14[?]

[question]

A national crisis is a situation that endangers the wellbeing of the American people or the security of our country. This can be either an economic challenge or it can be the prospect of our nation becoming embroiled in...in combat or war, or it can be a direct threat to the security of allies around the world whom we are pledged to support and to protect.

[question]

In times of national crisis the president's role becomes, not only more crucial but also more powerful. Because the American people then, the members of the Congress...have a strong tendency to support the president, as he deals with what is acknowledged to be a crisis or a challenge to our country's wellbeing. So the president is given a great deal of latitude in a time of crisis to act unilaterally, to use his own judgment, because there is no way to substitute a multiplicity of different opinions as would be the case in the Congress in dealing with a matter that's of top priority, and also rapidly changing. So this greatly enhances the power and the prestige of the President, and the public is much more forgiving of a president if he should make a transient error or mistake in judgment because they know that he's speaking for them in a time of great pressure and that there's a community of...of sharing in a time of testing, and everyone wants the president to succeed.

Sound 16 [2nd sticks] Both cameras] tail slate

###

Vision Associates - Prod. 825, President - SR 8A -

CR 27 A & B sound 17

[question]

① Well, during a time of major crisis, the limitations on a president are much less severe than in a routine circumstance where events occur very slowly and methodically...they can be predicted and there's a sharing of responsibility between the Congress and the President that's very jealously guarded. But in a time of major crisis, the President is expected to act, not only swiftly and unilaterally, but at times it's necessary for him to act secretly, with a minimum amount of consultation, which sometimes is almost non existent. So this greeatly enhances a president's power and prestige, and his ability to govern the nation without having to delay his actions and of course this puts a tremendous amount of responsibility on him also,..without those careful and considered consultations, to make sure that his judgment is right because his nation's future, perhaps, is at stake.

[question]

Well I think thexxxxx times when any constitutional violation has occurred have been very rare. and have not damaged our nation's structure of government in any permanent fashion. But by...by the timea person becomes president, there's a very clear awareness of constitutional limitations and legal limitations, and even the limitations of propriety and custmm. So a president would be foolish to use a national crisis, when the nation is already under a strain,

or the wellbeing of the people are threatened in order to enhance his own personal...power or influence in an unnecessary fashion. There is a...there's a reticence about abuse of power that is ~~xxxxly~~ deeply engrained within someone by the time they are in the White House and acting as the leader of this country.

[question]

It comes from the person inherently, but also is based upon that president's awareness or knowledge of the history of our country and particularly what his predecessors have done down through the ages in times of similar crisis.

[question]

(1) Well, as a president makes a decision in a time of major crisis there's always a necessary restraint...predicated upon analyses that will come in the future, of whether or not his actions were proper. Whether he did indeed violate constitutional limitations. Whether he did violate or circumvent the laws of our country. So even in a time of great challengs when a president can make dcsisions bcldly and sometimes secretly, there is a clear knowledge that history will judge what he has done and, even quicker, theCongress and the courts ...and the people of our nation will judge whether or not he has acted properly.

[question]

(1) Well when our hostages were seized in Iran, I was faced with the question of what to do about it. I had long discussions of a

secret nature with the secretary of State, the vice president, the joint chiefs of staff and the intelligence leaders. And we assessed a whole range of options. We could have wiped Teheran off the map with one small airplane attack. And in the process, of course, we would have killed our own hostages and killed thousands of Iranians. So what we did in that case was to decide to notify the Iranians' leaders ...the Ayatollah Khomeini...if you put any American on trial, or if you injure or kill any American, the consequences will be severe for you. A trial will result in a total interruption of all your commerce with the outside world...injury or death of a hostage will result in a direct military attack on your country. And we fed this warning to Khomeini through a multiplicity of avenues...not only through the Swiss embassy that was representing us, but also through the leaders of the western democracies,Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy and also Japan, to make sure that the Iranians knew that that we meant what we said. And as a result of that, no hostage was ever put on trial, no hostage was every injured or killed...contrary to what Khomeini had constantly threatened.

[question]

Yes...yes, this decision was made, obviously, without consultation with the Congress or with the other leaders in our government because it had to be done in an extremely secret way and it had to be done in an effective way, and it had to be done without throwing down a public gauntlet to the Iranians which might've precipitated

their accepting the challenge and putting on trial and executing some of the hostages. Again of course, the rescue attempt which was not finally successful, any revelation of our plans from someone with whom we had consulted, would've been suicidal...the entire rescue team team would've been killed...with an ambush and we might very well have lost the hostages also. So in a case like that the Presidenthas to act unilaterally...he has to act boldly, he has to act quickly, he has to act secretly. And at the same time he has to be sure that what he does is right, proper, legal, and also well advised.

[question]

Well, the best thing...the best thing that a president can do is to avoid a crisis situation and to try to prevent challenges to our nation or threats to our country's wellbeing. This is the essence of good leadership, is not toconstantly permit regional conflagrations to erupt and violence to take place and our own military to be involved. The proper approach to...the rapidly changing modern world and its potential areas of combat is to assuage those circumstances so that they don't erupt into war, and to use our nation's great strength not by the injection of troops into a troubled area which only exacerbates the situation, but by bringing the disputing parties together through diplomacy to try to iron out the trouble with honor, protecting our own nation's integrity and interests, and so that competing or even conflicting parties, both see that peace is preferable to war.

[question]

(2) In a time of crisis, this nation has historically put aside partisanship and...has seen come forth almost uniform support for difficult decisions made by a president from both Democratic and Republican leaders. The Congress has been basically supportive of a president, even when the decisions were difficult or which under non crisis circumstances might be severely criticized. So I think partisanship is not an element that needs to be of great concern during the time of crisis.Obviously, if a...if a difficult involvement of our nation is perpetuated, as was the case in the Vietnam war, and more and more people...of... Obviously, if a crisis is perpetuated over a long period of time as was the case in the Vietnam war, opposition has developed, both among the general public and also within the Congress, and those pressures build up more and more on a president and sometimes his decisions have to be modified to accommodate, not only political constraints from a demanding public, but also legal restraints imposed by the Congress, sometimes contrary to the president's wishes.

CR 28 A & B sound 18

[question]

(1) It's much easier for a president to act when the crisis is ...is relatively easy to perceive and is uniformly perceived as...as a crisis. This was the case when our hostages were taken. Everybody

saw that it was a crisis. There was no reason for the President to convince people we've got a crisis on our hands. But there are other kinds of crises as well. One that I recall vividly of course is the Panama Canal treaties. This was a pending crisis. It was the kind of thing that was...sapping away our nation's influence in this hemisphere. Unanimously we were condemned because the original Panama Canal treaty was grossly unfair to the Panamanians. And at the same time, the continued operation of the Canal was in danger because of militants who threatened to sabotage the canal mechanisms which would've been quite easy for...for a terrorist to do. Additionally there was a...a sense of...crisis in the early stage of my... let me say that again... Additionally there was a crisis that arose early in the 1970s when the OPEC nations imposed a rapidly increasing price on oil, and declared an embargo on oil shipments to our nation while President Nixon was in office. This continued to fester and our nation became increasingly dependent on foreign oil. And became quite vulnerable with its economic mechanism threatened if those tenuous oil supplies should be cut off, either because of war in the Persian Gulf region or because of another decision by the OPEC nations to embargo shipments of oil to our country. So...to deal with that kind of crisis, which was not warlike in nature, was a very difficult thing to do. The president there had to convince the American people that a crisis did indeed exist, that our own security was indeed threatened, that we were overly dependent on uncertain supplies of oil.

If those supplies were interrupted, our nation's economic structure and the wellbeing of our people would be adversely affected. But it required long and tedious negitiations to actually pass legislation that would correct this defect in our economic system and remove the threat. So...those kinds of crises that are not unanimously acknowledged or clearly recognized, like the Panama Canal traaty and the energy crisis, are very difficult ones with which a president must deal.

[question]

Yes. Not only is it difficult for a president to get the the overwhelming support that he needs in dealing with a crisis, but the president cannot make a unilateral decision...you can make a decision to negotiate a new treaty with Panama, but you've got to convince 2 thirds of the U.S. Senate to eatify what you have done. And then you've got to get the entire Congress to pass implementing legislation to put the treaty terms into effect. And in the case of the energy crisis, you had to share with the Congress the responsibility for changing the basic laws of our country to promote conservation, to quit wasting energy, and also to promote the production of different kinds of energy in our own country so that oil would not be such a crucial element in the economic wellbeing of our country.

[qaestion]

Well I t hink that the president has to make a judgment about that. Well I think the president has to make a judgment about when

he should use authority that he thinks is necessary when it might border on violating custom or violating established procedures or violating American law or even straining the constitution of the United States. There are times in war, as was experienced by Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson, for instance, when they took action that in time of peace not have been acceptable...which circumscribed or constrainted the individual freedoms of American people...orwhich were used boldly to establish a new governmental entity to deal with an unforeseen challenge. And sometimes this was done without an adequate...base of law, because there was no way to anticipate the challenge that the President faced. So, when that kind of decision is made, without a clear legal base for the President's authority, he must be careful... he must be cautious but he must also be willing to act if necessary and be willing to face the...consequences of his innovative action in subsequent weeks or months.

[question]

(1) There were...rare times during my own administration when I approached the edge of a presidential authority. One was when we froze all of the Iranian assets in our country, over $12 billion that had been deposited in our banks, and prevented their being returned to Iran, in order to put pressure on the Iranians to release the our hostages. I also stopped or prohibited any commerce or trade between an American citizen and Iran. And prohibited any travel by American citizens to or from Iran. These actions were done without clear

legal authority for them. And subsequently, sometimes 3 or 4 years later, the courts finally ruled that I acted properly. Another example relating to Iran was when I...issued an order that no Iranian students would be permitted to demonstrate in the public areas around Washington. I did this, not to...circumscribe the freedom of those students to express their will but to keep the students from being attacked or killed by Americans who were extremely angry at what the Iranians were doing and I issued this order...it was almost immediately tested in the Supreme Court, and the Courts upheld my action because it was in a time of crisis, and the courts decided that the Iranian demonstrators might very well have their lives in danger if they persisted in their actions while our hostages were being held. Another occasion was when I was negotiating for the release of the hostages shortly before I left the White House. I had to make a decision about... about future claims against Iran by both private citizens and also... corporations who had contracts interrupted at the time of the Iranian revolution. I kept enough Iranian money in escrow to be used to pay off any foresseable claims by the American corporations and others who might be financially injured. But at the same time I agreed that Iran would not be subject to direct lawsuits by the hostages for any damage they may have suffered psychologically by being imprisoned. And...of course when the hostages were first released, they were perfectly willing for that to be done to get them out of prison. But later they tested my action in court and again the courts upheld what

I had done in a time of emergency and certainly without any clear legal description of what I could do and what I could not do.

###

Vision Assoc. - Prod #825 - President - SR #9A

(CR #29 A&B)...(sound 19)

(question)

I really believe, from my own experience, that the presidential authority and power is adequate in times of crisis. There are some, including my predecessors in the White House, who disagree, and believe that the War Powers Act which was passed by Congress during the Vietnam War, to restrain what President Johnson was doing, has severely crippled the presidency. But I've studied that Act quite a lot, and I'm convinced, that it's not overly restrictive on the president. He can, indeed, act in a time of emergency, he's only required to consult with the Congress, and explain why he has committed American troups, and justify his decision, and in that case, my experience, and my judgement for the future, is, that the Congress would support the President, unless he was grossly in error, concerning the decisionhe's made.

(question)

As far as power is concerned, to act in an emergency, I think the President has an adequate amount

(question)

Well it doesn't have to be a military action, or threat, to precipitate a crisis. Sometimes, there is an era of rapid social change, where the role of the government is being modified, to accomodate new demands, or new challenges, or new needs. This occured during the

turn of this century, when Theodore Roosevelt saw a need, for instance, for the government to regulate the free enterprise system, which had become, in effect, monopolistic, and abusive, in using its powers, and there, he acted, to protect the American public from those abuses, and I think, in the process, tested the legal bounds of what a President could do.

(CUT)

(sound 20)

(question)

(1) One of the most time consuming and important responsibilities of a President, is to make economic policy for our country, recognizing, of course, that he doesn't have the unilateral authority to implement what he decides, that has to be a sharing of this responsibility, with a multitude of other political powers. The most important, of course, is the Free Enterprise system, itself, the manufacturing, economic, and financial leaders of our country. Secondly of course, is the Congress, and third would be the Federal Reserve Bank, but in the process of evolving that policy, there has to be a focal point, and that's the President, and a lot of that decision making, comes from a deliberate searching for ideas about where our nation is now, the problems that we have to face, some of the options for resolving those problems, and where our nation is likely to go in the future. There's a great deal of...of influence, exerted on our own economic system, by world wide events, how things are

changing in international trade circles...circles. What is the supply of raw materials, and basic energy supplies? What is the relationship between the developing world, and the industrialized nations? What elements of protectionism have been raised, to prevent the free flow of...of goods? What's the relative price of the American dollar, compared to other currencies? These kinds of things directly affect the economic strength of our own country, the prosperity and well being of our own people, and it also has a great impact on the quality of their own future lives.

(question)

Well, I think that nowadays, it would be very difficult for a president to go too far, because the...the constraints on his authority are severe, they're well established, and they're almost unbreakable, but during the time of Franklin Roosevelt, when the nation was afflicted with a crisis of a great depression, there was a remarkably quiescent Congress. The first hundred days, or so, of Roosevelt's administration, he had only to suggest a new law, and the Congress instantly sent it back to him for signature. And, I think the courts ruled, very quickly, that some of his proposals, and his actions, did exceed the bounds of the American constitution, and he had to cancel some of his plans. But I think in the process, he acted properly, he was encouraged by the outcome of the election, and also by the pressures on the American people to act boldly, and there was no precedent for the circustances

that he faced, so I don't think there was ever any real criticism of his attempt to abuse his perogatives, or his influence, or authority. It was just a matter of deciding, later, in a very careful and legal fashion, that he had, or had not acted in the strict interpretation that was required, of the Constitution itself.

(question)

Well as...I think in the case of Roosevelt, it's proven that he did go too far, because the court...the Supreme Court later reversed him, but I think that in modern times, those inherent constraints on the President, and the sharing of responsibility for economic policy, are so firmly established now, that it would be almost impossible for a President to go too far.

(question)

(1) The most obvious example of a President's role of...in forging social policy, in my lifetime, was the Civil Rights Movement, and the removal of segregation of, and persecution, and deprivation of black people, as a matter of...of history. These changes were necessary, and it was only when the President decided to act boldly, primarily during the time of Lyndon Johnson, that the Congress did indeed move, to prescribe by law, the changes that would be required to integrate the races, and to provide some element of...of equality. So I think that it's obvious that the President has a strong role to play when necessary. Again, his decisions had to be confirmed, through tedious negotiations in

the Congress, to evolve new laws, and then those laws had to be interpreted by the Supreme Court.

(question)

(2) Ordinarily the president would be expected to define changes or improvements, in the social justice system of our nation. In the absense of president leadership, though, there is, within the Congress, a legitimate role to plaee, and people who are abused, or who feel that their rights have been unnecessarily circumstances, or...and people who have been abused, or feel that their rights have been unnecessarily circumscribed, are restricted, if they can't get help from the President, they go to Congress, and I think this is a good guarantee that either the President, or...if he's unwilling, then the Congress, would act as leaders, in alleviating social injustice.

(question)

(1) Well I'm a product of the South, and with my own political philosophy, I could never have hoped to be President, in the days of racial segregation. It was only the...the actions of Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Civil Rights Movement, that removed the constraints on the south, that made it possible for me to be elected first governor, and then President, so when I arrived in the White House, my attitude towards Civil Rights on the domestic scene, and Human Rights on the world wide scene, were substantially shaped by my own experience in observing the results of the removal of

racial discrimination from our country. I saw the tremendous benefits that came, not only to the black people, who finally had equal opportunity, but also, to the white people, who in the past, had deprived their neighbors, of the opportunities for economic and social advancement.

(question)

(CUT)

(CR 30 A&B...sound 21)

(question)

(2) This is one area of the constitution that gives the President more authority than most presidents have used, to implement and protect the Bill of Rights, and to implement and expand the guarantees in the Constitution that have come to Women, to Blacks, and to young people, to participate on an equal basis, in the affairs of our country. My own belief is, that a President really can't go too far in being the champion of...of basic Civil Rights. In protecting meticulously the guarantees of human freedom, the responsibility of government, to the people, the right right of American citizens to know what is going on, within the government itself. Most Presidents have a...an inclination to restrict those rights, rather than to expand them, but I think this is an opportunity for the leader of our country to...to stretch the bounds of Constitutional authorization, which would not result in...in his own self-gratification, or political enhancement, but would benefit the people of our country, greatly.

(question)

Well, there again, I think they are...well, in addition to social progress, of course, which is covered quite meticulously in the Constitution, there is the matter of economic policy. Here, the constitutional authority to the President, is not nearly so clear, nor are his duties so clearly defined, but it's obvious to anyone who serves in the White House, that what goes on in our country, economically, has a direct bearing on the well being of our people, the strength, and even the security of our nation is shaped, to a substantial degree, by economic progress, and stability. So here, the President must act, almost by default. There is no other clearly defined, or focused point, from which the economic troubles can be expounded, or explained, future programs can be defined and enunciated, and proposals made to the Congress, and to the American public, on correcting deficiencies, answering questions, or dealing with changing circumstances.

(question)

Yes, I think they...the powers of the President to deal with economic circumstances, are implied, and authorised by the Constitution of the United States, even though they're not clearly expressed, as such.

(question)

Yes, when I came into office, I was faced, for instance, with a long history of repetative strikes in the Coal industry, there

was almost a breakdown in production, in our country, of coal. So eventually, I called into the White House, both the producers, and the mine workers, and required them to sit there, and to deal with this threat of wildcat strikes, which had interrupted the shipment of coal. At the time, we were also faced with the shortages of oil, and so the energy question in our country was of paramount importance, on the domestic scene. As a result of that, there was an agreement made, not only to resolve one particular strike, but in a more generic sense, a framework was established, which has, since that time, almost totally eliminated any strikes in the coal industry, in our country. Here, I was not directed to do it by legal constraints, or constitutional mandate, but by the fact that I recognized a problem, and acted on it. Another one, in a more general sense, was the energy question in its totality, where there was no other place, or person, who could demand, or define the needs in our country, and I had to take the initiative. In the process, I had to deal with every element of an extremely complicated energy industry, and with consumers of all kinds, from private citizens in their automobiles, or homes, to manufacturers of different goods,that required large quantities of different kinds of energy, to the producers of electric power, and coal, and oil, and natural gas themselves, so this was a...a matter that was unforeseen by our forefathers, or even in the times of Franklin Roosevelt, or Theodore

Roosevelt, or Woodroe Wilson, but which had become of great importance to our country, and to our people by the time I went into office.

(question)

(1) The role of the president was drastically changed, in formulating economic policy, or dealing with commerce and trade. Following the industrial revolution, and when the major corporations began to be formed, and then mergers took place, and the threat of monopoly reacted adversely to the well-being of consumers of goods, there was a threat to American health, for instance, by drugs that were being produced, and sold, without adequate safeguards, so that the Federal Drug Administration was formed, to make sure that we...when people went, and bought those drugs, that their health would not be endangered. There was a...an evolution of public interest when the radio was invented, and subsequently, of course, television. To make sure that the people had a right to listen to radios with a clear channel, so they could understand the program, there was a desire to limit the amount of advertising that might be put on, to the detriment of programs. When a radio or television station was given a monopoly in a certain channel, which could not be encroached upon by their competitors. (2) These kinds of things were of great importance to our country, particularly early in this century, and...and from the time of Theodore Roosevelt, to Woodroe Wilson, and even later, there was a tremendous

change in the power and expectations of presidents, and by the time of the Second World War, the American people looked to their president, to be responsible for all of these matters that affected their role, as a consumer, which had never been the case in the previous centuries.

(question)

In particular, what?

(question)

Okay. Whether we like it or not, our nation is the leader on Earth, militarily, politically, economically, and sometimes morally, and in recent times, our country has been expected to play the role of a leader. In recent times, our country has been expected to play the role of a leader. When an outbreak of disharmony or revolution, or combat occurs, almost anywhere on Earth, it has at first an indirect, and a potential direct effect on the peace of our own country. We've seen this in recent years, in Korea and in Vietnam, in Lebanon, and Central America, and so the role of a President, is to guard his country against the adverse consequences of a regional war, that might later spread to encompass our own interests. Obviously the best approach, is of a peaceful nature. The injection of American troops into the internal affairs of another country, is quite often counter productive. It involves our nation in the combat, that we ourselves are trying to avoid. Our best approach is to use our tremendous influence

as a superpower, to bring the disputing parties together, for consultation, communication, and perhaps detailed negotiations, to alleviate tension, or hatred, and to replace that with...with peace. (CUT)

(end SR #9A)

# # #

Vision Assoc. - Prod #825 - President - SR #10A

(CR #31 A&B...sound 22)

(question)

(1) The president has to exercise a great deal of reticence about how much we do intrude, even in seeking negotiations, and accommodations, there are times when that's not appropriate, when our own influence is minimal, or when we're not looked upon, as having a balanced position, that would be necessary for an arbitrator or a mediator. Also, there are times, when the motivations of those who seek justice in an area, are compatible with our own, but which might be inclined to disturb the status quo, and lead to revolution. Our country is almost automatically inclined to want to preserve the status quo, because we don't like unpredictable change, and even when those chances are precipitated by a gross violation of human rights, and the people themselves, are demanding justice, we tend to stand aloof. There is a...a direct responsibility on the President, to pursue negotiations with our potential adversaries, with the Soviet Union, and earlier with the People's Republic of China. I decided it would be to our advantage to normalize diplomatic relations with China, and to establish a permanent opportunity for us to exchange ideas, to...to find common ground on which we could act together, to acknowledge the differences that are inherent between a democracy, on the one hand, and...and a Communist nation on the other, and to try to handle those difficulties.

or inherent differences, so they wouldn't lead to future dissention. In the case of the Soviet Union, I and my predecessors, dealt almost on a continuing way in negotiations to control, and reduce the threat of nuclear weaponry. This was the case under Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford and me. And I think that was a very beneficial thing, even when the negotiations were interrupted, or delayed, even when, sometimes, they seemed to be unsuccessful, just the fact that we were negotiating, gave, a kind of an escape valve so that pressure points around the world, where we were in peaceful competition, didn't become exacerbated by disharmony and distrust. So, this was part of...of my responsibility, and it's a responsibility that other presidents have also...have also shared. In the case of the Middle East, I felt that this area of the world was potentially explosive, that if a third world war should erupt, it would probably be in the Middle East, and so, one of my earliest goals, as president, was to try to explore, with all the leaders there, the Israelis, and the Arab neighbors, their intentions and their willingness to compromise, or to be flexible, and eventually we were able to go to Camp David, and with Sadat and Begin, to negotiate a major step toward eventual peace, which can be the foundation for future progress. So, there, I think was a risk that we took to have our nation embarrassed. Had we failed at Camp David, our nation would have appeared to be over-exposed, but I felt the risk was worth the taking, and then, even after Camp

David, I decided against the advice of my own political supporters, to go to Egypt, and to go to Israel, to try to overcome a deadlock that had developed, even following the Camp David Accords, and did so. It was a risk, yes, and I could have been embarrassed personally and politically. Our country could have been embarrassed if this direct, and overt effort had been frustrated, or rejected, but luckily we came out with a treaty between Israel and Egypt, which has stood the test of time, so far, and which I think, showed that the taking of the risk was indeed warranted.

(question)

(1) Well obviously we can't run around the world trying to be peacemakers everywhere, and we can't expect other sovereign nations, and their leaders, to acquiesce to our own directives, or... or even requests. That exercise of American influence, has to be done responsibly, and cautiously, but it's been done by a wide range of presidents. Theodore Roosevelt intervened, in effect, to bring an end to the War between the Soviet Union, and Japan. Woodroe Wilson tried to implement America's entry and involvement in the League of Nations. He was not successful, but he laid the groundwork for subsequent action by Roosevelt and Truman, in evolving the United Nations, and even, following that, under Presidents Nixon and Ford, and with the help of Henry Kissinger, the shuttle diplomacy was evolved, to try to bring a...an end to the war in the Mid-East, following 1973. So...so I acted in conformity with

a basic policy, that had been established by our nation's leaders, that whenever possible, instead of letting war evolve, to try to interrupt those tendencies toward combat, and to bring about peace. (CUT)

(23)

(question)

(1) Well, I grew up under Roosevelt, during the Great Depression years, and our lives on the farm, were heavily affected by his policies, as we struggled to get out of the Great Depression, and saw a massive increase in the Federal burocracy, with all kinds of organizations being formed, that directly affected our lives, and I saw the dynamism, and agressiveness of Roosevelt, in the pre-World War II years. As I approached manhood, the Second World War started, and I looked upon Roosevelt as, in effect, my Commander-in-chief, when I was in the Navy, and almost wept when he died, because I thought that Truman was inadequate for the job. Later, Truman developed into my most admired President, of this century, and I...I saw his humility, his strength, his tenacity, his political courage, his committment to Human Rights, his awareness of international affairs, and how they affected us, and found...30 years later, when I became President, that many of the challenges that Truman faced, and many of the decisions that he made, had a direct effect on what I had to do, as President. So, the...the use of a powerful Federal government...(cough)...so the use of a

powerful Federal Government, by Roosevelt, was obviously part of my own capabilities, and resources when I was in office, and Truman's approach to the controversial, and difficult issues, also of great benefit to me, when I was in the White House.

(question)

I think part of the fact that Truman was there, as World War II was ending, and we spelled out in most definitive and effective terms, the real application of basic human rights, not only for our Allies and friends, like Greece and Turkey, as Truman moved to protect them from a communist take-over, but also the rebuilding of the society of our own former enemies. In Japan, Germany and Italy, and this investment in the well-being of other people, using the resources of our country, obviously paid great and rich dividends for us. Truman also was a...there in the initial stages of the formation of Israel, in the Mid-East, and of course I was preoccupied, to a major degree in my own presidency, with the struggles to protect the security if Israel, to make sure that it could survive in the face of tremendous Arab condemnation, and...and pressure, and also to try to find some avenue for peace, for Israel, and I looked back on what Truman decided, in the early days, as kind of a guide to me. In addition, Truman had a sense of the United States being a world power. He was effective in stopping Soviet encroachment, in Iran, for instance, he helped to get formed, the United Nations...

(mumble)

(CUT)

(CR #32 A&B...sound 24)

(question)

D In addition to the tangible things, or issues, that Truman and I both had to address, even 30 years apart, there were...there was an element of intangibles. Truman came from humble origins. He happened to have been a Baptist. He was never expected, ever, to be President. He treated the trappings of the Presidency, of the White House, as something of an embarrassment, rather than an asset. He looked upon himself as a servant of the people, and not a...a general leading, and commanding troops. He also had a...an innate sense of patriotism, in its finer sense, not patriotism based on bullying, or belligerency, but patriotism based on the unchanging elements that made our country great. Truman was courageous. He was not ever fearful, of risking his own political popularity, if he thought his actions were in the best interests of our nation, and he went out of his office more despised by the press and the public, than perhaps any other president who's...who's served, certainly in modern times. So, all these attributes endeared Truman to me, and I think, one of the most important, was that he never tried to shift the responsibility for what happened in the White House, or even in his entire administration, onto someone else. He really lived by the sign on his desk, that said, "The Buck Stops

Here." He was the President, and when something went wrong, it wasn't the fault of his predecessors, it was not the fault of his Congress, he didn't try to blame it on political allies in this country, or even our friends overseas. He took the responsibility himself. So, I was very proud to serve the following, Truman, and felt, in some ways, more of a harmony with him, than with any of my predecessors.

(question)

Well the effect on the office, I believe, was shaped much more by Roosevelt, who greatly expanded the role of a President, primarily because of two factors. One was domestic in nature, a crisis that came with the Great Depression, and the other one was international in scope, that was with the Second World War. Roosevelt did what he thought was necessary, and in the process, the country, and the Congress, acquiesced, in his greatly magnified role, as "The" leader of our country, for both domestic and international affairs. Truman didn't materially change the scope of the office. He wasn't bold in trying to reach out for additional authority or...or power. He had enough when Roosevelt died, to serve him well, and the office has really not been expanded all that much, in my judgment, since the time of Franklin Roosevelt.

(question)

I think it's possible for a big government, like ours, to be compassionate, at the same time it's powerful. It's not easy, to

accomplish that, I think notable goal, because a President, and his office are, to some degree, isolated from the adverse consequences of decisions that are made in Washington. There...there has to be an active attempt, by an incumbent President, to understand what is going on in the administration of Public Law, in the delivery of services to the American people who genuinely need them, and also the alleviation of suffering, caused by discrimination against certain people in our nation. In addition to that, I think the... the government, as exemplified by our President, needs to be compassionate about World Affairs, hunger, and deprivation of human rights, suffering because of a lack of medical care, inadequate educational opportunities. These things, are not only important just for American citizens, which is the President's primary responsibility, but...but for people in other nations as well and in the long run, most of the wise presidents have seen that...that what does occur in other parts of the world, has a direct, or at least an indirect effect on the future prosperity and well-being of the American people themselves.

(question)

During my campaign, I always emphasized the fact that the government could be both efficient, and effective, and at the same time, compassionate and understanding, and I think it can be possible to bridge that gap. Obviously, the government can be most compassionate, and most helpful to those who need assistance, if

it is well organized, and effective, so effectiveness, efficiency, compassion, and the delivery of services, all go together as a unit. They're not incompatible with one another, each depends on the other parts for...for its own status. There is an...perhaps a contrary factor in bigness. The Bureaocracy can grow so much that those who make decisions as the top level of government, have no real awareness of how well Washington orders are carried out, in a local community, or in the home of a needy family, or in a schoolhouse, or in a mental health care center, or in shaping the quality of a remote stream of water, or the delivery or sale of medicine. So...there's obviously a need for the President to... to shape his own administration, to make sure that there is a... an accurate, and constant feedback, from people who are receiving necessary, or useful government services on the one hand, and what has been decided in the past, in Washington by congress, in passing a law, or by the President in issuing an Executive Order. Many presidents have said that they were surprised when they issue an order, and nothing happens. You have to be sure that you've got a mechanism that extends all the wayfrom the Oval Office, to the County Courthouse, or the City Hall, or the welfare office, or the Agricultural Experiment station, right to the people who are supposed to be helped.

(question)

Yes, it's possible. Obviously it's possible, and I think, in

general, our government is fairly effective. We also, in this age of instant communication, become aware of...of complaints, when services are not delivered, because the American people are not inclined to be timid, in expressing their irate comments, about a government that is wasteful, or inadequate, and of course the news media also, very properly, is always looking for a way to expose a government program that fails, or officials that don't do their duty. So, this process of the American people demanding a good government, and a news media being eager to expose deficiencies in the government, help to give the President a way to understand how efficient this federal burocracy really is.

(question)

I don't think the impact of the media is really a recent thing, because, in the early days, before electronics media, about the only access the president had to the public, was through the written media, the newspapers, and...and magazines, and they could interpret the president's remarks, or emphases, almost without interruption, and the President had no direct way to deal di...with the large American population. Now, at least on...on some occasions, the President can deliberately bypass the media, by making a..a fireside chat, or an evening television address to the American people, or speech to the Congress, or the very highly watched White House Press Conferences. So, the president can deal directly with the people when it's absolutely necessary, without the

interference of the media, but obviously, the media tends to editorialize, and they have favorites in the White House, and they have those that they seem to condemn through constant criticism, or maybe through distortion, or misinterpretation, and...and this has always been both a mystery, and an intriguing question for me, how do you...How does the media chose those that they look on with great favor? But, there's been a pattern down through, at least the modern era, of the press having a beneficial, or a detrimental effect on the presidents service, and also on his continuation in office... I think the camera ran out.

(End SR #10A)

# # #

Vision Assoc. - Prod #825 - President - SR #11A

(CR #33 A&B...sound 25)

(question)

There's no question, that with the advent of the electronic media, that the Presidents have seen this as a tool to be used to present their views to the American people, as kind of a...of an attempted manipulation of the press, and in effect you build up a kind of a competition between the press...(mumble)...in a way you build up kind of a competition betwe n the press on the one hand, that refuses to be manipulated, and the president on the other hand, that wants to say certain things, not answer certain questions, and present his own views, or his own policies, or his own record, in the most favorable light. So that's part of it, it's kind of a competition, an adversarial relationship between the press, and the president. Unfortunately the press has the final word, because in the morning newspapers, on the radio broadcasts all day long, and the evening television broadcasts, they can interpret what the president has done, or said. They can omit things that he would like to have presented, and emphasize things that he would like to have obscured. Another, very important factor is a natural prejudice of the press. Certain presidents are darlings of the press, and scholarly analyses have confirmed what I say. For instance, in recent times, Roosevelt, and Eisenhower, Kennedy and Reagan, have been heavily favored by the press. They have

been put forward in an extremely favorable light. On the other hand, Truman, Johnson, Nixon, Ford and I, have been portrayed in a much more critical fashion. I never have been able to explain why the difference, but the difference is there, and it's very apparent, and I might add very quickly, that also in more ancient times, Presidents didn't have an easy time with the press. Jefferson, complained bitterly about the press, as he went through his second term, and portrayed the press, on occasion, as a more serious threat to American democracy. On the other hand, he said it had to be free, and Lincoln was portrayed by the press, almost as an animal, who was subhuman in character, by the time he was in office, even during the crisis of the War Between the States. So, throughout our nation's history, the press has played a major role. I don't think the press plays any more influential role now, than it did in former times, it's just a different relationship because of the immediacy of their message, and...and the high concentration of interest among the American people, in an hourly or daily report, about the, what...about what the government, or a particular president does.

(question)

Well, it does make life tough for the president. I thoroughly enjoyed the week...the weekly, or bi-weekly press conferences I had. I looked forward to them, because I liked the...the competition, or the verbal combat with the interrogators, and had I

been making all of the decisions myself, I would have had them more frequently, but my advisors, and my staff members, my press secretary, thought we ought to restrain my inclinations, and have a... a limit on how many times we went before the press, so that the American people wouldn't get bored.

(question)

(1) MY major guide, on international human rights questions, was Harry Truman, who spoke frequently on this subject, and in my own later speeches, I quoted him quite frequently, because I couldn't find any clear references among his successors, that would be useful in a speech. As far as nuclear arms control is concerned, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, had all participated in almost constant negotiations with the Soviet Union, to bring about limitation on the use of nuclear explosives, or the use of space for possible combat, and...and each of those presidents and I, built upon what predecessors had done, in order to remove this threat from the world, or at least to reduce the threat. So, I studied with meticulous care, not only the final agreements that were reached, between our country and the Soviet Union under various presidents, but also the negotiating techniques of my predecessors, and also the Soviets, so that I could do a better job in bringing to a conclusion, the SALT II negotiations, with President Brezhnev of the Soviet Union. So, I learned a lot from all my immediate predecessors on nuclear arms control. On human rights, the most

important factor was what Harry Truman both said, and did.

(question)

I think everyone on Earth, who was alive at the time that the first nuclear bomb was used, can remember the impressions and the feelings of the moment. I was in a...an old battleship, off the coast of our country, in the North Atlantic ocean, and I heard Truman's flat, nasal twang, explaining that he had just used a formidable weapon, of unprecedented power and destruction, on the Japanese, in order to bring to a conclusion, the Second World War, and to prevent the possible sacrifice of half a million American troops who would have had to invade the mainland of China...and to avoid the death of half a million American troops, whose lives may have been lost, in an invasion of...of Japan. So, I was relieved at the time, that this weapon had been used, and didn't understand the complexity of...of future threats. I still think that Truman made the right decision, to drop the bomb on Hiroshima. Whether it was necessary to drop the second bomb on Nagasaki, is still, and will always be debated. The fact that the terror, or horror, of even a relatively small atomic weapon was demonstrated vividly, not only induced the Japanese to end the war, much earlier than it would have been ended, and saved far more lives than were lost in the explosion itself, but also I think, has branded the human consciousness, with the horrors that would be attendant on a future nuclear exchange between us and the Soviet Union, and I

think that lesson has...has been a major factor in convincing the leaders, in both super powers, to pursue a nuclear arms control, even when, sometimes, the course of the negotiations, was quite frustrating or quite difficult.

(question)

Well, the awareness of what nuclear weapons could do, was obviously a major factor in my own determination to conclude a SALT agreement with the Soviet Union.

(question)

Well I hope presidents of the future, will learn, as I did, the importance of nuclear arms control, the importance of using diplomacy in negotiation, intead of belligerency, and armed forces as a threat, to deal with regional disputes. We'll see how valuable it is to our nation's prestige, and influence, and well-being, to honor human rights among people throughout the world. We'll see the environmental quality,in its most generic and broad sense, affects, not only the lives of people, who...whose soil cannot produce enough food for them to eat, and who have no shelter, and who have horrible conditions of health and early death, but also directly affects the...the country that we call our own. So, in a broad range of issues, my hope is, that history will show that we acted properly, not always with complete success, but that our motivations were compatible with the ethical and moral standards of our country, the vision of our forefathers, and that, in many

cases, we were quite successful in showing that these efforts could be fruitful. Who knows, about what the future will bring, but I think, that as I learned from the successes and failures, and attempts of my predecessors, my own struggles to create a better nation, and a better world, will be helpful to those who come in the future.

(CUT)

(CR #34 A&B...sound 26)

(unintell)

I know...I figured you were working by the hour, or something, just wanted to drag this...

(laughter)

(question)

When I gave my inaugural address, in 1977, I tried, in a very brief statement, to outline some things of the future, and also when I gave my farewell address, as I prepared to leave office four years later, I did the same thing. One of the obvious, and not very pleasant facts, is that although the United States is the most powerful nation on earth, it can't dominate others, there's a limit on our power, and there needs to be an accommodation of this fact, by using persuasion, and by setting examples, rather than by trying to force other people, through exertion of economic, or military means, to comply with our own desires, sometimes, contrary to their own best interests. So, that's one lesson we've learned,

that will have to be faced in the future, is a...a limit on the power, and influence of the United States. That's not an easy thing for Americans to accept. Another very important factor is, that whether our nation, and its people accept it or not, a desire for increasing human rights, is...is the wave of the future. People whocannot shape their own destiny, who cannot choose their own leaders, who cannot own property without its being confiscated by the government, who remain in constant fear of being arrested or incarcerated without trial, not even understanding the charges against them, fear of being tortured in prison, or even being murdered by one's own government, these fears among many people on earth are very real, and, our country will be best served, if we acknowledge this fear, this desire for enhanced freedom and human rights, and in effect be the champion of it. Therein lies a tremendous unexplored potential benefit, for our country and its principles and moral values. The threat of nuclear destruction is going to be with us. We've got thousands, and thousands of... of nuclear weapons now, far more destructive than the ones that we used on Japan at the end of the Second World War, and...and both the Soviet Union, and the United States are...are madly adding to these arsenals, in a highly costly, and unnecessary way. I think there's going to be increasing pressure, within Europe, and within the United States, and in other nations, for these two superpowers to go back to the negotiating table, regardless of

what the difficulties might be, and persist in trying to reach agreements that would result in a substantial reduction in...in these nuclear arsenals. That's going to be a constant matter on the agenda of the future. One that hasn't yet been explored adequately, is...is how the population explosion of the world, is forming an ever more serious cycle of poverty, and deprivation and...and discontent, among the people in Latin America, in Africa and in Asia. As the population grows, more is demanded of the land, it becomes eroded, the high cost of oil, and the lower income results in people cutting down the trees to...to heat their homes, or...or cook their food. The destruction of the trees means more erosion, and one of the unfortunate truisms of sociology is, that the poorer a family is, and the more uncertain the family is about the future, the more children they will have, and this ever increasing cycle, is already being felt, with a world of debt that will never be paid, by the poorer nations on earth, and by the outbreak of revolution, as people become despairing about how their lives are going to be improved, or even kept at the same level... for quality. There is another threat to our country, that comes more indirectly from this fact, and that is, that as people become frustrated, with the satisfaction of their own basic, human needs, they'll tend to turn away from democratic governments, to the more authoritarian governments, that can act instantaneously, and when someone is faced with the choice of freedom and democracy on one

hand, and a loaf of bread for a starving family on the other, they tend to forget political philosophy, and tend to meet their own human needs, so this is a threat to democracy itself, if we don't address these kinds of questions. Those are the kinds of future challenges, or, you might say opportunities for our nation, that to me are obvious, and will have to be faced by future presidents.

(question...direction)

(2) In spite of the tremendous challenge that presents itself for the future, I don't envision that...the office of the presidency being changed in a profound, or revolutionary fashion in the future. The people will begin to demand presidents who are willing to face the complexity of issues, and not govern with simplistic, or political slogans. The people will be trying to demand a president who will recognize the worldwide implications of land erosion and the population explosion, and other environmental questions. The people will tend to demand a leader in the White House, who will emphasize peace, and good will, diplomacy, negotiation, nuclear arms control, instead of belaboring real, or imaginary adversaries, so, I think that the attitude of the presidents will change in the future, as these issues that I've described become more pertinent, and more pressing, but...but I don't really see any need for the office of the Presidency to be expanded in scope or authority, much more than it is now, and...I am convinced, from experience, that in time of...of unforeseen crises, the

president has enough authority. In time of an evolutionary crisis, sometimes it's better for a reluctant president to be prodded by the American public, than by the members of Congress, and by the news media, so...I don't want to see the president being so powerful in his office, that...that these pressures for accommodation of change can be resisted successfully. A president can be too powerful. We don't need a dictator in this country, who can autocratically say, this is the way it's going to be, and...and be impervious to criticism, or comment, or forced political change. We need a presidency that's malleable, and flexible enough, not only to deal with problems, from the initiative of the White House but also to deal with problems, sometimes, when the president is reluctant, if the Congress or the public is wiser, or more perceptive, than the president might be.

(CUT)

(end SR #11A)

# # #

Vision Assoc. - Prod #825 - President - SR #12A

(CR #35 A&B...sound 27)

(question)

(1) Well if I could write a history book for 100 years in the future, I'd like for my own efforts to be characterized under the heading of Human Rights, and Peace. I was proud to keep a strong nation, constantly improving its own military capabilities, but at the same time, husbanding those military strengths and usually...and using them to bring peace to other people, not just to ourselves, and to improve the quality of life, of those who are suffering from persecution. So I think those two issues, peace and human rights, are the ones that would make me most proud.

(question)

(2) Well, as a candidate, as a governor before that, and then as a President, I acted in accordance with my engineering training, and with some scientific background, so I assessed all the challenges that our nation faced, all the opportunities for improvement, I placed those in an order of priority, and then chose the ones that I thought were most important for me to address. In domestic affairs, I wanted to deregulate the private sector, the Free Enterprise system, to let it be more competetive, and to protect the well being of consumers. In addition, I wanted to resolve the energy crisis, and to lessen the excessive

dependence on foreign oil, which threatened the very security of our nation. I wanted, also, to let the American people have embedded in their consciousness, a need for higher commitment to environmental quality, and to see the threats that existed to our people's health and happiness, from the encroachment...unwarranted encroachment on the quality of our air, land, our lakes and other water, and this was a kind of a domestic agenda that I had. In international affairs, I wanted to maintain peace between ourselves and other nations. I wanted to emphasize, and work toward an agreement on nuclear weapons with the Soviet Union. I wanted to extend the diplomatic relations of our nation, with other peoples on Earth, with the People's Republic of China being at the top of the list. In addition I wanted to protect and promote human rights, and let our nation be known as a champion of freedom and democracy, and the quality of life that comes with liberty. These kinds of goals were shaped very clearly in my mind, long before I was ever inaugurated president, and we persisted in these efforts, and, in general, at least had partial success. I wanted to bring complete peace to the Middle East, we brought a partial peace, but we set a basis of negotiating technique, and also some documents that will be crucial in the future, when another peace initiative might be successful. There were some unforeseen developments that afflicted our administration, the most serious of which was the revolution in Iran. Nobody ever dreamed that the revolution

would be successful, that the Shah would be overthrown, that world energy supplies would be totally interrupted for a while, from that particular area, and that we would have a...a wave of inflation, brought about by oil prices being more than doubled in one year, and of course the siezing of our hostages brought about the most difficult and crucial challenge for us, how to handle this with...with reticence, in a responsible way, how to get our hostages free, and keep them safe, without precipitating a war in the Persian Gulf region, that might extend its effect on a world wide basis. So, we didn't succeed in a...in a graphic way in getting the hostages free, they ultimately came home, and we didn't succeed in totally correcting the energy question, or bringing peace to the mid-east, but we had some other successes and, I was pleased at the record of our administration.

(question)

In many ways, the public express...expects...in many ways the public expects a President to have simple answers for complicated problems. The public wants to avoid the complexity of issues. The public likes to believe that our nation is all-powerful, that there is no limit on what we can achieve. On occasion, unfortunately, the public even wants to see our nation use its military forces, even against a small and relatively helpless nation, just to show, in a tangible way, America is...might. The public also wants to postpone decisions that require some sacrifice, like

in the correction of environmental defects, and...and a president can take this easy way out, and for a limited period of time this can be a very popular thing to do, but in the long run, the great presidents whom I've admired in the past, did not evade issues... they did not mislead the public, they didn't oversimplify a complex question, or claim answers when they didn't have them. They didn't necessarily use belligerence as a substitute for diplomacy and they were willing to take the blame for partial successes, or even mistakes. So, I think that it's difficult for any president to shape a current administration, just by the experiences of his past. Each president brings to the White House, a different attitude, and a different concept of his own role, a desire to expand his authority and power, and responsibility, or to avoid addition authority, power and responsibility. Some come to the White House determined to cooperate with the Congress, and look upon this as a welcome interrelationship. Some come to the White House with a feeling that Congress is inherently an adversary, with whom political combat is the only alternative. So, there's such a wide variation among presidents, that this variation far transcends the evolutionary changes that take place within the presidency itself by modifications in the law, or even by changes in domestic, or international society.

(question)

Yes, I...I think every president, in a way, tries to excel,

and...and tries to leave behind, a legacy that can be admired. I think everyone tries to improve the quality of life in our own country, and to enhance the influence and prestige, of the United States, on a world wide basis. Every president is a political animal, to a...a certain degree, some more than others, and there's a desire to be popular. This is inevitable, and it's not un...a trait to be condemned, or deplored, so there...there is often though, a mixture...there is often, though, a mixture of responsibilities, one is to be admired, and loved. On the other hand, there's a need to be bold, innovative, to take necessary steps, or make difficult decisions, even that you know will be unpopular, and the great presidents have done the latter. They've done what was right and they've taken the political consequences. The weak presidents have done what was popular, and the future consequences have damaged the nation that they were elected to serve.

(CUT)

(CR #36 A&B...sound 28)

(1) The presidency of the United States, is an office of great power, and great prestige, and great concern...great interest, great admiration, sometimes great trepidation and fear, and those are...expectations, as one looks at the President, are either realized, or become disappointments, depending upon the man who's in there, and how he addresses a momentous issues, that have to be decided by him, and those who work with him in our national

capitol. The office of the Presidency, has been adequate, and the foresight of our founding fathers, is astonishing to someone who's served in the White House. As you read the paragraphs that describe the role of the President, his relationship with the Congress, and with the courts, his responsibilities and powers as commander-in-chief of all the military forces, the most powerful military forces on Earth, you see very clearly there, that whether carefully designed or not, that the office has been permitted to grow, and to evolve, and to be strengthened, over a period of generations in our country. This growth, and expansion, in the power and influence of the presidency, has been brought about, not by a redefinition of what the office is, by outside forces, by Supreme Court rulings, or Congressional laws, but by the attitude and will of the Presidents who've served us, seeing a transient challenge, or a temporary crisis, dealing with it strongly, and effectively, so effectively that the admiration for what he has done becomes embedded in the laws of our country, and in the customs that prevail over his successors, is how the office is grown. These crises don't have to be domestic or...in nature. They don't have to be simple, or easily defined, they don't have to be crises that unanimously accepted as challenges requiring presidential action. The President can, in effect say, this is a crisis with which I will deal, in an innovative, unprecedented way, and I'll let history, or subsequent actions by Congress, or the Courts discern whether I have acted

properly. In most cases, the President has acted wisely, and properly, and has established a new realm of influence, or power, or responsibility for the office that he holds. No one could have envisioned, 200 years ago, that the United States would be the dominant world leader, but in that period of time, the President has become, not only the leader of our country, but to a substantial degree, the pre-eminant leader of the world, and with that leadership, there must be a realization, that you have to lead, you can't drive people, you can't force your will on others, there has to be a substantiality about what you decide, a justification for your decisions, particularly if they are innovative, or unprecedented, so that observers will say this was right. This was needed, this was proper, this has added to our nation's greatness. This has expanded the office of our president in a proper way. The president is a partisan politican, but in most cases, particularly in moments of great stress, or trial, or crisis, all Americans want to see the president succeed, and forge for them a better life. Forge for our nation, more strength and security. Enhance our nation's role as it sets the example for others. So, the... the forces that surround the offices of the President, have been conducive to strong leadership, and have, in effect, been an encouragement to presidents not to be timid, but to look upon themselves with an element of self-confidence, and the...an element of agressiveness, and not timidity, and reticence, in shaping what

our country is, at the time, and what our nation might be in the more distant future.

(question)

Well, for at least four years, I had planned for, and campaigned for the office, and even before that, had been an avid student of American history, as focused around the President himself. I had read, not only history books, but biographies, and in some cases, private papers, that described the role of a President, as our nation negotiated, or dealt with other countries, or as crises of a domestic nature had to be faced. So when I finally was elected, with great feeling of gratitude and relief, and then began to prepare for inauguration, it was a...a constantly sobering experience and then finally to walk into the Oval Office, as the President, and feel the responsibilities that were now on my shoulders, of war and peace, of hope or despair, of...of confidence or...or of trepidation, for a quarter of a million...hope or trepidation for a quarter of a billion people. It...it was a sense of...it was with a sense...(pause)...it was with a sense of...of determination, of humility, of gratitude, of prayer, that I would measure up to the task, and I never felt that I acted on behalf of my nation with a carefree spirit. I enjoyed being President, each day I looked forward to getting to the Oval Office, even when I knew that day held some disappointments in store, or some questions I couldn't answer, I still was eager to get there, and welcomed the responsibility,

but I also was constantly restrained, and sobered, by the fact that the decisions that I made, were extremely important for millions of people in my country, and also around the world. One of the things that I learned quite early, was that the more difficult decisions had to be made alone, because those are the decisions where opinion is sharply divided, and you get about the same amount of advice on each side, half say yes, half say no, and ultimately the President has to decide, should it be yes, or no, and that loneliness of the oval office, is also an integral element, if a president is willing to address those controversial, extremely important and history-shaking decisons with courage.

(question)

(end SR #12A)

# # #

Vision Assoc. - Prod #825 - President - SR 14A

(wild track)

Our country is the greatest, and strongest on Earth, and a president is chosen by all the people in this nation, to lead and a president is a very powerful man, or woman. I think that the main thing that the president has to remember, though, is that he's not a commander who tells the people of this country what to do, or who tells other people around the world, what to do, he's really a servant, he's kind of a number one servant of the people of the United States, and although he has great power, in the office itself, he has to share that power with a lot of other people, with members of the Congress, with people in our Courtrooms, with judges, with governors and mayors, with county officials. This whole country kinda ties together, with its political system, to make a team, that represents, and needs, and serves the people of our country. The president, though, is the only one who is the Commander-in-Chief of our military forces. He gives orders to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the U.S. Marines, and tells them what to do. In a time of crisis, this could mean the life or death of our nation as we know it, so this is a very important and sobering responsibility for a president, but one of the main duties of a president is to avoid war, and...and when the president sees a situation in the world that might involve our country in combat, and result in death and destruction, the president has

a responsibility to try to remove those causes of war, to let people understand each other better, to bring them to the negotiating table, and let them discuss their problems or their differences, to get to know one another, and to see that they themselves, and we...and others on earth, are better served by peace, and cooperation, and concern, rather than hatred, and war and killing and bloodshed. We have, in the world, other countries that compete with us. They're like an opposing football team or basketball team, they see things in a different way. This...people in the Soviet Union, the Russians, they're different from us but they also want peace. They want a better life for their people, and we have to recognize that there're going to be differences that we might compete with them, on occasion, but that we share the same world. And we share the same opportunities for progress, and for a better life. The President, in addition to serving as Commander-in-Chief and dealing with foreign nations, also has to be responsible for the life and the well-being of people in this country, so I would say that an important duty is to give the people of this country a better life, and to protect the things that we've inherited from our forefathers, and to give our children and grandchildren, an even better America, with pure air, pure water, outdoors, parks, streams that are beautiful, that we can have vacations, have a good time, and see the beauties of nature. This is a responsibility of a President. A president is also, very much aware, of the fact

that not all Americans are as lucky as others. Some are not rich, they don't have nice homes, their parents didn't get a good education, sometimes they don't have, even, a good job, if they want to work, they can't find good work, so a president has to look constantly at those people who need a better chance in life, to stand on their own feet, to take care of their own needs, to grow, to expand, to stretch their minds, and to stretch their hearts, to learn more about God's Earth, to learn more about other people, and to live a fuller life. So...are presently responsible foreducation, for health care. A president is responsible for better housing, better roads and highways. A president is responsible for the interrelationships, a president is responsible for how people deal with each other, whether they can understand one another, whether they can work in harmony, or whether they might be divided between themselves, even in this country, so...this is another responsibility of the president. A president has to look back on the history of our nation, he has to be, not only a teacher, to explain complicated issues to the American people, but he also has to be a student, to learn from the past, to study changing times, and to prepare, as best he can, for the years ahead. A president must always be very eager, to preserve the freedom that we enjoy in this country, the right of each individual American not to be restricted unfairly, just because one might be black or poor or a woman, and...or young, to make sure that every American, regardless of background, or race, or religion, or creed, has an equal opportunity to survive, and to

live, both prosperously, and to live a pleasant life, so when any danger comes to the freedom of our people, the president has to be on guard, and...to remove those dangers. Our country is so great and strong, that other people on earth look at us, with admiration, and also with respect, and sometimes they look to us for leadership. It's hard for Americans to believe, but there are people on earth, who fear their own government, who are arrested and put in jail, when they are innocent. They're kept in prison without trial, sometimes they're even tortured, or killed by their own government, and...the president of the United States has a responsibility to speak for those persecuted people, to let the world know, that here in this country, that innocent people being hurt, by their own government.

(question)

It happens because everybody hasn't gotten to the same stage that we have found in this country. They've not been given a nation that was formed on the basis of justice and equality and freedom, and democracy. The people in some countries, don't have the right to chose their own leaders. The leaders take power, away from the people, by using their own military means, or their own strength, and in effect their...they cheat their own people out of their rights, that a human being deserves, and...and when this does happen, if no one speaks for those persecuted people, then their needs can't be met, and they can't be freed from the suffering

that they endure, and, if we are silent, then our great country, if the President is silent, when he knows that the basic human rights of people in other nations,..(cough)...if he knows that the basic human rights of people in other nations are being taken away, then there is no voice, to speak for those people who suffer. So, in many ways a president is not only a leader for Americans, he's also a leader...(cough)...the president is also a leader for people who don't live in our country. Another fear that exists around the world, is of the threat of nuclear weapons, weapons that are so powerful, that if a war should break out, and those weapons should be used, it might destroy all life on earth. This is a responsibility that's shared by everyone, but it's a responsibility that falls most heavily on the shoulders of a president, and so there is a need to understand our potential enemies, and to make sure that they're changed, from enemies, to friends. There's a need to communicate with them, and to talk to them so that we can reduce the enormous storehouses of weapons that have nuclear explosives, so that over a period of time, we can have smaller and smaller arsenals of nuclear weapons, and eventually eliminate the threat of nuclear destruction, from the face of the earth. None of these tasks, or duties, or responsibilities of a president are easy ones, because...if a question is easy to answer, or if a problem is easy to solve, it'll be solved in the individual homes in our country, or maybe at the County Court House, or the City Hall,

or in the State Capitol, or when a problem is so important, and so complicated and difficult that it can't be resolved in a city or a state, then it eventually winds up in the Oval Office, where a president works, and a president then has to examine that problem, seek all the advice he can get, meet with the members of the Congress, private citizens who have a special interest, make a decision about what ought to be done for our country, and then convince the people of our nation, that his decision was a wise one, and then after that, perhaps, new laws have to be passed, to make sure that that decision is put into effect, and kept their permanently, so that that problem, once solved, stays solved forever, and doesn't continue to arise, over and over again.

(question)

Its not easy for a president to know that a decision is always right. There has to be a willingness on the part of a president, to trust others, as well as himself, to seek advice from others. There has to be a knowledge that our very wise forefathers who founded this country, had a system of checks and balances, where the president could not make a decision that may be unwise, and force it on others. There has to be a close inter-relationship, a sharing of responsibility, among the president, the members of Congress, and the federal Courts System, where judges, members of Congress, and the President, share, over a period of time, responsibility for the same decision. If the president makes an unwise

judgement, or one that's not good for our country, then the Congress is there to check on what the president decides, and maybe to change it,.or if the president and the congress make a decision that's not wise or fair, then the federal courts say no, this is not the right thing to do. You'd have to change your decision, or you can't put that decision into effect. There is also another way to make sure that the president doesn't make an unwise or damaging decision, and that is, that outside Washington, there are 50 governors, and 50 state legislatures, and literally thousands of cities and towns and counties, each one has its own leaders, and those leaders are constantly observing what the president has decided, and what the Congress has decided, and...and they are close to the people who are receiving services from the government, and if the government doesn't deliver good services, then the complaints come into Washington, and the president has to say, well I made a mistake, or we have not done enough, or we have answered this question in a...in an improper way, or our answers to this question were not wise, we'd better take another look, and do it better. So, our country, over a period of more than 200 years now, has constantly improved itself, by adjusting to changing times, by correcting mistakes that have been made, by sharing experiences under the...under our open democratic system, where every person in this country has a voice, and over a period of time, the election results have been a show...or the election results have indicated or have shown...the election

results have shown how the people feel, and what their basic needs are. And presidents, and members of congress, and others in the government have to respond.

(question)

It's hard to be president, yes. But it's also hard to be a good schoolteacher, and it's hard to make a good pair of shoes or a good piece of furniture. It's hard to be a good farmer, and so the challenge of being a good citizen, exists for almost everyone, but when a president has a task, they're obviously more complicated and more important than the tasks, or responsibilities of most citizens, and this is where our country puts the president through a good training program, because most people, when they get to be president, have already served in the Congress, or they've already served as a governor of a great state, and they've also had to go to people throughout this nation, Hawaii, Alaska, Georgia, Massachussets, Iowa, Texas, and so forth, to...to say, I want to be your president, look me over, listen to what I have to say, ask me questions, and observe my answers, and you have a...a lot of good people, each election year, who want to be president, and they present themselves in a very competitive way, to the American people, and then a judgement is made about who the American people prefer, and then that process of looking for votes, or looking for supporters, or becoming president, those who want to be president, learn a lot about this country, because they have to go to different places

they have to learn things that they never would have known otherwise, so being a president is not...is not an easy job, but it's an exciting, challenging job, and it's a source of great pride to be holding the highest elective office, in the greatest nation on earth.

(question)

It's a lot easier to make war, than it is to keep peace. To make war, you just have to issue an order. To the military forces, to take action against someone else. To make peace, you have to realize that the opinion of others, who seem to be enemies, must be considered.Y...youhave to create a sense of mutual trust, so that people who seem to be enemies and who are filled, perhaps with hatred, can at least begin to talk to each other, and to listen, is even more important than talking, and as people of different nations learn about one another, they began to see, well maybe I was not all right, and maybe those other people were not all wrong, maybe there's some common ground on which we can agree, and maybe those things on which we disagree can be changed. Maybe there's some compromise that can be reached, and there may be some permanent disagreements that can't ever be eliminated, but we'll just have to live with those differences, and maybe even compete with each other, but instead of competing with guns, and bombs, and rockets, we'll compete in a peaceful way, and I think that whenever our nation competes in a peaceful way, we have all the

advantages on our side. Whenever our nation competes in a peaceful way, we have all the advantages on our side. Because people around the world like freedom, they like democracy, they like productive land, they like competition within a country. They like a nation that guarantees the freedom of speech, and the freedom of worship, and the right to move from one place to another, and the right to communicate, and to share experiences, the right to organize, the right to change things, the right to vote, so what our nation has to offer, is very attractive to other people on earth, and so when we compete peacefully, we have a pretty good guarantee that the United States will do very well, and in that competition, with others, what we learn, and sometimes in the competition, some of our own weaknesses are becoming...And sometimes in the competition with other people, our own weaknesses become clear, and we can say well, here's a way that we can improve our nation, which is already great, and make it even more great, so...competition within our country, and even in other nations, if done in a peaceful way, can be very beneficial.

(question)

The first duty of a president, is to guarantee the security of our country, to make sure that the United States is not destroyed, or that our way of life, is not changed by the power of another nation, and in order to do this, our country has always maintained

a...a very strong military force. On some occasions, our military force has had to be used, and...when they have been used, they have been very effective, and...and it's very important for our people, and for those around the world who might challenge the United States to know, that we are militarily strong. Every president has guaranteed that no other nation would be stronger than us, strong enough to treat us as a bully, strong enough to threaten us with destruction, or strong enough to impose their will, on this country, so...it's very important for a president to keep our nation strong, but to use that strength, not as a bully ourselves but to preserve the peace, to improve the quality of life of our own people, and also the guarantee freedom, and to improve the life of people in other countries.

(question)

(silence)

(end SR #14)

# # #

Vision - Prod # 825 - President - SR #15A

(question)

(beep)

(question)

I think you're underestimating...eighty or ninety...

(direction)

You ready?

(direction)

Well, the children of this country, as do their mothers and fathers, look upon the President, as not only a leader, but a spokesman for our nation. What the President says, is basically what our nation says, and what the President does, has to be done so that the lives of those children will be...will be better in the future. The PResident has to deal with the same kind of things that affect children, as well as adults. How good is your school? How good a place do you have to live? Do your parents have an adequate...have a good job? Is the stream near your home good to swim in, or to fish in? So, a President has to deal with those kinds of practical things, and also with the future. Are the children going to have a world at peace? Or a world at War? Is the world going to be filled with hatred, or is it going to be filled with concern and love for one another? In most cases, the decisions that a President makes, affect all the people of this country, regardless of age, and...I think

that it's important for the children to recognize that decisions made by a president, and what the president does, can give them a better life, if the decisions are wise. In addition, a president listens very carefully to the voices of children, and their...and the voices of children quite often express questions, that are ignored by their parents, or overlooked by their parents, and as a president, I was always very eager to hear what Amy had to say, and what Amy had to say about their own life, how good was the lunch in school, were their teachers giving them what the children wanted? Were all the kids in the classroom being treated as individuals? Did the slow children have a chance to catch up? Were the faster learners held back, or not challenged? How did people treat the black kids, who happen to be a small group in a school where most of the students were white? So these sort of questions, that are the concern of...of small children, are also the concern of a president.

(CUT)

(direction)

(end SR #15A...work track for "If I Were President")

# # #