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August 14, 1976

Jimmy Clifton
A-1, USA 5165, Box 8174
Fort Gordon, GA 30905

Dear Mr. Clifton:

Thank you for your kind letter and continued interest in the Carter campaign. I have enclosed a complete set of our issues papers.

Unfortunately, we have no copies of the magazine: Jimmy Carter - Georgia's Governor for a New Political Season, or Vote for Jimmy Carter pamphlets. You may be able to obtain bumper stickers and other campaign items through local campaign headquarters.

If you have any further questions or comments, please do not hesitate to write again, and who knows, maybe we will have some "Republicans for Carter" bumper stickers.

Sincerely,

Neil S. Sader
Issues Staff

NSS/stc

Enclosures
Dear Dr. Cardon:

Thank you for your recent letter concerning the Treasury Small Business Advisory Committee on Economic Policy.

I welcome your interest in the Committee and your suggestion that a representative of the community of small, technologically-based companies be included among its members. Presently, all positions on the Committee have been filled. We do anticipate that vacancies and planned turnovers will occur. We will, therefore, retain your letter to assure that the community of small, high-technology companies is given serious consideration for membership when an opening occurs.

In the meantime, I have requested that you be provided with copies of the minutes of Committee meetings, and I encourage you to share with the Committee your thoughts and recommendations concerning any of the issues considered.

Thank you again for your interest in the work of the Committee.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

William E. Simon
August 26, 1976

Mr. Thomas Bootz
918 W. Parkway Boulevard
Appleton, Wisconsin  54911

Dear Mr. Bootz:

Thank you for your interest in the campaign. Mr. Carter has referred your letter to me. Please excuse the delay in response. We have been trying to catch up with a large work backlog.

Mr. Carter feels that the economic problems of unemployment and inflation should receive highest priority, in his administration. In order to accomplish these goals, he will encourage voluntary attempts by labor and management to hold down increases in wages and prices, including federal employees. The benefits of restraint will pay off in greater prosperity for all Americans.

Your support of Mr. Carter's commitment to bringing integrity to government is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jerry Jasinowski
National Issues & Policies

JJ/bt
May 28, 1976

Dr. Samuel Z. Cardon, President
American Association of Small Research Companies
c/o General Technical Services, Inc.
8794 West Chester Pike
Upper Darby, PA 19082

Dear Dr. Cardon:

We want to express our deep appreciation for your support of S. Res. 104, granting legislative authority to the Select Committee on Small Business. The resolution, as you may know, passed the Senate on April 29 by a vote of 71 to 12, and will become effective at the beginning of the 95th Congress in January, 1977. This overwhelming vote, we believe, is indicative of the importance individual Senators attach to the small business area of our economy.

Our new legislative status will help provide the authority and the impetus the committee needs to meet the special problems of small businessmen and women and, additionally, will assure greater access to the legislative process in the Senate.

We look forward to hearing from you whenever you feel we can be of assistance in any endeavor which would further the interests of the nation's small business community.

Sincerely,

William D. Hathaway
United States Senator

Gaylord Nelson
Chairman

Bill Brock
United States Senator
Sept 1, 1976
Noel

Dear Ms. Egenstat,

Here is a copy of a draft proposal "Revitalizing the Space Program" that is presently being discussed with a small group of opinion leaders in this area of opinion.

It provides a lot more substance for you than I included on the cassette you recently received.

Best with everything,

Alyosha

P.S. Feel free to use it any way it may be helpful.

Alyosha. 2824 Scott Street. San Francisco, CA. 94123. 415/563-0934
September 11, 1976

Dear Carter for President Committee,

May I suggest that before the American public votes for their next President, their knowledge of pertinent factors might be improved if someone could investigate why, under the Ford Administration, our federal energy agencies are refusing to authorize the testing of the most cost-effective alternate energy systems (according to their figures), sited in the best of all locations: Which would be wind energy systems attached to tall buildings in which people could live within elevator range of their jobs and schools. (Actually, I suppose, a President from Michigan cannot be expected to be in favor of a development specifically intended to reduce the necessity for people to own and operate automobiles.)

If I could interest someone up there to look into this question, could I further suggest that your investigator start with a quick review of the inclosed material.

Tony Butler 2
3224 Timmons La., 136
Houston, Texas 77027

P.S. Also, I would like to suggest that the energy agency feds seem to be concentrating their efforts in part at restricting the issuance of patents in this particular field of energy systems.
**LETTERS**

Independent inventors

In evaluating "Whatever Happened to Independent Inventors" (SN: 7/23/76, p. 60) a significant factor may have been overlooked. From my former firing line of electro-mechanical research the change over a number of recent years in the training and attitude of many young people entering this field brought the conviction that this result was inevitable. The ability to break away from the traditional and successfully develop the innovative requires a high degree of individualism, an appreciation of the smallest factors involved in the scientific underpinning and knowledge of what has already been done.

The modern behavioral-motivated effort of our school system from grade one up is to "avoid teaching dull facts in favor of concepts," "encourage creativity by abandoning rote-learning," "promote team action rather than individualism," "abandon the lock-step of unwavering schedules," "eliminate the repressive effect of strict discipline," and ignore the other meaning of "disciplines" in the categorizing of knowledge. I believe the understanding of detailed basic facts must precede appreciation of concepts; that allegedly "dull" facts cannot be adequately fixed otherwise than by rote-learning; that emphasis upon team approach discourages creativity by destroying individualism; and that breaking the lock-step of scheduled learning and abandoning disciplines, in both senses, establishes a new lock-step of lack of unwavering purpose.

Years ago, I noted: "There is nothing sadder than an intelligent graduate who has been so trained that he is unable to function without a five-foot shelf of reference books and a computer terminal; and who, with these, works long and hard to 'invent' many things that were discovered generations ago, studied, and abandoned for sound reasons." I have clear memories of many such cases. I cannot accept that the vast proliferation of highly specialized data must free us from the elimination of effective teaching of primary basic knowledge, which is the unchanged vital foundation of the inventive process.

While I have never discussed this matter with him, I am inclined to believe my friend Jacob Rabminow might concur.

George V. Morris
Sequim, Wash.

You logically noted that it would be unreasonable for you to attempt to "uncritically acclaim" any of the many requests to publicize new inventions which you receive. O.K. But shouldn't it be your position to take note of, and make comment on, huge gains in research activity when federal agencies are apparently actively ignoring, if this could be seriously called into question? If I could command your ear for just a little longer, I would like to suggest that although every efficient wind energy conversion system on which the Energy Research and Development Administration has appropriate data is currently estimated by EDA to be more cost-effective (if properly sited) than any solar radiant energy system on which it has information, nonetheless, EDA is refusing to authorize the actual, physical testing, in prototype form, of any wind system of substantial capacity attached to an urban structure.

What is really dangerous about EDA's ignoring of methodologies that could prove cost-effective right now is that, if EDA continues on—concentrating heavily on dispersed technologies which must all await the day of much higher conventional fuel prices before such new innovations become competitive, this, the competitiveness of distantly located technologies might take forever to manifest itself.

Tony Butler II
Houston, Tex.

Despite your policy statement at the beginning of your article on independent inventors, I am sure that some of your subscribers would like to see a page of 'dead' inventions or original thoughts once in a while in our magazine. I don't believe that this is asking too much.

Human W. Douglas
Clearwater Beach, Fla.

Which is right?

A question: Which is closest to the Milky Way, "Snickers" Galaxy (SN: 11/15/75, p. 309) or Magellanic Clouds (SN: 2/21/76, p. 116)?

Karen R. Mermel
Round Lake Beach, Ill.

(Snickers, if its existence is confirmed. Until then, the Magellanic Clouds are the nearest whose existence is certain.—Ed.)

Address communications to Editor, Science News, 1719 N. Street, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036

**SCIENCE SERVICE**

Institution for the Popularization of Science founded 1921; a nonprofit corporation

Board of Trustees—Nominated by the AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE: Deborah P. Wolfe, Queens College of City University of New York; Bowen C. Dees, The Franklin Institute; Athelstan Spilhaus, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Nominated by the NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES: Gerald F. Tape, Associated Universities; Allen V. Astin, Berkeley; Nominated by the NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL: Gerald Holton, Harvard University; Joseph W. Berg Jr., National Research Council; Adron Rosenthal, Nominated by the JOURNALISTIC PROFESSION: Edward Bliss Jr., American University; Julius Duscha, Washington Journalism Center; O. W. Riegel (Secretary), Washington and Lee University; Nominated by E. W. Scripps Trust: Milton Harris (Treasurer), Washington and Lee University; Edward W. Scripps II (Vice President and Chairman of the Executive Committee); Edward W. Scripps Trust; John Troan, Pittsburgh Press.

Director: E. G. Sherburne Jr.; Assistant Director: Dorothy Schriver; Business Manager: Donald R. Harless; Things of Science: Ruby Yoshioka.
June 29, 1976

Ms. Mary King
Mary King Associates
Suite 511
2000 P Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dear Mary:

Realizing that one of Governor Carter's key campaign issues will be the country's need for some form of national health insurance, I wanted to take this opportunity to acquaint you with the Federation's policy on this subject. As you know, the Federation of American Hospitals is the national trade association representing approximately 1,100 investor-owned hospitals with over 111,000 beds. We share Governor Carter's concern that all Americans have equal access to quality care delivered in the most efficient manner possible.

Governor Carter has recently voiced increasing support for the development of a universal, mandatory program of national health insurance as the most desirable means of achieving this goal. I am sure you agree that an essential prerequisite to the formulation of such a program is an awareness of the various positions of providers, third party payors, and other interested parties. This letter will focus on what we perceive to be the most equitable and efficient means of reimbursing institutional providers. The enclosed testimony covers our positions on financing, administration, and benefits.

We are gratified to see that Governor Carter properly recognizes the current system of retrospective cost reimbursement as being the major cause of inflation in hospital services.

To be sure, any number of other factors make inroads on a hospital's ability to hold the line on patient charges. These factors include labor costs (which typically compose about 60% of a hospital's budget and increase as the federal minimum wage escalates), the high price of new technology and malpractice insurance premiums, and the increased costs of borrowing capital.
Unquestionably, however, the key culprit in the high costs of providing care is the current system of open-ended payment, providing as it does a disincentive to efficient delivery of services.

Once again, Governor Carter is right on target in recommending that rates be set in advance prospectively. The Federation has endorsed prospective payments in endless appearances before this and prior Congresses. And we believe that there is no reason to wait until national health insurance is enacted to implement such a reform in the current payment mechanism. As you are aware, Senator Herman Talmadge has introduced a comprehensive Medicare-Medicaid bill which recommends many needed reforms in those programs. One section of the measure provides for the development of target rates for the payment of institutional providers. Although not strictly a prospective reimbursement scheme, it is an imaginative step in the right direction.

The Federation supports the use of multiple prospective payment methods negotiated and developed in the private sector by providers, third-party payors, and other interested parties, under federal (rather than state) guidelines. The Secretary would be empowered to disapprove agreed upon systems only upon a finding that the methodology is inconsistent with the federal criteria. Providers would have an annual election from at least three approved payment methods, with the election made in advance of the provider's fiscal year.

Prospective payment methods authorized under such a system would have to incorporate certain basic features, including: (1) financial incentives for efficiency, equal to the potential difference between the prospective rate and actual costs; (2) assure providers that their total income will equal their financial requirements; (3) and recognize the total cost of operation to the provider, including costs attributable to approved capital expenditures, costs of approved working capital, and costs due to bad debts. In addition, the payment rate should provide a reasonable rate of return based on total assets that is equal to rates of return on investments of comparable risk for investor-owned facilities.

The Secretary would be authorized to make adjustments to the agreed prospective rate to compensate for such unforeseeable events as natural catastrophies and significant, unexpected changes in demand for services or patient mix not under the hospital's control.
Language virtually identical to that outlined above is presently contained in H. R. 10888, the national health insurance measure introduced by Congressman Young of Georgia. Although we do not support that bill in general, the reimbursement section does have our endorsement. In addition, the same prospective payment language has appeared in the past in H. R. 13870, the national health insurance bill sponsored jointly by Congressman Wilbur Mills and Senator Edward Kennedy in the last Congress, as well as in the Ways and Means NHI draft of August 1974. Finally, it was the gist of a Medicare reform proposal introduced by Congressman Mills two years ago. A copy of his introductory speech is attached.

As you are aware, some national health insurance legislation provides for the establishment of state rate setting commissions to determine health provider charges. We have consistently indicated our opposition to such an approach because it lacks flexibility and relegates provider participation in the reimbursement process to a negligible status. Our hospitals are keenly aware of the fact that patients' charges are rising, due to hospital costs that are increasing for reasons outlined above. But we firmly believe that the most efficient and equitable means of reversing this situation lies in the approach that directs the Secretary of HEW to work in conjunction with providers and third party payors in implementing various schemes of prospective reimbursement.

Since national health insurance in any form will most likely be funded primarily on the federal, rather than state, level, it seems inappropriate to delegate to the states responsibility for determining payment for services rendered under a federal program.

I look forward to working closely with you on this, and many issues confronting the nation's health industry. If I can supply you with any further information relating to the reimbursement option outlined in this letter, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Bromberg
Director, National Offices
Federation of American Hospitals

MDB:rt
Attachment
August 12th, 1976.

Mr. Stuart Eizenstat,
Issues Director,
P.O. Box 1976,
Atlanta, Ga. 30301.

Dear Mr. Eizenstat,

The enclosed material was delivered to our office with the request that it be forwarded to Atlanta, for Governor Carter's attention.

I am putting it in your good hands to take it from here.

Many thanks.

Sincerely,

Irene S. Adrian
Executive Assistant
William J. vanden Heuvel.

Enc.
PERSONAL

Mr. Neil Sader
Carter Campaign Headquarters
P. O. Box 1976
Atlanta, Georgia 30301

Dear Mr. Sader:

Congratulations on a winning primary result. This is the letter I promised would follow after our phone conversation last week.

We are very much interested in meeting with your new staff member who will be assigned to work on the National Health Plan issue. The "we" are representatives of Health Insurance Association of America and the National Association of Life Underwriters. H.I.A.A. represents the 314 companies writing most of America's personal and group health insurance. N.A.L.U. represents over 140,000 professional life and health insurance agents who currently service the present private sector health insurance industry in literally every precinct throughout the U.S.

We are in favor of a federally regulated, private sector administered (state by state) approach to a National Health Insurance plan, and we sincerely believe we can accomplish this goal faster and at less cost to the taxpayer than another federal layer of bureaucracy.

We need to show how this can be accomplished in a fashion satisfactory to Mr. Carter's position and to begin discussions which will produce the result we have so long endorsed -- quality medical attention, for all Americans, at a price they can afford.

-- more

"We represent you"
Mr. Neil Sader  
August 3, 1976  
page 2  

Would you be so kind as to direct our inquiry to the proper person, and let us know what would be a convenient time for him to meet with us in Atlanta.  

Please advise, and thank you.  

Most cordially,  

George A. Corkum  
National Association of Life Underwriters  
Public Relations Chairman  

jad  

cc:  Bill Bartlett, N.A.L.U.  
     Marv Kobel, N.A.L.U.  
     Stuart Eizenstat  
     Robert Froehlke, H.I.A.A.  
     Bruce Hendrickson, N.A.L.U.  
     Stan Stone, F.A.L.U.
August 10, 1976

Mr. George A. Corkum
National Association of Life Underwriters
Fringe Benefit Consultants, Inc.
1995 E. Oakland Park Blvd.
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33306

Dear Mr. Corkum:

Thank you for your letter of August 3. Our health care specialist here on the staff is Mr. Robert S. Havely, and I am certain he will be most appreciative of any information you would send on National Health Insurance.

Our issues specialists are under heavy time constraints, preparing briefings for Governor Carter, beginning work on speeches, and planning position papers. They are consequently unable to attend meetings personally. However, we have established a good system for receiving and handling written submissions from individuals and groups with expertise in important areas, and I am sure Mr. Havely will find your advice and suggestions very helpful.

I am forwarding a copy of this letter to Mr. Havely so that he will be expecting to hear from you. Please contact me again if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Neil Sader
National Issues and Policies

NS:dan
Neil Sader, Issues Staff
% Carter Campaign
Box 1976
Atlanta, GA 30301

Dear Mr. Sader:

I hope you don't get tired of receiving letters from me. However, I hope some of my ideas are worthwhile. Below are some I believe can be useful.

1. Carter must not "lose his temper" at Ford-Dole insults...NEVER!
2. Carter must remind the public that pardons or amnesties, granted or not, WILL NOT relieve unemployment; WILL NOT reduce inflation; WILL NOT rebuild the cities; WILL NOT provide better education for any of our children; and WILL NOT give the farmers of America a decent living.
3. I think the Carter staff should try to get a piece of the film where President Ford appeared before Congress before being sworn in as Vice President where when asked if he would be a candidate for the Presidency he said, "No..." This could be used to counter-act any claims that Carter changes or "lies."
4. The more Ford-Dole bring up the pardon issue; Carter should, besides state what's in number 2 above, remind the voters that immediately after becoming President, Ford, himself, had some sort of amnesty program: "...I want them home..." he said!
5. Throughout the campaign and debates, Carter should continue to say that Ford is an honest and decent man. In fact, the more personal and bitter the Ford-Dole camps get, the more appraisal of Ford's character and honesty the Carter camp should give.
6. The Nixon pardon and Watergate should be written off as things of the past and best forgiven. The future, not the past, should be the main campaign theme.
7. Let Ford-Dole be the mudslingers; let them evade the issues; let them put their feet in their mouths.
8. If the Ford-Dole camps say Carter's programs are socialistic...respond, "Prove it!"
9. If members of the GOP say how great Ford is, ask them if so, why did nearly half his party want to "dump" him?

I hope these come in handy in some sort of way. If they spur better ideas, having written them will have been worthwhile.

Sincerely yours,

Jimmy Clifton
August 26, 1976

Mr. Neil Sader
Issues Staff
Jimmy Carter Presidential
Campaign Headquarters
Atlanta, Ga.

Dear Mr. Sader,

Enclosed is a photograph of a chart I prepared while researching JFK's assassination. It is based on the autopsy drawings and an interview with the physician who performed the ballistics tests for the Warren Commission.

The reason I am sending you this information, is that my conclusion about the source of the shots is that a remote controlled weapon was mounted in the trunk of President Kennedy's limousine. At first glance you may not see how this could possibly affect Jimmy Carter's candidacy. But I would like to remind you that it was the diligent efforts of congressman Gerald Ford who pointed the Warren Commission into accepting Lee Harvey Oswald as the assassin. I want to urge that Jimmy Carter in the upcoming debates, ask Gerald Ford this question: What do you know about the history of President Kennedy's limousine--SS100X?

His answers, such as within a week of the assassination, the FBI removed the car's windshield to better examine a bullet fragment mark, and within two weeks of Nov. 22, the entire car was remodeled, are not the only answers. He should include the events in Tampa, Florida on November, 18, 1963; President Kennedy angrily ordered his protective agents to keep off the back of the car. President Ford should discuss why on the day before the assassination in San Antonio that no one sat in the jump seat directly in front of President Kennedy--and this seat was occupied by Governor Connally on the day of assassination, and the governor was wounded. Ford should say something about why Mrs. Kennedy climbed onto the trunk after the last shot was fired. He should say something about why the car wasn't made available for the reenactment, and who is behind the organization of Hess-Eisenhardt in Cincinnati, Ohio.

I can furnish you with additional research if you like, but I'd prefer that Ford answer these questions.
I realize the stand made by Jimmy Carter to not discuss Nixon's pardon is an important one. But I wonder if Mr. Carter would change his mind if he saw the events of JFK's assassination and the events of Watergate linked as I see them? Richard Nixon was in Dallas the day Kennedy was shot. Gerald Ford was on the Warren Commission--and became the only President to occupy the White House with out being elected. Of the three times that Nixon ran for the Presidency, each major candidate was shot or slain in the opposing party: 1960- John Kennedy, 1968- Bobby Kennedy, 1972- George Wallace.

I think it is increasingly clear that the real truth behind Watergate was the murder of President Kennedy in 1963. Current events like the disappearance of representative Hale Boggs (a member of the Warren Commission) point to it.

Please ask Jimmy Carter to bring this up during the debates.

Sincerely,

Michael L. Brown

P.S. "Once is happenstance/ twice is coincidence/ three times is definite action."

--Ian Fleming
Dear Jim:

Thank you for dropping by my office today to leave copies of your letters to Robert Strauss and Jack Watson.

Your strong support of Jimmy Carter is very much appreciated, of course, by him as well as each of us who have labored long and hard in Jimmy's campaign and are so thrilled with the progress he is making.

By the time you receive this letter, we should have announced that the National Carter-Mondale Headquarters will be at Colony Square. I know Jimmy and his staff will want to know you while they are here. A number of his advisors have already leased apartments from us for the four month general election which will give us further opportunity to know this outstanding group.

As always, it is a pleasure to have you living with us at Colony Square. Your comfort here is our principle objective as we continue the struggle to bring our "Micropolis" into full fruition.

Best regards,

Mr. James E. Barnett
Colony House West
Apartment 1204
Atlanta, Georgia 30361

JEC/jdd

cc: The Honorable Jimmy Carter
May 10, 1976

If you attended the 1972 American Nursing Home Association Convention in Atlanta, you were addressed by Georgia's Governor Jimmy Carter. He spoke to you about his appreciation for the nursing homes in America, and even though he did not use notes, many were impressed with Jimmy's indepth knowledge of the nursing home industry.

Many years ago, Jimmy gained an appreciation for and understanding of nursing homes by frequent visits to the Plains Convalescent Home in his home town of Plains, Georgia. Jimmy's mother served as administrator of a home near Plains before joining the Peace Corps to serve in India. As Governor of Georgia, he reorganized state government in an attempt to better meet the health needs of all Georgians, and he was always supportive of nursing home programs during his term in office.

We have never had a President that really understood or appreciated the nursing home industry. This lack of understanding has kept us from fully developing services that could be provided to America's disadvantaged elderly. When Jimmy Carter is elected President, America will have a leader knowledgeable of our industry and its problems, and more importantly, one who is open minded about our industry. Jimmy will insure that long term health care will assume its rightful place among governmental health and social programs.

You can play a major part in shaping America's future by supporting Jimmy Carter for President and by actively working on his behalf. He needs your financial help to keep the campaign going. Would you send Jimmy $100 or more and ask a friend to do likewise. Under the Federal Election Campaign Law, there will be no fund raising after the Democratic Convention in July. So, please participate now. Help make our government as great as our people.

Very truly yours,

Member, Jimmy Carter Finance Committee
NURSING HOMES FOR JIMMY CARTER
FINANCE COMMITTEE
P. O. BOX 5, PLAINS, GA.
R. DEAN FOWLER – CHAIRMAN  L. E. GODWIN, TREASURER
(912) 472-7543

BILL LEVINSON, REGION I, CHAIRMAN
MARK TOBIN, MASS.
EUGENE E. TILLOCK, N.H.
RAY GOBEIL, VT.

LABE MELL, REGION II, CHAIRMAN
RAYMOND J. A. LEBLANC, CONN.
MIKE BENNENSON, N.Y.

WILEY CRITTENDON, REGION III, CHAIRMAN
HARVEY HERTLIEB, MD.
NICHOLAS J. RUCCI, MD.
HOMER W. CUNNINGHAM, VA.
HENRY DEGROTE, N.C.
JIMMY AYCOCK III, S.C.
FRED BEENE, TENN.

WILLIAM C. DAVIS, REGION IV, CHAIRMAN
FRANK VERSNICK, KY.
JEFF L. CAMPBELL, W. VA.
E. LEO GLASS, OHIO
GERALD W. THORNSBY, IND.

PHIL WESTBURY, REGION V, CHAIRMAN
DAVID WALKER, MISSOURI

FRED C. LONG, REGION VI, CHAIRMAN
JIM WESTBURY, GA.
HERB ROGERS, FLA.
ROWENA ROGERS, FLA.
JOHN HAGAN, ALA.
ROBERT A. RAYFORD, LA.

TROY ATHON, REGION VII, CHAIRMAN
ROBERT REIGER, KA.
STORMY SMITH, ARK.
EDWARD WALKER, OKLA.
JACK WICKS, N.M.
ROGERS D. WILSON, TEXAS

ED BOND, REGION VIII, CHAIRMAN
EVELYN M. MCCRARY, NEB.
KEN NORGAN, WYO.

GENE BISHOP, REGION IX, CHAIRMAN
DARYL SANDE, MONT.
CAROLYN L. PAVLOFF, WASH.
HARVEY R. YOUNG, ORE.

GERALD BISHOP, REGION X, CHAIRMAN
TOM STUTCHIAN, NEV.
GEORGE SCHOLL, CALIF.
ANN MARKEL, ARIZ.
JOHN HOUSER, ALASKA
Dear Sir:

I am a Federal employee with 20 years of government service. In 1970 the Congress passed the Pay Comparability Act for federal employees. Since that time President Nixon and President Ford have attempted to postpone the pay increase and limit the increase to 5%.

In 1975 we were supposed to get an increase of 8.66%. President Ford succeeded in limiting the increase to 5%.

According to the statistics I have recently read we should get 11-12% this year. President Ford has instituted a new system of determining comparability and according to his figures we should get about 6.5%. He has however, indicated that
This year's increase should also be limited to 5%. Since it is an election year, he may go along with 6.5%.

In view of the rapid increases in the cost of living in recent years and the wage increases won by the Teamsters, Rubber workers etc. I feel this is extremely unfair. How does the government expect to maintain qualified employees?

I would like to know exactly how you feel and what your proposals would be for Federal employees for pay and fringe benefits. I expect to circulate your response to various Federal offices in the state.

I have watched many TV programs that you were on and I believe that I will vote for you regardless of your response since the county urgently needs moral leadership.

Respectfully yours,

Thomas Booth
918 W. Postway Blvd.
Appleton, Wis. 54911
Mr. James Carter  
P. O. Box 1977  
Atlanta, GA  30309

Dear Mr. Carter:

Now that the bill (S.2387) to dismember the oil companies has been moved out of the Judiciary Committee, you'll soon get a chance to consider this issue. I urge you to take a stand against this issue because:

+ There is no reason to believe this bill can possibly help the public or our country.
+ Passage would weaken the major oil companies and their position in the world market.
+ Any bill motivated to arouse the public for political gains is morally wrong.

If you look at the greatness we've achieved over the last 200 years, it is because of the free enterprise system. In our society, big business is not bad, it is the source of power we need to allow our goods to compete in world markets. Ask yourselves what country has a higher standard of living. If you want to help our country, you had better look at the monopoly of big government.

Do you want America's Tricentennial to be a success? You had better think out and implement an energy independence policy. You and I working together can help to formulate a plan to give us another 100 years of growth. Ask your young, capable staff some penetrating questions:

+ What percent of our energy needs does oil supply?  
+ What percent of our oil supply comes from foreign countries?  
+ What impact does importing of oil have on our balance of payments?  
+ What is the production rate of oil vs. the realistic expectation of finding new reserves?  
+ How fast are we developing alternate energy sources?

Have them graph the answers from 1955 through 2005. You'll be very shocked. I hope you share your findings with me and your thoughts about my letter.

Very truly yours,

W. E. Bartz
August 26, 1976

Mr. Eugene R. Black, Jr.
One Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10020

Dear Gene:

I am sorry to be delayed in responding to your letter of July 16th. Thank you for sending me your paper on Foreign Economic Policy. I have forwarded it to Jerry Jasinowiki, our generalist in the field of economics.

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Stuart Eizenstat
National Issues
2nd Policy Director

SE/bt
Mr. Stuart Eizenstat  
Powell, Goldstein, Frazer  
& Murphy  
1100 C&S National Bank Bldg.  
35 Broad St.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dear Stuart:

I am enclosing that position paper we discussed on foreign economic policy, "World Interdependence and Economic Priorities". It is presented in such a way that it could be used as the basis for a speech, or released as a public statement. It is in draft form, and requires additional review by responsible people in the field. Cy Vance has a copy, and I expect to be having lunch with him next week. At a later date, if you wish, I will write you a personal letter enlarging on the theme and making specific recommendations.

I believe this subject matter is very important for two reasons:

(1) With the quieting down of the world's politically troubled areas, over 50% of Secretary Kissinger's speeches, and probably a corresponding amount of his time, have been devoted to international economic questions over the last 18 months. As you know, the new demands of the LDC's, the world recession and the oil cartel disruptions have focused world attention on this whole subject.

(2) This could be a politically vulnerable area for the Governor.

In the attached I have been mindful of Kissinger's statements on this subject, particularly his speech before the UN on September 1, 1975, and his address before the Fourth Ministerial Meeting of the United Nations Conference on Trade & Development in Nairobi, Kenya, on May 6, 1976. I believe the statement attached is somewhat distinctive from the Secretary's approach in the following ways:

...
-- It attempts to place the present international economic scene in more historical perspective.

-- A more global overview is also attempted. It puts more stress than the Administration has on the emerging economic role of the Eastern Bloc and the importance of OPEC's cooperation in stabilizing the international monetary system.

-- It emphasizes a stronger economic alliance with our industrial partners, both for mutual advantage and for invoking sanctions in case of unwarranted economic actions by others. Ford and Kissinger are moving in this direction, of course, with their recent meetings at Rambouillet and Puerto Rico, but not aggressively enough, in my opinion.

-- The paper also stresses the importance of keeping the American public better informed on this subject.

-- It emphasizes the necessity of planning and government reorganization in the foreign economic field.

-- There is more emphasis on America's leading role in international economic matters--and the value of that role to our own self-interest.

-- Finally, there is more discussion of international finance and capital markets, including the role of the private banking system on the growth and well-being of the developing nations.

Good luck and let me know what else I can do for you.

Sincerely,

Encl.

Dear Gene,

I'm sorry to be delayed in responding to your letter of July 16th. Thank you for sending me your paper on Foreign Economic Policy. I have forwarded it to Jerry Jasinski, our generalist in the field of economics. If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know. Sincerely,

[Signature]

S. Eizenstat
Atlanta, Ga.
July 28, 1976

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

Dear Mr. Cabot:

Thank you for your letter of July 6. It occurred to me two of my concept papers on organizational communication and policy sciences might have some relevant ideas for you. I have enclosed them for your use.

The main goal of policy sciences is the improvement of policymaking—making better policies which achieve more effectively established goals and values. Thus the purpose is to help in better policymaking, and not to displace legitimate policymakers and decisionmakers with policy scientists who become "gray eminences."

Bad policies are quite probable for a number of reasons. Therefore, unless policymaking is significantly improved, the probabilities of catastrophe are quite high.

I believe policy sciences, when measured against stiff, pragmatic standards, will prove to be a new, workable strategy for an assault on complexity. For example, on governmental planning one begins with available revenues rather than with programs. Certainly I have no pet or pat solutions to the problems that beset government, but I do offer a method of approach for handling our problems. We can run the new methods in, alongside the overstretched systems that we have—until they are shown to cope.

In order to gain control of government, you will have to manage many different professional and technical people. These people know far more about what they do than any one manager can know. You will not be able to supervise them; you must manage them, because you can't supervise professional and technical people in the traditional sense. You have to figure out how to get the maximum contribution, how to integrate their expertise with the organization.

Both policy sciences and organizational communication are
interrelated concepts and are necessary for effective government policy. The enclosed papers are brief and introductory; but I hope they will be of some use to you and your staff.

Sincerely,

T. Harrell Allen
T. Harrell Allen, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor

THA:sc
Enclosures
Dear Mr. Moore:

Thank you for sending me a copy of your letter to Congressman Rangel requesting that the Congressional Black Caucus investigate conditions in the advertising/marketing industry which constrict and decimate Black participation and ownership.

Having worked in the communications area, I am well aware of the difficulties and practices which exist, and I can fully understand your reaction to them.

I strongly feel that hearings by Congress would be the most effective way to expose existing inequities in the industry, and I would hope that the Caucus would be amenable to encouraging their Congressional colleagues to participate. I feel that the general public would find this type of selective exclusion as reprehensible as any other form of racism.

Thank you for sharing your views with me, and if I can be of any assistance, please let me know.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

JOHN CALHOUN
Special Assistant to the President

Mr. Sanford W. Moore
Black Perspective Incorporation
134 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10016
Mr. Sanford W. Moore  
Black Perspective Inc.  
134 Lexington Avenue  
New York, New York  10016

Dear Mr. Moore:

Thank you for forwarding to me copies of your recent correspondence relating to the advertising and marketing industry. Please continue to keep me informed.

Sincerely yours,

THADDEUS GARRETT, JR.  
Special Assistant to the Vice President

TG:dej
Hon. Charles B. Rangel  
Chairman, Congressional Black Caucus  
107 Cannon HOB  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Rangel:  

January 26, 1976

At the suggestion of the office of Federal Communications Commissioner, Benjamin Hooks, I am requesting that the Congressional Black Caucus initiate a review and investigation of conditions existing in the advertising/marketing industry. Specifically, those conditions which have effectively decimated Black participation and ownership in the advertising/marketing sector.

The virtual exclusion of Black owned advertising agencies has been accomplished by the largest advertising agencies with the full knowledge and participation of many of their corporate and governmental clients. This exclusion has been systematically accomplished through unfair and illegal business practices. In addition, there is a conscious and deliberate attempt on the part of general advertising agencies and their corporate clients to deny, suppress and minimize the true import of Black consumer spending and the actual level of that spending. In essence, the advertising agencies and some of their clients have purposely sought to prevent the following:

1. The recognition and true evaluation of the economic significance, scope and leverage which the national Black consumer community represents.

2. The free competition in and equal access to entrepreneurial and professional opportunities for Blacks in the advertising/marketing industry.

3. The development and growth of Black owned and oriented media by effectively restricting the flow of vital advertising revenues to these same alternative media vehicles.
My firm, Black Perspective Inc., is presently in litigation with Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn Inc. (BBDO), the third largest U. S. advertising agency and some of its clients; Burger King Corporation, Division of Pillsbury Inc., Campbell Soup Company and Schaefer Brewing Company. The case is being handled by Basil Paterson's firm, Paterson, Michael Dinkins & Jones. However, the issues involving BBDO et al, are merely reflective of what has become accepted and established policy in the advertising/marketing industry vis-a-vis Black representation and competition.

In no way, at any point in the advertising/marketing cycle do Black people, Black media or Black advertising agencies profit from or participate in this vital sector on an equitable basis. Black consumers represent some 10% of each and every consumer dollar spent in this country, or some 70 BILLION at current levels. The vast majority of this enormous sum is spent outside the Black community. However, Black consumer and tax dollars are utilized by corporations and governmental agencies for advertising, promotional and other marketing programs. The total amount currently spent in advertising is some 32 Billion dollars.

This advertising revenue which is derived from corporate sales and governmental taxes, both of which Black consumers contribute to in a disproportionate degree, is spent in White agencies. These agencies in turn, advertise in and, in effect, subsidize White oriented media. These media then produce White oriented programming and content for the masses of White consumers. Thus, the negative images created for and by White people willfully perpetuate existing negative images of Black people, to Black people. In the final analysis, these media present programming which serves to reinforce and regenerate historically racist values. The limited aspects of a vibrant and creative Black culture which are permitted exposure, exist solely for the economic enrichment of corporate America. One need only examine the exploitative relationship which exists for Blacks in the music and film industries.

Thus, instead of allocating some 10% of all advertising revenues to reach those same Black consumers who account for 10% of all consumer spending; the advertising/marketing combine sees fit to only allocate about .003% of all advertising revenues to Black oriented media. Most of this microscopic sum is spent through White agencies.
Since 1973, of the 8 Black owned advertising agencies in New York, the center of the industry, 6 have been forced to cease operations. Only Zebra Associates, which is a "decoy" owned by a consortium of White agencies and Uniworld Group, are still functioning. Both at best have marginal or worse situations. Even given the obvious intent of establishing Zebra Associates as an example of Black representation in the industry, the agency still has only billings of some 2-3 million. Recently, John F. Small Inc., which in 1973 was the nation's largest Black owned agency with some 9 million in billings, has been forced to suspend operations. Thus, Blacks have been effectively denied participation and representation in one of the nation's largest and most powerful sectors with all the manifest ramifications of that exclusion.

This exclusion has been accomplished in the following ways by the largest agencies and their corporate clients:

1. Suppression and manipulation of Black consumer data and media data to restrict allocation of advertising revenues to Black oriented media.

2. Deliberate use of television and television data to further limit revenues allocated to Black owned and oriented media. Black ownership of television stations is nil.

3. Formation by largest White agencies of "ethnic units" composed of Black employees to prevent Black agencies from competing for Black oriented accounts.

4. The raiding of Black agencies of senior professional staff for the sole purpose of positioning them against independent Black agencies.

5. The deliberate attempt of White agencies to prevent and restrict Black access into the industry on an equal basis. Historically, advertising has been almost a closed industry at any but entry level.
6. Refusal to comply with affirmative action guidelines by preventing development and evolution of Black suppliers in industry related businesses; such as photography, modeling agencies, marketing research, production companies, etc.

These and other historically practiced exclusionary policies by the advertising/marketing combine threaten the very economic, cultural and political survival of the national Black community. Our dollars are constantly drained from our communities and in actuality, represent the profit margin for some of the nation's largest and most prosperous companies. Thus our money, and our labor are constantly being utilized by corporate America to reinforce institutions which not only discriminate against Black people; but, are in essence, openly hostile to any meaningful Black participation.

I've had a series of meetings with the New York office of the Federal Trade Commission relative to the possible anti-trust and/or restraint of trade implications inherent in the policy and practices adopted by the major agencies vis-a-vis Black advertising agencies. It is my belief that the Caucus will see the merit of addressing its attention to the broader issues implicit in the restrictive and illegal practices engaged in by the advertising/marketing industry. Advertising revenue allocation, Black participation and ownership in advertising and media, affirmative action compliance, FCC licenses and agency/client involvement in South Africa are issues which might be explored in an inquiry by the Caucus. The interest of the Caucus would also facilitate and contribute to appropriate actions by other governmental regulatory agencies.

It is truly hoped that the issues which have been delineated will strike a responsive cord among the Caucus membership. With that expectation, it is requested that a meeting be arranged at the convenience of the membership, where a more detailed and documented presentation might be made regarding the issues and allegations contained in this letter. Enclosed, please find some background documents for your review.

Sincerely,

Sanford W. Moore

Enclosures
cc: Hon. Julian Bond
    Hon. Edward Brooke
    Hon. James Buckley
    Hon. Yvonne Burke
    Mr. John Calhoun
    Hon. Shirley Chisholm
    Hon. William Clay
    Hon. Cardiss Collins
    Hon. John Conyers
    Hon. Ronald Dellums
    Hon. Charles C. Diggs Jr.
    Hon. Walter E. Fauntroy
    Hon. Harold E. Ford

    Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins
    Comm. Benjamin Hooks
    Rev. Jesse Jackson
    Hon. Jacob K. Javits
    Hon. Barbara Jordon
    Mr. Vernon Jordon
    Hon. Ralph Metcalfe
    Hon. Parren Mitchell
    Hon. Robert N. C. Nix
    Hon. Louis Stokes
    Hon. Andrew Young
Mr. S.D. Watson  
Chairman of the Board  
Heublein, Inc.  
230 New Park Avenue  
Hartford, Conn.

Dear Sir:  

April 5, 1976

In a recent communication to the Congressional Black Caucus, it was requested that the Caucus initiate a Congressional investigation of conditions existing in the advertising/marketing industry. Specifically, those conditions which have ended effective Black participation and ownership in the advertising/marketing sector.

During September, 1975, Black Perspective, Inc. completed an assignment on Black & White Scotch, initiated by George Edwards, the then V.P., "Special Markets." The assignment was to develop a creative concept for utilization in the Black consumer market. The project was completed and is currently in use, in retail outlets and bars throughout the Black community.

Unfortunately, the aforementioned project was completed under the most distasteful and disrespectful of circumstances for BPI. I would venture to suggest that a white supplier, providing the same services, would not have been treated in a similar manner, nor compelled to function under the same set of conditions as was BPI.

As of this writing, BPI has not even received a copy of the reproduced finished product or received any communication from the Marketing Group regarding the status, utilization and/or effectiveness of the concept among Black consumers. Furthermore, neither BPI or any other Black advertising agency has been given a subsequent assignment by Heublein, Inc. Although, Uniworld Group, the last surviving advertising agency owned by Blacks in New York, has reportedly lost the Smirnoff account, a flagship brand among Heublein's varied product line.

This situation exists, despite the enormous dollar contribution which Heublein, Inc. enjoys from the national Black consumer market. A consumer market which ranks among the top dozen consumer market segments in the entire world.
In large measure, it is Black consumption rates and dollar contributions which account for the extreme profitability of many of Heublein's products in the American marketplace. These same dollars provide the capital and profits for Heublein's corporate expansion, diversification and growth. However, in no way, do these same dollars provide for the economic development and growth of the Black communities from which they are derived; or of the Black consumers who purchase Heublein products.

As is evident, one is not referring to the issue of corporate "social responsibility," but the issue of economic reciprocity. However, even in "social" terms, has corporate America forgotten all those frequent and eloquent "commitments" uttered amid the upheavals of the 1960's.

The Black community, Black people, Black workers, Black banks, Black media, Black advertising agencies, etcetera, etcetera, are constantly reminded that the harsh economic realities of the 1970's prohibit a greater flow of corporate America's dollars into these various channels. We are repeatedly told this in the face of record profits for Heublein, Inc. and many other corporations having significant franchises among Black consumers. I would suggest that there exists a major dichotomy in our perception of reality.

The fact that Heublein, Inc. is currently in favor on Wall Street, should not be attributed to innovative and/or efficient marketing/advertising techniques initiated by management. But, more directly to the fact that Black people heavily overconsume liquor, wine and fast foods.

An examination of Heublein's advertising/marketing programs and plans would exemplify management's failure to recognize, the significance of Black consumer spending to Heublein's profitability and success. In other words, Black consumer spending, to an appreciable degree, was/is responsible for much of management's bonus and a disproportionate percentage of Heublein's net profits.

Hopefully, the days of merely having a few "token" Black executives, of merely visiting a few "Civil Rights Affairs" and of having a few "token" advertising and promotional programs; while simultaneously taking millions, upon millions of dollars annually from the Black communities across America, are nearing an end.

Sincerely,

Sanford W. Moore
cc: Rev. Ralph Abernathy
    Hon. Julian Bond
    Hon. Edward Brooke
    Hon. James Buckley
    Hon. Yvonne Burke
    Mr. John Calhoun, Special Assistant to the President
    Mr. Thad Garrett, Special Assistant to the Vice President
    Hon. Jacob Javits
    Rev. Jesse Jackson
    Mr. Vernon Jordon
    Mr. Roy Wilkens
Dear Congresswoman Burke: March 22, 1976

I would like to thank the Congressional Black Caucus for responding to my correspondence of January 26, 1976; in which it was requested that the Caucus initiate a review and investigation of conditions existing in the advertising/marketing industry. Specifically, those illegal and exclusionary policies vis-a-vis Black participation and ownership.

As indicated in the Caucus' reply, the materials are being reviewed to determine the appropriate course of action. In addition, I met with Congressman Rangel on March 17, 1976, who personally assured me that he would review the material, in particular, the pending suit involving BBDO et al.

As you are well aware, it is extremely difficult for a Black man to redress a given injustice in this country. Nevertheless, Black Americans must accomplish this feat in a system which has historically been unjust to Black people and one which continues to be so at this very moment.

Thus, it is most disheartening when Black organizational heads are unresponsive to a situation which so bespeaks of injustice and exploitation. It is especially alarming when the issues involved are in such need of amplification and clarification to the national Black community.

The materials received by the Caucus were also forwarded to both the Rev. Jesse Jackson, President, Operation P.U.S.H. and Mr. Vernon Jordan, Executive Director, National Urban League. To date, I have received no reply, inquiry or correspondence from either gentlemen or their respective organizations. For several months prior to the letter to the Caucus et al, both Rev. Jackson and Mr. Jordan ignored repeated telephone calls and requests for meetings.
It is suggested that Mr. Jordon's and Rev. Jackson's demonstrated behavior gives evidence of a very questionable attitude on their part. Furthermore, the failure of either party to adequately address the issues, severely reflects on both their credibility and purpose.

Let us not forget that both Rev. Jackson and Mr. Jordon and their respective organizations are chartered and pledged to actively support the lawful economic and political claims of Black Americans. Such themes have been publicly cried by both individuals on numerous occasions; in Black and general media, over the past several years. The advertising/marketing sector is the foremost instrument by which the commerce of this nation is expanded and made eminently profitable for corporate America.

Surely, both parties endorse the lawful right of Black Americans to participate in the commerce of this land with all the commensurate rewards of that participation. Unless of course, Black Americans are really in effect, a colonized consumer market and a vital source of cheap labor and talent for the benefit of the majority community.

In the face of the apparent failure of some of our community-based organizations to recognize the centrality of the issues presented, the role of the Congressional Black Caucus becomes increasingly more crucial. The nature and dimension of the Caucus' response could serve as the impetus for these same organizations to truly evaluate and recognize the commonality of interests and interdependencies.

The initiation of a Congressional investigation by the Caucus of conditions in the advertising/marketing sector could examine such pertinent areas as: FCC licenses, Black ownership in the media, advertising, communications and publishing sectors, discriminatory employment and hiring policies, affirmative action compliance by agencies and clients and agency/client involvement in South Africa. By providing such forum, the Caucus would render the national Black community with all its myriad of interests, an invaluable and historically long overdue service. Additionally, the interest and action of the Caucus would assure an adequate review of those areas under the jurisdiction of the various governmental regulatory agencies.

Finally, since my initial communication, even Zebra Associates has been forced to end operations. As is readily apparent, things ain't gettin' no better.

Sincerely,

Sanford W. Moore
April 7, 1976

Mr. Sanford W. Moore
Black Perspective Inc.
134 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10016

Dear Mr. Moore:

Mayor Gibson has asked me to write responsive to your correspondence regarding your request that the Congressional Black Caucus review and investigate exclusion of minority participation in the advertising industry.

As Mayor of the largest City in New Jersey, the Mayor believes that Blacks and other minorities have a distinct and important role to play in the advertising/marketing industry. Mayor Gibson believes that minorities should have significant involvement in existing firms as well as, not be excluded from the opportunity of ownership in new businesses within the industry.

We appreciate the information you have sent us and trust you will continue to keep us informed of your activities and progress.

Sincerely,

Donald Harris
Special Assistant to the Mayor

DH/rk
April 6th, 1976

Mr. Sanford W. Moore
Black Perspective Inc.
134 Lexington Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10016

Dear Mr. Moore:

I thank you for sharing with me your letter of January 26th to Congressman Rangel.

Please share with me the reply.

Sincerely,

PERCY E. SUTTON
July 11, 1976

Stu:

1. Al Friendly Jr. will come to the hotel tomorrow morning to meet you. I will bring Al to you at the Albert Room at 9:30 A.M. Attached is a resume which Al's father prepared while Al was in Moscow, not knowing that Newsweek was recalling Al for consultations so soon.

2. Urban Affairs Task Force: Mallory Walker probably knows as much about urban housing problems as anyone in Washington. Mallory has been involved in public housing, while on the private side running the last mortgage banking company with offices principal offices in Washington (the others moved to the suburbs). Mallory would like to volunteer for the task force. Attached is Mallory's resume, and the last 5 of quarterly newsletters written by Mallory and published by his firm.

Bardyl Bull

P.S. Also attached is a note from Marguerite Kelly on attacking government forms as an issue.