

The original documents are located in Box 63, folder “12/12/75 - To Stu Spencer - Reaction to Barody's State of the Union Proposal” of the Robert Teeter Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

December 12, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: STU SPENCER
FROM: BOB TEETER *Rmt*
SUBJECT: Baroody State of the Union Proposal

Attached is a copy of Baroody's proposed SOTU with some of my comments. Below are some of my reactions to it.

1. I agree strongly with the need for an all-inclusive theme.
2. There needs to be equal emphasis on improving the quality of life and solving problems along with the need to reduce and cut back. The positives are ultimately more important than the negatives in gaining support.
3. The idea of a re-birth of freedom is good but if used, the term freedom needs to be defined by the President so it is clear that he means the freedom of individuals, not the freedom of large institutions to exploit individuals.
4. I don't like the term "5th branch of government." The last thing we need is another branch of government or any more large national institutions.
5. It is not going to be possible to re-build "the new majority" from 1972 with a Republican President in a recession. Too many of the new majority were Democrats who came over on the social issues and who are now far more concerned with the economic issues, are a long way from the President's position of them.
6. There is a terrific paragraph on Page 3 dealing with the cause for the current cynicism toward government.
7. We need to keep in mind that while people want less government, they also have a number of problems they want solved and this means change. The President has got to be perceived as for change and representing the solutions to many problems as well as against large government and spending.



November 28, 1975

*need to de-jure P. Finis's
concept of as it relates
to individuals Freedom has
become a cliché to many.*

MEMORANDUM FOR: DISCUSSION
FROM: BILL BAROODY
SUBJECT: Political Strategy/State of the Union Message

The ingredients of the strategy needed for 1976 include the following:

1. understandable and all-inclusive theme (to be highlighted in State of the Union message); *agree!*
2. emphasis on reducing growth in Federal spending and reducing tax burden on American citizens coupled with a new public policy formula that promises to improve quality of life and increase the nation's ability to solve all major public problems; *agree*

3. continuation of our program to return power to the states and localities through such programs as revenue sharing coupled with an implied criticism of those (most candidates) who seek primarily to reform government at all levels. The missing ingredient in today's public policy positions is that we are only dealing with one half of the problem -- the government half. There is a whole panoply of institutions in the private sector that are eager and willing to be involved in public policy formation, and more importantly, implementation. I describe them as the Fifth Branch of government. They include representatives of ethnic and voluntary associations, neighborhoods, churches and families -- in short, the value-generating institutions which provide meaning and rules for living in people's lives. Whatever we call them, we have had representatives from every one of these institutions in for many meetings in the last year and a clear foundation has been laid to maximize the fact of incumbency through implementation of a public policy formula that turns these institutions on.

I believe these groups would respond to a Presidential strategy of restructuring public policy to build around and strengthen these private sector institutions. I outline possible specific examples in the attached SOTU draft for discussion.



*as may also come across
in helpful for if not
voters.*
*rebirth of freedom
question the
may sound a little to much like
let's get back to the point - it
which cost don't want. Also don't
no evolution of great important
B. central.*

Broad Theme

The terms "rebirth of freedom" or "new birth of freedom" or "rebuilding the free society" are variations of the basic unifier I believe the President can capitalize on in this Bicentennial year to get across his basic message. It would be:

1. consistent with his rhetoric to date;
2. consistent with his basic policies, including
 - a. foreign policy,
 - b. revenue sharing, block grants and decentralization,
 - c. regulatory reform,
 - d. getting back to basics in energy and economy.

*come ok but come
through on getting
the big corp. run
free.*

The "rebirth of freedom" or "rebuilding the free society" themes, in conjunction with a "fifth branch" or private institution-community renewal approach has great political potential. It could help to do the following:

1. restore the coalition of 1972, i.e. the new majority elements which have largely come unglued;
2. appeal to groups left out of the "action" by the Federal government that are generally GOP or conservative oriented.
3. appeal to both conservatives and left-wing libertarians;
4. provide a positive vision and not just a negative (the President in responding to Lawrence Spivak's question on Meet the Press about his lack of vision, stated that he wanted to see a society where government was not the master of the citizen. Although a worthy goal, negatives do not generally inspire great political support).
5. would restate fundamentally conservative arguments in a unique new way.

*can it do as
a Rep President
a recession*

*Good
Soul*

*yes
very
important*



The only way I know to provide a concrete feel for the ideas I have described is through an illustrative State of the Union draft (attached). In reading it, you should remember that some of the specific programs and ideas discussed in the draft may not be consistent with Presidential thinking, since I have not been privy to the issues discussion in preparation for the State of the Union Message. Regardless of that, I am absolutely convinced that most if not all of the positions the President will ultimately take will be consistent with the general theme of rebuilding a free society through community renewal and fifth branch involvement.



ILLUSTRATIVE STATE OF THE UNDER DRAFT

MY FELLOW AMERICANS:

A REBIRTH OF FREEDOM AS AMERICA CELEBRATES ITS TWO HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY AND PREPARES TO EMBARK ON ITS THIRD CENTURY OF HOPE AND PROGRESS FOR THE HUMAN CONDITION IS THE STANDARD TO WHICH ALL AMERICANS CAN REPAIR.

A REBIRTH OF FREEDOM FOR THE INDIVIDUAL AMERICAN AT HOME, AT WORK AND IN HIS OR HER COMMUNITY.

don't like the phrase
A REBIRTH OF FREEDOM THROUGH COMMUNITY RENEWAL FOR THOSE FIFTH BRANCH INSTITUTIONS OF FAMILY, CHURCH, NEIGHBORHOOD, VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION, AND ETHNIC COMMUNITY TO PARTICIPATE ACTIVELY IN THE FORMULATION AND EXECUTION OF PUBLIC POLICY AT LOCAL, STATE AND NATIONAL LEVELS.

A REBIRTH OF FREEDOM FOR STATE AND LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT THROUGH GENERAL AND SPECIFIC REVENUE SHARING TO DEAL EFFECTIVELY AND CAPABLY WITH PROBLEMS THAT PROPERLY FALL WITHIN THEIR AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY UNDER OUR FEDERAL SYSTEM.



A REBIRTH OF FREEDOM FOR THE WORKER, THE BUSINESSMAN
AND THE CONSUMER THROUGH UNSHACKLING THE BONDS OF
OPPRESSIVE GOVERNMENT REGULATION AND ARTIFICIAL
GOVERNMENT INTRUSION INTO FREE ENTERPRISE IN AMERICA.

A REBIRTH OF FREEDOM AS AMERICA REAFFIRMS ITS
BELIEF IN THE BASIC VALUES THAT HAVE MADE THIS
NATION A BEACON OF HOPE AND INSPIRATION FOR ALL
MANKIND.

IN SHORT, MY FELLOW AMERICANS, ALL OF OUR HOPES
FOR REBUILDING A FREE SOCIETY AND FOR REDRESSING ALL
OF THE IMBALANCES THAT HAVE CREPT INTO THE BODY
POLITIC OF AMERICA IN ITS FIRST TWO HUNDRED YEARS CAN
BE REALIZED THROUGH DEDICATING OURSELVES ONCE
AGAIN TO A NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM.

(Specific discussions and programs for all of the above are expected to be contained in Domestic Council, OMB, EPB and ERC inputs with the exception of item two, the Fifth Branch and community renewal concepts. This would be the new ingredient that reshuffles the ideological cards and provides a new Public Policy Formula that no other candidate has yet addressed. What follows is an illustrative draft of a section of the proposed State of the Union message that deals with community renewal and the Fifth Branch.)



COMMUNITY RENEWAL & FOURTH BRANCH SECTION

A YEAR AGO, CANDOR COMPELLED ME TO REPORT THAT THE STATE OF THE UNION WAS NOT GOOD. THERE HAS BEEN SOME FORWARD MOVEMENT IN THE INTERVENING TWELVE MONTHS, BUT ANY CANDID ASSESSMENT OF THE STATE OF THE UNION MUST STILL TODAY MIX OPTIMISM WITH CONCERN.

THE CAUSE FOR GREATEST CONCERN IS THE PERSISTENT CYNICISM AMONG THE AMERICAN PUBLIC TOWARD THEIR GOVERNMENT AND THEIR PUBLIC OFFICIALS. CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT, ESPECIALLY BIG GOVERNMENT, HAS BEEN THE CHIEF CASUALTY OF TOO MANY PROMISES MADE AND BROKEN. SO THE PEOPLE HAVE SUSPENDED THEIR FAITH IN GOVERNMENT'S ABILITY TO DELIVER AND OUR RESPONSE TO THAT HAS BEEN TOO OFTEN INAPPROPRIATE AND UNIFORMLY INADEQUATE.

excellent

FROM NOW ON, WE SHOULD DE-EMPHASIZE THE BUREAUCRACIES WHO WORK FOR US AND RE-EMPHASIZE THE COMMUNITIES WE WORK FOR.

AS REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE, OUR JOINT TASK IN THIS BICENTENNIAL YEAR SHOULD BE TO DEVELOP



DOMESTIC POLICIES THAT ENHANCE OUR FREE INSTITUTIONS
RATHER THAN DETRACT FROM THEM. WE SHOULD HAVE
POLICIES THAT ENCOURAGE, NOT DISCOURAGE, SELF-
MOTIVATION AND DEDICATION TO FREEDOM ON THE PART
OF ALL AMERICANS. IN THE PROCESS, WE WILL IMPROVE
THE POLITICAL CLIMATE IN WHICH WE MUST WORK, AND
ELEVATE THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND DEMOCRATIC POLITICS
WE MUST SERVE.

THE FOCUS OF DOMESTIC POLICIES THAT WILL ENCOURAGE
DEDICATION TO FREEDOM BY INDIVIDUAL CITIZENS SHOULD
BE ON FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES CONFRONTING EACH AMERICAN
WHERE HE OR SHE LIVES AND WORKS -- ISSUES OF CHILD
CARE, EDUCATION, HEALTH, HOUSING, LAW ENFORCEMENT
AND WELFARE. THIS IS A POLICY APPROACH THAT ENHANCES
ALL AREAS OF THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY AND IMPROVES
EACH AREA'S ROLE IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS. IT IS TIME FOR
US TO TURN TOWARD A DOMESTIC PROGRAM OF COMMUNITY
RENEWAL AND TO TURN AWAY FROM BUREAUCRATIC RULE.
I PROPOSE SUCH A PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY RENEWAL IN
THIS BICENTENNIAL STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE, A PROGRAM
NOT OF GRAND NATIONAL PLANS NOR OF EXTREME IDEOLOGICAL
DISILLUSIONMENT, BUT A PROGRAM OF VIGOROUS LOCAL
ACHIEVEMENT.

*good
for people*



THE COMMUNITIES I REFER TO IN THIS PROGRAM OF COMMUNITY
RENEWAL ARE THOSE SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL INSTITU-
TIONS THAT STAND BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE LARGER
STRUCTURES OF MODERN SOCIETY. FIVE SUCH COMMUNITY INSTI-
TUTIONS ARE CRITICAL TO EACH OF OUR LIVES: FAMILY, CHURCH,
VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION, NEIGHBORHOOD, AND ETHNIC COMMUNITY.
IF PROPERLY MOTIVATED AND UTILIZED, THESE INSTITUTIONS OF
AMERICAN SOCIETY CAN TRULY SERVE AS A FIFTH BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT.

*I agree
how many people
see the
evidence*

EACH INDIVIDUAL AMERICAN RELATES IN SOME IMPORTANT WAY TO SOME
OR ALL OF THESE INSTITUTIONS. AS DISTINCT FROM THEIR
INVOLVEMENT WITH GOVERNMENT, WHICH IS AT BEST OCCASIONAL AND
INCIDENTAL TO MANY AMERICANS, THE INDIVIDUAL'S INVOLVEMENT
WITH THESE INSTITUTIONS IS DIRECT AND MEANINGFUL, A PART
OF THEIR IDENTITY. AS I SHALL MAKE CLEAR LATER IN THIS
MESSAGE, MY NEW PROGRAMS OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL WHICH WOULD
BE SPONSORED OR IN OTHER WAYS ENCOURAGED, BUT NOT CONTROLLED
BY THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT, WOULD SEEK TO MAXIMIZE THE
SILENT STRENGTH THAT THESE INSTITUTIONS AND THE CLOSE
RELATION OF PEOPLE TO THEM REPRESENTS.

IN RECENT YEARS, THESE INSTITUTIONS, THOUGH VITAL TO
INDIVIDUAL AMERICANS, HAVE AT BEST BEEN IGNORED AND

*gov't is perceived as bad
let's build these private inst.
but not tie them to gov't*



THESE INSTITUTIONS REACH INTO THE ORDINARY LIVES OF INDIVIDUALS AND IF THEY ARE STRONG AND VITAL, THESE INSTITUTIONS FUNCTION AS A BRIDGE BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL AND GOVERNMENT AND THE OTHER LARGE INSTITUTIONS OF PUBLIC ORDER. IN A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY SUCH AS OURS, A DEMOCRATIC STATE CAN DERIVE ITS DYNAMISM AND ITS LEGITIMACY FROM THE CONSENT OF THESE COMMUNITIES. OR IT CAN SIMPLY VIEW THEM AS A TAX-BASE. THE CHOICE IS OURS -- AND IT MUST BE MADE SOON.

IN MY VIEW, A HEALTHY AMERICA CAN ONLY REMAIN SO IF ITS COMMUNITIES ARE STRONG. A POLICY OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL IS DESIGNED TO REVITALIZE, TO RENEW AND ASSURE THEIR STRENGTH.

THIS CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL IS BY NO MEANS A NEW ONE. FOR A LONG TIME, OBSERVERS OF MODERN LIFE HAVE POINTED OUT THE DANGER IN A SITUATION WHERE NOTHING STANDS BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL IN HIS PRIVATE LIFE AND THE HUGE STRUCTURES OF PUBLIC ORDER. WHERE A VACUUM EXISTS BETWEEN CITIZEN AND STATE, CONSUMER AND CORPORATION, LABORER AND UNION, THERE DEVELOP INDIVIDUAL FEELINGS OF POWERLESSNESS. FROM THE



AT WORST THREATENED BY THE DOMINATING AMERICAN
INSTITUTION OF BIG GOVERNMENT. SO LONG AS THE PRE-
DOMINANCE OF BIG-GOVERNMENT AS SOLE POLICY-MAKER
AND PROBLEM SOLVER PERSISTS, THEN THE GREATEST
IMBALANCE OF CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN LIFE WILL GO
UNCORRECTED. FOR IN THE MINDS OF MANY, IF NOT MOST
AMERICANS TODAY, GOVERNMENT AND ITS BUREAUCRACIES
ARE NOT SERVANTS BUT AGGRESSORS AND PEOPLE IN THEIR
COMMUNITIES ARE NOT ITS BENEFICIARIES BUT ITS VICTIMS.

THAT IMBALANCE WILL NOT BE REDRESSED UNLESS WE
SHIFT OUR FOCUS FROM STRENGTHENING GOVERNMENT'S
ABILITIES TO ONE OF RENEWING THE STRENGTH OF OTHER
INSTITUTIONS. GOVERNMENT'S ABILITY TO TAKE AND TAX,
TO REGULATE AND REQUIRE HAS ALREADY REACHED EXTRA-
VAGANT PROPORTIONS. LET THAT TREND CONTINUE UNCHECKED
AND IN A NARROW SENSE, OUR POWER MAY CONTINUE TO GROW.

BUT AS THE FOUNDING FATHERS NOTED, "GOVERNMENTS
DERIVE THEIR JUST POWERS FROM THE CONSENT OF THE
GOVERNED." AS THIS GOVERNMENT HAS EXPANDED ITS
POWERS TO GIVE AND TAKE, IT HAS DIMINISHED ITS POWER
TO LEAD AND RESPOND -- AND TO BE TRUSTED. LET THAT
TREND CONTINUE AND AS GOVERNMENT GROWS BIGGER, IT
WILL GROW WEAKER.



IF WE CHOOSE NOT TO CHANGE OUR FOCUS AND ADDRESS THE IMBALANCE THAT NOW EXISTS, THEN THE GOVERNMENT WHICH NOW TAKES IN TAXES FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE A THIRD OF WHAT THEY EARN EVERY YEAR, WILL BY THE END OF THIS CENTURY BE TAKING FULLY HALF. WHEN THAT HAPPENS, GOVERNMENTS PRESENT ABILITY TO INFLUENCE PRIVATE DECISIONS OF FREE PEOPLE WILL BECOME THE ABILITY TO CONTROL THOSE DECISIONS. AND SHOULD THAT HAPPEN, THEN THIS WILL BE AN ALTOGETHER DIFFERENT KIND OF GOVERNMENT AND WE WILL NO LONGER BE A FREE PEOPLE.

A DOMESTIC POLICY OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL IS DESIGNED TO MOVE IN A VERY DIFFERENT DIRECTION, TOWARD THE REBUILDING OF A FREE SOCIETY. IT RESTS ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE STILL RETAIN A STRONG AND VITAL ALLEGIANCE TO OUR CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES AND FREE INSTITUTIONS AND THAT THOUGH THEY MAY HAVE LOST FAITH IN THE KIND OF GOVERNMENT THEY HAVE BEEN GIVEN, THEY HAVEN'T LOST FAITH IN THEMSELVES NOR IN THE REALITY OF THE AMERICAN IDEAL.

THAT IDEAL RESTS ON THE VALUES WHICH THE COMMUNITIES OF FAMILY, CHURCH, VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION, NEIGHBORHOOD AND ETHNIC COMMUNITY HAVE BOTH CREATED AND SUSTAINED.



LET US START FROM A BASIC ASSUMPTION WHICH I BELIEVE TO BE FUNDAMENTAL. MOST AMERICANS LIVE LIVES OF QUIET HONOR. AND THE BUREAUCRATIZATION OF AMERICA HAS OFFENDED THEIR HONOR AND STIFLED THEIR PROGRESS.

THE DEBUREAUCRATIZATION OF AMERICA IS WHAT A POLICY OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL IS ESSENTIALLY ALL ABOUT.

I WILL PROPOSE TO THE CONGRESS SPECIAL PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO IMPLEMENT SUCH A POLICY BY ALLOWING THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT TO ASSIST DIRECTLY AND INDIRECTLY THE INSTITUTIONS OF FAMILY, CHURCH, VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION, NEIGHBORHOOD AND ETHNIC GROUP. THE OBJECTIVE OF THESE PROGRAMS WOULD BE NOT TO SUBORDINATE THESE GROUPS TO NATIONAL POLICY BUT TO MAKE THEM FULL PARTNERS IN ITS FORMULATION.

A POLICY OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL, IN ITS MOST BASIC TERMS, IS AN EFFORT TO CREATE THAT PARTNERSHIP. AS ONCE I PROPOSED A MARRIAGE NOT A HONEYMOON BETWEEN CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE, AND THAT THERE BE COMPROMISE, CONCILIATION, COMMUNICATION AND COOPERATION BETWEEN THE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT, SO DO I NOW PROPOSE THE SAME BETWEEN THE BASIC INSTITUTIONS OF AMERICAN SOCIETY, GOVERNMENTAL AND NONGOVERNMENTAL.



STANDPOINT OF THE VALUES OF INDIVIDUAL PEOPLE, THESE ORGANIZATIONS SEEM Distant. AND ON THOSE OCCASIONS WHEN THEY ARE NOT REMOTE, WHEN THEY DO AFFECT ONLY LIVES, THEY SEEM INTRUSIVE.

IT IS EASY TO BECOME FEARFUL AND EVEN ANGRY AT SUCH BUREAUCRATIC INTRUSIONS. AND SUCH FEAR AND ANGER CAN BE A TEMPTING TARGET FOR THOSE AT THE EXTREMES OF OUR POLITICAL SPECTRUM. RESPONSIBLE LEADERSHIP MUST AVOID SUCH TEMPTATIONS IF WE ARE TO SUCCEED IN THE REBUILDING OF A FREE SOCIETY. IN SPITE OF THE VIEWS OF SOME, PUBLIC DISCONTENT WITH BIG GOVERNMENT DOES NOT LEGITIMIZE THE NEGATIVE AND SIMPLISTIC COUNSEL THAT IMPLIES WE MUST GIVE UP ON OUR DECADES OF EFFORT TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ALL IN AMERICA.

good.

PUBLIC DISCONTENT WITH BIG GOVERNMENT SAYS TO US SIMPLY THAT WE HAVE STRAYED FROM OUR TRADITIONS OF FREE CHOICE AND COMPROMISE FOR THE COMMON GOOD. IT IS A WARNING TO US, BUT NOT ONE THAT LEGITIMIZES A POLITICS OF DESPAIR.



TURNING FROM THE PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL
TO CONCRETE PROGRAMS, I WILL PROPOSE TO THE CONGRESS
SPECIAL PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO ALLOW THE NATIONAL
GOVERNMENT TO ASSIST DIRECTLY AND INDIRECTLY THE
INSTITUTIONS OF FAMILY, CHURCH, VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION,
NEIGHBORHOOD AND SUBCULTURAL GROUP TO ENGAGE IN THE
ACTUAL MAKING AND ADMINISTERING OF DOMESTIC POLICY
IN THE AREAS OF CHILD CARE, EDUCATION, HEALTH, HOUSING,
LAW ENFORCEMENT AND WELFARE.

FIRST, WE SHALL SEEK TO IMPROVE NATIONAL METHODS FOR
LISTENING TO THE NEEDS OF THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY,
INSTEAD OF STRENGTHENING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO
DICTATE POLICY CHOICES TO THE AMERICAN COMMUNITY.

OVER THE PAST YEAR OR MORE I HAVE TRAVELLED EXTENSIVELY
IN THE UNITED STATES, ENGAGING IN NUMEROUS SESSIONS ON A
RANGE OF POLITICAL ISSUES WITH BROAD SEGMENTS OF OUR
CONCERNED CITIZENRY, PEOPLE FROM ALL WALKS OF LIFE,
ALL POLITICAL PERSUASIONS AND ALL GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS.
[OPTIONAL: I WILL SEEK LEGISLATION THAT WILL PROVIDE
FUNDS FOR EXTENSIVE TRAVELLING BY ALL CABINET AND
SUBCABINET OFFICIALS, NOT FOR THE PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT
PROPAGANDA BUT FOR THE PURPOSE OF GAINING INSIGHT INTO



WHAT OUR COMMUNITIES WANT FROM THEIR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT. ATTENDANCE AT THESE FORUMS, OVER THE LENGTH AND BREADTH OF THE UNITED STATES, WOULD BECOME PART OF THE REQUIRED DUTIES OF FEDERAL OFFICERS AFTER JANUARY 1977.]

[ALSO, AS PART OF AN EXTENSIVE PROGRAM OF LISTENING TO WHAT OUR AMERICAN COMMUNITY HAS TO SAY ABOUT NATIONAL POLICY, I WILL SEEK LEGISLATION FOR REORGANIZING CERTAIN FEDERAL DOMESTIC DEPARTMENTS IN ORDER TO DECENTRALIZE THEIR ACTIVITIES. I HAVE IN MIND HERE SUCH AGENCIES AS HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND TRANSPORTATION.]

[FINALLY, IN ORDER TO PROVIDE CLOSER LINKS BETWEEN WHAT WE DO HERE IN WASHINGTON AND WHAT OUR VAST CITIZENRY HAS TO SAY TO US, I WILL PROPOSE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL OMBUDSMAN SYSTEM WHEREBY GRIEVANCES OF PERSONS AGAINST OUR SPRAWLING BUREAUCRACY CAN BE READILY, SYMPATHETICALLY AND SYSTEMATICALLY ANSWERED ON A FULL-TIME BASIS BY RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS. NOT ONLY HAS THE OMBUDSMAN SYSTEM BEEN SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTED IN NORTHERN EUROPE FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS, BUT SOME OF



*good,
but how do you keep it
from becoming another bureaucracy*

OUR OWN STATES AND ORGANIZATIONS IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR
HAVE ADAPTED THIS INSTITUTION TO THEIR OWN NEEDS. WE
WANT OUR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT TO MOVE CLOSER TO OUR
COMMUNITY LIFE, AND WE WANT OUR COMMUNITY LIFE
EXPRESSED IN ITS FULL POWER WITHIN OUR NATIONAL GOVERN-
MENT.]

MOVING FROM METHODS OF GIVING OUR COMMUNITIES A MORE
FORCEFUL VOICE IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS TO PROGRAMS THAT
WILL FOSTER COMMUNITY RENEWAL IN AMERICAN LIFE, IT
IS IMPORTANT FIRST TO UNDERSTAND WHAT HAS PREOCCUPIED
GOVERNMENT POLICYMAKERS IN THE LAST TEN YEARS.

THE FOCUS OF GOVERNMENT POLICY THUS FAR IN THE LATE SIXTIES
AND EARLY SEVENTIES HAS BEEN AN INWARD ONE. THERE HAS
BEEN A PROPER BUT BY NO MEANS COMPREHENSIVE CONCENTRATION
ON PUTTING GOVERNMENT'S OWN HOUSE IN ORDER.

MOVING TOWARD PROGRAM CONSOLIDATION AND BLOC-GRANT
MECHANISMS, WE HAVE TRIED TO DECENTRALIZE THE FEDERAL
GOVERNMENT AND RE-DISTRIBUTE THE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
ACCUMULATED IN WASHINGTON BACK TO THE STATES
AND LOCALITIES.



THE INNOVATION OF REVENUE SHARING HAS BEEN A KEYSTONE
OF THAT EFFORT. I BELIEVE IT SHOULD BE CONTINUED AND
STRENGTHENED. BUT TO RETURN TO MY THEME OF COMMUNITY
RENEWAL, IT IS BY NO MEANS ENOUGH FOR GOVERNMENT TO
PUT ITS OWN HOUSE IN ORDER.

A PUBLIC POLICY WHICH FOCUSES ON GOVERNMENT ALONE
AS PROBLEM SOLVER. BY DEFINITION FAILS TO FOCUS ON THE
ABILITIES OF PEOPLE AND INSTITUTIONS OUTSIDE GOVERNMENT.
REVENUE SHARING, IN MY VIEW, WILL NOT HAVE FULFILLED
ITS FULL POTENTIAL AS A VEHICLE FOR A TRANSFER OF
POWER FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IF THE LINES OF
TRANSFER EXTEND ONLY FROM BIG GOVERNMENTAL
BUREAUCRACIES TO SMALLER ONES.

A POLICY OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL ENVISIONS A CONTINUATION
OF THAT TRANSFER OF POWER TO REDUCE THE SIZE OF THE
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND ENHANCE THE CAPABILITIES OF
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT. BUT IT ALSO ENVISIONS
AN EXTENSION OF THAT PROCESS SO THAT POWER CAN BE
TRANSFERRED TO LEGITIMATE NON-GOVERNMENTAL INSTITU-
TIONS -- SUCH AS THE FAMILY AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD -- IN
WAYS I WILL SHORTLY OUTLINE FOR YOU.



FOR MOST AMERICANS LIVING TODAY, THIS MAY REPRESENT A
VERY NEW APPROACH TO MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE
AMERICAN PEOPLE. BUT LET ME ASSURE YOU AND THEM,
THAT THOUGH THIS MAY BE RADICALLY DIFFERENT FROM THAT
TO WHICH TWENTIETH CENTURY AMERICANS HAVE GROWN
ACCUSTOMED, THERE IS NOTHING RADICAL ABOUT IT. THIS
IS A PROGRAM OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL WHICH IS DESIGNED TO
PUT THE NATION'S HOUSE IN ORDER, NOT JUST THE GOVERN-
MENT'S. SO LONG AS WE CONTINUE, THROUGH REVENUE
SHARING OR ANY OTHER PROGRAM, TO EMPHASIZE WHAT
GOVERNMENT DOES TO THE EXCLUSION OF WHAT PEOPLE
CAN DO. WE CONTINUE THAT IMBALANCE I SPOKE OF.
CONSCIOUSLY OR NOT, WE MAKE IT US, THE GOVERNMENT,
AGAINST THEM, THE PEOPLE. AND NO MATTER HOW WELL
ORDERED OUR SIDE OF THE HOUSE MAY BE, THIS COUNTRY
WILL REMAIN A HOUSE DIVIDED.

SO LET US TURN NOW TO SOME OF THE SPECIFIC INGREDIENTS
OF A POLICY OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL.

PERHAPS WHAT IS MOST MISSING FROM PUBLIC POLICY TODAY
IS THE IMAGINATION IT TAKES TO COMBINE PROBLEMS THAT
SEEM UNRELATED AND COME UP WITH COMMON SOLUTIONS.
THE RISING DEMAND FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES MAY SEEM



TOTALLY DISASSOCIATED FROM THE PROBLEMS OF OUR
LADDEST POPULATION. AND INDEED THE TWO MAY BE
VERY DIFFERENT PROBLEMS, BUT I WOULD SUGGEST THERE
MAY BE A COMMON SOLUTION.

THE DEMAND FOR CHILD CARE IS GROWING AS A LEGITIMATE
OUTGROWTH OF THE ENTRY OF MANY WORKING MOTHERS
INTO THE NATIONAL LABOR FORCE. THERE IS, AS OF NOW,
A VERY REAL DANGER THAT BIG GOVERNMENT WILL BE CALLED
UPON TO SUPPLY THAT DEMAND IN A TYPICALLY IMPERSONAL
BUREAUCRATIC WAY, THROUGH THE CREATION OF LARGE,
INSTITUTIONAL AND EXPENSIVE CHILD-CARE CENTERS. THIS
INDEED WOULD BE ONE SOLUTION TO THE "CHILD-CARE
PROBLEM." BUT THERE IS CONCEIVABLY ANOTHER. FROM THE
STANDPOINT OF THE TAXPAYER, IT WOULD HAVE THE VIRTUE
OF BEING LESS EXPENSIVE. FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE
PARENT, IT WOULD HAVE THE VIRTUE OF BEING LESS
IMPERSONAL. AND FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE CHILD,
IT WOULD HAVE THE VIRTUE OF BEING MORE CLOSELY AKIN
TO THE FAMILIAL ENVIRONMENT IT IS INTENDED TO AUGMENT.
I AM SUGGESTING HERE A CONCEPT VERY CLOSE TO THE
FOSTER GRANDPARENTS PLAN THAT HAS BEEN TRIED WITH
SOME SUCCESS ALREADY. RATHER THAN ESTABLISHING COLD



AND IMPERSONAL DAY CARE FACILITIES, WHY COULD THE ELDERLY NOT BE EMPLOYED IN NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS AND FAMILY-LIKE SETTINGS TO LOOK AFTER SMALL NUMBERS OF CHILDREN. PUBLIC FUNDS COULD BE USED, EITHER IN DIRECT PAYMENT OF STIPENDS TO THE ELDERLY OR THROUGH INDIRECT TAX CREDITS TO THE PARENTS AND THE LEGITIMATE PUBLIC DEMAND FOR CHILD CARE WOULD BE SERVED AS WOULD THE VALID PUBLIC INTEREST IN PROVIDING MEANINGFUL AND REWARDING AND REMUNERATIVE OCCUPATION FOR THOSE OLDER AMERICANS WHO EITHER NEED OR SEEK SUCH INVOLVEMENT.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT, THROUGH ITS WELFARE LAWS, FORCE MOTHERS OUT OF THE HOME AND TO THE EXTENT THAT WELFARE LAWS AND REGULATIONS PRESENTLY TEND IN THAT DESTRUCTIVE DIRECTION, I WILL SEEK AMENDMENT. BUT WHERE ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCE OR PERSONAL PREFERENCE LEADS A MOTHER TO SEEK EMPLOYMENT, GOVERNMENT POLICY SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE CREATION OF SUCH NON-BUREAUCRATIC CHILD-CARE OPPORTUNITIES AS I HAVE DESCRIBED. AND I INTEND TO PROPOSE PROGRAMS WHICH CAN ENCOURAGE THE CREATION OF SUCH OPPORTUNITIES.



ALSO IN THE FIELD OF CHILD CARE, I SHALL INTRODUCE PROGRAMS TO PROVIDE NEEDED ASSISTANCE TO PARENTS WHO WISH TO CARE FOR THE HANDICAPPED CHILD IN THE HOME, AS OPPOSED TO SEEKING INSTITUTIONALIZED CARE. I DO NOT THINK IT RIGHT OR JUST THAT ONLY THOSE PARENTS WHO DECIDE TO INSTITUTIONALIZE THESE CHILDREN SHOULD HAVE ACCESS TO PUBLIC HELP. DIRECT AID OR A COMBINATION OF SUCH AID ALONG WITH TAX DEDUCTIONS COULD MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR MANY SUCH PARENTS WHO SO DESIRE TO KEEP THE CHILD AT HOME AND WITHOUT BY THAT DECISION, FORSAKING THE PROFESSIONAL GUIDANCE WHICH IS SO OFTEN ESSENTIAL IN THESE SITUATIONS.

THESE ARE TWO CONCRETE EXAMPLES OF WAYS IN WHICH PUBLIC POLICY COULD SEEK TO ENHANCE RATHER THAN DEBILITATE THE STRENGTHS WHICH ARE INHERENT IN FAMILY LIFE. AND THE STRONG LIKELIHOOD THAT SUCH NON-BUREAUCRATIC SOLUTIONS TO SUCH VERY PERSONAL PROBLEMS COULD ALSO STRENGTHEN AND TEND TO HUMANIZE PUBLIC POLICY IS WORTH EMPHASIS.

IN THE SAME SPIRIT, I INTEND TO INTRODUCE PROGRAMS OR MORE GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH CAN OFFER WAYS TO



CONTINUE OUR DRIVE TO MEET SPECIFIC PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES IN AMERICAN LIFE THROUGH A NEW EMPHASIS ON FOSTERING COMMUNITY RENEWAL. THESE WILL ENCOURAGE THE INSTITUTION OF GOVERNMENT TO ALLY ITSELF WITH, RATHER THAN IGNORE OR PREEMPT AS IN THE PAST, THE STRENGTHS INHERENT IN OTHER AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS.

IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION, I SHALL VIGOROUSLY SUPPORT INITIATIVES TO END GOVERNMENTAL PRACTICES WHICH MILITATE AGAINST FREE MORAL CHOICE, AND EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY. FORCED BUSING OF CHILDREN TO SCHOOLS OUTSIDE THEIR OWN COMMUNITIES, RESTRICTIONS ON THE PUBLIC USE OF RELIGIOUS SYMBOLS IN THE SCHOOLS INHIBIT FREE CHOICE AND I SHALL SEEK REMOVAL OF THOSE INHIBITIONS.

BUT OPPOSITION TO FORCED BUSING STEMS CHIEFLY FROM ITS COERCIVE ELEMENTS. SOME PARENTS, FOR REASONS OF THEIR OWN EDUCATIONAL OUTLOOK WOULD NOT, IF GIVEN THE CHOICE, SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO THEIR OWN NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL IN ANY EVENT. TODAY, THE LOWER INCOME PARENT WHO WOULD PREFER AN ALTERNATIVE TO PUBLIC



EDUCATION LACKS THE RANGE OF CHOICE OPEN TO UPPER
MIDDLE CLASS PARENTS.

A VOUCHER SYSTEM OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE WOULD
BROADEN THEIR RANGE OF CHOICES AND WOULD, IN
ADDITION, STRENGTHEN EDUCATION IN THIS COUNTRY BY
OPENING IT UP TO THE DYNAMICS OF COMPETITION. I
SHALL OFFER TO THE CONGRESS MY PROPOSAL FOR THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF SUCH A FREEDOM-OF-CHOICE SYSTEM.

THERE ARE VARIOUS VERSIONS OF THE VOUCHER CONCEPT
WHICH HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED, BUT THE BASIC IDEA IS QUITE
SIMPLE. RATHER THAN CHANNELLING PUBLIC FUNDS DIRECTLY
TO THE SCHOOL SYSTEMS, WHICH PRESENTLY HOLD AN EFFEC-
TIVE EDUCATIONAL MONOPOLY IN MOST JURISDICTIONS, A
VOUCHER PLAN WOULD DISTRIBUTE THESE SAME FUNDS
DIRECTLY TO PARENTS WHO WOULD THEN BE FREE TO
CHOOSE BETWEEN A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT SCHOOLS.

SUCH A PLAN WOULD HAVE A NUMBER OF BENEFITS. BUT
MOST SIGNIFICANTLY, IT WOULD CONVERT PARENTS FROM
BEING PASSIVE OBJECTS OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY TO BEING
ACTIVE PARTICIPANTS IN THE FORMULATION OF THAT POLICY.
PARENTS WOULD BE FREE TO CHOOSE FOR THEIR CHILDREN



THOSE SCHOOLS WHICH MOST CLOSELY CORRESPOND TO THEIR OWN CULTURAL AND MORAL VALUES. IN THIS WAY, THE SCHOOLS WOULD BE STRENGTHENED BY THE FAMILIES STRENGTHS AND THE FAMILIES STRENGTHS WOULD BE REINFORCED.

SUCH A VOUCHER CONCEPT CAN BE SO DESIGNED AS TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF EDUCATIONAL UNIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS AND TO PREVENT THE ABUSE OF RACIAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC EXCLUSIONSISM.

THE PATH TO BETTERMENT OF OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS LIES IN THE RENEWAL OF PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS. IF THE TWO ARE STRENGTHENED AND BROUGHT TOGETHER IN A MEANINGFUL PARTNERSHIP, EACH CAN BE RENEWED.

A FINAL WORD ABOUT FORCED Busing: THE PERCEIVED NEED FOR THIS POLICY ARISES FROM THE VERY REAL SEPARATION WHICH STILL PERSISTS IN MANY OF OUR NEIGHBORHOODS. I WILL WORK STRENUOUSLY AND ENUNCIATE POLICIES TO END THE HOUSING AND ZONING DISCRIMINATION WHICH PERPETUATE, BY ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS LEGAL STANDARDS, THIS DISCRIMINATION. TO THIS END I SHALL PROPOSE DECENTRALIZATION OF OUR DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND WILL SEEK STRONG LEGAL POWERS FOR THESE DECENTRALIZED INSTRUMENTS



OF GOVERNMENT TO INTERCEDE ON BEHALF OF PARTIES
ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY BLATANT HOUSING AND ZONING
DISCRIMINATION.

CRIME IS A SOCIAL PROBLEM WITH MANY FACETS, AND IT
IS CLEAR THAT THERE CAN BE NO SINGLE, SIMPLE SOLUTION
TO IT. STRENGTHENING POLICE FORCES AND COURT
SYSTEMS MUST CERTAINLY BE PART OF THE SOLUTION. BUT
WHERE CRIME IS LOW, IT IS USUALLY BECAUSE THE INFORMAL
COMMUNITY PRESSURES ARE STRONG ENOUGH TO PREVENT IT
-- AS, FOR EXAMPLE, IN OLD-STYLE ETHNIC NEIGHBORHOODS, IN
WHICH PEOPLE KNOW EACH OTHER, CARE ABOUT EACH OTHER,
AND WATCH OUT FOR EACH OTHER. IT SHOULD BE PUBLIC
POLICY TO ENCOURAGE AND UTILIZE SUCH COMMUNITY
PRESSURES WHERE THEY EXIST, AND TO HELP CREATE THEM
IN PLACES WHERE THEY ARE ABSENT.

PUBLIC POLICY SHOULD BE GEARED TO CONVERTING URBAN
NEIGHBORHOODS INTO CRIME-PREVENTING SITUATIONS. THIS
HAS PHYSICAL ASPECTS, MOST APPLICABLE TO NEW CONSTRUCTIONS:
THERE SHOULD BE AS LITTLE SPACE AS POSSIBLE THAT
WILL BE EMPTY AT CERTAIN HOURS; CONVERSELY, ACTIVITIES
SHOULD BE SO SPACED THAT PEOPLE ARE CONTINUALLY



PRESENT ALL OVER A GIVEN AREA. THE SOCIAL ASPECTS ARE MORE IMPORTANT, THOUGH. NEIGHBORHOOD AND BLOCK ASSOCIATIONS, AS WELL AS OWNERS AND TENANTS ASSOCIATIONS, CAN BE STRENGTHENED TO PERFORM CRIME-PREVENTION FUNCTIONS. INDIVIDUALS NORMALLY LOCATED IN STRATEGIC PLACES CAN BE FORMALLY RECOGNIZED AND REMUNERATED FOR SUCH CRIME-PREVENTING PERFORMANCES-- THE RETIRED PERSON, SAY, WHO LIKES TO SIT AT THE WINDOW OR ON THE STOOP TO WATCH WHAT GOES ON IN THE STREET, OR THE OWNER OF A SMALL STORE AT A CORNER WHERE YOUNGSTERS TEND TO CONGREGATE, OR THE DRIVER OF AN ICE-CREAM TRUCK CIRCULATING REGULARLY IN THE AREA. AS HAS BEEN WIDELY RECOGNIZED BY POLICE OFFICERS, THIS TYPE OF COMMUNITY LAW-ENFORCEMENT IS BY NO MEANS A NEW VIGILANTISM IN COMPETITION WITH THE POLICE; ON THE CONTRARY, IT SUPPLEMENTS AND FACILITATES THE WORK OF THE POLICE. IT DOES NOT BESTOW RIGHTS THAT CITIZENS DO NOT POSSESS ALREADY. WHAT IT DOES DO IS TO GIVE PUBLIC RECOGNITION AND REWARD TO THE EXERCISE OF THESE RIGHTS -- AT A FRACTION OF THE COST OF FORMAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.



AS A FINAL NOTE, LET ME OBSERVE THAT I HAVE NOT INTENDED TO OUTLINE ANY LIST OF LARGE DOMESTIC NATIONAL GOALS IN THIS ADDRESS. I HAVE SET FOR MY ADMINISTRATION, BUT ONE PRE-EMINENT GOAL, THE REBUILDING OF A FREE SOCIETY THROUGH THE POLICY OF COMMUNITY RENEWAL. THE OBJECTIVE OF SUCH A POLICY IS TO MOVE OURSELVES AND THE COUNTRY TOWARD ACCEPTANCE OF A MORE LIMITED GOVERNMENT AND A LESS LIMITED CITIZENRY.

SO LONG AS THE COMMON GOOD MAY BE DEFINED ONLY BY WE IN GOVERNMENT, THEN THE DANGER EXISTS THAT THE COMMON GOOD MAY BE SUBORDINATED TO OUR OWN VIEW AND TO THAT ALONE. THE FIRST PHRASE OF OUR CONSTITUTION ENVISIONS A MORE BROADENED BASIS FOR NATIONAL POLICY. "WE THE PEOPLE" ARE TO BE ITS SHAPERS, NOT MERELY WE THE GOVERNMENT.

IN MY TRAVELS OVER THE PAST YEAR, I HAVE BECOME ACUTELY AWARE OF THE FRUSTRATIONS OF GOOD PEOPLE ALL ACROSS THIS COUNTRY WHO HAVE LABORED FOR YEARS IN GOOD CAUSES BUT WHO HAVE HAD TO DO SO IN ISOLATION FROM THE RESOURCES AND EXPERTISE WHICH THEIR GOVERNMENT HAS DEVELOPED AND CHANNELLED INTO NARROW AVENUES OF



DEMOCRATIC UTILIZATION.

FOR TOO LONG, THESE GOOD PEOPLE, WORKING ON THEIR OWN HAVE BEEN VIEWED BY THEIR GOVERNMENT AS JUST SO MANY SPECIAL INTERESTS. IN A VERY REAL AND VERY LEGITIMATE SENSE, THAT IS PRECISELY WHAT THEY ARE. BUT IN AN EQUALLY REAL AND VITAL SENSE, UNLESS THESE DIVERSE SPECIAL INTERESTS ARE BROUGHT TOGETHER INTO A UNIFIED WHOLE THERE CAN BE NO DEFINITION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

FOR IN AMERICA, NO SINGLE CONCENSUS DEFINITION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST CAN BE IMPOSED, NOT EVEN BY REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT. A COMMON SENSE OF THE COMMON INTEREST MUST EMERGE FROM THE VARIOUS SPECIAL INTERESTS OF OUR DIVERSE AND PLURALISTIC SOCIETY, FROM US THE PEOPLE.

I WOULD PROPOSE THAT THE ONLY SURE WAY TO THAT END IS THE REBUILDING OF A FREE SOCIETY.

