

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

Urban Policy

TO THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE ON MAYORS IN MILWAUKEE

June 29, 1976

I.

More than forty years ago, President Franklin Roosevelt declared that America's number one economic problem was poverty in the South.

President Roosevelt was right, and he had the vision and political ability to enact programs such as TVA and REA that changed my life and the lives of millions of Southerners.

Today, America's number one economic problem is our cities, and I want to work with you to meet the problems of urban America just as Franklin Roosevelt worked to meet the problems of the rural South in the 1930's.

I want to make one point at the outset, as plainly as I can.

There is no room in my concept of the Presidency for the politics of alienation and division.

For eight years, our cities and their people and their elected officials have too often been viewed by the White House as adversaries and used as political whipping boys.

Too often our highest federal officials have tried to score political points by pitting the suburbs and the rural areas against the cities.

Too often, these administrations have ignored the common interests which unite our local, state and federal governments.

I pledge to you an urban policy based on a new coalition—recognizing that the president, governors and mayors represent the same urban constituency.

I pledge to you that if I become President, you, the mayors of America, will have a friend, an ally, and a partner in the White House.

The mayors of America will have direct access to the White House to get prompt assistance on any problems that may arise.

It is time for our government leaders to recognize that the people who inhabit even the poorest and most deteriorating of our central cities are our fellow Americans, and that they want the same things we all want: personal security, a decent job, a good education for their children, opportunities for recreation—in short, the basic American promise of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Our goal must be to develop a coherent national urban policy that is consistent, compassionate, realistic, and that reflects the decency and good sense of the American people.

We have never really had a comprehensive urban policy in this country, although we have been moving toward one, in fits and starts, for several decades.

The initial steps came in the late 1930's when we began the first public housing projects. In 1949 we started the Urban Renewal Program. In the 1960's the Anti-Poverty Program and the Model Cities Program broke new ground in urban policy, and gave us some successes, some failures, and much experience to draw upon.

But for the past eight years we have drifted, we have seen indifference replace experimentation, and divisiveness replace the search for unity that this country so urgently needs.

Between 1972 and 1974 alone, the Nixon-Ford Administration cut \$4.5 billion in urban programs and another \$7 billion from programs to aid the poor, the unemployed and the medically indigent.

The cities, with their revenues already reduced by the worst recession in forty years, and with rapidly rising costs, could only respond to the financial crunch with higher taxes or reduced services. Thus, in 1975, our cities enacted \$1.5 billion in new taxes while reducing expenditures by \$1.4 billion. The result of these increased taxes and reduced services can only be to speed the flight to the suburbs and leave behind urban dwellers bereft of the hope for a better quality of life.

In short, in the absence of understanding and coordinated assistance among government leaders, many of our cities are caught in a vicious cycle, a downward spiral that can only be broken by new attitudes, new initiatives, and new leadership.

II.

The time has come for us to work together toward a restoration of federalism, through the creation of a balanced national partnership that is based on mutual trust, mutual respect, and mutual commitment to the future of the American city.

The balanced national partnership I envision must incorporate three basic elements.

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

A copy of our report is filed with the Federal Election Commission and is available for purchase from the Federal Election Commission, Washington, D.C.

First, the Federal Government must provide predictable and adequate financial support to assist communities in meeting your legitimate fiscal needs, so that localities can avoid excessive service cutbacks and inordinate property tax increases.

Of course, we must be realistic. We cannot just throw money at problems. We must respect the desire of the American taxpayer to get a dollar's worth of results for each dollar spent. But I believe that if we talk sense to the American people, we will find support for a realistic program to meet the urban crisis. That is what I intend to do as President.

Secondly, a balanced national partnership must, to the greatest degree possible, grant to the local governments the administrative freedom needed for innovative, creative programming.

Between the mid-1950's and this year, the number of categorical grant programs grew from 150 to more than 1600, each with its own administrative bureaucracy, its own restrictive conditions, individual application procedures, review conditions and funding priorities.

These categorical grants can often serve important functions. On a program of national dimensions, such grants can maximize local involvement in confronting national problems.

In practice, however, the proliferation of grants has built an irrational structure, which has often limited local initiative and fragmented local efforts toward sound fiscal planning.

It is important to attach conditions to programs which ensure that funds are directed toward the beneficiaries intended by Congress and the President. But too often programs designed for the ghetto families have been shifted to further benefit affluent families whose political influence can prevail.

You, this nation's mayors, are the people on the firing line, fighting a hard battle against heavy odds, and we cannot expect you to fight well if you are trapped in the bureaucratic straightjacket that categorical grants have too often imposed.

To achieve a balanced national partnership, I intend to undertake a review, beginning this year and involving full consultation with state and local officials, and congressional leaders, to determine in which instances consolidation of categorical grants would be desirable.

That process of consolidation will insure that the federal structure is organized to allow localities maximum flexibility in delivering services within the framework of national standards. I can insure that consolidation will not be a cover to reduce needed federal assistance, or to change the distribution of benefits so as to discriminate against those individuals with the greatest need.

Third, a balanced federal partnership must involve the governors and the mayors in the earliest stages of formulating our national urban policy, and in the design of new administrative machinery to implement that policy.

Finally federalism is not going to mean anything until the Federal Government sets its own house in order. I intend as President to direct a complete re-

organization of the executive branch of the Federal Government along rational functional lines, one that will enable Washington to work more effectively with you in responding to the urban crisis.

I look forward with interest to observe similar improvements in municipal government organization and management which you are sharing with one another. We have long recognized that federal tax funds should not finance local waste.

My own views on federalism are not just theories: they directly reflect my experiences in dealing with the delivery end of complicated programs when I was Governor of Georgia.

I learned, along with you mayors, just how confused and irrational the Washington bureaucracy can be. For example, when we started a Drug Treatment Program under one state agency, we discovered there were some fourteen different agencies that were funding various aspects of the drug problem, and with little, if any, coordination among them.

But I am absolutely convinced that if we work together on the task, we can come up with a federal system that is effective and efficient and that can be a source of national pride instead of national embarrassment.

We simply can no longer afford the price of the red tape. We must get the money and services to the people who need them, and not just to the communities that happen to be most skilled in the art of grantsmanship.

III.

These are among my beliefs as I consider the urban problem. Now I want to discuss some of the specific programs I support.

The first thing we need is jobs, a job for every American who wants one. Unemployment and poverty are at the heart of the urban problem.

Last year, the central city unemployment rate was 9.6%, and among black teenagers the jobless rate in many areas was over 40%. Those figures are unacceptable. They reflect a national sickness that we must confront head-on. They reflect not only human tragedies but they are at the heart of the fiscal and social problems of cities. The only way to achieve the growth in the urban tax base required to meet rising expenditures is through a healthy local economy.

To provide employment, we need both a program of incentives to private employers and a program of public needs employment.

We must recognize at the outset that almost 85% of America's workers depend on private industry for jobs. I would like to maintain or improve this ratio.

To encourage new industrial development in the cities, I have proposed assistance to local governments for urban economic planning, employment credits to businesses for hiring the unemployed, and federal funds to support on-the-job training by business.

In terms of public employment, I favor an improved CETA Program, an accelerated Public Works Program,

and funds for a total of some 800,000 summer jobs. Like some of you, I remember the impact of the CCC and WPA in the 1930's, and I think similar initiatives are called for today, but with stress on urban, rather than rural work projects, and with maximum possible local control over those projects. Public employment must be meaningful and productive in meeting the most urgent needs of the community.

Our efforts toward full employment must be supplemented by fiscal assistance, and in particular by an improved program of revenue sharing.

I predicted at the outset of the Nixon Administration's ~~Revenue Sharing Program~~ that it would eventually be used to reduce, rather than increase, net federal assistance to our states and cities. Unfortunately, I was correct.

I stand with you in urging Congress to extend the General Revenue Sharing Program with an inflation factor and with full enforcement of the civil rights provisions of the bill.

As perhaps you know, I have for some time stated my belief, even when I was a governor, that revenue sharing funds should go directly to localities, and that they should be free to use those funds to defray costs of education and social programs.

We also need countercyclical assistance, with revenue sharing and other financial aid designed to meet the special needs of the most hard-pressed urban areas. We need an automatic countercyclical assistance program, with a long-term authorization, triggered by carefully defined economic conditions in particular localities and designed to maintain service levels in our cities and thereby avoid disruptive tax increases and public employee layoffs.

I regret President Ford's veto last year of the Public Works Economic Development Act, with its needed provision for public works, for countercyclical aid to cities, and for waste water treatment plants, and I join you in urging that he sign the new version passed with overwhelming Democratic majorities, which now awaits his action.

The present bill is within the budget resolutions adopted by Congress, and it would not be rejected by a President who genuinely understood and cared about our cities and their people.

In the past year, the dramatic financial difficulties of New York City have been the focus of national attention on urban fiscal problems. But the truth is that cities throughout America share the same problems of declining revenues and increasing costs. Your own 1976 economic report makes that point abundantly clear. For the first time, cities of every size, and in every part of the nation, including the sunbelt, are face to face with financial crisis.

I think the public at large does not yet realize that what we confront is not just New York City's fiscal crisis, but a national problem. It will be your duty and my duty to make the nation aware of the broad nature of the urban problem, and to provide the leadership and the ideas that can cope with it.

Another need in easing urban problems, as I have

stressed throughout my campaign, is a complete overhaul of our welfare system.

Our present system is a failure deplored alike by those who pay for it, those who administer it, and those who supposedly benefit from it.

About 10% of those on welfare are able to work full time, and they should be offered job training and jobs. Any such person who refuses training or employment should not receive further welfare benefits.

The other 90% of the people on welfare are children, persons with dependent children, old people, handicapped people, or persons otherwise unable to work full time. They should be treated with compassion and respect.

We should have a simpler National Welfare Program, with one fairly uniform standard of payment, adjusted for cost of living differences by areas and with strong work incentives built in. In no case should the level of benefits make loafing more attractive than working. And we should have welfare rules that strengthen families rather than divide families. Local governments should not be burdened with the cost of welfare and my goal would also include the phased reduction of the states' share as soon as that is financially feasible.

I believe we are competent enough to create a welfare program that is both efficient and compassionate.

We also need presidential leadership in helping cities meet their housing and transportation needs.

1975 was our worst year in nearly three decades in terms of the number of housing units constructed. We set a goal in 1968 of 2½ million new housing units per year; last year we constructed barely one million.

At the same time, costs have been rising so that only one American family in six can now afford new housing.

We need a program that will provide jobs for hundreds of thousands of unemployed construction workers and also fulfill our national commitment to adequate housing construction.

Our long-range, comprehensive and predictable national housing policy must include:

Federal subsidies and low-interest loans for the construction of low and middle-income housing;

Greater effort to direct mortgage money into the financing of private housing;

Expansion of the successful Section 202 Housing Program for the Elderly;

Greater emphasis on the rehabilitation of existing housing to rebuild our neighborhoods and publicly created jobs to spearhead this rehabilitation;

Continued construction of rental homes for low-income families; and

Prohibition of red-lining practices by lending institutions.

We should give serious consideration to the proposals now before Congress for a domestic development bank that would make low-interest loans to businesses and state and local governments to encourage private sector investment in chronically depressed areas.

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 can be improved when it comes up for reauthor-

ization next year. If I become President, it will be necessary for me to submit my proposals on this program to Congress very soon after taking office, and I want your ideas and recommendations on how it can be made more effective.

The plight of our municipal transportation systems is another subject for presidential concern and initiative.

For twenty years we have spent tens of billions of dollars on the interstate highway system while virtually ignoring public transportation. Our bus and subway systems have deteriorated, public use of them has declined, and deficits have mounted.

Although we must expedite final completion of the interstate highway system, we cannot allow mass transit to remain a national stepchild. If people cannot get in and out of our cities in comfort and safety, then the economic strength of our central cities is doomed.

As first steps toward revitalizing our urban transportation system, I propose:

To create a total national policy for all modes of transportation;

To increase the portion of transportation money available for public mass transportation;

To change the current restrictive limits on the use of mass transit funds by localities, so more money can be used as operating subsidies;

To revitalize our nation's railroads.

There is also a tremendous opportunity for relatively inexpensive transportation improvement by strong local action to provide off-street parking, one-way streets, exclusive bus lines, limited unloading hours for downtown stores, more carpools, and staggered working hours for public and private employees.

These are some of the necessary first steps if we are to deal with the urban crisis. There are obviously other areas of need, such as parks and recreation, education, pollution, and crime prevention, that must also be addressed.

Perhaps most importantly, we must recognize that many federal programs in the past have had a counterproductive effect on the health and wealth of our cities. It is time to assure that federal spending policy takes into account the best interests of our urban communities.

IV.

In order to have a comprehensive urban strategy, federal, state and local governments must provide incentives to direct the resources of private enterprise into our cities. Our national urban partnership would be incomplete without the creative involvement of private resources. The public sector cannot rebuild our cities alone. *An optimum public-private partnership must be forged.*

In this era of scarce resources, the Federal Government can help magnify limited public sector funds by engaging substantial private sector investment in our cities. As urban economist Anthony Downs noted, "Federal funds alone—and even all public sector funds together—have little chance of stimulating effective community development unless they are used as a

catalyst to attract large amounts of additional resources from the private sector."

The government can also help local communities encourage innovative new structures, such as tax increment financing, which allows a city to use growth in its property tax in a given area to stimulate needed urban reinvestments, and joint public-private development mechanisms.

The Community Development Act should not only be extended but its scope should be significantly oriented to encourage financial and political innovation by municipalities and their private sector partners. Community development funds, local tax increment financing, federal loan guarantees and other public and private funds should be used flexibly to create a revolving pool of financial resources for urban redevelopment. Unfortunately, the Ford Administration has not yet even implemented a small scale version of the current act, which affords an outstanding opportunity to combine public and private urban development investments.

Privately operated non-profit organizations committed to urban redevelopment, such as Central Atlanta Progress in my home state's capital, are being formed throughout the country to help serve as a catalyst for private investment in our cities. They must be encouraged in their efforts.

V.

I do not underestimate the magnitude of the problem. But neither do I underestimate the strength and compassion and good sense of the American people, when they are given the right kind of leadership and make up their minds to solve a problem.

A nation that can send men to the moon can meet its urban needs. It is a matter of priorities, of leadership, and of determination.

I think we stand at a turning point in history. If, a hundred years from now, this nation's experiment in democracy has failed, I suspect that historians will trace that failure to our own era, when a process of decay began in our inner cities and was allowed to spread unchecked throughout our society.

But I do not believe that must happen. I believe that, working together, we can turn the tide, stop the decay, and set in motion a process of growth that by the end of this century can give us cities worthy of the greatest nation on earth.

I recall the oath taken by the citizens of Athens:

"We will ever strive for the ideals and sacred things of the city;

"We will unceasingly seek to quicken the sense of public duty;

"We will revere and obey the city's laws;

"We will transmit this city not less, but greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

Those words are more than two thousand years old, but they are still valid today. They are your goals, and they are my goals, and working together, we can achieve them. Thank you.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR JIMMY CARTER

On Foreign Policy

TO MEMBERS OF THE

AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, TOKYO, JAPAN

May 28, 1975

The world in 1975 is a very different world from that which we knew in the 1950s and the 1960s. Recent events have proven that a stable world order for the future cannot be built on a preoccupation with the old strategic issues which have dominated East-West and North-South relations since the end of World War II.

Recently, with the end of the Vietnam conflict, a tremendous burden has been lifted from our shoulders—both an economic burden and one of divisiveness and doubt. Our over-involvement in the internal affairs of Southeast Asian countries is resulting in a mandatory reassessment by the American people of our basic foreign policies. The lessons we have learned can be a basis for dramatic improvements in the prospects for world peace and the solutions for international problems. The people of the United States are inclined to look toward the future and not to dwell on the mistakes of the past.

What are the lessons we have learned? What are our likely decisions about the future?

There is no doubt that our people are wary of any new foreign involvements, but we realize that many such involvements will be necessary.

We have learned that never again should our country become militarily involved in the internal affairs of another nation unless there is a direct and obvious threat to the security of the United States or its people. We must not use the CIA or other covert means to effect violent change in any government or government policy. Such involvements are not in the best interests of world peace, and they are almost inherently doomed to failure.

When we embrace one of the contending leadership factions in a country, too often it is the power

of the United States, not the support of the people, which keeps that leader in power. Our chosen leader may then resort to repressive force against his own people to keep himself in power.

We have learned the hard way how important it is during times of international stress and turmoil to keep close ties with our allies and friends and to strive for multilateral agreements and solutions to critical problems. I hope that our days of unilateral intervention such as occurred in Vietnam, Cambodia, and the Dominican Republic are over.

Another lesson to be learned is that we cannot impose democracy on another country by force. Also, we cannot buy friends; and it is obvious that other nations resent it if we try. Our interests lie in protecting our national security, in preventing war, in peacefully promoting the principles of human freedom and democracy, and in exemplifying in our foreign policy the true character and attitudes of the American people.

We understand the vital importance of our relationship with our allies. Our friends in Japan, Western Europe and Israel must know that we will keep our promises; yet, they will be reassured not by promises but by tangible actions and regular consultations. It is particularly important that we recent strained relationships with our allies; that will be far easier to accomplish now that our involvement in Vietnam is over. The United States will always honor those commitments which have been made openly by our leaders and with the full knowledge and involvement of the people of our country.

We must never again keep secret the evolution of our foreign policy from the Congress and the Ameri-

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

A copy of our report is filed with the Federal Election Commission and is available for purchase from the Federal Election Commission, Washington, D.C.

can people. They should never again be misled about our options, our commitments, our progress, or our failures. If the President sets the policy openly, reaching agreement among the officers of the government, if the President involves the Congress and the leaders of both parties rather than letting a handful of people plot the policy behind closed doors, then we will avoid costly mistakes and have the support of our citizens in our dealings with other nations. Our commitments will be stronger; abrupt changes will be fewer.

Secretaries of State and Defense and other Cabinet officers should regularly appear before Congress, hopefully in televised sessions, to answer hard questions and to give straight answers. No equivocation nor unwarranted secrecy should be permitted.

What are the other elements of our future foreign policy? This is no time for thoughts of isolationism. We can now turn our attention more effectively toward matters like the world economy, freedom of the seas, environmental quality, food, population, peace, conservation of irreplaceable commodities, and the reduction of world armaments. The intensity of our interrelated problems is rapidly increasing, and better mechanisms for consultation must be established and utilized before these problems become more dangerous.

Interdependence among nations is an unavoidable and increasing factor in our individual lives. We know that even a nation with an economy as strong as ours is affected by errors such as the excessive sale of wheat to Russia in 1973, by commodity boycotts, and by the ebb and tide of economic events in the rest of the world. Our own temporary embargo of soybeans and other oil seeds was a damaging mistake to ourselves and to our friends like Japan. Such mistakes can be avoided in the future only by a commitment to consultation, as exemplified by the Trilateral Commission relationship among North America, Western Europe, and Japan.

The machinery of consultation must be reexamined and some new mechanisms developed. Others need to be abandoned or revitalized. We must strengthen international organizations such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the United Nations. Our new commitment to multinational consultation should be reflected in the quality of the representatives we appoint to international agencies.

It is likely in the near future that issues of war and peace will be more a function of economic and social problems than of the military security problems which have dominated international relations in the world since World War II.

The relationship between Japan and the United States is based on both firm pillars of interest—our mutual security and our great economic relationship.

The security of Japan is vital to the United States, and we will maintain our commitment to Japan's defense. The sensitive question of the level and deployment of military forces here will, of course, be shaped in a continuing dialogue with Japan.

The enormous trade flow of \$24 billion a year is the largest overseas commerce the world has ever known. We rely on one another. There is no place for abrupt unilateral decisions which shock the other trading partner. Major foreign policy actions affecting the other must be thoroughly discussed in advance with our friend.

Interdependence means mutual sacrifice. For example, we must cooperate with our allies in reducing our demands for fossil fuel, assist them in the alternative development of energy resources, build up common stockpiles, plan jointly for future crises, and share the oil investments of the OPEC countries.

Among our people there is broad support for continuing the policy of detente with the Soviet Union and China—but not at the expense of close cooperation and consultation with our friends and allies. We must again reorient our foreign policy attention toward our friends. Our recent emphases have all too often involved our adversaries and ignored the interests and needs of our allies. Detente should be pursued on a mutually beneficial basis through a series of sustained, low key and open discussions among the participants—and not just dramatic or secret agreements among two or three national leaders.

Our concern with foreign policy, however, must go beyond avoiding the mistakes of the past, reaffirming our close relationship with our allies, and continuing the process of detente. We must end the continuing proliferation of atomic weapons throughout the world, which is as senseless as a waste of precious resources as it is a mortal danger to humanity. We should refuse to sell nuclear power plants and fuels to nations who do not sign the nuclear nonproliferation treaty or who will not agree to adhere to strict provisions regarding international control of atomic wastes. The establishment of additional nuclear free zones in the world must also be encouraged.

In addition, however, the United States and the Soviet Union have an obligation to deal with the excessive nuclear armaments which we possess. Our ultimate goal should be the reduction of nuclear weapons in all nations to zero. In the meantime, simple, careful and firm public proposals to implement these reductions should be pursued as a prime

national purpose in all our negotiations with nuclear powers—both present and potential. The Vladivostok agreement obviously permits the continued atomic arms race.

We must play a constructive role in the resolution of local conflicts which may lead to major power confrontations. Peace in the Middle East is of vital interest to us all. While peace is the basic responsibility of the nations in the area, the United States must help secure this peace by maintaining the trust of all sides. We must strive to maintain good relations with the Arab countries as well as Israel, and to recognize Arab needs and aspirations as long as they recognize that the major element of a settlement is the guaranteed right of Israel to exist as a viable and peaceful nation. The rights of the Palestinians must also be recognized as part of any final solution.

It is essential that the flow of oil to Japan and Western Europe never be shut off. The United States should not consider unilateral action in the Middle East to assure our own nation's access to Mideast oil. Open or veiled threats of armed intervention do not contribute toward a peaceful settlement of the problems of this tortured region.

The peoples of the developing nations need the aid, technology and knowledge of the developed nations. We need the developed nations as sources for raw materials and as markets for our exports. The world will not be a safe or decent place in which to live, however, if it continues to divide between countries which are increasingly rich and those which are increasingly impoverished.

The knowledge that food, oil, fertilizer and financial credit are vital must not be the cause of international extortion; rather, our interdependence should provide

a basis on which continuing international trade agreements can be reached. There is a danger that the recent economic successes of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries cartel will encourage other confrontations by countries possessing scarce raw materials. This could be a serious and self-damaging mistake, resulting in a series of pyramiding and perhaps uncontrollable confrontations, leading to serious damage to the poorer and weaker nations.

A stable world order cannot become a reality when people of many nations of the world suffer mass starvation; when the countries with capital and technology belligerently confront other nations for the control of raw materials and energy sources; when open and discriminatory trade has become the exception rather than the rule; when there are no established arrangements for supplying the world's food and energy nor for governing, control and development of the seas; and when there are no effective efforts to deal with population explosions or environmental quality.

We must remember that because of our tremendous and continuing economic, military and political strength, the United States has an inevitable role of leadership to play within the community of nations. But our influence and respect should go beyond our military might, our political power, and our economic wealth—and be based on the fact that we are right, and fair, and decent, and honest, and truthful.

Our United States foreign policy must once again reflect the basic ideals of our people and our nation. We must reassert our vital interest in human rights and humanitarian concerns, and we must provide enlightened leadership in the world community. The people of the United States want to be trusted and respected, and we are determined, therefore, to be trustworthy and respectful of others.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER TO THE CHICAGO COUNCIL ON

Foreign Relations

March 15, 1976

I am pleased to speak to you today. This council is the oldest, the largest, and the most active organization of its kind in the country. For over fifty years you have helped make this city and this region better informed about a world which the St. Lawrence Seaway now brings to your doorstep. Men like Adlai Stevenson, Paul Douglas, and Frank Knox studied the world through this council and went on to make history.

I want to take this opportunity to explain how I shall approach the problems of foreign policy if I am elected President:

How I see our international situation today;

What our role in the world should be;

How we should approach our relationships with different kinds of international neighbors;

What kinds of policies, and what kind of policy-makers we shall need so that our international relations can be true expressions of the goals and the character of the people of our country.

Our recent foreign policy, I am afraid, has been predicated on a belief that our national and international strength is inevitably deteriorating. I do not accept this premise.

The prime responsibility of any president is to guarantee the security of our nation, with a tough, muscular, well-organized and effective fighting force. We must have the ability to avoid the threat of successful attack or blackmail and we must always be strong enough to carry out our legitimate foreign policy. This is a prerequisite to peace.

Our foreign policy today is in greater disarray than at any time in recent history.

Our Secretary of State simply does not trust the judgment of the American people, but constantly conducts foreign policy exclusively, personally and in secret. This creates in our country the very divisions which he has lately deplored. Longstanding traditions of a bi-partisan policy and close consultation between the President and Congress have been seriously damaged.

We are losing a tremendous opportunity to reassert our leadership in working with other nations in the cause of peace and progress. The good will our country once

enjoyed, based on what we stood for and the willingness of others to follow our example, has been dissipated.

Negotiations with the Soviets on strategic arms are at dead center, while the costly and dangerous buildup of nuclear weapons continues.

The policy of detente, which holds real possibilities for peace, has been conducted in a way that has eroded the public confidence it must have.

The moral heart of our international appeal — as a country which stands for self-determination and free choice — has been weakened. It is obviously un-American to interfere in the free political processes of another nation. It is also un-American to engage in assassinations in time of peace in any country.

The people of other nations have learned, in recent years, that they can sometimes neither trust what our government says nor predict what it will do. They have been hurt and disappointed so many times that they no longer know what to believe about the United States. They want to respect us. They like our people. But our people do not seem to be running our government.

Every time we have made a serious mistake in recent years in our dealings with other nations, the American people have been excluded from the process of evolving and consummating our foreign policy. Unnecessary secrecy surrounds the inner workings of our own government, and we have sometimes been deliberately misled by our leaders.

For many nations, we have two policies: one announced in public, another pursued in secret. In the case of China, we even seem to have two Presidents.

No longer do our leaders talk to the people of the world with the vision, compassion and practical idealism of men like Woodrow Wilson and John Kennedy and Adlai Stevenson.

Our foreign policy is being evolved in secret, and in its full details and nuances, it is probably known to one man only. That man is skilled at negotiation with leaders of other countries but far less concerned with consulting the American people or their representatives in Congress, and far less skilled in marshalling the support of a nation behind an effective foreign policy. Because we have let our foreign

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

A copy of our report is filed with the Federal Election Commission and is available for purchase from the Federal Election Commission, Washington, D.C.

policy be made for us, we have lost something crucial in the way we talk and the way we act toward other peoples of the world.

When our President and Secretary of State speak to the world without the understanding or support of the American people, they speak with an obviously hollow voice.

All of this is a cause of sorrow and pain to Americans, as well as to those who wish us well and look to us for leadership. We ought to be leading the way toward economic progress and social justice and a stronger, more stable international order. They are the principles on which this nation was founded two hundred years ago, by men who believed with Thomas Paine that the "cause of America is the cause of all mankind."

Every successful foreign policy we have had — whether it was the Good Neighbor Policy of President Franklin Roosevelt, The Point Four of President Truman or the Peace Corps and Trade Reform of President Kennedy — was successful because it reflected the best that was in us.

And in every foreign venture that has failed — whether it was Vietnam, Cambodia, Chile, Angola or in the excesses of the CIA — our Government forged ahead without consulting the American people, and did *things* that were contrary to our basic character.

The lesson we draw from recent history is that public understanding and support are now as vital to a successful foreign policy as they are to any domestic program. *No one can make our foreign policy for us as well as we can make it ourselves.*

The role of the United States in the world is changing. For years, we were the only free nation with the military capacity to keep the peace and the resources to insure world economic stability. Japan and Western Europe would never have been able to achieve their economic miracles without our help. Nor could world exports have risen to their present level of three-quarters of a trillion dollars, had not international trade and investment been backed for so long by the American dollar.

These were historic and generous accomplishments, of which we can be justly proud. But we also had the power to make or break regimes with adroit injections of money or arms, and we sometimes used this power in ways that are less commendable.

The world is different now. The old postwar monopolies of economic resource and industrial power have been swept aside and replaced by new structures. The Common Market countries and others like Japan, Mexico, Brazil, and Iran are strong and self-sufficient.

We have learned that we cannot and should not try to intervene militarily in the internal affairs of other countries unless our own nation is endangered.

Over 100 new nations have come into being in the past 30 years. A few have wealth, but most exist in bitter poverty. In many, independence has set loose long-suppressed emotions and antagonisms. In Uganda and Angola, Bangladesh and Lebanon — and recently in the United Nations — we have seen what can happen when nationalist and racial passions, or tribal or religious hatreds, are left to run their course.

We cannot isolate ourselves from the forces loose in the world. The question is not whether we take an interest in foreign affairs, but how we do it and why we do it.

In the last few years, I have travelled in foreign lands, and met with many of their leaders. I have served on international bodies, such as the Trilateral Commission, which makes recommendations on some of these problems. I have given thought to the structure of what our foreign policy should be.

There are certain basic principles I believe should guide whatever is done in foreign lands in the name of the United States of America.

First, our policies should be as open and honest and decent and compassionate as the American people themselves are. Our policies should be shaped with the participation of Congress, from the outset, on a bi-partisan basis. And they should emerge from broad and well-informed public debate and participation.

Second, our policies should treat the people of other nations as individuals, with the same dignity and respect as we demand for ourselves. No matter where they live, no matter who they are, the people of other lands are just as concerned with the struggles of daily life as you and I. They work hard, they have families whom they love, they have hopes and dreams and a great deal of pride. And they want to live in peace. Their basic personal motives are the same as ours.

Third, it must be the responsibility of the President to restore the moral authority of this country in its conduct of foreign policy. We should work for peace and the control of arms in everything we do. We should support the humanitarian aspirations of the world's people. Policies that strengthen dictators or create refugees, policies that prolong suffering or postpone racial justice weaken that authority. Policies that encourage economic progress and social justice promote it. In an age when almost all of the world's people are tied together by instant communication, the image of a country, as seen through its policies, has a great deal to do with what it can accomplish through the traditional channels of diplomacy.

Fourth, our policies should be aimed at building a just and peaceful world order, in which every nation can have a constructive role. ~~For too long~~, our foreign policy has consisted almost entirely of maneuver and manipulation, based on the assumption that the world is a jungle of competing national antagonisms, where military supremacy and economic muscle are the only things that work and where rival powers are balanced against each other to keep the peace.

Exclusive reliance on this strategy is not in keeping with the character of the American people, or with the world as it is today. Balance of power politics may have worked in 1815, or even 1945, but it has a much less significant role in today's world. Of course, there are rivalries — racial, religious, national, some of them bitter. But the need for cooperation, even between rivals, goes deeper than all of them.

Every nation has a stake in stopping the pollution of the seas and the air. Every nation wants to be free from the

threat of blackmail by international terrorists and hijackers. Every nation, including those of OPEC, sits on limited resources of energy that are running out. The vast majority of countries, including the Soviet Union, do not grow enough food to feed their own people. Every nation's economy benefits from expanding two-way trade. And everyone — except perhaps the speculator — has a stake in a fair and reliable international monetary system.

Our diplomatic agenda must also include preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and controlling the flow of narcotics.

In the future, we must turn our attention increasingly towards these common problems of food, energy, environment, and trade. A stable world order cannot become a reality when people of many nations of the world suffer mass starvation or when there are no established arrangements to deal with population growth or environmental quality. The intensity of these interrelated problems is rapidly increasing and better mechanisms for consultation on these problems that affect everyone on this planet must be established and utilized.

While the American people have had their fill of military adventurism and covert manipulation, we have not retreated into isolationism. We realize that increased anarchy will not only reverse the progress toward peace and stability that we have made, but also strengthen the hand of our adversaries.

That is why we must replace balance of power politics with world order politics. The new challenge to American foreign policy is to take the lead in joining the other nations of the world to build a just and stable international order.

We need to reorder our diplomatic priorities. In recent years, we have paid far more attention to our adversaries than to our friends, and we have been especially neglectful of our neighbors in Latin America.

It is important to continue to seek agreements with the Russians and the Chinese, especially in the control of weapons. Success there could mean life instead of death for millions of people. But the divisions between us are deep. The differences of history and ideology will not go away. It is too much to expect that we can do much more in these relationships than reduce the areas of irritation and conflict and lessen the danger of war.

Our nation should coordinate its policy with our friends — countries like the democratic states of Europe, North America and Japan — those countries who share with us common goals and aspirations. We should work in concert with them. Ours are the fortunate countries of the world. But our continued prosperity and welfare depend upon increased coordination of our policies. If we can work together on goals which reflect the common needs and shared values of our people, we can make our societies the strong and stable inner core around which world cooperation, prosperity and peace can develop.

If we believe in the importance of this effort, we should make some changes. We must both lead and collaborate at the same time. We must consult with others more about our plans. The days of "Nixon Shocks" and "Kissinger

Surprises" must end. Our goal should be to act in concert with these countries whenever we can.

And we must have faith in their commitment to democracy. We do not need to preach to the western Europeans about the dangers of communism as the Secretary of State did last week. Their traditions and political good sense are not inferior to ours.

Our policies toward the developing countries also need revision. For years, we have either ignored them or treated them as pawns in the big power chess game. Both approaches were deeply offensive to their people. The oil embargo taught us that even the least developed nation will eventually have control over its own natural resources and that those countries which, alone or together, can control necessary commodities are a force that can neither be ignored or manipulated.

An attitude of neglect and disrespect toward the developing nations of the world is predicated in part on a sense of superiority toward others — a form of racism. This is incompatible with the character of American people.

We need to enlist the cooperation of the developing nations, for when we speak of the tasks of a stable world order, we include preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, policing the world's environment, controlling the flow of narcotics and establishing international protection against acts of terror. If three-quarters of the people of the world do not join in these arrangements, they will not succeed.

Our policies toward the developing world must be tough-minded in the pursuit of our legitimate interests. At the same time, these policies must be patient in the recognition of their legitimate interests which have too often been cast aside.

The developing world has, of course, a few leaders who are implacably hostile to anything the United States does. But the majority of its leaders are moderate men and women who are prepared to work with us. When we ignore the Third World, as we have for so long, the extremists will usually have their way. But if we offer programs based on common interests, we can make common cause with most of their leadership.

Our program of international aid to developing nations should be redirected so that it meets the minimum human needs of the greatest number of people. This means an emphasis on food, jobs, education, and public health — including access to family planning. The emphasis in aid should be on those countries with a proven ability to help themselves, instead of those that continue to allow enormous discrepancies in living standards among their people. The time has come to stop taxing poor people in rich countries for the benefit of rich people in poor countries.

In our trade relations with these nations we should join commodity agreements in such items as tin, coffee and sugar which will assure adequate supplies to consumers, protect our people from inflation, and at the same time stop the fluctuation in prices that can cause such hardship and uncertainty in single-commodity countries.

The burden of economic development is going to be a heavy one. There are many countries which ought to share

it, not only in Europe and Asia but in the Mideast. Today, a greater proportion of royalties from oil can be channelled to the Third World by international institutions. Tomorrow, they can receive a part of the profits from the mining of the seas. The purpose of such development is not to level the economic lot of every person on earth. It is to inject the wealth-creating process into countries that are now stagnant; it is to help developing countries to act in what is their own best interest as well as ours — produce more food, limit population growth, and expand markets, supplies and materials. It is simply to give every country a sufficient stake in the international order so that it feels no need to act as an outlaw. It is to advance the cause of human dignity.

We must also work with the countries of the Communist World. The policy of East-West detente is under attack today because of the way it has been exploited by the Soviet Union. The American people were told it would mean a "generation of peace," at no risk to the nation's vital interests. And yet, in places like Syria or Angola, in activities like offensive missile development, the Soviets seem to be taking advantage of the new relationship to expand their power and influence, and increase the risk of conflict.

I support the objectives of detente but I cannot go along with the way it has been handled by Presidents Nixon and Ford. The Secretary of State has tied its success too closely to his personal reputation. As a result, he is giving up too much and asking for too little. He is trumpeting achievements on paper while failing to insist on them in practice.

The relationship of detente is one of both cooperation and competition, of new kinds of contacts in some areas along with continued hostility in others. In the troubled history of our relationships with the Soviet Union, this is where we have arrived. The benefits of detente must accrue to both sides, or they are worthless. Their mutual advantage must be apparent, or the American people will not support the policy.

To the Soviets, detente is an opportunity to continue the process of world revolution without running the threat of nuclear war. They have said so quite openly, as recently as a month ago at their 25th party congress. To the Soviet Union, with our acquiescence, detente is surface tranquility in Europe within boundaries redefined to their benefit, together with support for wars of national liberation elsewhere. It is having the benefits of the Helsinki Accords without the requirement of living up to the human rights provisions which form an integral part of it. This is not the road to peace but the bitter deception of the American people.

But while detente must become more reciprocal, I reject the strident and bellicose voices of those who would have this country return to the days of the cold war with the Soviet Union. I believe the American people want to look to the future. They have seen the tragedy of American involvement in Vietnam and drawn appropriate lessons for tomorrow. They seek new vistas, not a repetition of old rhetoric and old mistakes.

It is in our interest to try to make detente broader and more reciprocal. Detente can be an instrument for long-term peaceful change within the Communist system, as well

as in the rest of the world. We should make it clear that detente requires that the Soviets, as well as the United States, refrain from irresponsible intervention in other countries. The Russians have no more business in Angola than we have.

The core of detente is the reduction in arms. We should negotiate to reduce the present SALT ceilings on offensive weapons before both sides start a new arms race to reach the current maximums, and before new missile systems are tested or committed for production.

I am not afraid of hard bargaining with the Soviet Union. Hard bargaining will strengthen support for the agreements that can be reached, and will show that we, as well as they, can gain from detente. We can increase the possibility that the fear of war and the burden of arms may be lifted from the shoulders of humanity by the nations that have done the most to place it there.

Our vision must be of a more pluralistic world and not of a communist monolith. We must pay more attention to China and to Eastern Europe. It is in our interest and in the interests of world peace to promote a more pluralistic communist world.

We should remember that Eastern Europe is not an area of stability and it will not become such until the Eastern European countries regain their independence and become part of a larger cooperative European framework. I am concerned over the long-range prospects for Rumanian and Yugoslavian independence, and I deplore the recent infliction upon Poland of a constitution that ratifies its status as a Soviet Satellite. We must reiterate to the Soviets that an enduring American-Soviet detente cannot ignore the legitimate aspirations of other nations. We must likewise insist that the Soviet Union and other countries recognize the human rights of all citizens who live within their boundaries, whether they be blacks in Rhodesia, Asians in Uganda, or Jews in the Soviet Union.

Our relations with China are important to world peace and they directly affect the world balance. The United States has a great stake in a nationally independent, secure, and friendly China. The present turmoil in Chinese domestic politics could be exploited by the Soviets to promote a Sino-Soviet reconciliation which might be inimical to international stability and to American interests. I believe that we should explore more actively the possibility of widening American-Chinese trade relations and of further consolidating our political relationships.

The Middle East is a key testing area for our capacity to construct a more cooperative international system. I believe deeply that a Middle East peace settlement is essential to American interests, to Israel's long-range survival and to international cooperation. Without a settlement, the region will become increasingly open to Soviet influence and more susceptible to radical violence. I believe that the United States should insure Israel's security while at the same time encourage both sides to address themselves to the substance of a genuine settlement.

There is no question that both Africa and Latin America have been ignored since the presidencies of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. These areas should become, and indeed will become, increasingly important in the next decade. Our relationships with these must abandon

traditional paternalism. The United States-Brazilian agreement, signed recently by Secretary of State Kissinger on his trip to Latin America, is a good example of our present policy at its worst. Kissinger's remarks during his visit that "there are no two people whose concern for human dignities and for the basic values of man is more profound in day-to-day life than Brazil and the United States" can only be taken as a gratuitous slap in the face of all those Americans who want a foreign policy that embodies our ideals, not subverts them.

If our aim is to construct an international order, we must also work through the international bodies that now exist. On many of these issues, they are the only places where nations regularly come together. We have all been deeply disturbed by the drift of the United Nations and the other international organizations, and by the acrimony and cliquishness that seems to have taken hold. But it would be a mistake to give up on the United Nations.

In the future, we should make multilateral diplomacy a major part of our efforts so that other countries know in advance the importance the United States attaches to their behavior in the United Nations and other international organizations. We should make a major effort at reforming and restructuring the U. N. systems.

We should undertake a systematic political and economic cost-benefit analysis of existing international institutions in the United Nations systems and outside, with a view to determining the appropriate level of United States support. We should end the current diplomatic isolation of the United States in international forums by working more closely with our allies and with moderate elements in the developing world on a basis of mutual understanding consistent with our respective national interests.

A stable world order cannot become a reality when people of many nations of the world suffer mass starvation, when the countries with capital and technology belligerently confront other nations for the control of raw materials and energy sources, when open and non-discriminatory trade has become the exception rather than the rule;

when there are no established arrangements for supplying the world's food and energy, nor for governing control and development of the seas, and when there are no effective efforts to deal with population explosions or environmental quality. The intensity to these interrelated problems is rapidly increasing and better mechanisms for consultation on these problems that affect everyone on this planet must be established and utilized.

For it is likely that in the future, the issues of war and peace will be more a function of economic and social problems than of the military security problems which have dominated international relations since 1945.

Finally, I said I would touch on the kind of people we need to administer our foreign policy. I believe that the foreign policy spokesman of our country should be the President, and not the Secretary of State. The conduct of foreign policy should be a sustained process of decision and action, and not a series of television spectacles. Under the current administration, the agencies which are supposed to conduct our foreign affairs have been largely wasted and demoralized. They must be revitalized and if necessary reorganized — to upgrade their performance, their quality, and the morale of their personnel.

In our search for peace we must call upon the best talent we can find in the universities, the business world, labor, the professions, and the scientific community. Appointments to our U. N. delegation, to other diplomatic posts, and to international conferences should be made exclusively on a merit basis, in contrast to the political patronage that has characterized appointments under this administration.

The world needs a strong America and a confident America. We cannot and should not avoid a role of world leadership. But our leadership should not be based just on military might or economic power or political pressure, but also on truth, justice, equality, and a true representation of the moral character of our people.

For this leadership the world can derive mutual peace and progress.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON THE Middle East ELIZABETH, NJ

June 6, 1976

I am very grateful to all of you for giving me the chance to meet this morning with your Mayor, Thomas Dunn, and those clergymen who could come here from throughout the State of New Jersey, and community leaders who have assembled here and others who have a deep interest in the attitude of our nation toward both domestic and foreign affairs.

For the last sixteen and one-half months, I have been campaigning around our country spelling out with increasing amount of attention among people my positions on issues that are important to you and also of importance to other nations in the world. This morning I wanted to take an opportunity, which is a fairly rare occasion for a candidate, to make a major policy statement in written form because if I do become President of this country I want it to be known very clearly what my policy will be throughout my administration representing you as a spokesman for this country, as commander-in-chief of our armed forces, as a shaper and consummator of our foreign policy on the various important subjects of the Middle East.

The land of Israel has always meant a great deal to me. As a boy I read of the prophets and martyrs in the Bible—the same Bible that we all study together. As an American I have admired the State of Israel and how she, like the United States, opened her doors to the homeless and the oppressed.

I've traveled in Israel, visiting Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, the Golan Heights, the West Bank of the Jordan, visiting personally with Mrs. Meir, Prime Minister Rabin, Mr. Abba Eban, Finance Minister Sapir, and other Israeli leaders, as well. I have also had a chance to meet and talk and learn about Israel's people. Like all of you, I have been inspired by the optimism and courage and the hard work that I have seen in Israel.

When I announced my candidacy for the presidency in December of 1974, I said that the time for American intervention in all the problems of the world is past. I also said that we cannot retreat into isolationism. I pointed out that America must fulfill commitments and maintain its strength if world peace is to be preserved. I stressed also that the integrity of Israel as a Jewish State must be preserved.

Three months ago, in a foreign policy speech in Chicago, I said that balance of power politics should be replaced by a new effort to join with other nations to build a just and a stable world order, and that it is unfortunate that our own nation's foreign policy is being made and executed by just one man—the Secretary of State. I stressed my views that in a democracy a nation's foreign policy should be openly arrived at, and should reflect the essential decency and generosity and honesty of the American people.

I want to speak today about how these principles should apply to the situation in the Middle East.

This region has experienced a resurgence of the tension and conflict which has been its lot for decades and, indeed, for centuries. Since 1948, four wars have been fought there. Countless diplomatic initiatives have been launched. Yet peace seems no closer today than it was in 1948, and the possibility of the Middle East touching off a global war is still very much with us.

But even without war, terrorism runs rampant and the burden of arms bleeds the budget of every nation in the area.

Obviously, all people of goodwill can agree it is time—it is far past time—for permanent peace in the Middle East. A peace based on genuine reconciliation and respect between all the concerned nations there.

And in this quest for peace, the American people as well as the people of Israel and the Arab states look to the United States Government to help lead the way.

We have a unique opportunity to contribute to the solution of this conflict if we can maintain the trust of all sides. Our constant and unswerving goal must be the survival of Israel as a Jewish State, and the achievement for all people of a just and lasting settlement. As long as there is no such settlement, there can be no peace. There will only be periods of uneasy truce punctuated by border raids and terrorism while each side builds up forces preparing for another conflict.

A real peace must be based on absolute assurance of Israel's survival and security. As President, I would never yield on that point. The survival of Israel is not just a political issue, it is a moral imperative. That is my deeply held belief and it is the belief that is shared by the vast majority of American people.

Rarely in history have two nations been so closely bound together as the United States and Israel. We are both democratic nations, we both cherish freedom of the press, freedom of expression, and freedom of religion. We are both nations of immigrants. We both share cultural and artistic values. We are friends and we are constant allies. Ours was the first nation to recognize the State of Israel when it was formed and we must remain the first nation to which Israel can turn in time of need.

Just as we must be clear about our commitment for the preservation and well-being of Israel, we must also be clear about our commitment to meaningful and productive Arab-Israeli negotiations.

Only face-to-face communication can build a trust and insure the accommodations that will be needed. By insisting on these kinds of talks, by demonstrating the seriousness of our commitment to a real peace, we can use our influence to prepare all sides for the best way out of this tragic conflict.

I favor early movement toward discussion of the outline of an eventual overall settlement. I discussed this particular subject with Mrs. Golda Meir within the last few weeks—an early movement towards discussion of the outline of an eventual overall settlement. A limited settlement, as we have seen in the past, still leaves unresolved the underlying threat to Israel. A general settlement is needed—one which will end the conflict between Israel and its neighbors once and for all.

Now the guide to a general settlement is to be found in United Nations Resolution 242 which has been accepted by Israel and all her neighboring governments. It sets forth two main principles.

One of these is, and I quote, "termination of all claims on states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secured and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force."

That is a very important commitment, which I repeat has been accepted by Israel and all the surrounding nations.

This is the heart of the matter. Peace in the Middle East depends more than anything else on a basic change of attitude. To be specific, on Arab recognition of the right of Israel to exist as a Jewish State.

Now this change of attitude on the part of the Arab states must be reflected in tangible and concrete actions including first of all the recognition of Israel, which they have not yet done; secondly, diplomatic relations with Israel; third, a peace treaty with Israel; fourth, open frontiers by Israel's neighbors; last, an end to embargo and official hostile propaganda against the State of Israel.

In justifying these steps to their own people, Arab leaders will have to acknowledge that the Arab-Israeli war is over once and for all, that this is not just another armed truce. Without this basic change, no permanent peace is possible.

The other principle of the United Nations Resolution 242 calls for, and again I quote, "withdrawal of Israel's armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict." This language leaves open the door for changes in the pre-1967 lines by mutual agreement.

Final borders between Israel and her neighbors should be determined in direct negotiations between the parties and they should not be imposed from outside.

Now this general settlement we all want to see will take time to negotiate and even more time to implement. Its execution would probably come in stages. This would permit both sides to test the durability of the settlement, and it would give either side the opportunity to halt the process if it found that its own interests were being violated.

We are dealing with a deep and bitter legacy of hatred and distrust which can only be dissipated over time. This makes it all the more important now to lift the sights of all concerned by focusing on the long-term goal.

While we work toward peace, we must acknowledge the lessons of the past wars. Progress towards peace requires that Israel remain strong enough, that it can neither be overrun militarily nor isolated in the international community.

Israel has never sought American soldiers and in all of the many discussions I have had with top Israeli leaders in the present and past governments, in the Knesset, in the military, I have never heard an Israeli leader say they might some day need American troops. They seek only the tools to assure their own defense.

We should continue to supply, in the full amount necessary, economic and military aid so that Israel can pursue peace from a position of strength and power.

We should continue to aid Israel's economy which has been strained to the utmost by the burdens of

defense. Mrs. Meir told me that over 40% of Israel's total budget went for defense.

We must also continue to maintain our strong military presence in the Eastern Mediterranean under every circumstance, with a capacity to reinforce that presence powerfully, if need be, in order to deter outside interference in any local conflict.

Now none of this need prevent our maintaining good relations with the Arab states. Avoiding conflict and achieving a settlement is in their interest as well as in Israel's.

In assisting both sides' efforts to achieve such a settlement we not only fulfill our commitments to Israel, we strengthen the strong lines of friendship that have developed between us and the Arab countries over many years. The process of peace will be best served if these relations deepen—not at the expense of Israel—but in the interest of all countries involved. I do not believe it serves the cause of peace if we arm any country beyond its legitimate needs for defense. Local arms races, besides being very costly, increase the chances of war.

I said two months ago that I do not favor supplying offensive weapons to Egypt and I still hold to that view. We should help Egypt obtain housing and jobs and health care for its people, not such offensive weapons as tanks and attack planes and missiles. Investing in Egypt's economic development is an investment in peace.

We have already developed close ties of investment and economic aid with many Arab countries. This shows that economic interdependence can also be a foundation of peace, that Arab people are no less tired of war than Israel, no less weary of its burden and waste, and no less mournful of their dead. Some Arab states have set goals for economic development and education which are worthy of great respect as well as our aid and participation. But their dreams, like the dreams of Israel, will come true only if there is a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Unless there is peace the Arab countries will inevitably become radicalized, more militant, and more susceptible to Soviet re-entry, both politically and militarily. If that happens, Israel will be confronted with an even greater threat than she faces today.

Peace in the Middle East involves difficult, highly emotional issues. In face-to-face negotiations, if all parties will act with fairness and goodwill, the questions of boundary lines and the status of the Palestinians can be resolved.

There is a humanitarian core within the complexities of the Palestinian problem. Too many human beings, denied a sense of hope for the future, are living in makeshift and crowded camps where demagogues and terrorists can feed on their despair. They have rights which must be recognized in any settlement and the Government of Israel has made it clear that it is sensitive to that fact.

But those terrorists who wage war and deny the very concept of Israeli nationhood only undermine their own people's best interests. We must make it clear to the world that there can be no reward for terrorism.

I am going to speak to you of the Soviet Union. We want no clash with the Soviets, but we cannot accept the intervention of its combat forces into any Arab-Israeli conflict. Our naval and air presence in the eastern Mediterranean should make this clear. Mutual non-intervention by the super-powers serves these powers' interests and also the interest of all states in the area.

By the same token, I do not believe that the road to peace can be found by U.S.-Soviet imposition of a settlement. It would, however, be desirable to attain Soviet agreement and support for any settlement, since we do not want to give the Soviet Union any reason or excuse to subvert or undermine that settlement. We seek the support of the Soviet Government in the search for peace, but we will continue that search with or without her support.

We all want to see a Middle East dedicated to human progress rather than sterile hate. We want to see the desert bloom on both sides of the River Jordan, and along the Nile River, and everywhere that human beings hope for better life for themselves and for their children.

We must work towards these goals through international organizations, as well as bilateral negotiations.

This is a difficult time for Israel in the international arena, primarily because of the importance of oil to the world's developing nations. I deplore the actions taken recently in the United States. I reject utterly the charge that Zionism is a form of racism. Indeed, as you know, Zionism has been, in part, a response to racism against the Jewish people. The concept of the State of Israel was born out of centuries of persecution of human beings because they practiced a different religion.

For these 2000 years, the Jewish people in century after century, in country after country, have faced propaganda, attempts at forced conversion, discrimination, pogroms, and death, until the ultimate horror of the holocaust. Surely, the Jewish people are entitled to one place on this earth where they can have their own State on soil given them by God from time immemorial.

For years the vision of Israel has embodied the dream that there could be at least one place on earth where racism could never exist. Now that dream has come true. As a country founded upon religious freedom and dedicated to brotherhood, America has a special responsibility, not only to oppose this baseless charge wherever it appears, but to keep that dream alive.

Finally, I want to say that there have been far too many secret undertakings, covert assurances, contradictory promises, and diplomatic sleights of hand. Maneuvers of this kind are bound to produce, as they have produced, both failure in negotiations and suspicion among the participants.

American policy toward the Middle East and toward every other part of the world should be shaped with the knowledge of the Congress from the outset on a bipartisan basis. It would emerge from broad and well-informed public debate. Indeed, this is a necessity. In every foreign venture that has failed, whether it was Vietnam, Cambodia, Chile, Angola or in the excesses of the CIA, our government operated secretly, and forged ahead without consulting the American people. It did things that were contrary to our basic character.

Public understanding and support today are as vital to successful foreign policies as they are to any domestic policies. No one can make our foreign policy for us as well as we can make it for ourselves. It should be based not just on military might or economic power or political pressure, but also on truth, justice, equality

and a true representation of our moral character and the compassion of our people. A policy of that kind will reflect the best in all of us. And that kind of policy can succeed.

Peace in the Middle East is not an impossible dream. It can be a concrete objective, and it is one to which the next President should direct his efforts from the date he takes office as a matter of the highest priority and the greatest urgency.

If I become your President, I will do everything in my power to make our nation an agent of peace in the Middle East; a just and lasting peace that will be in keeping with the teaching of Scripture, in keeping with our nation's best traditions and in fulfillment of the highest hopes of all mankind.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org