

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

Nuclear Energy and World Order

AT THE UNITED NATIONS

May 13, 1976

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Director-General, Captain Cousteau, Ambassador Akhund, Mr. Lehman:

I have a deep personal concern with the subject of this conference today — "Nuclear Energy and World Order."

I have had training as a nuclear engineer, working in the United States Navy on our country's early nuclear submarine program. I learned how nuclear power can be used for peaceful purposes — for propelling ships, for generating electric power and for scientific and medical research. I am acutely aware of its potential — and its dangers. Once I helped in disassembling a damaged nuclear reactor core in an experimental reactor at Chalk River, Canada.

From my experience in the Navy and more recently as Governor of Georgia, I have come to certain basic conclusions about the energy problem. The world has only enough oil to last about 30 to 40 years at the present rate of consumption. It has large coal reserves — with perhaps 200 years of reserves in the United States alone. The United States must shift from oil to coal, taking care about the environmental problems involved in coal production and use. Our country must also maintain strict energy conservation measures, and derive increasing amounts of energy from renewable sources such as the sun.

U.S. dependence on nuclear power should be kept to the minimum necessary to meet our needs. We should apply much stronger safety standards as we regulate its use. And we must be honest with our people concerning its problems and dangers.

I recognize that many other countries of the world do not have the fossil fuel reserves of the United States. With the four-fold increase in the price of oil, many countries have concluded that they have no immediate alternative except to concentrate on nuclear power.

But all of us must recognize that the widespread use of nuclear power brings many risks. Power reactors may malfunction and cause widespread radiological damage, unless stringent safety requirements are met. Radioactive wastes may be a menace to future generations and civilizations, unless they are effectively isolated within the biosphere forever. And terrorists or other criminals may

steal plutonium and make weapons to threaten society or its political leaders with nuclear violence, unless strict security measures are developed and implemented to prevent nuclear theft.

Beyond these dangers, there is the fearsome prospect that the spread of nuclear reactors will mean the spread of nuclear weapons to many nations. By 1990, the developing nations alone will produce enough plutonium in their reactors to build 3,000 Hiroshima-size bombs a year, and by the year 2000, worldwide plutonium production may be over 1 million pounds a year — the equivalent of 100,000 bombs a year — about half of it outside of the United States.

The prospect of a nuclear future will be particularly alarming if a large number of nations develop their own national plutonium reprocessing facilities with the capacity to extract plutonium from the spent fuel. Even if such facilities are subject to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency and even if the countries controlling them are parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, plutonium stockpiles can be converted to atomic weapons at a time of crisis, without fear of effective sanction by the international community.

The reality of this danger was highlighted by the Indian nuclear explosion of May, 1974, which provided a dramatic demonstration that the development of nuclear power gives any country possessing a reprocessing plant a nuclear weapons option. Furthermore, with the maturing of nuclear power in advanced countries, intense competition has developed in the sale of power reactors, which has also included the sale of the most highly sensitive technologies, including reprocessing plants. With the spread of such capabilities, normal events of history — revolutions, terrorist attacks, regional disputes, and dictators — all could take on a nuclear dimension.

Dr. Alvin Weinberg, former Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and one of the most thoughtful nuclear scientists in the United States was properly moved to observe: "We nuclear people have made a Faustian bargain with society. On the one hand we offer an inexhaustible supply of energy, but the price that we

demand of society for this magical energy source is both a vigilance and a longevity of our social institutions that we are quite unaccustomed to."

Nuclear energy must be at the very top of the list of global challenges that call for new forms of international action. The precise form which that action should take is the question to be addressed by this distinguished group of scientists, businessmen, diplomats and government officials during the next four days.

I would not presume to anticipate the outcome of your expert deliberations. But I suggest that new lines of international action should be considered in three main areas:

- (1) action to meet the energy needs of all countries while limiting reliance on nuclear energy;
- (2) action to limit the spread of nuclear weapons; and
- (3) action to make the spread of peaceful nuclear power less dangerous.

1. *We need new international action to help meet the energy needs of all countries while limiting reliance on nuclear energy.*

In recent years, we have had major United Nations conferences on environment, population, food, the oceans and the role of women — with habitat, water, deserts, and science and technology on the schedule for the months and years immediately ahead. These are tentative first steps to deal with global problems on a global basis.

Critics have been disappointed with the lack of immediate results. But they miss an important point: a new world agenda is emerging from this process — an agenda of priority problems on which nations must cooperate or abdicate the right to plan a future for the human condition.

The time has come to put the world energy problem on that new agenda. *Let us hold a World Energy Conference* under the auspices of the United Nations to help all nations cope with common energy problems — eliminating energy waste and increasing energy efficiency; reconciling energy needs with environmental quality goals; and shifting away from almost total reliance upon dwindling sources of non-renewable energy to the greatest feasible reliance on renewable sources. In other words, we must move from living off our limited energy capital to living within our energy income.

Such a conference would have to be carefully prepared. Just as the World Food Conference provided us with a world food balance sheet, this conference could give us a world energy balance sheet. Just as the World Food Conference stimulated international cooperation in agricultural research and development, so a world energy conference could stimulate research and development in the field of energy.

Existing international ventures of energy cooperation are not global in scope. The International Energy Agency in Paris includes only some developed non-Communist countries. The Energy Commission of the Conference on International Economic Cooperation does not include countries such as the Soviet Union and China, two great producers and consumers of energy. And the International

Energy Institute now under study does not call for a substantial research and development effort.

A World Energy Conference should not simply be a dramatic meeting to highlight a problem which is then forgotten. Rather, it should lead to the creation of new or strengthened institutions to perform the following tasks:

- improving the collection and analysis of worldwide energy information;
- stimulating and coordinating a network of worldwide energy research centers;
- advising countries, particularly in the developing world, on the development of sound national energy policies;
- providing technical assistance to train energy planners and badly needed energy technicians;
- increasing the flow of investment capital from private and public sources into new energy development;
- accelerating research and information exchange on energy conservation.

An international energy effort would also be the occasion to examine seriously and in depth this fundamental question:

Is it really necessary to the welfare of our countries to become dependent upon a nuclear energy economy and if so, how dependent and for what purposes? Surely, there is a moral imperative that demands a worldwide effort to assure that if we travel down the nuclear road we do so with our eyes wide open.

Such a worldwide effort must also provide practical alternatives to the nuclear option. Many countries, particularly in the developing world, are being forced into a premature nuclear commitment because they do not have the knowledge and the means to explore other possibilities. The world's research and development efforts are now focused either on nuclear energy or on the development of a diminishing supply of fossil fuels.

More should be done to help the developing countries develop their oil, gas, and coal resources. But a special effort should be made in the development of small-scale technology that can use renewable sources of energy that are abundant in the developing world — solar heating and cooling, wind energy, and "bioconversion" — an indirect form of solar energy that harnesses the sunlight captured by living plants. Using local labor and materials, developing countries can be helped to produce usable fuel from human and animal wastes, otherwise wasted wood, fast growing plants, and even ocean kelp and algae.

Such measures would be a practical way to help the poorest segment of humanity whose emancipation from grinding poverty must be our continuing concern.

And all countries could reap benefits from worldwide energy cooperation. The costs to any one country would be small if they were shared among nations; the benefits to each of us from a breakthrough to new energy sources anywhere in the world would be great. We have tried international cooperation in food research and it has paid handsome dividends in high-yielding varieties of corn, wheat, rice and sorghum. We could expect similar benefits from worldwide energy cooperation.

The exact institutional formula for coping with energy effectively on a world level will require the most careful

consideration. The IAEA is neither equipped nor staffed to be an adviser on energy across the board; nor would it be desirable to add additional functions that might interfere with its vitally important work on nuclear safeguards and safety.

One possibility to be considered at a World Energy Conference would be the creation of a new World Energy Agency to work side by side with the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna. A strengthened International Atomic Energy Agency could focus on assistance and safeguards for nuclear energy; the new agency on research and development of non-nuclear, particularly renewable, sources.

2. We need new international action to limit the spread of nuclear weapons.

In the past, public attention has been focused on the problem of controlling the escalation of the strategic nuclear arms race among the superpowers. Far less attention has been given to that of controlling the proliferation of nuclear weapons capabilities among an increasing number of nations.

And yet the danger to world peace may be as great, if not greater, if this second effort of control should fail. The more countries that possess nuclear weapons, the greater the risk that nuclear warfare might erupt in local conflicts, and the greater the danger that these could trigger a major nuclear war.

To date, the principal instrument of control has been the Non-Proliferation Treaty which entered into force in 1970. By 1976 ninety-five non-weapons states had ratified the Treaty, including the advanced industrial states of Western Europe, and prospectively of Japan. In so doing, these nations agreed not to develop nuclear weapons or explosives. In addition they agreed to accept international safeguards on all their peaceful nuclear activities, developed by themselves or with outside assistance, under agreements negotiated with the International Atomic Energy Agency — a little appreciated, but an unprecedented step forward, in the development of international law.

Important as this achievement is, it cannot be a source of complacency, particularly under present circumstances. There are still a dozen or more important countries with active nuclear power programs which have not joined the Treaty. Hopefully, some of these may decide to become members; but in the case of several of them, this is unlikely until the underlying tensions behind their decision to maintain a nuclear weapons option are resolved.

The NPT was not conceived of as a one-way street. Under the Treaty, in return for the commitments of the non-weapons states, a major undertaking of the nuclear weapons states (and other nuclear suppliers in a position to do so) was to provide special nuclear power benefits to treaty members, particularly to developing countries.

The advanced countries have not done nearly enough in providing such peaceful benefits to convince the member states that they are better off inside the Treaty than outside.

In fact, recent commercial transactions by some of the supplier countries have conferred special benefits on non-treaty members, thereby largely removing any incentive for

such recipients to join the Treaty. They consider themselves better off outside. Furthermore, while individual facilities in these non-treaty countries may be subject to international safeguards, others may not be, and India has demonstrated that such facilities may provide the capability to produce nuclear weapons.

As a further part of the two-way street, there is an obligation by the nuclear weapons states, under the Treaty, to pursue negotiations in good faith to reach agreement to control and reduce the nuclear arms race.

We Americans must be honest about the problems of proliferation of nuclear weapons. Our nuclear deterrent remains an essential element of world order in this era. Nevertheless, by enjoining sovereign nations to forego nuclear weapons, we are asking for a form of self-denial that we have not been able to accept ourselves.

I believe we have little right to ask others to deny themselves such weapons for the indefinite future unless we demonstrate meaningful progress toward the goal of control, then reduction, and ultimately, elimination of nuclear arsenals.

Unfortunately, the agreements reached to date have succeeded largely in changing the buildup in strategic arms from a "quantitative" to a "qualitative" arms race. It is time, in the SALT talks, that we complete the stage of agreeing on ceilings and get down to the centerpiece of SALT — the actual negotiation of reductions in strategic forces and measures effectively halting the race in strategic weapons technology. The world is waiting, but not necessarily for long. The longer effective arms reduction is postponed, the more likely it is that other nations will be encouraged to develop their own nuclear capability.

There is one step that can be taken at once. The United States and the Soviet Union should conclude an agreement prohibiting all nuclear explosions for a period of five years, whether they be weapons tests or so-called "peaceful" nuclear explosions, and encourage all other countries to join. At the end of the five year period the agreement can be continued if it serves the interests of the parties.

I am aware of the Soviet objections to a comprehensive treaty that does not allow peaceful nuclear explosions. I also remember, during the Kennedy Administration, when the roles were reversed. Then the U.S. had a similar proposal that permitted large-scale peaceful explosions. However, in order to reach an accord, we withdrew our proposal. Similarly, today, if the U.S. really pushed a comprehensive test ban treaty, I believe the United States and the world community could persuade the USSR to dispose of this issue and accept a comprehensive test ban.

The non-proliferation significance of the superpowers' decision to ban peaceful nuclear explosions would be very great because of its effect on countries who have resisted the Non-Proliferation Treaty's prohibition of "peaceful" nuclear explosives, even though they are indistinguishable from bombs.

A comprehensive test ban would also signal to the world the determination of the signatory states to call a halt to the further development of nuclear weaponry. It has been more than a decade since the Limited Test Ban Treaty entered into force, and well over 100 nations are now parties to that agreement.

It now appears that the United States and the Soviet Union are close to an agreement that would prohibit underground nuclear tests above 150 kilotons. This so-called threshold test ban treaty represents a wholly inadequate step beyond the limited test ban. We can and should do more. Our national verification capabilities in the last twenty years have advanced to the point where we no longer have to rely on on-site inspection to distinguish between earthquakes and even very small weapons tests.

Finally, such a treaty would not only be a demonstration on the part of the superpowers to agree to limit their own weapons development. As President Kennedy foresaw in 1963, the most important objective of a comprehensive treaty of universal application would be its inhibiting effect on the spread of nuclear weapons by prohibiting tests by every signatory state.

3. *We need new international action to make the spread of peaceful nuclear power less dangerous.*

The danger is not so much in the spread of nuclear reactors themselves, for nuclear reactor fuel is not suitable for use directly in the production of nuclear weapons. The far greater danger lies in the spread of facilities for the enrichment of uranium and the reprocessing of spent reactor fuel — because highly enriched uranium can be used to produce weapons; and because plutonium, when separated from the remainder of the spent fuel, can also be used to produce nuclear weapons. Even at the present early stage in the development of the nuclear power industry, enough materials are produced for at least a thousand bombs each year.

Under present international arrangements, peaceful nuclear facilities are sought to be safeguarded against diversion and theft of nuclear materials by the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna. As far as reactors are concerned, the international safeguards — which include materials accountancy, surveillance and inspection — provide some assurance that the diversion of a significant amount of fissionable material would be detected, and therefore help to deter diversion.

Of course, as the civilian nuclear power industry expands around the globe, there will be corresponding need to expand and improve the personnel and facilities of the international safeguards system. The United States should fulfill its decade-old promise to put its peaceful nuclear facilities under international safeguards to demonstrate that we too are prepared to accept the same arrangements as the non-weapon states.

That would place substantial additional demands on the safeguards system of the IAEA, and the United States should bear its fair share of the costs of this expansion. It is a price we cannot afford *not* to pay.

But in the field of enrichment and reprocessing, where the primary danger lies, the present international safeguards system cannot provide adequate assurance against the possibility that national enrichment and reprocessing facilities will be misused for military purposes.

The fact is that a reprocessing plant separating the plutonium from spent fuel literally provides a country with direct access to nuclear explosive material.

It has therefore been the consistent policy of the United States over the course of several administrations, not to authorize the sale of either enrichment or reprocessing plants, even with safeguards. Recently, however, some of the other principal suppliers of nuclear equipment have begun to make such sales.

In my judgment, it is absolutely essential to halt the sale of such plants.

Considerations of commercial profit cannot be allowed to prevail over the paramount objective of limiting the spread of nuclear weapons. The heads of government of all the principal supplier nations hopefully will recognize this danger and share this view.

I am not seeking to place any restrictions on the sale of nuclear power reactors which sell for as much as \$1 billion per reactor. I believe that all supplier countries are entitled to a fair share of the reactor market. What we must prevent, however, is the sale of small pilot reprocessing plants which sell for only a few million dollars, have no commercial use at present, and can only spread nuclear explosives around the world.

The International Atomic Energy Agency itself, pursuant to the recommendations of the Non-Proliferation Treaty review conference of 1975, is currently engaged in an intensive feasibility study of multinational fuel centers as one way of promoting the safe development of nuclear power by the nations of the world, with enhanced control resulting from multinational participation.

The Agency is also considering other ways to strengthen the protection of explosive material involved in the nuclear fuel cycle. This includes use of the Agency's hitherto unused authority under its charter to establish highly secure repositories for the separated plutonium from non-military facilities, following reprocessing and pending its fabrication into mixed oxide fuel elements as supplementary fuel.

Until such studies are completed, I call on all nations of the world to adopt a voluntary moratorium on the national purchase or sale of enrichment or reprocessing plants. I would hope this moratorium would apply to recently completed agreements.

I do not underestimate the political obstacles in negotiating such a moratorium, but they might be overcome if we do what should have been done many months ago — bring this matter to the attention of the highest political authorities of the supplying countries.

Acceptance of a moratorium would deprive no nation of the ability to meet its nuclear power needs through the purchase of current reactors with guarantees of a long-range supply of enriched uranium. Such assurances must be provided now by those supplier countries possessing the highly expensive facilities currently required for this purpose.

To assure the developing countries of an assured supply of enriched uranium to meet their nuclear power needs without the need for reprocessing, the United States should, in cooperation with other countries, assure an adequate supply of enriched uranium.

We should also give the most serious consideration to the establishment of centralized multinational enrichment facilities involving developing countries' investment participation, in order to provide the assured supply of enriched

uranium. And, if one day as their nuclear programs economically justify use of plutonium as a supplementary fuel, similar centralized multinational reprocessing services could equally provide for an assured supply of mixed oxide fuel elements.

It makes no economic sense to locate national reprocessing facilities in a number of different countries. In view of economies of scale, a single commercial reprocessing facility and a fuel fabrication plant will provide services for about fifty large power reactors. From an economic point of view, multinational facilities serving many countries are obviously desirable. And the co-location of reprocessing, fuel fabrication and fuel storage facilities would reduce the risk of weapons proliferation, theft of plutonium during transport, and environmental contamination.

There is considerable doubt within the United States about the necessity of reprocessing now for plutonium recycle. Furthermore, the licensing of plutonium for such use is currently withheld pending a full scale review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission of the economic, environmental, and safeguards issues. And there is a further question to be asked: If the United States does not want the developing countries to have commercial plutonium, why should we be permitted to have it under our sovereign control?

Surely this whole matter of plutonium recycle should be examined on an international basis. Since our nation has more experience than others in fuel reprocessing, we should initiate a new multinational program designed to develop experimentally the technology, economics, regulations and safeguards to be associated with plutonium recovery and recycle. The program could be developed by the U.S. in cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

If the need for plutonium reprocessing is eventually demonstrated — and if mutually satisfactory ground rules for management and operation can be worked out, the first U.S. reprocessing plant which is now nearing completion in Barnwell, South Carolina, could become the first multinational reprocessing facility under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Separated plutonium might ultimately be made available to all nations on a reliable, cheap, and non-discriminatory basis after blending with natural uranium to form a low-enriched fuel that is unsuitable for weapons making.

Since the immediate need for plutonium recycle has not yet been demonstrated, the start-up of the plant should certainly be delayed to allow time for the installation of the next generation of materials accounting and physical security equipment which is now under development.

One final observation in this area: We need to cut through the indecision and debate about the long-term storage of radioactive wastes and start doing something about it. The United States could begin by preparing all high-level radioactive wastes currently produced from our military programs for permanent disposal. Waste disposal is a matter on which sound international arrangements will clearly be necessary.

The nuclear situation is serious, but it is not yet desperate. Most nations of the world do *not* want nuclear weapons. They particularly do not want their neighbours to

have nuclear weapons, but they understand that they cannot keep the option open for themselves without automatically encouraging their neighbours to “keep options open” or worse.

It is this widespread understanding that it is *not* in the interest of individual nations to “go nuclear” which we must use as the basis of our worldwide efforts to control the atom. We must have negative measures — mutual restraint on the part of the producers and suppliers of nuclear fuel and technology. But these negative measures must be joined to the larger, positive efforts of the non-nuclear weapon states to hold the line against further proliferation.

The recent initiative of the Finnish Government along these lines deserves commendation. The Finns have urged a compact among the purchasers of nuclear fuel and technology to buy only from suppliers who require proper safeguards on their exports.

This proposal would convert the alleged advantages to a supplier of breaking ranks and offering “bargains” in safeguards into a commercial disadvantage. Instead of broadening his market by lowering his dangerous merchandise than if he maintained a common front on safeguards with other suppliers. There would be competition to offer to buyers the safest product at the best price.

Most important, the Finnish proposal would plainly put the full weight of the non-nuclear world into the effort against proliferation. It would make it evident that this struggle is not a struggle by the nuclear “haves” to keep down the nuclear “have-nots”; it would be a common effort by all mankind to control this dangerous technology, to gain time so that our political structures can catch up with sudden, enormous leaps in our technical knowledge, to turn us around and head us in the right direction — toward a world from which nuclear weapons and the threat of nuclear war have been effectively eliminated. That may be a distant goal — but it is the direction in which we must move.

I have talked to you today about the need for new international action in three areas — action to meet the energy needs of all countries while limiting reliance on nuclear energy, action to limit the spread of nuclear weapons, and action to make the spread of peaceful nuclear power less dangerous.

Of one thing I am certain — the hour is too late for business as usual, for politics as usual, or for diplomacy as usual. An alliance for survival is needed — transcending regions and ideologies — if we are to assure mankind a safe passage to the twenty-first century.

Every country — and the United States is no exception — is concerned with maintaining its own national security. But a mutual balance of terror is an inadequate foundation upon which to build a peaceful and stable world order. One of the greatest long-term threats to the national security of every country now lies in the disintegration of the international order. Balance of power politics must be supplemented by world order politics if the foreign policies of nations are to be relevant to modern needs.

The political leaders of all nations, whether they work within four year election cycles or five year plans, are under

enormous temptations to promise short-term benefits to their people while passing on the costs to other countries, to future generations, or to our environment. The earth, the atmosphere, the oceans and unborn generations have no political franchise. But short-sighted policies today will lead to insuperable problems tomorrow.

The time has come for political leaders around the world to take a larger view of their obligations, showing a decent respect for posterity, for the needs of other peoples and for the global biosphere.

I believe the American people want this larger kind of leadership.

In the last two years, I have visited virtually every one of our fifty states. I have found our people deeply troubled by recent developments at the United Nations. But they do *not* want to abandon the U. N. — they want us to work harder to make it what it was created to be — not a cockpit

for controversy but an instrument for reconciling differences and resolving common problems.

And they want U. N. agencies to demonstrate the same commitment to excellence, impartiality and efficiency they are demanding of their own government.

We want to cooperate — not simply debate. A joint program — whether on nuclear energy or other global problems — is infinitely preferable to sustained and destructive polemics. Our desire for global cooperation is prompted by America's confidence in itself, in our capacity to engage in effective cooperation, and upon the moral imperative that as human beings we must help one another if any of us is to survive on this planet.

The nuclear age, which brings both sword and plowshare from the same source, demands unusual self-discipline of all nations. If we approach these problems with both humility and self-discipline, we may yet reconcile our twin goals of energy sufficiency and world order.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

Relations Between the World's Democracies

TO THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

NEW YORK CITY

June 23, 1976

For the past seventeen months, as a candidate for President, I have talked and listened to the American people.

It has been an unforgettable experience and an invaluable education. Insofar as my political campaign has been successful, it is because I have learned from our people, and have accurately reflected their concerns, their frustrations, and their desires.

In the area of foreign policy, our people are troubled, confused and sometimes angry. There has been too much emphasis on transient spectaculars and too little on substance. We are deeply concerned, not only by such obvious tragedies as the war in Vietnam, but by the more subtle erosion in the focus and the morality of our foreign policy.

Under the Nixon-Ford Administration, there has evolved a kind of secretive "Lone Ranger" foreign policy—a one-man policy of international adventure. This is not an appropriate policy for America.

We have sometimes tried to play other nations, one against another, instead of organizing free nations to share world responsibility in collective action. We have made highly publicized efforts to woo the major communist powers while neglecting our natural friends and allies. A foreign policy based on secrecy inherently has had to be closely guarded and amoral, and we have had to forego openness, consultation and a constant adherence to fundamental principles and high moral standards.

We have often sought dramatic and surprising immediate results instead of long-term solutions to major problems which required careful planning in consultation with other nations.

We must be strong in our internal resolve in order to be strong leaders abroad. This is not possible when Congress and the American people are kept in the dark. We simply *must* have an *international policy of democratic leadership*, and we must stop trying to play a lonely game of power politics. We must evolve and consummate our foreign policy openly and frankly. There must be bipartisan harmony and collaboration between the President and the Congress, and we must reestablish a spirit of common purpose among democratic nations.

What we seek is for our nation to have a foreign policy that reflects the decency and generosity and common sense of our own people.

We had such a policy more than a hundred years

ago and, in our own lifetimes, in the years following the Second World War.

The United Nations, The Marshall Plan, The Bretton Woods Agreement, NATO, Point Four, The OECD, The Japanese Peace Treaty—these were among the historic achievements of a foreign policy directed by courageous presidents, endorsed by bipartisan majorities in Congress, and supported by the American people.

The world since that time has become profoundly different, and the pace of change is accelerating.

There are one hundred new nations and two billion more people.

East-West tensions may be less acute, but the East-West rivalry has become global in scope.

Problems between the developed and developing nations have grown more serious, and in some regions have come to intersect dangerously with the East-West rivalry.

Economic nationalism complicates international relations, and unchecked inflation may again threaten our mutual well-being.

Finally, such global dilemmas as food shortages, overpopulation and poverty call for a common response, in spite of national and philosophical differences.

It is imperative therefore that the United States summon the leadership that can enable the democratic societies of the world once again to lead the way in creating a more just and more stable world order.

In recent weeks, I have made speeches on the subject of nuclear proliferation and also on the Middle East. In the months ahead I will speak out on other subjects of international concern.

Today I would like to speak about our alliances, and ways they can be improved to serve our national interests and the interests of others who seek peace and stability in the world.

We need to consider how—in addition to alliances that were formed in years past for essentially military purposes—we might develop broader arrangements for dealing with such problems as the arms race and world poverty and the allocation of resources.

The time has come for us to seek a partnership between North America, Western Europe and Japan. Our three regions share economic, political and security concerns that make it logical that we should seek ever-increasing unity and understanding.

I have traveled in Japan and Western Europe in

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

recent years and talked to leaders there. These countries already have a significant world impact; and they are prepared to play even larger global roles in shaping a new international order.

There are those who say that democracy is dying, that we live in the twilight of an era, and that the destiny of modern man is to witness the waning of freedom.

In Japan, Western Europe, Canada, some countries in Latin America, Israel and among many other peoples, I have found not a decline of democracy but a dynamic commitment to its principles.

I might add that I can testify personally to the vigor of the democratic process in our own country.

In addition to cooperation between North America, Japan and Western Europe, there is an equal need for increased unity and consultation between ourselves and such democratic societies as Israel, Australia, New Zealand, and other nations, such as those in this hemisphere, that share our democratic values, as well as many of our political and economic concerns.

There must be more frequent consultations on many levels. We should have periodic summit conferences and occasional meetings of the leaders of all the industrial democracies, as well as frequent cabinet level meetings. In addition, as we do away with one-man diplomacy, we must once again use our entire foreign policy apparatus to reestablish continuing contacts at all levels. Summits are no substitute for the habit of cooperating closely at the working level.

In consultations, both form and substance are important. There is a fundamental difference between informing governments after the fact and actually including them in the process of joint policy making. Our policy makers have in recent years far too often ignored this basic difference. I need only cite the "Nixon Shocks" and the abrupt actions taken by former Treasury Secretary Connally.

We need to recognize also that in recent years our Western European allies have been deeply concerned, and justly so, by our unilateral dealings with the Soviet Union. To the maximum extent possible, our dealings with the communist powers should reflect the combined views of the democracies, and thereby avoid suspicions by our allies that we may be disregarding their interests.

We seek not a condominium of the powerful but a community of the free.

There are at least three areas in which the democratic nations can benefit from closer and more creative relations.

First, there are our economic and political affairs.

In the realm of economics, our basic purpose must be to *keep open the international system* in which the exchange of goods, capital, and ideas among nations can continue to expand.

Increased coordination among the industrialized democracies can help avoid the repetition of such episodes as the inflation of 1972-73 and the more recent recessions. Both were made more severe by an excess of expansionist zeal and then of deflationary reaction in North America, Japan and Europe.

Though each country must make its own economic

decisions, we need to know more about one another's interests and intentions. We must avoid unilateral acts and we must try not to work at cross-purposes in the pursuit of the same ends. We need not agree on all matters, but we should agree to discuss all matters.

We should continue our efforts to reduce trade barriers among the industrial countries, as one way to combat inflation. The current Tokyo round of multi-lateral trade negotiations should be pursued to a successful conclusion.

But we must do more. The International Monetary System should be renovated so that it can serve us well for the next quarter of a century. Last January, at a meeting of the leading financial officials, agreement was reached on a new system, based on greater flexibility of exchange rates. There is no prospect of any early return to fixed exchange rates—divergencies in economic experience among nations are too great for that. But we still have much to learn regarding the effective operation of a system of fluctuating exchange rates. We must take steps to avoid large and erratic fluctuations, without impeding the basic monetary adjustments that will be necessary among nations for some years to come. It will be useful to strengthen the role of the International Monetary Fund as a center for observation and guidance of the world economy, keeping track of the interactions among national economies and making recommendations to governments on how best to keep the world economy functioning smoothly.

Beyond economic and political cooperation, we have much to learn from one another. I have been repeatedly impressed by the achievements of the Japanese and the Europeans in their domestic affairs. The Japanese, for example, have one of the lowest unemployment rates and the lowest crime rate of any industrialized nation, and they also seem to suffer less than other urbanized peoples from the modern problem of rootlessness and alienation.

Similarly, we can learn from the European nations about health care, urban planning and mass transportation.

There are many ways that creative alliances can work for a better world. Let me mention just one more, the area of human rights. Many of us have protested the violation of human rights in Russia, and justly so. But such violations are not limited to any one country or one ideology. There are other countries that violate human rights in one way or another—by torture, by political persecution and by racial or religious discrimination.

We and our allies, in a creative partnership, can take the lead in establishing and promoting basic global standards of human rights. We respect the independence of all nations, but by our example, by our utterances, and by the various forms of economic and political persuasion available to us, we can quite surely lessen the injustice in this world.

We must certainly try.

Let me make one other point in the political realm. Democratic processes may in some countries bring to power parties or leaders whose ideologies are not shared by most Americans.

We may not welcome these changes: we will certainly not encourage them. But we must respect the

results of democratic elections and the right of countries to make their own free choice if we are to remain faithful to our own basic ideals. We must learn to live with diversity, and we can continue to cooperate, so long as such political parties respect the democratic process, uphold existing international commitments, and are not subservient to external political direction. The democratic concert of nations should exclude only those who exclude themselves by the rejection of democracy itself.

Our people have now learned the folly of our trying to inject our power into the internal affairs of other nations. It is time that our government learned that lesson too.

II

The second area of increased cooperation among the democracies is that of *mutual security*. Here, however, we must recognize that the Atlantic and Pacific regions have quite different needs and different political sensitivities.

Since the United States is both an Atlantic and a Pacific power, our commitments to the security of Western Europe and of Japan are inseparable from our own security. Without these commitments, and our firm dedication to them, the political fabric of Atlantic and Pacific cooperation would be seriously weakened, and world peace endangered.

As we look to the Pacific region, we see a number of changes and opportunities. Because of potential Sino-Soviet conflict, Russian and Chinese forces are not jointly deployed as our potential adversaries, but confront one another along their common border. Moreover, our withdrawal from the mainland of South-east Asia has made possible improving relationships between us and the People's Republic of China.

With regard to our primary Pacific ally, Japan, we will maintain our existing security arrangements, so long as that continues to be the wish of the Japanese people and government.

I believe it will be possible to withdraw our ground forces from South Korea on a phased basis over a time span to be determined after consultation with both South Korea and Japan. At the same time, it should be made clear to the South Korean Government that its internal oppression is repugnant to our people, and undermines the support for our commitment there.

We face a more immediate problem in the Atlantic sector of our defense.

The Soviet Union has in recent years strengthened its forces in Central Europe. The Warsaw Pact forces facing NATO today are substantially composed of Soviet combat troops, and these troops have been modernized and reinforced. In the event of war, they are postured for an all-out conflict of short duration and great intensity.

NATO's ground combat forces are largely European. The U.S. provides about one-fifth of the combat element, as well as the strategic umbrella, and without this American commitment Western Europe could not defend itself successfully.

In recent years, new military technology has been developed by both sides, including precision-guided munitions, that are changing the nature of land war-

fare.

Unfortunately, NATO's arsenal suffers from a lack of standardization, which needlessly increases the cost of NATO, and its strategy too often seems wedded to past plans and concepts. We must not allow our alliance to become an anachronism.

There is, in short, a pressing need for us and our allies to undertake a review of NATO's forces and its strategies in light of the changing military environment.

A comprehensive program to develop, procure, and equip NATO with the more accurate air defense and anti-tank weapons made possible by new technology is needed to increase NATO's defensive power. Agreement on stockpiles and on the prospective length of any potential conflict is necessary. We should also review the structure of NATO reserve forces so they can be committed to combat sooner.

In all of this a major European and joint effort will be required. Our people will not support unilateral American contributions in what must be a truly mutual defense effort.

Even as we review our military posture, we must spare no effort to bring about a reduction of the forces that confront one another in Central Europe.

It is to be hoped that the stalemated mutual force reduction talks in Vienna will soon produce results so that the forces of both sides can be reduced in a manner that impairs the security of neither. The requirement of *balanced* reductions complicates negotiations, but it is an important requirement for the maintenance of security in Europe.

Similarly, in the SALT talks, we must seek significant nuclear disarmament that safeguards the basic interests of both sides.

Let me say something I have often said in recent months. East-West relations will be both cooperative and competitive for a long time to come. We want the competition to be peaceful, and we want the cooperation to increase. *But we will never seek accommodation at the expense of our own national interests or the interests of our allies.*

Our potential adversaries are intelligent people. They respect strength, they respect constancy, they respect candor. They will understand our commitment to our allies. They will listen even more carefully if we and our allies speak with a common resolve.

We must remember, too, that a genuine spirit of cooperation between the democracies and the Soviet Union should extend beyond a negative cessation of hostilities and reach toward joint efforts in dealing with such world problems as agricultural development and the population crisis.

The great challenge we Americans confront is to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that our good will is as great as our strength until, despite all the obstacles, our two nations can achieve new attitudes and new trust, and until in time the terrible burden of the arms race can be lifted from our peoples.

One realistic step would be to recognize that thus far, while we have had certain progress on a bilateral basis, we have continued to confront each other by proxy in various trouble spots. These indirect challenges may be potentially more dangerous than face to face disagreements, and at best they make mock-

ery of the very concept of detente. If we want genuine progress, it must be at every level.

III

Our democracies must also work together more closely in a joint effort to help the hundreds of millions of people on this planet who are living in poverty and despair.

We have all seen the growth of North-South tensions in world affairs, tensions that are often based on legitimate economic grievances. We have seen in the Middle East the juncture of East-West and North-South conflicts and the resultant threat to world peace.

The democratic nations must respond to the challenge of human need on three levels.

First, by widening the opportunities for genuine North-South consultations. The developing nations must not only be the objects of policy, but must participate in shaping it. Without wider consultations we will have sharper confrontations. A good start has been made with the conference in international economic cooperation which should be strengthened and widened.

Secondly, by assisting those nations that are in direst need.

There are many ways the democracies can unite to help shape a more stable and just world order. We can work to lower trade barriers and make a major effort to provide increased support to the international agencies that now make capital available to the Third World.

This will require help from Europe, Japan, North America, and the wealthier members of OPEC for the World Bank's soft-loan affiliate, the International Development Association. The wealthier countries should also support such specialized funds as the new International Fund for Agricultural Development, which will put resources from the oil exporting and developed countries to work in increasing food production in poor countries. We might also seek to institutionalize, under the World Bank, a "World Development Budget," in order to rationalize and coordinate these and other similar efforts.

It is also time for the Soviet Union, which donates only about one-tenth of one percent of its GNP to foreign aid—and mostly for political ends—to act more generously toward global economic development.

I might add, on the subject of foreign aid, that while we are a generous nation we are not a foolish nation, and our people will expect recipient nations to undertake needed reforms to promote their own development. Moreover, all nations must recognize that the North-South relationship is not made easier by one-sided self-righteousness, by the exercise of automatic majorities in world bodies, nor by intolerance for the views or the very existence of other nations.

Third, we and our allies must work together to limit the *flow of arms into the developing world*.

The North-South conflict is in part a security problem. As long as the more powerful nations exploit the less powerful, they will be repaid by terrorism, hatred, and potential violence. Insofar as our policies are self-

ish, or cynical, or shortsighted, there will inevitably be a day of reckoning.

I am particularly concerned by our nation's role as the world's leading arms salesman. We sold or gave away billions of dollars of arms last year, mostly to developing nations. For example, we are now beginning to export advanced arms to Kenya and Zaire, thereby both fueling the East-West arms race in Africa even while supplanting our own allies—Britain and France—in their relations with these African states. Sometimes we try to justify this unsavory business on the cynical ground that by rationing out the means of violence we can somehow control the world's violence.

The fact is that we cannot have it both ways. *Can we be both the world's leading champion of peace and the world's leading supplier of the weapons of war?* If I become President I will work with our allies, some of whom are also selling arms, and also seek to work with the Soviets, to increase the emphasis on peace and to reduce the commerce in weapons of war.

The challenge we and our allies face with regard to the developing nations is a great one, a constant one, and an exciting one. It is exciting because it calls for so much creativity at so many levels by so many nations and individuals.

I have suggested steps which we and our allies might take toward a more stable and more just world order. I do not pretend to have all the answers. I hope you will help me find them.

What I do have is a strong sense that this country is drifting and must have new leadership and new direction. The time has come for a new thrust of creativity in foreign policy equal to that of the years following the Second World War. The old international institutions no longer suffice. *The time has come for a new architectural effort, with creative initiative by our own nation, with growing cooperation among the industrial democracies its cornerstone, and with peace and justice its constant goal.*

We are in a time of challenge and opportunity. If the values we cherish are to be preserved—the ideals of liberty and dignity and opportunity for all—we shall have to work in the closest collaboration with like-minded nations, seeking, through the strength that follows from collective action, to build an international system that reflects the principles and standards of our national heritage.

The primary purpose of our foreign policy is to create and maintain a world environment within which our great experiment in freedom can survive and flourish.

Ours would be a chilled and lonely world without the other democracies of Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Israel and this hemisphere with whom we share great common purposes. There is a special relationship among us based not necessarily on a common heritage but on our partnership in great enterprises. Our present limits are not those of natural resources but of ideas and inspirations.

Our first great need is to restore the morale and spirit of the American people.

It is time once again for the world to feel the forward movement and the effervescence of a dynamic and confident United States of America.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON ABORTION

I do not support constitutional amendments to overturn the Supreme Court ruling on abortion.

However, I personally disapprove of abortion. I do not believe government should encourage abortion. The efforts of government should be directed toward minimizing abortions.

If, within the confines of the Supreme Court ruling, we can work out legislation to minimize abortion with better family planning, adoption procedures, and contraception for those who desire it, I would favor such a law.

Abortion is the result of the failure of measures to prevent unwanted pregnancies. Abortion should never be considered just one of a number of equally acceptable methods of contraception.

As Governor of Georgia I obtained the first line item appropriation for family planning in the history of the state. I created by executive order the Special Council on Family Planning to spearhead the implementation of a comprehensive, voluntary, family planning program throughout the state.

The Georgia Medical Consent Act was amended to allow all females regardless of age or marital status to receive medical treatment for the prevention of pregnancy.

Although we have 159 counties in Georgia, it became one of the few states in the nation with family planning clinics operating in every county health department. Participation in family planning programs increased by 200 percent just during the first two years of my administration.

I believe my record as Governor and my personal inclinations equip me to insure a more productive role for the government in this area.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ANSWERS QUESTIONS ON AFRICA

1. What are the general objectives that should guide U.S. foreign policy; how do these objectives find expression in Africa?

The United States should pursue a foreign policy which encourages the process of needed change and orderly nonviolent progress for the peoples of the entire earth. As a nation which itself struggled for freedom, we must be aligned with the legitimate aspirations for self-determination and liberty of peoples all over the world. This should be accomplished primarily through support and cooperation with multilateral international institutions.

The development potential of the world can best be encouraged through the World Bank, through the establishment of an economic partnership in the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), and by the establishment (through the International Monetary Fund) of an international monetary system which is equitable to the developing nations as well as to ourselves.

The United States must also continue to enter into bilateral aid programs and respond to the emergency needs of those nations that are struggling to develop democratic institutions. When in our national interest, we may also enter into military aid programs whenever the national sovereignty of friendly nations is threatened by external powers. However, I think that the United States should refrain from covert activities which interfere with the internal affairs of friendly nations and should develop the kind of economic interdependence which would assure our ability to relate in a variety of ways to the nations of the world.

The United States of America is a world power and cannot escape from that responsibility and all that it entails. Our economy needs the natural resources which Africa can offer, and we will not be able to solve our problems of unemployment and inflation until there is a worldwide market system in which the producers and the consumers share equitably in the earth's resources.

2. How should aid priorities be determined, as between friends and non-friends, between Africa and the rest of the developing world; between "democratic" and "non-democratic" regimes; between countries with interesting natural resources and those with none; between countries that have potential for economic development and those who need long term humanitarian assistance?

As a nation, we must protect our own self-interest and give some priority to those nations who share the democratic principles and ideals which our nation tries to embody. However, we live in a world in which no nation can be completely written off as unfriendly; a nation's friends are sometimes determined by her interest in a particular situation, and such should be the case with Africa. While it is very difficult to export American concepts of democracy to another continent, we should always show preference for those democratic regimes that are based on majority rule and on the protection of minority rights. But we must not ignore political realities that may not conform to our ideals.

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

United States business interests will automatically move in the direction of those countries which are rich in natural resources such as Zambia, Zaire, Angola and Nigeria, but the foreign policy needs of the United States might well be further advanced by an association with Tanzania or Mazambique or the Sahel region which are in need of humanitarian assistance. Essentially, our two-fold approach of assistance through the International Development Agency of the World Bank and through improved AID programs will be in the long-term interests of this nation.

3. Do you think that situations such as that pertaining in Angola should be met by an active U.S. reaction, overt or covert?

I think that the United States' position in Angola should be one which admits that we missed the opportunity to be a positive and creative force for good in Angola during the years that we supported Portuguese colonization. We should also realize that the Russian and Cuban presence in Angola, while regrettable and counterproductive of peace, need not constitute a threat to United States interests; nor does that presence mean the existence of a Communist satellite on the continent. The Communists have given military assistance in many African nations but have never been able to remain there once independence is achieved. The OAU policy of non-alignment is so strong in the African tradition that it is reasonable to assume that an independent Angola would continue in that tradition. Furthermore, since Angola's survival economically depends on the sale of oil and other natural resources to the West, there will be some economic ties with any government which emerges.

It is extremely unfortunate that a unified government did not emerge along the lines of the Alvor Agreement, and Americans and Africans alike should deplore the cynical racism and violence perpetuated by the Soviet Union and Cuba on the people of Angola. But it is not in the U.S. interest to perpetuate the killing by covert or overt military assistance which would only prolong the fighting. The need for stability and order will force any government to come to terms with tribal and ideological differences which might exist.

4. How do you perceive the present U.S. government's policy toward southern African issues in general? Toward Namibia, Rhodesia, South Africa? Should stronger sanctions, boycotts, or other measures be taken against South Africa because of its apartheid policies? How do you see the oppression of apartheid, compared with oppression in some Black-ruled states? Is it being partial to take measures against South Africa and none against, for example, Uganda, Central African Republic or Equatorial Guinea?

For almost a decade the United States has had no positive policy toward South Africa. The Angola situation is a result of this policy vacuum. The United States should move immediately toward using leverage on South Africa to encourage the independence of Namibia and the beginning of majority rule in Rhodesia. There is no question that independence will come in the near future. The only question is whether it comes through armed struggle sponsored by the Soviet Union or through an aggressive diplomacy of peace encouraged by the United States.

The economic dependence of South Africa on the United States is such that an aggressive diplomacy need not include economic sanctions. Our influence on South Africa is even stronger than the influence of Vorster on Rhodesia's Ian Smith.

The experience which we have had with race relations in this country could also help South Africa to develop a system of guaranteed majority rule, while protecting minority rights. It is in the United States' interest to avoid further bloodshed in southern Africa. It is also in the interest of Black Africa to settle the question of African liberation without violence. The oppression of apartheid is a systematic policy institutionalized under law by the South African government, while the oppression in certain Black-ruled states of Africa is the result of a particular dictator and the attempt to deal with historic tribal tension or the vestiges of colonially-inspired division. However, the same policy of aggressive diplomacy toward freedom and justice for all should be the policy in our relationships with Black African states, and we must condemn injustice wherever it is and whatever the color of its originators.

5. Do you think that the U.S. can have a special relationship with Africa because of its own large Black population? Could this relationship be analagous to the U.S.-Israel relationship which exists because of this country's influential Jewish population?

Yes. The involvement of Black Americans, Spanish-speaking Americans and other ethnic and religious groups in our political system should be viewed as a national strength. We are blessed with the fact that we are the world in microcosm. This should make us sensitive to the affairs of the entire world and should also be the basis of very positive and creative relationships with the rest of the world. This is particularly true of this nation's Black minority and Africa, as well as our Spanish-speaking minority and Latin America.

6. Are you aware in your public and political life, of a significant Black constituency for Africa?

I have received a growing number of questions in my political campaigning from Black Americans on the question of Africa. But, for the most part, Black Americans are as domestically oriented as most white Americans, and they predominantly ask about race relations in this country and my approach to the problems of education, unemployment and economic justice in America. It would be a great help to this nation if people in public life were to be made aware of the problems of Africa through a significant Black interest in Africa. Americans might not have made the mistakes we made in Vietnam had there been an articulate Vietnamese minority in our midst. Such an articulate minority could have saved this nation 50,000 of her most promising young men, as well as more than \$150 billion from our nation's treasury.

7. If there were such a pressure group on African issues, would you pay attention to it? How might such a pressure group influence you to give a different emphasis to your policies?

Any politician who survives in public office learns to be sensitive to the active and legitimate concerns of the voters. And while I would resist being dictated to by any particular constituency, there is no question that such a group would be influential. A President, however, must consider the total national need and develop foreign and domestic policies which do most for the "common good" and the national interest. There should be strong input from all constituencies into such a policy, but ultimately that policy must be greater than the sum of its parts and become a coherent national policy protective of the interests of the United States and not just responding to the political pressures of any particular constituency.

8. Do you think that African questions, as a whole, receive less than their warranted consideration by the U.S. government?

There is no question that Africa has been ignored since the days of John F. Kennedy. Africa should become, and will become, one of the major foreign policy issues of the coming decade. Many of our domestic and international problems will be determined by the direction of our policies in Africa.

9. What would you like to see as the basis of relations between the U.S. and Africa?

The only basis of relationships between the United States and any part of the world must be that of mutual self-interest. There is an amazing congruity between the interests and needs of the United States and Africa. Africa needs development assistance and technological advances which only the United States can supply, and the United States needs both the resources and markets of an emerging Africa. This relationship should be built on mutual responsibility, mutual need, and a kind of partnership that is best expressed in the concepts of equality, justice and brotherhood.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON AGRICULTURE

The greatest need among those involved in the agricultural economy of this nation is a coherent, predictable and stable government policy relating to farming and the production of food and fiber.

The second requirement is an emphasis in government policy on the mutual concerns of the family farmer and the consumer, which are irrevocably tied together.

A third requirement is a Secretary of Agriculture who is inclined toward stability, predictability, and honest concern for the needs of family farmers and consumers.

There is now no coordination between our Departments of Agriculture or Commerce or Interior or Defense or any of the countless agencies, boards and bureaus that make decisions affecting agricultural policy. There is no logical reason for separating commodity policy from policies involving energy, land use, foreign affairs, monetary exchange or foreign trade.

We should again maintain a predictable, reasonably small and stable reserve of agricultural products. About a two months' supply would be adequate with about one-half of these reserves being retained under the control of farmers to prevent government "dumping" during times of moderate price increases.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON VIETNAM PARDON

If I am President, I will issue a pardon for all those who are outside our country, or in this country, who did not serve in the armed forces. I am going to issue a pardon, not an amnesty. I think those kids who have lived in Sweden or in Canada or who have avoided arrest have been punished enough. I think it is time to get it over with.

In my opinion, amnesty says what you did was right. Pardon says whether what you did was right or wrong, you are forgiven for it.

For those who deserted due to their opposition to the Vietnam War, I would not issue a blanket pardon, but would treat them on a case by case basis.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON THE ARTS

The United States government's cultural and educational programs here and abroad have been of enormous benefit to our country. Indeed, more and more of the American public has come to recognize the important role cultural institutions play in improving the quality of commodity life.

However, the very success of the government's role in cultural life focuses renewed attention on a number of identifiable problems. The Carter Administration will review existing programs and institutions in order to further improve what is by common consent a highly constructive federal role in our domestic cultural life.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON THE B-1

I oppose production of the B-1 bomber at this time. I believe that research and development should continue. The decision on the production of this weapon system should be made by the next Administration. An addition to our manned bomber fleet may become necessary, but I do not think the B-1 meets this need at this time.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON

BUREAUCRACY AND GOVERNMENT INEFFICIENCY

Our government in Washington now is a horrible bureaucratic mess. It is disorganized, wasteful, has no purpose, and its policies -- when they exist -- are incomprehensible or devised by special interest groups with little regard for the welfare of the average American citizen.

This is not an inherent, unavoidable aspect of government. We must give top priority to a drastic and thorough revision of the federal bureaucracy, to its budgeting system and to the procedures for analyzing the effectiveness of its many varied services.

Tight businesslike management and planning techniques must be instituted and maintained utilizing the full authority and personal involvement of the President himself.

This is no job for the fainthearted. It will be met with strong opposition from those who now enjoy special privileges, those who prefer to work in the dark, or those whose personal fiefdoms are threatened.

In Georgia, we met that opposition head on -- and we won! We abolished 278 of 300 agencies. We evolved clearly defined goals and policies in every part of government. We developed and implemented a remarkably effective system of zero base budgeting. We instituted tough performance auditing to insure proper conduct and efficient delivery of services.

Steps like these can insure a full return on our hard-earned tax dollars. These procedures are working in our state capitols around the nation and in our successful businesses, both large and small. They can and they will work in Washington.

There is no inherent conflict between careful planning, tight management, and constant reassessment on the one hand, and compassionate concern for the plight of the deprived and afflicted on the other. Waste and inefficiency never fed a hungry child, provided a job for a willing worker, or educated a deserving student.



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