

Richard Nixon Presidential Library
White House Special Files Collection
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
26	8	10/25/1968	Report	Radio address: Where Government Should Be. 15 pgs.
26	8	10/27/1968	Other Document	RN's handwritten notes for appearance on Face the Nation. 4 pgs.

RN's Copy

Radio Address

Friday, October 25, 1968

WHERE GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE

As we have crossed and recrossed the United States in this campaign year 1968, I have been impressed as never before with something we must always remember about America.

1. This is an enormous country, a continental country.

(1) And though other countries have been large, America is something else.

1. Its people, its Americans, are diverse.

(1) And there are enormous energies in that diversity.

I have looked at America at night from my campaign plane -- at the great cities of our nation -- New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Tulsa, Dallas, and a hundred others.

1. At night our cities seem almost to be made of electricity.

(1) The lights in the homes, the cars moving along the roads, the colors.

2. During the day, the skyscrapers of our cities reach into the clouds.

- (1) Their factories and offices, their millions of Americans, drawn from every nation in the world, sustain an economy, and a free society, that is one of the wonders of history.
3. Between the cities there is something else that is unique in history.
 - (1) The flowing fields and plains of our Republic, an agriculture of unprecedented abundance.
 - (2) And the geographical diversity of America -- from the deserts of the Southwest (who could ever forget their sunsets) to the rich green delta lands, from our mountain ranges, the Sierra Nevadas, and the green mountains of Vermont, to the vast fertile plains of the mid-continent.

And the more one sees of America -- its size, its diversity, and its energy -- the more ridiculous, and the more dangerous it seems that anyone would suppose that planners in a remote city could draw up blueprints which would be adequate guides for a continent.

This is not a new feeling about America.

1. In its earliest days, America was diverse and vast, and the most acute observers drew the correct conclusions.

(1) "However enlightened or skillful a central power may be," wrote Alexis de Tocqueville in his "Democracy in America," "it cannot of itself embrace all the details of the life of a great nation . . . and when it attempts unaided to create and set in motion many complicated springs, it must submit itself to a very imperfect result or exhaust itself in fruitless efforts."

1. de Tocqueville wrote this in 1835, and if he saw this truth about an earlier America, how much truer it is today.

There has nevertheless been a tendency in our history for the Federal government, during crises, to pre-empt functions which it is not suited to perform, and to retain them when the crisis is past.

1. As a result, the federal role in the life of the nation has continued to expand, and has expanded at an accelerating rate.

Since the turn of the century, the gross national product in America has multiplied 33 times but the Federal government is 234 times as large as it was then.

1. I know that with the increasing complexity of our society, with increasing mobility and with urbanization, government must provide many services.

- (1) Legitimate questions, to be sure, may be raised about some services.
- (2) But the crucial question our history now poses for us is not so much what services are to be provided, but rather who should make the decisions.
 1. Should the decision be made and the priorities be set by the citizens and their elected local officials, or by the government in Washington and its appointed bureaucrats?

The centralization of power in Washington has been a gradual thing.

1. A few federal programs were launched during the nineteenth century, and a few others following the first world war.
2. The really large increase, however, came during the Depression, when a dozen new programs were enacted.
 - (1) These were emergency times, and the programs often were necessary.
3. Since World War II, we have seen a vast proliferation in the number and kind of federal programs, as well as an ominous tendency toward programs which by-pass the states, or else call for a minimal participation by state governments.

Let me say that the men who have launched these programs have meant well.

1. They wanted to solve a particular problem, it seemed to them that the federal government was the source of funds, and the place to go to solve it.

- (1) As a result, whether measured in numbers of programs or in expenditures, federal grants have increased significantly in the last twenty years, substantially in the last decade, and very sharply in the last four years.

The crucial question of the 1970s about who and at what level of government, should make the decisions, has become especially pressing because of the nature of the problems confronting us.

1. In the earliest stages, federal programs were largely confined to disbursing money or to building physical facilities such as dams and highways.

- (1) But in the recent activities the federal government has involved itself in matters of much greater complexity and delicacy -- even the quality of life.

1. As anyone might expect, Washington has increasingly found itself in far over its head.
2. By their very nature, these modern problems demand diversity of approach, independent creativity, citizen

participation and involvement, local direction and co-ordination.

(1) Even to think that a large, remote, impersonal bureaucracy could deal with them effectively strikes me as presumptuous.

1. Let me be more specific.

(1) By latest count there are 82 separate aid to education programs;

(2) And 86 separate health assistance programs,

(3) And over 400 programs in all fields combined, twice the number of three years ago.

(2) Programs dealing with one type of problem are scattered among numerous federal agencies.

1. There are, believe it or not, 38 separate federal agencies involved in water resource programs.

(1) The city of Oakland, California, made a count and discovered that it was involved in 140 separate federal aid programs, each with its own guidelines, matching fund requirements, and reporting procedures.

2. This entire approach has resulted in a tangled web of confusion, ineffectiveness, and tight federal controls. All too often, the result has been chaos.

- (1) Take one example.

1. In 1965, the town manager of West Rutland, Vermont, determined that his town needed a new water and sewer system and set out to obtain federal aid.

- (1) First, he was told by the Farmer's Home Administration, which administered a grant program of this type, that the program was new and that though funds were available application forms were not.

- (2) So, not giving up, he devised his own application form, and the local office sent it to Washington.

- (3) Two months later the application was returned without explanation of any sort.

- (4) After another four months of inquiry, the town manager was told the reason: West Rutland, he was told, was too urban to qualify. Its population is 2300.

- (5) Next the town manager sent his application through the Economic Development Administration of the Commerce Department, which also makes grants for sewer and water projects.

- (6) EDA was receptive, but told him to rush his application since such grants depend upon a high unemployment rate, and the rate of unemployment in West Rutland was falling.
 - (7) He rushed in his application. But it was bounced by EDA because he had not asked for enough money.
 - (8) Next he tried another federal agency, the Rural Community Development Service.
 - (9) He was sent back to the Farmer's Home Administration, which was where he had begun.
 - (10) But at just this time, the Soil Conservation Service, without consulting anyone, announced plans which would change the flow pattern in West Rutland's water supply, and so the entire project had to be redesigned.
- (2) Well, the town survived all this; but this entire approach has resulted in dangerous failures on a larger scale, failures on the national scale.
1. The Federal Agriculture Program is a classic and colossal example, but it is far from the only one.

- (1) --The Federal Housing Program is more eloquently condemned by its former advocates than by its opponents.
- (2) -- The persistence of poverty in America gave rise to a flamboyant war on the problem, which has not made a dent in poverty, and actually bears witness to the fact that thirty years of expensive federal efforts to eliminate dependency have only succeeded in institutionalizing it.
- (3) --Urban renewal, another flamboyant slogan, has destroyed more low cost housing than it has created, and instead of reducing tension has actually precipitated urban riots.
- (4) -- Increasing centralization has siphoned top management talent from the State to Washington, handicapping the states in dealing with their pressing problems.
- (5) -- Increasing centralization has created a situation of local fiscal poverty amid federal fiscal plenty.
 1. Our states and cities have the problems, and Washington has the money.

- (6) Increasing centralization has removed decision-making from the local level and helped to breed an atmosphere of alienation, made people feel that they have no control over their destiny or the quality of their lives.

The idea behind all this is that a few men in Washington know more about how to spend our money than we do -- know more about it than state government, more about it than local government.

Even among some Democratic spokesmen it is beginning to be recognized that we must go no longer down this road.

1. Professor Daniel Moynihan of Harvard has said that Democrats "must divest themselves of the notion that the nation, especially the cities of the nation, can be run from agencies in Washington. We must," he said, "attend to what the federal government is good at it is good at collecting revenues, and rather bad at disbursing services."
2. U. S. Budget Director Charles Schultze put it in a nutshell: He said that "to be effective, we must decentralize."

But Hubert Humphrey hasn't gotten the message. The federal program for a narrowly defined purpose has become the main instrument for building the so-called great society.

Mr. Humphrey's stock answer to a failing, stuck-in-the-mud program is to expand it.

1. When millions of dollars have been spent ineffectively, he answers: quadruple the expenditure.
2. He is unable to change; he is trapped in the attitudes of the generation before last.
3. His campaign symbol ought to be the dinosaur, not the Democratic donkey.

(1) He has forgotten nothing.

1. No, not one slogan, and he has learned nothing -- and so all he can offer in response to the problems of the 1970s are the slogans of the 1930s.

(1) He would end by bankrupting the taxpayers, because he himself is bankrupt of ideas.

We hear much talk of revolution these days. I think we should consider for a moment the French Revolution.

1. No doubt it had many causes, but the main cause, as historians agree, was the rigidity and ineffectiveness of the central government.

(1) **Years of waste and mismanagement, a cumbersome, encrusted, inefficient bureaucracy, a gigantic debt, and**

a king out of touch with reality, brought down the whole structure.

1. The result was disaster.

But I believe that we can find new approaches, both more effective and more responsive to the needs of the people.

1. The main reason for the growth of federal power and the decline in home rule and self-government has been the proliferation of specialized federal grants-in-aid.

(1) I believe that there is a better approach than such proliferation of programs at the federal level.

1. Instead, we should begin to return tax revenue to states and the local communities in the form of bloc grants, and thus allow them, within the very broadest policy definitions, to determine their own priorities in the allocation of resources.
2. The initial distribution of funds should be to the states.
3. However, the pressing needs of our cities and of other local governments require that any final plan must contain enforceable provisions to ensure that they receive a fair share.

2. Revenue sharing will restore real partnership to American government.

(1) It will help to place decision-making in the right hands.

1. For we do not believe that a man sitting in an office in Washington knows more about the needs of the people than our Governors and our Mayors and our local leaders.

We must have a vital and effective federal government in Washington.

1. One way to ensure that we do have one is to get the federal government out of matters it is not competent to handle, and allow it to focus on its proper business.

The threat posed by increasing centralization to the traditional balance of governing authority in America is so great, and the problems of our cities, counties, and states are so serious, that we must not postpone this new direction in governmental policy.

1. Unless we move in the direction suggested by revenue sharing, our fifty state governments, 35,000 municipalities and townships, and 43,000 school districts, will be reduced to subdivisions which take most of their orders from non-elected federal administrators in Washington.

- (1) Revenue sharing is an urgent and necessary step, but it is only one of the steps our new Administration will take.

We will also:

1. -- Reverse the tendency to proliferate specialized federal programs -- now estimated at well over 400 -- by a gradual consolidation of grants under more broadly defined categories, thus allowing for more discretion in setting priorities at the state and local level.
2. -- Allow increased Federal income tax credits for taxes paid at the local and state level, thus enabling state and local governments to increasingly finance their own activities.
3. -- Press measures to relieve the financial strain on private institutions, such as schools, which perform public services.
4. -- Place greater emphasis on the potentialities of the independent sector.
5. -- Act promptly to increase cooperation and consultation between the Governors of the States and the Administration in Washington.

And while we are talking about the Governors of the States, I would like you to remember that the overwhelming majority of our new and creative Governors have been Republicans.

1. This is no accident.

(1) For we believe in the value and effectiveness of state government.

And so, after forty years of steady Federal expansion, the pendulum is beginning to swing, and I believe that we are on the edge of great rebirth of state, local and independent vitality.

1. Everywhere the recognition is growing that this great nation, with its diverse peoples and its complex needs cannot be run in every detail from Washington.

This philosophy is right in the mainstream of the American tradition.

1. The founders of this country, in the very beginning, rebelled against rigid, remote government -- government "from the top down."

(1) They would not be ruled by kings -- and we will not be ruled by Bureaucrats.

2. The first three words of the preamble to the Constitution place the emphasis where it always ought to be in America: "We, the people....."

That is the American tradition, and it's time we began to recover it.

#####

Debate:

My Face the Nation
Sunday Oct. 27, 1968

Let's get facts straight:

- ① I have always said I would do debate if Congress passed law -
I mean T.V. -
He said?
- ② ~~He~~ ^{He} ~~didn't~~ ^{didn't} pass law:
 - ① He opposed & ~~didn't~~ ^{didn't} vote against Bill to allow I ~~can~~ ^{can} debate in 68
 - ② He ~~refused~~ ^{refused} to debate with ~~McCarthy~~ ^{McCarthy} -
~~run out~~
- ③ Now he suggests 3 man debate -
 - ① Only effect = like 3 ~~man~~ ^{man} ~~year~~ ^{year} ~~years~~ -
3 man monthly match -
 - ② It would ~~be~~ ^{not} be a debate
it would build Wallace - ~~(give him money)~~ ^(give him money)
 - ③ In a 2 party system the Majority, while
a 3 party the minority
- ④ He ~~doesn't~~ ^{doesn't} want to be believe in debate
why didn't he vote for it in '64
why didn't he debate McCarthy -
why didn't he get Democrats to pass the law? -
He doesn't want to ~~be~~ ^{be} debate he wants
to build Wallace

He can't win
Refuse to join me - man who gets most votes

Polls - only poll that matters is one everyone participation

① We both gain:

② He will gain more - 80% of undecided
are Democrats - 1 to 3 -

③ But I will win -

④ We are in an all out fight

⑤ I predict we will run 3 points
better than the polls show
shows before election.

① Our people care - adventure -
our vote will get out -

Consider this a
fight down to
win

Admin must not miss this chance to
clear House to change course of history.

Defense Admin will ^{this is what's happened} ~~this is what will happen~~ -
(add - decided - vote)

Cliffed agrees. Should we are we ahead?
yes - but they are going to will pass
Every body seems to agree -

There is a
house - we
are not running

1) Senate ~~Stennis~~ Russell - said for
1st time in 40 years - he could not
say we were clearly ahead

2) British Institute of Strategic Studies - Alastair Buchan -
Should we be? -

Cliffed says yes.

Why? -

1) Because if we must we negotiate for peace

2) We are defensive not offensive -

1st strike

3) From strength we can negotiate
peace - (Midwest - Missouri they are ahead)

3) We shall see that in the air, on the sea,
in research - in missiles we are not 2d

4) And in a defensive system -

4) We have kept peace for 20 years through strength

Comm Contact ^{don't give down U.S. being 2d rate power}

1) Open Society <sup>Pueblo - would not have
happened</sup>

2) Communist v. Nuclear -

3) NATO -

4) offensive - Defense weapon -

5) U.N. -

Law & Order:

1) For 4 years - do nothing -

2) Program:

- Natl Council -
- Natl Academy -
- Narcotics - 600
- Drug Abuse -
- Organized Crime -
- Respect for law

Calli head
Wire tap
Court
permin - any thing done

Send a Proolt -!
Draft card being!
No quarrell -

man can work to change peacefully
can handle the law of reality
to change peacefully

Work of Man is important -
No one has
right to break the law or violate

Anti-Militarist
Defensive

I saw ~~not~~ all day -
I saw ~~number~~ dead

Go a program:

For 3 months - has been on ^{of 25} ~~323~~ Press before,
T.V., ^{radio} ~~television~~, & ~~print~~ ⁱⁿ ~~in~~
Answered every question -
17 major speeches -

only man who
appears in
minutes
215

I appear now - when audience is biggest -
as I did in 66 -

Spending:

- ① Do now funds 15 plus - ~~billions~~ in savings -
- ② Our program - cost a total of 10 billions per year -

Humphrey:

- 30,000,000,000 for ~~costs~~ Marshall Plan
- 15,000,000,000 for Korea -
- 15,000,000,000 for social security -
- 10,000,000,000 for Miscellaneous -

Agree:

- ① 3 months ago - a shadow ^{rather} ~~of a~~ paper
- ② Changes are 2 years old - not worthy of a paper
- ③ Time 1 week before - all on that -
- ④ a retraction has been demanded ^{all new print} (Chambers)
- ⑤ Fast, minute, screen - Ben Franklin

Credibility
has been
destroyed

- for all news fit to print
- He is strong, descent, honest -
- ① He will rebuild it too - not burden
- ② He can take the heat - of savage assault
- ③ He will make a great V.P. -

Who makes says I have no quarrel - with
defeat and him - if willing to
pay penalty

In a society which provides for
peaceful change - no one has
a right to break the law - ^{& vote} ~~law~~ ^A
& we + V.P. should set an example

V. Nam:

Negotiate - no:

① Underst. A.B.D.

② Restraint bargaining -

Policy:

~~Help~~ ① Help them fight;

② Trying -

③ Pacification -

④ Extend ceasefire -

Make our goals clear -

End war in way not another war