


The original documents are located in Box 25, folder “Carter on Foreign Policy (1)” of the Michael Raoul-Duval Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

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 Michael Raoul-Duval donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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

Conduct of
Foreign Policy

CARTER ON CONDUCT OF FOREIGN POLICY



1. General Criticisms of The Ford Administration:

Carter has a long litany of criticisms of the Ford Administration in foreign policy. Among them:

-- Lack of Presidential leadership; drift at the top;

-- Excessive secrecy by HAK -- calls him "the Long Lone Ranger." Cites Vietnam, Cambodia, Chile, Angola, CIA abuses as fruits of secrecy;

-- Failure to consult either the Congress or the people on major foreign policy issues;

-- Lack of idealism in policy; policies amoral;

-- Failure to bargain toughly with the Soviets;

-- Neglect of European and Japanese allies (mostly aimed at Nixon-Ford);

-- Paternalism toward developing nations;

-- Excessive interference in the internal affairs of other nations;

-- Failure to curb nuclear weapons or to curb excessive foreign arms sales.

2. What Carter Would Do: Carter talks more in generalities than specifics about his own plans. His "basic principles," he says, are to make our policies more open and honest, to treat the people of other nations "as individuals (sic), to restore the moral content to foreign policy, and to aim policies at building a "just and peaceful world order." What specifics there are -- e.g., creating stronger relations with developing nations -- can be bound in subsequent sections.

3. View of Kissinger: In 1973 and 1974, before he was a serious contender for the Democratic nomination, Carter spoke very highly of Kissinger, supported his approach to foreign policy, and even called him a close friend according to a Wisconsin newspaper. Today, Carter is harsh in his criticisms, says he would not keep HAK as Secretary, but adds that he might call on him for special assignments. Carter promises that he himself would be much more actively involved in foreign policy decisions.

4. Foreign Policy as Key 1976 Issue: In January of this year, Carter foresaw foreign policy -- not domestic policy -- as the key issue between himself and the President during the election.

5. Kissinger Sees Carter Policy as "Compatible:" Note that in an interview this summer, Kissinger was quoted as saying that Carter's foreign policy views were "fairly consistent" and "compatible" with those of the Administration.

CARTER'S BASIC ATTACK

General

There are substantial differences between my concept of foreign policy and the Kissinger-Nixon-Ford approach.

-- I favor an open evolution of foreign policy, with the American people and Congress more involved in the decisions.

-- Too often decisions are made behind closed doors, and then Kissinger speaks without the knowledge or support of the American people.

-- I would follow the example of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshal Plan. Truman appointed strong advisers, listened closely and then took the issue to the American people.

-- We must take this more open approach, because major international decisions greatly affect the daily lives of the American people -- energy, commodity shortages, as well as foreign crises.

The Nixon-Kissinger-Ford policy is covert, manipulative, and deceptive in style. It runs against the basic principles of this country, because Kissinger is obsessed with power blocs, with spheres of influence. This is a policy without focus. It is not understood by the people or the Congress.

The President is not really in charge. Our policies are Kissinger's ideas and his goals, which are often derived in secret.

The results have been disastrous. Our allies see no consistency or reliability in the United States. Our neighbors in Latin America feel neglected. Our policy toward the developing countries is peripheral and

unplanned. The world's richest country ranks 12th in foreign assistance, and most of this goes to countries that are fairly well off. We can no longer tax the poor people of America to aid the rich people of foreign countries.

What we need are clear and consistent goals, that are understood and supported by the American people. We must strengthen our bilateral relations with friendly countries and stop treating them as power blocs. We must reorient our foreign assistance to help the world's poor. In accordance with our own principles we must be tolerant of diversity in the world.

I would have these priorities:

First, to restore stability and cooperation in our relations with our European Allies and Japan. We must be more predictable, and consult them before making decisions. Increased cooperation can help avoid a repetition of the disastrous world recession of 1972-1973.

Second, I would work for a reform in the international system which would emphasize greater cooperation between North and South, and try to enlist the new nations in a cooperative effort. In doing so, we would have to be responsive to their concerns, both economically and politically. Failure to do this resulting in the damaging handling of the Angolan conflict, and created openings for the Soviet Union.

We are increasingly dependent on raw materials from developing nations. Unless we cooperate with the developing nations, we face a

disaster by the end of the century.

Third, I would be a tougher bargainer with the USSR.

-- We want detente, nuclear arms control, but we also have to stand up for human rights and freer emigration.

-- Each time we give something to the Soviets we should get a commensurate return.

-- They need our machinery, our technology, and our grain. In return I would ask for such things as: (1) help in solving the Middle East, rather than stoking the fires of war; (2) help in avoiding oil embargoes, (3) help in restraining North Korea, and work for peace in that area; (4) concessions on controversial issues in strategic arms limitation; (5) reducing nuclear testing.

Detente was oversold:

-- At Helsinki we endorsed Soviet domination of East Europe; also in the Sonnenfeldt doctrine we conceded Eastern European freedoms to the Soviets.

-- We should either not have gone at all to Helsinki, or drove a harder bargain. The Soviets have not lived up to the promises on free movement of people.

I favor maximum exchanges of tourists, students, professors.

ON CHINA: Recognition is inevitable, but we should not be in any hurry; we must have assurances that Taiwan will be settled peacefully, and that people on Taiwan are assured of relative independence; I would repeat

our commitments to them.

ON THE MIDDLE EAST: Step-by-step diplomacy was right at the time, but it is no longer adequate; we need to be more active in permitting peaceful settlements.

ON NATO: It is time for an in-depth review of military forces strategy; the Allies can take a greater burden. We cannot allow the Alliance to become anachronistic.

ON TRADE: We can work to lower trade barriers and make a major effort to provide increased support for international agencies that make capital available to the Third World. Support the International Fund for Agricultural Development; under the World Bank, we might seek a "World Development Budget"; it is also time for the Soviet Union to act more generously toward global economic development.

ON ARMS SALES: This is a unsavory business. How can we be both the world's leading champion of peace and the world's leading supplier of the weapons of war. I will work with our allies and the Soviet Union to increase the emphasis on peace and reduce the commerce in weapons of war.

ON AFRICA: I agree with Secretary Kissinger's efforts but this is a long-delayed interest. We may have waited too late.

* * * * *

I believe the American people do not understand our foreign policy and they do not support it. Some in-depth public opinion polls point out the grounds for considerable public apprehension. The American people have a negative evaluation of our handling of relations with the Soviet Union. Moreover, almost 7 out of 10 Americans believe these relations will get worse. Almost half of the public believes we have stood still or even lost ground in reducing international tensions. There is rising public concern about the danger of the US becoming involved in a major war within the next few years. It is little wonder that more than 6 out of 10 Americans feel the overall situation we face today in the world leaves much to be desired. Only one percent believe the situation is excellent. And over 60 percent believe it is poor or only fair.

I believe all of this indicates we must reexamine our foreign policy. We must bring it into line with the aspirations of our people. Every major mistake we have made has been because the American people have been excluded from the decision. When I am President the American people will understand our goals because these goals will reflect what is good and decent in the American people and therefore they will support our foreign policy.

CARTER QUOTES ON CONDUCT OF FOREIGN POLICY

Carter's General Criticisms: 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 outer countries but far less concerned with consulting the American people of 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 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 of 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.

JCPC - Address at the Council
on Foreign Relations, Chicago
March 15, 1976

Q. In your Chicago speech on March 15, you said that this nation's foreign policy has never been in greater disarray than it is at present. What did you mean?

A. The foreign policy of a country derives its strength ultimately from the people of the country; their understanding of it, their evolution of it, their role in the consummation of it. Our foreign policy is without focus. It is not understood by the people, by the Congress or by foreign nations.

It is primarily comprised of Mr. Kissinger's own ideas, his own goals, most often derived and maintained in secrecy. I don't think the President plays any substantial role in the evolution of our foreign policy. Kissinger has tended to neglect our natural allies and friends in consultation on major policy decisions. Our neighbors in this hemisphere feel that they've been neglected; the Japanese feel that we've ignored their interests; the European nations feel that our commitment to them is suspect; plus there's no attitude of respect or natural purpose toward the developing nations.

*Time
May, 76*

Our participation with developing nations is peripheral and unplanned. We have treated them almost with contempt. A small amount of investment and genuine interest would pay rich dividends. I think the small nations are

hungry for a more predictable and mutually advantageous relationship with our country.

Time
May 10, 1976

Under the Nixon-Ford Administration, there has evolved a kind of secretive "Long 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.

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.

JCPC - JC Address
Relations Between the World's
Democracies to the Foreign
Policy Association
New York City
June 23, 1976

Carter Criticisms Continued

We have an inevitable role of leadership to play. Even if countries don't trust us and don't respect us at this moment, because we're considered to be war-like, we're considered to be disrespectful of them, they still recognize that because of our innate political strength, the size of our country, our economic strength, our military strength, that we are going to be a major voice in the world, and we ought to assume that position. We can't withdraw from participation in the United Nations or its ancillary organizations, because that's where decisions are made which affect the lives of everyone who lives in Georgia, or Kentucky, or Iowa. In food, population, freedom of the seas, international trade, stable monetary systems, environmental quality, access to commodities and energy and so forth, we've got to be part of it. But our foreign policy ought not to be based on military might nor political power nor economic pressure. It ought to be based on the fact that we are right and decent and honest and truthful and predictable and respectful; in other words, that our foreign policy itself accurately represents the character and the ideals of the American people. But it doesn't. We have set a different standard of ethics and morality as a nation than we have in our own private lives as individuals who comprise the nation. And that ought to be changed. The President ought to be the spokesman for this country, not the Secretary of State. And when the President speaks, he ought to try to represent as accurately as he can what our people are. And that's the basis, I believe, on which a successful foreign policy can be based, to correct some of the defects we know about and to restore us once again as a nation that is loved, respected, and which has friends around the world.

We've done a lot in this country in the last 20 years to end racial discrimination within our own borders; but we still have a gross, I think unconscionable, attitude of racial discrimination in international affairs. I don't believe, for instance, that we would have ever bombed or strafed villages in France or Germany as we did in Vietnam; and this kind of attitude, of concentrating our own emphasis in foreign policy on the white-skinned people, is felt throughout the world. And I think we ought to end that.

Democratic Louisville Forum
November 23, 1975

I hope we've learned some lessons (in recent years). One lesson is that we should cease trying to intervene militarily in the internal affairs of other countries unless our own nation is endangered. If it were possible for us to establish democracy all over the world by military force, you might arouse an argument for it. But the attempt to do that is counterproductive. We've seen that vividly in South Korea and also in South Vietnam. The Soviet Union, with the exception of street skirmishes in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, hasn't lost a single soldier in combat since the Second World War. We lost 34,000 in South Korea and 50,000 in South Vietnam, basically trying to tell other people what kind of government they ought to have, what kind of leader they should have -- and it doesn't work. Either you have a repressive government taking away liberty from their people, as is the case in South Korea, to stay in office, and kicking us in the shins to demonstrate some superficial independence of us, or, as was the case in South Vietnam, a constant overthrow of governments as they became acknowledged to be American puppets. When we go into a country and put our arms around somebody and say "This is the leader who we want to be your President or your Prime Minister," no matter how popular they might be at the time, we put the political kiss of death on them. And the proud people who live in that country automatically react against a puppet. Had we spent another 50,000 lives and had we spent another \$150 billion in South Vietnam and had we dropped the atomic bomb on North Vietnam, we still could not have propped up the governments of Thieu or Ky.

In the last two or three years, I've traveled as an official visitor to 11 foreign countries, in the Far East, the Mid East, South America, Central America, and Europe, and met with leaders there, and talked to them at length. I've also been in our embassies. And I think in the recent administrations, there has been a vivid demonstration of our attitude toward other people and our lack of respect for them in the quality of diplomatic officials appointed. When I go into an embassy in South America or Central America or Europe and see sitting as our ambassador, our representative there, a fat, bloated, ignorant, rich major contributor to a presidential campaign who can't even speak the language of the country in which he serves, and who knows even less about our own country and our consciousness and our ideals and our motivation, it's an insult to me and to the people of America and to the people of that country.

When challenged by columnist Robert Novak to name any ambassador who fit that "ugly American" caricature, Carter said he "wouldn't want to name any."

Boise Idaho Statesman
April 2, 1976

"You don't plot murder and I don't plot murder, so why should our government plot murder against some foreign leader?"

The Atlantic
July 1976

"In Angola, we clung to the Portuguese to the last moment...The Cuban government, on the other hand, had learned the people's language, formed friendships and studied their politics...Our reaction was to send in weapons and let the people kill each other."

"I think we can find a better ambassador to send to Africa than Shirley Temple."

The Atlantic
July 1976

Carter criticized the delayed signing of a Russian-American nuclear test limitations agreement, a recent veto of a foreign aid bill, and administration uncertainty on the Rhodesian chrome import issue as "increasing signs that our nation's foreign policy has become hostage to Republican Party politics. There is not one good reason in the world why Gov. Reagan should hold a veto over U.S. foreign policy."

Washington Post
May 15, 1976

Under Kissinger "our foreign policy has consisted almost entirely of maneuvers 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 matter.

Atlanta Constitution
March 21, 1976

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 cornerstones, and with peace and justice its constant goal.

JCPC - JC Address
Foreign Policy Association
New York
June 23, 1976



What Carter Would Do

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.

JCPC/Address by Jimmy Carter
to the Chicago Council on
Foreign Relations
March 15, 1976

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.

JCPC/Jimmy Carter Address on
Foreign Policy to Members of
the American Chamber of Commerce
Tokyo, Japan
March 28, 1975

We must never again keep secret the evolution of our foreign policy from the Congress and the American 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.

JCPC/Jimmy Carter Address on
Foreign Policy to Members of
the American Chamber of Commerce
Tokyo, Japan
March 28, 1975

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.

JCPC/Jimmy Carter Address on
Relations Between the World's
Democracies to the Foreign
Policy Association
New York, N.Y.
June 23, 1976

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.

Jimmy Carter Address on
Relations Between the World's
Democracies to the Foreign
Policy Association
New York, N.Y.
June 23, 1976

I would move away from power-bloc confrontation and would pursue much more singular bilateral relationships with the countries of the world. I would consult much more closely and continually with our natural allies and friends in Europe, this hemisphere and Japan. There would be much less keeping secrets from them about basic changes in our orientation toward the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

Newsweek (European Edition)
May 10, 1976

I would never again see our nation become militarily involved in the internal affairs of another country unless our own security is directly threatened. But it is absolutely imperative that the world knows that we will meet obligations and commitments to allies and that we will always keep our nation strong. We must also remember that excessive foreign commitments can overtax our national ability."

American Legion Convention
Seattle
August 24, 1976

The candidate says the U.S. should never get involved in foreign wars "unless our own nation is endangered."

Wall Street Journal
April 2, 1976

"I don't claim to be an expert on foreign affairs, (but) I've got excellent advisers."

Chicago Sun Times
October 19, 1975

Foreign policy is not Carter's strong suit. A New Hampshire speech that was billed as a "major address" was largely platitudinous: If the U.S. loves the rest of the world, he seemed to say, the rest of the world will love the U.S.

Time
March 8, 1976

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.

JCPC/Jimmy Carter Address to the
Chicago Council on Foreign
Relations
March 15, 1976

Carter's Personal Approach to Foreign Policy

Q. Would you press for a summit conference with other leaders soon after you took office?

A. "I think that a summit conference after the election would be important, but I would prefer that leaders of other countries come here."

U.S. News and World Report
September 13, 1976

"I think a crucial prerequisite of an effective foreign policy is to restore the confidence and morale and commitment of our people in their own domestic affairs. So I would not use foreign affairs or foreign trips as an escape mechanism to avoid responsibilities on the domestic scene."

"The main thing that's missing now is confidence by the Secretary of State in the sound judgment, common sense and integrity of the American people."

Q. Would your Secretary of State be there to make foreign policy or to carry out the foreign policy that you make?

A. Both. I would retain the responsibility of making the final decisions. I would insist on being clearly informed. And I would retain the role of being spokesman for this country. But I would consider the Secretary of State to be a partner with me, an adviser, and administrator of the complex foreign affairs mechanism that falls within the responsibility of the Secretary of State. But I would be the ultimate one to make the decisions."

National Journal
July 17, 1976

"I remember when I first became interested in foreign affairs, when Harry Truman was in office. He always had Sen. (Arthur) Vandenberg, a great Republican senator, and Senator Walter George, a great Democrat senator from Georgia, and they always consulted with him in setting up...The Marshall Plan, the United Nations, aid to Turkey and Greece and the establishment of Israel as a nation. It was a working relationship between the White House and the Congress. We haven't had that lately and I intend to restore it."

Carter noted that he has not had "a great deal of experience" in foreign affairs but said that a foreign policy "that would make us proud again" could be based largely on "sound judgment and common sense and intelligence and openness."

Washington Post
June 29, 1976

He said he would constantly consult with Congress on the formulation of policy, but would also "make every reasonable attempt to preserve the prerogatives and authority of the president."

Carter said he would be the nation's "spokesman" but not his own Secretary of State. While coordination "would be my responsibility, I would like to let the Cabinet officers run their own departments."

"We must replace balance-of-power politics with world-order politics.:

New York Times
July 7, 1976

Q. Can you conceive of a situation in the Third World -- Latin America, Asia, and Africa -- where you would send American combat forces?

A. "If the altercation was internal, a struggle for control of the government, I can't envision any circumstances under which I would send troops. If there as a war begun between countries and I felt that our own national security interests were directly endangered, I would certainly consider sending troops."

New York Times
July 7, 1976

CARTER + THE SECRETARY OF STATE

"He's (Kissinger) a remarkable man and a very good friend of mine. He's the kind of person who has a tremendous sense of humor and who, I think, is preserving the character of his nation in a superlative way during the times that are so trying to us all."

Speech, B'nai B'rith
April 20, 1974

Carter supported Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's approach to Foreign Policy, calling Kissinger a close friend with whom he met frequently for discussions.

Capital Times, Wisconsin
February 8, 1975

"I think Dr. Kissinger deserves the gratitude of the American people for having concluded these very difficult negotiations and I want to congratulate them in a wonderful achievement."

Atlanta Journal
January 24, 1976

"There is no way I would keep Kissinger as Secretary of State, but as a personal diplomat, in a particular circumstance, I would certainly call on Kissinger either for a confrontation or perhaps as a negotiator."

Chicago Tribune
May 8, 1976

- Q. What type of qualities would you look for in a Secretary of State? What type of background and personal characteristics? Would you like to have someone who came out of the foreign policy "establishment" and had been involved in foreign affairs over the years? Or someone who had been watching it in a more detached way?
- A. That's something I haven't yet decided, nor have I had to decide it. I would probably depend more upon my confidence in the intelligence and judgment and moral commitment of the person, than I would on the particular environment that has shaped that person's knowledge of foreign affairs. I've got about 15 or 20 people in whom I have placed a lot of responsibility, and among that group I would seek advice before I made a final decision on Secretary of State. The main thing that's missing now is confidence by the Secretary of State in the sound judgment, common sense and integrity of the American people.
- Q. Do you see a model in any of the recent Secretaries of State -- William Rogers, who was sort of a sword carrier, Henry Kissinger the policy maker, or perhaps Dean Acheson, who seemed to do it fairly cooperatively with the President?
- A. I think Dean Acheson, George Marshall would be two who did a superb job, in my opinion. I don't think there was every any doubt in the minds of the American people about who was responsible ultimately. Even when those two very strong Secretaries of State were in office, it was the President. They were men of conviction, of sensitivity, of competence and authority. And they worked harmoniously with the President. And they carried out the responsibilities specifically designated to them by the President, on an individual basis of agreement. So I think those two would be the kinds of persons that I would admire very much.

Q. Do you intend to be primarily your own Secretary of State?

A. "Not as far as the administration of our foreign policy is concerned. But I would want to have a Secretary of State and heads of other departments of the government who are capable of performing their functions independently, reporting to me and keeping me conversant with what their overall policies might be."

"As far as the evolution of foreign affairs and policies are concerned, I would not want to have a White House staff in effect superior to the Secretary of State. Now I believe in putting into office the most competent and qualified people as administrators of that department and letting them perform their functions without interference from me, but responsible always to me. I really prefer to be the spokesman for the nation in the area of foreign affairs and on matters of major policy and let the American people look to me as the one to represent our country in that respect."

New York Times
July 7, 1976

"I would probably stay in this country most of the time and not travel so much abroad. But I would encourage them to come to visit me. And I've got a fairly large family. I would put them on the road, especially in Latin America. All of them speak some Spanish."

Newsweek (European Edition)
May 10, 1976

Carter also wants to give the NSC, an important arm of the White House, a much broader charter which would involve it for the first time in traditionally domestic concerns. The altered role that he is contemplating for the NSC would make a major change in a key presidential instrument for dealing with the nation's most vital foreign policy, defense and intelligence matters.

"I think that the economic strength, the transportation system, energy policies and the priorities in how tax revenues are spent are all important elements in the security of the country." While he wants the council to encompass economic and social questions in its dealings, Carter said he has not yet worked out in his mind precisely what form such an expanded body should take."

Atlanta Constitution
August 8, 1976

Kissinger, in Carter's view, is a "brilliant man, and a superb negotiator," but he could never be Carter's Secretary of State because he "does not trust the American people."

New York Times
February 11, 1976

Kissinger professes to find Carter's views "fairly consistent" and "compatible" with those of the Ford Administration.

"The difference is that what the present administration says it is doing -- although it is not doing it -- would actually be Carter's policy. Kissinger has made an expedient change of language and rhetoric. He has discovered morality, the importance of fundamentals, the virtues of openness. But it's all a bunch of rhetoric. No one should be deceived."*

*A Carter foreign policy adviser

Los Angeles Times
July 18, 1976

1976 ELECTION AND FOREIGN POLICY

"I think that following the convention this year, perhaps as much at any time in recent history, the debate, if I'm successful, will be between myself and President Ford on foreign policy. I think domestic issues will be much less significant than the debate on basic foreign policy."

Capital Times (Wis.)

March 29, 1976

"Jimmy Carter on the issues"

Carter warned foreign countries to "stay out of our election campaign," called "inappropriate" for them to inject themselves into U.S. domestic politics or to suggest that they could. He called it a "detriment" to the campaign.

...even if nominated, he would not meet with foreign representatives "without prior consultation with the secretary of state."

The former Georgia governor said he had requested and held one meeting in Miami with the Israeli ambassador earlier this year to ask him some questions about the Israeli-occupied West Bank of the Jordan River--"I wanted to understand what was going on," Carter said.

N.Y. Daily News

May 14, 1976

"I plan to spend five or six hours at the first (CIA briefing) session just letting the CIA educate me about current and unpublished relationships between our country and other countries around the world, particularly those that might be of some threat to peace. I want to make sure that during the campaign itself that I'm as well informed as possible so that I don't make a statement inadvertently that would contravene the purposes of our country or might be some disruption in the search for peace or good relationships with other countries."

AP

Hershey, Pa.

July 6, 1976

CARTER ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The question, I think, is whether in recent years our highest officials have not been too pragmatic, even cynical, and as a consequence have ignored those moral values that had often distinguished our country from the other great nations of the world.

We must move away from making policies in secret; without the knowledge and approval of the American people.

Over the years, our greatest source of strength has come from those basic, priceless values which are embodied in our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution and our Bill of Rights, our belief in freedom of religion -- our belief in freedom of expression -- our belief in human dignity.

These principles have made us great, and unless our foreign policy reflects them, we make a mockery of all those values that we have celebrated in this bicentennial year.

Still in recent years, we have had reason to be troubled. Often there has been a gap between the values we have proclaimed and the policies we have pursued. We have often been overextended, and deeply entangled in the internal affairs of distant nations. Our government has pursued dubious tactics, and "national security" has sometimes been a cover-up for unnecessary secrecy and national scandal.

We stumbled into the quagmires of Cambodia and Vietnam, and carried out heavy-handed efforts to destroy an elected government in Chile. In Cyprus, we let expediency triumph over fairness, and lost both ways.

We responded inadequately to human suffering in Bangladesh, Burundi, the Sahel, and other underdeveloped nations.

We lessened the prestige of our foreign service by sending abroad ambassadors who were distinguished only by the size of their political contributions.

We have allowed virtually unlimited sales of U.S. arms to countries around the world -- a policy as cynical as it is dangerous.

I find it unacceptable that we have in effect condoned the effort of some Arab countries to tell American businesses that in order to trade with one country or company, they must observe certain restrictions based on race or religion. Those so-called "Arab boycotts" violate our standards of freedom and morality.

I regret that a senior official of the Ford Administration, and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, last week told Congress that efforts should not be made to address this basic issue of human rights.

Moreover, according to a recent House subcommittee report, the Department of Commerce has shut its eyes to the boycott by failing to collect information on alleged offenses, and failing to carry out a firm policy against the boycott.

If I become President, all laws concerning these boycotts will be vigorously enforced.

We also regret our government's continuing failure to oppose the denial of human freedom in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Similarly, the American government has failed to make serious efforts to get the Russians to permit greater numbers of people to emigrate freely to countries of their choice, and I commend those members of Congress and others who have demonstrated a strong personal concern and commitment to that goal.

Despite our deep desire for successful negotiation on strategic arms and nuclear proliferation, we cannot pass over in silence the deprivation of human rights in the Soviet Union. The list of Soviet prisoners is long and includes both Christians and Jews. I will speak only of two: Valadimar Bukovsky and Vladimir Slepak. Bukovsky, a young scientist, has been imprisoned most of the last 13 years for criticisms of the Soviet regime. Slepak, a radio engineer in Moscow, applied for an exit visa for Israel in April of 1970. The visa was denied and since 1972, he has been denied the right to hold a job.

I ask why such people must be deprived of their basic rights, a year after Helsinki. And if I become President, the fate of men like Bukovsky and Slepak will be very much on my mind as I negotiate with the Soviet Union.

There are those regimes, such as South Korea, which openly violate human rights, although they themselves are under threat from Communist regimes which represent an even greater level of repression.

Even in such cases, however, we should not condone repression or the denial of freedom. On the contrary, we should use our influence to increase freedom in those countries that depend on us for their very survival.

I do not say to you that these are simple issues.

I do not say that we can remake the world in our own image. I recognize the limits on our power, and I do not wish to see us swing from one extreme of cynical manipulation to the other extreme of moralistic zeal, which can be just as dangerous.

But the present administration has been so obsessed with balance of power politics that it has often ignored basic American values and a proper concern for human rights. The leaders of this administration have rationalized that there is little room for morality in foreign affairs, and that we must put self-interest above principle.

Let me suggest some actions our government should take in the area of human rights.

First, we can support the principle of self-determination by refraining from intervention in the domestic politics of other countries, but obviously, we are going to protect our interests and advance our beliefs in other nations.

We should not behave abroad in ways that violate our own laws or moral standards. You and I would not plot murder, but in recent years officials of our government have plotted murder, and that is wrong and unacceptable.

In giving trade advantages or economic assistance to other governments, we should make sure that such aid is used to benefit the people of that country. There will be times when we will want to help those who must live under a repressive government, yet wish to provide food, health care, or other humanitarian assistance directly to the people.

The United States should lend more vigorous support to the United Nations and other public and private international bodies in order to attract world attention, to the denial of freedom. These bodies are limited in power, but they can serve as the conscience of the world community, and they deserve far more support than our government has given them in recent years.

Insofar as they comply with our own Constitution and laws, we should move toward Senate ratification of several important treaties drafted in the United Nations for the protection of human rights. These include the Genocide Convention that was prepared more than 25 years ago, the Convention against racial discrimination that was signed during the Johnson administration, and the covenants on political and civil rights, and on economic and social rights. Until we ratify these covenants, we cannot participate with other nations in international discussions of specific cases involving freedom and human rights.

We should quit being timid and join Israel and other nations in moving to stamp out international terrorism!

Excerpts from B'nai B'rith Speech
September 8, 1976

CARTER QUOTES ON THE CIA

Carter says he has not decided whether he would replace George Bush as CIA director if he is elected.

Although Bush previously has been involved in Republican politics, he has "brought the CIA a good background as former United Nations ambassador and U.S. representative to China." He added that his choice for CIA head would be a person "with stature with the American people, whose integrity was beyond doubt and with some analytical ability."

AP
July 28, 1976

President from now on should accept direct responsibility for CIA activities. The President "has got to say to the American people that the CIA functioned legally and properly and guarantee that that's the case."

U.S. News and World Report
September 22, 1975

"I will assume personal responsibility for the intelligence activities of our government," he said.

New York Times
February 12, 1976

Carter says he has no objection to Congress "monitoring" the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. But the real answer to its abuses is for him as President "to take on my own shoulders the responsibility for telling you (the public) when something has gone wrong, who did it and how I intend to correct it. You can hold me responsible for it, not some committee."

Washington Post (Broder)
May 2, 1976

CARTER QUOTES ON CYPRUS

The Democratic nominee received a standing ovation from about two dozen Greek-American leaders after reading a statement that criticized the Ford Administration for "tilting away from Greece and Cyprus" and called for an end to the impasse over that Mediterranean Island.

Baltimore Sun
September 17, 1976

Speaking on the Turkey-Greece-Cyprus issue, Carter said: "There should be a constant pressure upon our own government to reduce that encroachment on Cyprus itself. I would favor the retaining of some bases in Turkey if worked out mutually with Turkey..."

Portland, Oregon
May 21, 1976

CARTER QUOTES ON THE PANAMA CANAL

I would try to work out some arrangement within these two limitations: First of all, I would not be in favor of relinquishing actual control of the Panama Canal or its use to any other nation, including Panama. I think we've got to retain that actual practical control. On the other hand, I think there are several things that can be done to assuage the feeling among the Panamanians that they've been excluded or perhaps even out-traded back in the 1903 period. So I would be glad to yield part of the sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone to Panama. I would certainly be willing to renegotiate the payment terms to Panama and I would also be willing to remove the word "perpetuity" from the present agreement.

Democratic Forum
Louisville, Kentucky
November 23, 1975

Allies

CARTER ON RELATIONS WITH MAJOR ALLIES



1. Trilateralism: Carter consistently argues that under the Nixon-Ford Administrations, "we have made highly publicized efforts to woo the major communist powers while neglecting our natural friends and allies." He says that he would place far more emphasis upon U.S. alliances and less emphasis on relationships with the U.S.S.R. and the P.R.C. To underscore his point, he has called for a new "creative partnership" between North America, Western Europe and Japan that would deal with problems such as the arms race, world poverty and the allocation of natural resources.

Commentators point out that Carter's views seem to stem from his membership on the Trilateral Commission and that some of his advisers (e.g., Brezinski) are the leaders of the commission. Other commentators point out that Carter's criticisms of U.S. policy toward Europe and Japan were better aimed at the Nixon Administration; under Ford, they say, far more attention has been paid to the allies and the era of "diplomatic shocks" has ended.

2. Goals for the Industrial Democracies: Carter's most complete statement on the aims of a new trilateral relationship came in a Foreign Policy Association speech in New York City on June 23, when he set forth three areas in which the industrial democracies must make greater progress:

-- Greater economic and political cooperation aimed at lowering trade barriers, better coordination of economic policies, sharing of ideas on health care, transportation, etc., and promotion of human rights;

-- Greater cooperation on mutual security issues (See NATO, other defense sections);

-- Greater cooperation on North-South issues. Carter wants to widen North-South consultations, give more effective assistance, and limit the flow of arms into the developing world.

3. Expansive Rhetoric: Carter does not have many specifics but he uses very grand rhetoric to describe the new relationships he foresees: "The time has come for a new thrust of creativity in foreign policy equal to that of the years following World War II. 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."

New York City
June 23, 1976

4. Communism in Europe: While Carter has constantly opposed communist gains in Europe, he has also said that it is shortsighted for the U.S. to work with Brezhnev but not become acquainted with communist leaders in NATO. Specifically, Carter said "we should not close the doors to communist leaders in Italy for a friendship with us." This remark came before the Italian election, and was regarded as a gaffe by conservatives in the U.S.

CARTER QUOTES ON RELATIONS WITH ALLIES

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 community of the free.

JCPC JC Address - Relations
Between the World Democracies
to the Foreign Policy Association
New York City
June 23, 1976

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.

JCPC JC Address - Relations
Between the World Democracies
to the Foreign Policy Association
New York City
June 23, 1976

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 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.

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 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.

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

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

Address, Foreign Policy
Association
New York City
June 23, 1976



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.

Address, Foreign
Policy Association
New York City
June 23, 1976

Carter claims that the United States has "neglected our natural allies like France, England, Mexico and Japan."

Capital Times
Madison, Wisconsin
March 25, 1976

"I should think it is shortsighted of us to deal openly with Brezhnev and leaders of the Soviet Union and refuse to understand and become acquainted with leaders in a NATO country who are communist. I believe we should support strongly the democratic forces in Italy, but still we should not close the doors to communist leaders in Italy for friendship with us. It may be that we would be better off having an Italian government that might be comprised at least partially of communists tied in with the Western world rather than driven into the Soviet orbit irrevocably."

Newsweek
May 10, 1976
(European Edition)

In reference to the election held in Italy, Carter said: "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 needs."

St. Louis Post-Dispatch
June 24, 1976

Carter told a French television interviewer he doesn't believe France will go communist. But he said he's not going to tell the French how to vote.

"I think the French people themselves believe that communism could be a threat to justice and freedom, and I believe the average feeling of the French tends toward a more democratic government. But in any event the French know how to vote, and I am not going to tell them how to do it."

AP
July 13, 1976

"I see no reason why we should go to Russia and meet with Brezhnev and not also get to know the attitudes and hopes and strengths and reason for the strengths of these communist parties in the European countries."

"If we decide the other, more competitive democratic parties would be better for world peace," then the United States should encourage those parties through diplomatic means, trade negotiations and statements in NATO.

"But we ought not to freeze out the American people's knowledge of the communist parties."

Capital Times
Madison, Wisconsin
March 25, 1976

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, upholding 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.

JCPC JC Address - Relations
Between the World's Democracies
the Foreign Policy Association
New York City
June 23, 1976

"I really believe that the situation in Italy is not as serious as it was a year ago when Italy was on the verge of absolute, total bankruptcy and when many people who were quite conservative and even leaders of some of the major corporations felt that the communists would do a better job of managing the nation's affairs than the present leaders. I think the situation has improved. I would certainly hate to see Italy go communist. I think we ought to do everything we can within reasonable and open bounds through NATO, through our strengthening of the position of the more democratic leaders, to prevent it...if it becomes obvious that the present government is incapable of leadership and the communists are the choice of the people of Italy,...then I don't think we ought to intervene militarily or by any sort of covert means. That would include assassinations, for instance, I don't think that would be right."

National Democratic Issues
Conference
Louisville, Kentucky
November 23, 1976

Developing
Nations

CARTER ON DEVELOPING NATIONS



1. Criticisms of Current Policy: A consistent theme in Carter's foreign policy pronouncements has been his view that the Nixon-Ford Administrations have either ignored the developing nations or treated them like pawns in a big power chess game. This "traditional paternalism" reflects, he says, a sense of superiority -- a form a racism. Many of his comments came before HAK's most recent venture to southern Africa but after his trip to Latin America.

2. Vague Program: Carter promises to be both more solicitous and tough-minded in dealing with the developing nations, but the only specifics he has put forward are:

-- Greater cooperation among the industrial democracies (see below);

-- A desire for more commodity agreements in such items as tin, coffee and sugar;

-- Redirection of international aid "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." A favorite Carter line: "The time has come to stop taxing poor people in rich countries for the benefit of rich people in poor countries."

-- He has indicated that U.S. foreign aid should amount to about one-half of one percent of GNP. (Foreign aid for FY 1977 is just over \$5 billion, which is less than one-half of one percent of GNP. Under Carter's proposal, foreign aid in FY 1977 would be about \$8.4 billion. Double checking this.)

-- He also wants to persuade OPEC and the USSR to participate more fully in aid programs.

-- He has indicated an interest in revitalizing international monetary institutions, but he hasn't said how.

3. International Cooperation: As part of creating stronger relationships with the developing nations, Carter wants to solicit their cooperation in limiting nuclear weapons, controlling the flow of narcotics, and combatting terrorism. Without their help, he says, such efforts will fail. He thinks U.S. aid can be used as a lever to reduce repression in other nations.
4. Latin America: Carter has said he would make use of members of his family as emissaries to Latin America. He himself speaks Spanish (he is reportedly learning the language by reading a Spanish Bible), and he has shown a special affection for Latin America -- but again no programs.
5. Africa: Carter has consistently supported U.S. efforts to achieve racial peace in southern Africa, though he hasn't said much lately.
6. Resolving the North-South Conflicts: Carter says that in order to overcome growing tensions between North and South, the industrial democracies must unite for a three-fold purpose: to widen North-South consultations, to improve aid programs, and to limit the flow of weapons to developing nations.

CARTER QUOTES ON DEVELOPING NATIONS

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 a 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 counties for the benefit of rich people in poor counties.

In 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 health-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 take in the international order so that it feels no need to act as an outlaw. It is to advance the cause of human dignity.

JCPC/Address by Jimmy Carter
to the Chicago Council on
Foreign Relations
March 15, 1976



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.

JCPC/Address by Jimmy Carter
to the Chicago Council on
Foreign Relations
March 15, 1976

The other nations of the world who think we ought to be leaders have lost respect for us. They don't think we tell the truth. We're not predictable. We don't respect them. And we've lost their respect for us. That hurts me personally, and it hurts our country -- to know that the more weak, or embryonic, or dark-skinned a nation is, the less likely it is to say "I want my destiny to be tied to, I want my future to be connected with, that of the people of the United States." They don't say that. They say, "as a last resort I put my eggs in the Soviet Union's basket, or I put my eggs in the basket of China." It has to be a mutual thing.

Louisville Forum
November 23, 1975

- Q. Beyond improving the process of consultation with developing countries, what else would you do? Would you increase foreign economic aid?
- A. I don't think gifts are the major need for the establishment of good relationships. We need trade agreements, and maybe a foreign aid expenditure equivalent to one-half of 1% of our gross national product, plus a reorientation of the ultimate beneficiaries of that foreign aid. One of my advisers has said that we should no longer tax the poor people of a rich country to give aid to the rich people in the poor countries. I think that's what we have been doing. We also have very little predictability with respect to foreign aid. We lack openly expressed and clearly understood goals. The American people are not part of the process. The Congress is not part of the process. We've lost our very precious bipartisan support that involved both Congress and the Executive.

Time
May 10, 1976

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 inter-related problems is rapidly increasing and better mechanisms for consultation on these problems that affect everyone on this planet must be established and utilized.

Address to the Chicago Council
on Foreign Relations
March 15, 1976

"I would like to get as much as possible the OPEC countries and the Soviet Union, for instance, to join with the developed democracies of the world to share the responsibility for the less developed nation."

National Journal
July 17, 1976

Carter and his aides have indicated U.S. aid would be used as a lever to fight repression in such countries as South Korea, Chile and Brazil. This would put him in a touchy position on Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union, because his stated intention is to increase trade with that nation.

Chicago Tribune
July 30, 1976

"I think in the recent administrations, there has been a vivid demonstration of our attitude toward other people and our lack of respect for them in the quality of diplomatic officials appointed. When I go into an embassy and see sitting as our ambassador, our representative a fat, bloated, ignorant, rich, major contributor to a Presidential campaign who can't even speak the language of the country in which he serves, and who knows even less about our own country and our consciousness and our ideals and our motivations, it's an insult to me and to the people of America and to the people of that country."

"I doubt if you would find any diplomats in Washington who don't speak English. But you go into a small country that's embryonic or weak or dark-skinned, and you very seldom find a diplomat who can even speak their languages ..."

National Democratic Issues
Conference
Louisville, Kentucky
November 23, 1975

Africa

- Q. What should be the U.S. stance toward Africa? Kissinger this week has seemed to be tilting U.S. policy toward Black Africa states. What is your reaction to his initiative?
- A. I've been gratified by it. I agree with what Kissinger has done in the last week. I favor majority rule in Rhodesia.

Newseek (European Edition)
May 10, 1976

Jimmy Carter, urging a greater foreign policy focus on developing nations in general and Africa in particular, said today the United States could use its experience in race relations and its private investment to help bring majority black rule to southern Africa.

Reaffirming his previous support for majority rule in South Africa and Rhodesia, Carter said he had no quick, easy answers to the problem but added: "I think our country has established through our own experience in race relationships, and particularly in the South, an understanding of this very sensitive issue of black and white people within the same community. . . . with that special knowledge in our country, I think we might be help in Africa."

Urging that the United States "continue constraining our relationship with South Africa to encourage a move toward majority rule," the former Georgia governor noted that moves toward equality in the American South were slow to come until the business community became involved.

"Obviously, the heavy investments that we now have by the private sector in industrial opportunities and banking (in white-ruled Africa), for instance, is a possible mechanism that we might use jointly with government to bring about that kind of persuasion," Carter added.

Washington Post
July 30, 1976

Resolving North-South Conflicts

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

Speech, Foreign Policy
Association
New York City
June 23, 1976

MIDDLE EAST

CARTER ON THE MIDDLE EAST



1. General Position: Carter promises a more aggressive policy of achieving an overall peace settlement in the Middle East. He has been contradictory about the way he would pursue negotiations and has shown a certain haziness about the participants, but he has been fairly consistent about the elements of a final settlement and about his strong support for Israel.

2. Essentials for a Settlement: Carter endorses U.N. Resolution 242 as the basis of a settlement and interprets it to mean that there are two essentials for peace:

-- A basic change in Arab attitudes so that they would recognize the right of Israel to exist as a Jewish state. He thinks the change in attitude should be reflected in several concrete actions:

- Recognition of Israel;
- Diplomatic recognition of Israel;
- Peace treaty with Israel;
- Open frontiers with Israel's neighbors;
- End to embargo and official hostile propaganda against Israel.

--A second essential beyond the change of attitude would be a withdrawal of Israel to basically the 1967 borders; while Carter thinks that final borders must be determined in direct negotiations between the parties, he has said on several occasions that he would be inclined to let the Israelis keep the Golan Heights and holy places in Jerusalem.

3. Process of Negotiations: Carter said in New Hampshire early this year that U.S. mediation efforts "have been fruitful and I think well-advised"; he also told the Boston Herald Examiner in July that the Sinai agreement was "a good step forward". But of late, as the political campaign has sharpened up, he has indicated unhappiness with the pace of negotiations; he would be more aggressive, he says. He has been unclear just how he would proceed. On some occasions, he has endorsed general negotiations, perhaps Geneva; on other occasions, he has endorsed step-by-step negotiations -- at least as an interim measure. So his differences with the Administration on the negotiations seem more cosmetic than real.



4. The Palestinians: Carter has said that the Palestinian interests must be taken account of in a final settlement after they have recognized Israel. He has not been very specific.
5. Soviet Participation: Carter has also said that the U.S. must seek Soviet participation in achieving a peace settlement. On one occasion, he indicated that the U.S. and the Soviets should enter into non-publicized negotiations to arrive at a general solution which they could then publicly propose to the parties.
6. U.S. Support for Israel: Carter says that U.S. support for Israel must be constant and unequivocal. This is a moral imperative of U.S. policy. He wants U.S. economic and military aid to be "adequate" to Israel's needs, recognizing that Israeli resources are being drained off for defense purposes. He does not want to send U.S. troops to Israel. But he has also said that he would be willing to consider assigning U.S. troops to the area to guarantee a settlement -- although he thinks that is not the most desirable solution.
7. Relations with Arabs: Carter has professed much less friendship for the Arabs than the Israelis. He opposes sales of offensive weapons to them and thinks that European arms sales to them have been excessive. He wants to maintain a strong trade and economic relationship with the Arab states, but he has also promised much stiffer enforcement of anti-Arab boycott legislation (he has not publicly committed himself on the Ribicoff anti-boycott efforts). He has also promised stiff economic sanctions against the Arabs in the event of another oil embargo.
8. Israel as a Fulfillment of Biblical Prophecy: One special feature of Carter's ties to the Israelis is his belief that the existence of Israel as a Jewish state would represent a fulfillment of Biblical prophecy. Some commentators think that because of his religious background, Carter would make recognition of Israel a prime personal objective of his Administration.

9. Movement of Israeli Capital: The Democratic platform supports the transfer of the capital from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Carter has specifically reserved judgment on that.

CARTER QUOTES ON THE MIDDLE EAST

General

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.

Chicago Council on Foreign
Relations
March 15, 1976

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.

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.

Address in Elizabeth, N.J.
June 6, 1976

Achieving a Settlement

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.

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 - on 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.

Address on the Middle East
Elizabeth, New Jersey
June 6, 1976

I would not send troops to Israel. I have never met an Israeli leader, president or previous prime minister, or any defense leaders or foreign executives who ever advocated under any circumstances, the sending of American troops to Israel.

I think that we should pursue aggressively the general provisions of the United Nations Resolution 242 and I think we ought to use whatever influence we have through the Soviet Union and directly, (on) Arab nations through our own friendship with them, through trade agreements, and through other means to get them to recognize Israel's right to exist and to be willing to declare a non-belligerency status against Israel.

The resolution calls for the Arab nations to negotiate with Israel directly and I think that would be a matter that we should seek. In the absence of that willingness on the part of the Arab nations, we should offer our services as an equal third party as was the case in the Sinai agreement which I thought was a good step forward.

Ultimately, of course, Israel will have to withdraw from major portions of territory captured by them in the '67 war. That should be done on a quid pro quo basis. There are some exceptions that I would personally recognize. One is, I don't think that Israel is going to relinquish to the Syrians direct control of the Golan Heights. I would not. And I think that Israel is going to be reluctant, and I would support their reluctance, to relinquish control of the Christian and Jewish holy places in Old Jerusalem.

The legitimate interest of Palestinians is probably the most important aspect of the Middle East settlement. They ought to be recognized. There ought to be territories ceded for the use of the Palestinians. I think they should be part of Jordan and be administered by Jordan. I think half the people in Jordan are Palestinians themselves. And that would be my own preference.

We ought to be constantly probing for some mutuality of purpose there. I would not be adverse to a step-by-step approach if it was the only alternative. I think overall, though, a better possibility would be a comprehensive approach.

I think that the Geneva conference might possibly be reconvened in the future, if all other possibilities break down. The major possibility is participation by the Palestinians, which Israel objects to very strongly. I think the Arab countries ought to make that a requisite. Also, the Soviet Union ought to be a party to the conference.

"I favor early movement toward discussion of the outline of an eventual overall settlement, limited settlements, as we have seen in the past, leave 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."

Statement by Carter
June 5, 1976

We want no clash with the Soviets, but we could not accept the intervention of its combat forces into any Arab-Israel conflict.

I do not believe that the road to peace can be found by U.S.-Soviet imposition of a settlement.

Statement by Carter
June 5, 1976

"It may be that some time in the future, after unpublicized negotiations between us and the Soviet Union, we might jointly make a public proposal of a solution to the Middle East. In the meantime, the step-by-step approach is a reasonable approach. I think Jordan might be the next possibility for some rapprochement with Israel. If the Lebanese can resolve their problems they might come next. The Soviet Union is going to have to participate in a forceful way before Syria will be amenable to any productive negotiations with Israel. Ultimately the interests of the Palestinians are going to have to be recognized. I would not negotiate with the PLO, nor would I try to force Israel to do that, until I was convinced that the Palestinians do recognize Israel's right to exist in peace in the Middle East ... One possibility would be to grant

territory to the Palestinians in which to live, possibly the West Bank of the Jordan. My personal preference, and I'm sure that of the Israelis, would be for that to be under the Kingdom of Jordan. It would be premature for me to say under what circumstances a Palestinian state independent of Jordan would be acceptable."

Newsweek
May 10, 1976 (European Edition)

In a speech to New Jersey Jewish leaders Carter proposed a solution to the Middle East which, in the words to a reporter, it would "make the United States' commitment to the survival of Israel so solid and so unequivocal that the Israelis would have the confidence to relinquish occupied Arab territory."

New York Times
June 9, 1976

"I do think that the Palestinian people do have to be recognized ... their legitimate interest and their right to exist and perhaps to choose their own leaders, but that is something that I think would be better left to future negotiations."

WETA "Candidate on the Line"
February 16, 1976

Mr. Carter said that if he were the Prime Minister of Israel he would not be in favor of giving up the contested Golan Heights to Syria and that he would also be inclined to retain control of "Jewish and Christian holy places" in the City of Jerusalem.

He spoke of suggestions made by others that "might possibly give access to Moslem Places" in Jerusalem for Moslems. He also said, "I do think Moslems should have access to their own holy places."



New York Times
July 2, 1976

U.S. mediation efforts so far "have been fruitful and I think well-advised."

Concord, N.H. Monitor
January 27, 1976
Quoted by Common Cause
How They Stand, May, 1976

Relations with Israel

Carter told a group of Jewish leaders today that the Mideast situation had been aggravated by recent uncertainty over American policy, and he promised that his administration would give Israel "unwavering, unequivocal" support.

"One of the things that has aggravated the Mideast situation is the uncertainty lately about where our nation stands that makes the leaders of Israel and the people of Israel uneasy and that builds up false hopes in those countries that are probing for weaknesses in Israel or weaknesses in our commitment to Israel."

Carter, fielding audience questions, said: "This is not just a political statement. As a Christian myself, I think that the fulfillment of Israel, the coming of that nation, is a fulfillment of Biblical prophecy."

Carter said that the U.S. "must insist -- in an aggressive way -- that Arab countries recognize Israel's existence and its right to exist as a Jewish state." He pledged that he would support "whatever military and economic aid that is necessary to let Israel defend itself."

He also said that any settlement of the Palestinian question must "recognize that the Israelis did not cause the Palestinian problem." That assertion drew enthusiastic applause.

N.Y. Daily News
August 31, 1976

Carter has reaffirmed his "unequivocal" commitment to Israel. "I would never waiver on that commitment."

He said that the United States should provide Israel "with adequate military and economic aid so they could defend themselves, persevere (their) existence and identify as a Jewish state and hopefully be strong enough to deter any potential aggressor against Israel."

Stuart Eizenstat, issues coordinator, says that Carter believes "Israel has made enough concessions, and it is time that the Arabs made some." He said Carter "comes at the Israel issue from two points of view. First of

all there are the conventional geopolitical concerns which all politicians would share. Secondly, he sees Israel's future as a moral and religious matter of deep personal concern. The Governor believes in the Bible. He believes that Israel is not just supposed to exist, but that it must exist as a Jewish state."

The Mideast Review
July 28, 1976

Carter said he would continue economic and military aid indefinitely, although he would make "an annual judgment on the amount of aid that was absolutely necessary."

New York Times
July 7, 1976

Even in the absence of a peace settlement, "I would continue the economic and military aid to Israel indefinitely," and that he might consider using American forces to help guarantee a territorial settlement but would prefer not to.

New York Times
July 7, 1976

"If there was a mutual agreement between Israel and all her neighbors the only basis on which they could declare nonbelligerency and recognize the existence of Israel permanently and resolve the Palestinian question and leave Israel in a defensible posture and carve out a permanent peace through the temporary presence of American forces in certain areas within the territory, I might consider it (use of U.S. forces to guarantee peace). But I would prefer that those forces be United Nations forces or multinational forces and not American forces.

New York Times
July 7, 1976

Carter won strong applause when he reaffirmed the U.S. commitment to Israel, said the Israelis were not to blame for the plight of the Palestinians and pledged to use economic sanctions against any Mideast Arab nations that attempt to repeat of the 1973 oil embargo.

Carter promised to take "aggressive and open action" against any nations that discriminate against U.S. firms because they have Jews in management or ownership positions.

Washington Post
September 1, 1976

"...I think the establishment of Israel...is a fulfillment of Biblical prophecy. I think God wants the Jews to have a place to live."

Newsweek
April 5, 1976

Carter called Israel "an oasis of democracy and freedom in the Middle East." He also backed Israel against the criticism that they are imperialistic.

Washington Star News
May 29, 1976

Jimmy Carter said that "survival of Israel is not a political issue, it is a moral imperative."

At the Teitz Jewish Educational Center here, the former Georgia Governor, wearing a yarmulke, drew sustained applause of nearly 1,000 persons that he rejected "utterly the charge that Zionism is a form of racism."

In addition, he said: "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."

Chicago Sun Times
June 7, 1976

Q. On the Middle East, should the United States underwrite the security of Israel as a way of bringing about a final settlement?

A. "Not a commitment to send troops, no. But I would let it be known to the world, and particularly the people of Israel, that our backing for Israel in economic and military aid is absolute, that this would be a national commitment of ours. Most Americans would agree with this: to give the Israelis whatever military or economic aid they need to protect the integrity of their country, their right to exist in peace.

"I would also play a more aggressive role in searching for some degree of compatibility among Middle East nations. The situation there is fluid. The relationship, for instance, among Israel, Lebanon and Syria has changed in the last few months.

"The framework of United Nations resolution 242 is a general one that everybody has adopted...But I think the recognition of Israel as a permanent entity in the Middle East is important; the willingness of Israel to cede back to other countries major portions of land acquired in the 1967 war is an inevitable requirement.

Some resolution of the Palestinian question is certainly inevitable."

U.S. News and World Report
September 13, 1976

"One that I recall offhand is the commitment of the Democratic Party platform immediately to move the Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. I have said I will consider this but I have never committed myself to this in any manner. I would reserve that right until I can assess the diplomatic consequences and the hope that I might have for achieving an overall Mideastern settlement that might be delayed by that very quick move.

Carter Press Conference
Indianapolis
September 16, 1976

Relations with Arab Countries

"I intend to be friendly to Arab countries, but I will let them know our commitment to Israel is constant and unshakeable."

Atlanta Constitution

May 14, 1976

"I do not believe arms sales buy lasting friends. I am concerned with the way in which our country, as well as the Soviet Union, Britain and France, have poured arms into certain Arab countries far beyond their legitimate needs for defense -- five or six times more than Israel receives."

"...it would not be wise at this time to supply strike weapons to Egypt...Investment in Egypt's economic development is an investment in peace-- and this country should willingly make it."

Speech to Jewish Leaders

New York City

April 1, 1976

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.

Address in Elizabeth, New Jersey

June 6, 1976

Carter spoke out strongly against bribes made by American companies abroad and Arab boycotts against some companies who have Jewish citizens in their employ.

Carter said he found that he called "tertiary boycotts" -- whereby Arab governments and individuals boycott firms doing business with firms that have Jews in their managements, as well as boycotting firms with the Jewish managers themselves -- to be "morally obnoxious." He pledged to fight them more vigorously than the Ford Administration had.

Los Angeles Times
August 19, 1976

Moreover, Carter defined the issue as one of "human rights." In fact, administration officials say the principal object of the Arabs' anti-Israel boycott, based on the state of belligerency between Israel and the Arabs, is to prohibit any Arab benefits to Israel growing out of Arab trade with the United States.

A footnote: A partial explanation of the Ribicoff-Carter strategy is found in the latest Harris survey, showing only 48 percent of the Jewish vote now backing Carter -- far below normal for a Democratic presidential nominee.

Washington Post (Evans and Novak)
September 11, 1976

Palestine

He called for "humane settlement" of the Palestinian refugee problem, as he has before, but then went out of his way today to stipulate that any settlement should absolve Israel of blame for the problem.

Washington Post
August 31, 1976

"I would not personally favor recognition of the PLO or other government entities representing the Palestinians until after they have convinced me that they recognize Israel's right to exist in peace."

U.S. News and World Report
May 24, 1976

"...An integral part of an ultimate settlement has got to be the recognition of the Palestinians as a people, as a nation, with a place to live and a right to choose their own people, as a nation, with a place to the Palestine Liberation Organization or Yasser Arafat as the spokesman...after Arafat agrees that Israel has a right to ...exist."

Boise Idaho Statesman
April 2, 1976

Embargo

Carter stated the U.S. should consider an "economic declaration of war" against the Arab-oil producing countries if they try imposing another oil embargo. He said that the U.S. should cut off all food, arms, oil drilling equipment and other products.

Bangor Daily News
December 1, 1975

"...as long as I am president, the American people will never sacrifice the security of survival of Israel for barrels of oil. Even if every other nation were forced by thirst for oil to desert Israel, we in this country, with our resources, our power, and our sense of decency can and will stand fast."

Speech to Jewish Leaders
New York City
April 1, 1976

EASTERN EUROPE

CARTER ON EASTERN EUROPE



Carter has played a delicate game on Eastern Europe, flailing at the Administration for the Sonnenfeldt doctrine and insensitivity toward human rights in that region, suggesting that Eastern Europe must eventually become independent, but carefully avoiding any invitations to roll back the Iron Curtain. Other than promising tougher bargaining with the Soviets on human freedoms, Carter has promised little in the way of specifics.

CARTER QUOTES ON EASTERN EUROPE

We also regret our government's continuing failure to oppose the denial of human freedom in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

The Republican Administration, with the Sonnenfeldt statement, has shown a lack of sensitivity to the craving of the Eastern European people for greater independence. That is unacceptable.

Only 13 months ago, President Ford and Henry Kissinger travelled to Helsinki to sign the treaty of comprehensive security and cooperation in Europe. It was supposed to lead to greater personal freedom for the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, including greater freedom to travel, to marry, and to emigrate. But since that elaborate signing ceremony in Finland, the Russians have all but ignored their pledge -- and the Ford Administration has looked the other way.

B'nai B'rith Speech
Washington, D.C.
September 8, 1976

"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 Romanian 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."

Chicago Council on
Foreign Relations
March 15, 1976

"At Helsinki, we signed an agreement approving the takeover of Eastern Europe. I would be very much tougher in the following years (in negotiations) with the Soviet Union."

UPI
March 11, 1976

"When we've had negotiations at Helsinki, we approved Russia's takeover of Eastern Europe."

Speech
Youngstown, Ohio
May 28, 1976

USSR

CARTER ON RELATIONS WITH THE USSR



1. His General Position: The NY Times summarizes Carter's views on US-Soviet relations as three-pronged:

-- First, he would de-emphasize the importance of Soviet relations and upgrade relations with major allies;

-- Second, he supports the "objectives of detente" and would "continue our friendly relationship with Russia."

-- But, third, he charges that the Ford Administration is giving up too much and asking too little of Moscow.

2. Out-traded by Soviets: Carter charges that the U.S. has been out-traded by the Soviets on several fronts:

- 1972 wheat deal;
- Helsinki;
- Vladivostok;
- 1975 space flights.

3. What he Seeks From the Soviets: Carter says that he would be a tougher bargainer with the Soviets and would seek their help in obtaining:

- A Salt II agreement that lowers nuclear arms ceilings;
- Nuclear pact banning all peaceful as well as military nuclear explosions;
- Assistance toward reaching a permanent settlement in the Middle East;
- Restraint of North Korea;

-- Reduction in sales of conventional weapons;

-- Assistance toward preventing future oil embargoes.

Carter doesn't say how or why he would expect to achieve such Soviet cooperation.

5. The Jackson Amendment: Carter has generally been critical of the Jackson amendment, saying that the U.S. would resent such actions by the Soviet government and that it was counterproductive.

CARTER QUOTES ON THE USSR

- Q. Do you believe that the policy of detente has been in the best interest of the United States?
- A. I approve of the concept of detente. I don't think we'll have a permanent settlement in the Middle East without the full cooperation of the Soviet Union. Our interests are best served by strengthening cultural exchanges, promoting trade agreements, tourism, student exchange with the Soviet Union. But I would be a tough bargainer. Whenever the Soviet Union derived a benefit from negotiations, I would want to derive an equivalent benefit.

Time
May 10, 1976

- Q. Do you feel that we should adopt a tougher approach in pursuing detente with the Soviet Union?
- A. "Yes, I think so. The Soviets would respect that approach. I would also make our commitments much more public. I think that the stature of our nation in international councils is damaged when the President and the Secretary of State speak just as two people, when there's no bipartisan assessment or support derived from the Congress, and when it's obvious that the American people don't know what is going on."

U.S. News and World Report
September 13, 1976

- Q. In what way would you be tougher toward the Soviet Union?
- A. We should have been much more aggressive when we attended the Helsinki Conference -- or should have been absent in the first place.

We now have in Eastern Europe at least a tentative endorsement by our country of the domination of the region by the Soviet Union. They didn't have that before the Helsinki accords. It was a very great diplomatic achievement for the Soviets to have our promise not to interfere in their control over Eastern Europe.

In response to our yielding on that point, there was an agreement on the Soviet Union's part that they would liberalize their policies toward human rights. They have not fulfilled those commitments.

As we sell the Russians things that they must have -- food in their drought years, electronics equipment, heavy machinery -- we ought to get a quid pro quo from the Soviets.

I think it was a mistake, personally, to attach the Jewish-migration question to the trade bill: You can't have the legislative body of a sovereign nation requiring publicly that another sovereign nation accede to a certain demand in order to get a very slight favor. But freedom for Jews to leave Russia would be a legitimate and a very strong commitment of mine as President. As we negotiate with the Soviets, they should know that if they could yield on that point it would greatly improve our relationships.

I think we could ask them to help to resolve the Middle Eastern question, not let them stoke the fires; to help us avoid a future

oil embargo; to try to give us stronger assurances that they would restrain Northern Korea from any possible attack on South Korea; to yield on controversial points in the Salt II talks.

There are a lot of things that we need and would like to have from the Soviet Union to insure peace around the world, and there are a lot of materials we have that they would need more of.

U.S. News and World Report
September 13, 1976

I think that following the convention this year, perhaps as much at any time in recent history, the debate, if I'm successful, will be between myself and President Ford on foreign policy. I think domestic issues will be much less significant than the debate on basic foreign policy.

If detente means a search for peace, maximum communication, maximum trade, maximum interchange of diplomatic knowledge and students and cultural knowledge and so forth with the Soviet Union, it's very good.

If detente means a mutual search with the Soviet Union for a solution to the Middle Eastern problem, restraint on North Korea when it's attacking South Korea, a mutual disarmament, particularly of nuclear weapons, then I'm for detente.

I think there are two very serious problems that have been created and in one instance it's different from what Reagan has pointed out.

One is that we have neglected our natural allies and friends, like France, England, Canada, Mexico and Japan. They feel as though they've been relegated to a position of secondary importance by the Secretary and also by the Presidents under whom Kissinger has served. That's a very serious defect, in my opinion, in our foreign policy.



Another serious defect is that we have always treated the developing nations of the world as of secondary or tertiary importance, which in my opinion is a form of racism. We ought to be learning about nations like Angola and Mozambique and Ghana and working very closely with them on a feeling of mutual respect and friendship and concern so they can trust us for a change. That's a very important absence in the achievements of our foreign policy.

Another thing is that Kissinger tends to act unilaterally, to exclude the American people, to exclude Congress, he's destroyed the bipartisan nature of legislative support for executive decisions in the field of foreign policy. That's a very serious mistake too.

And I think the other thing is that Kissinger has equated his own personal popularity with highly publicized successes under the broad umbrella of detente. He's tried to make us think we won a victory in Helsinki. I think we lost in Helsinki. We ratified the takeover of Eastern Europe. We got practically nothing in return. The things we did derive on paper in return, we have let Russia ignore. In the Vladivostok agreement on nuclear arms, I think we came out second best. In the wheat deal in 1972, we obviously came out second best. Even in the highly publicized space flight last April, we gave Russia a lot of our space flight technology secrets; we paid most of the cost of the excursion; we got very little in return.

Capital Times, Wisconsin
March 29, 1976
Jimmy Carter on the Issues

"I would certainly favor the continuation of any effort to be friendly with Russia, to increase communications, trade, tourism, student exchange. And the same with the People's Republic of China. But I think in the past that Nixon and Ford and

Kissinger have been too much inclined to over-emphasize the so-called advantages of detente, the successes of negotiations with Russia. I do think we were out-traded in the wheat deal of 1972. I think in Helsinki, for the agreement we signed with the Soviet Union we got very little in return. Even in the space flight last spring we put most of the money into the project, we let Russia have many of our secrets in technology. I think we ought to be tougher and more competitive with Russia. Another thing that concerns me about detente is that we overemphasize the importance of visits and negotiations with Russian and China to the exclusion of our own natural allies and sometimes neighbors. I would like to repair the damages done."

Washington Star
January 25, 1976

We want no clash with the Soviets, but we cannot accept the intervention of its combat forces into any Arab-Israeli conflict. Our navel 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.

JCPC, Jimmy Carter Address
on the Middle East
Elizabeth, New Jersey
June 6, 1976

"I would move away from powerbloc confrontation and would pursue much more singular bilateral relationships with the countries of the world. I would consult much more closely and continually with our natural allies and friends in Europe, this hemisphere, and Japan. There would be much less keeping secrets from them about basic changes in our orientation toward the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China."

"We would seek relations with (the other nations of) the world on an equal basis with ourselves, with greater respect to them and with much closer attention paid to the best interests of their citizens. I would probably stay in this country most of the time and not travel so much abroad. But I would encourage them to come to visit me."

Chicago Tribune
May 8, 1976

Carter told the platform committee: "I reject the strident and belligerent voices of those who would have this country return to the days of the Cold War with the Soviet Union ... We must pay more attention to China and to Eastern Europe. It is in our interest and in the interest of world peace to promote a more pluralistic communist world."

Philadelphia Inquirer
June 20, 1976

"Henry Kissinger does not trust the American people. I would be a tough negotiator with the Soviet Union. Detente under Henry Kissinger has meant we have yielded too much. We have neglected our friends and our natural allies."

Indianapolis Star
April 7, 1976

"Russia is always probing for our weaknesses," said Carter. "They'll move in and take our place, not militarily, but economically."

Omaha World Herald
May 29, 1976

Carter said the U.S. should "continue our friendly relationships with Russia -- maximum communications and understandings with one another -- because it would be very difficult for us to have an ultimate settlement in the Middle East or in the Korean area or a substantial reduction in atomic weapons or conventional weapons without the cooperation of the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China." But, Carter continued, the Soviet Union "is highly unlikely to change to a democratic society. Their government will always be incompatible with ours, and if we ever appear to be vulnerable in any area of the world, my belief is that the Soviet Union would naturally take advantage of our vulnerability or weakness."

Associated Press
January 26, 1976

We should make it clear that the Soviets, as well as the U.S. refrain from irresponsible intervention in other countries. The Russians have no more business in Angola than we have."

Boise Idaho Statesman
April 2, 1976

Carter wants the same things from the Soviets that Kissinger has tried to get, only more.

He wants a new arms control agreement, increased trade, and broadened political ties. Carter doesn't explain how he would force these concessions from the Soviets, and in fact his strength in international haggling remains to be proven.

Chicago Tribune
July 30, 1976



Through peaceful means they (Soviets) would continue "to pursue their ultimate goal to communism which is to prevail throughout the world and to probe for possibilities for the expansion of their system ... I think we ought to recognize it and be prepared for it."

Washington Post
March 21, 1976

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE JACKSON AMENDMENT

We should continually remind the Soviet Union, by word and conduct, of its commitments in Helsinki to the free flow of people and ideas and of how offensive we and other free peoples find its violations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Democratic Platform
Congressional Record
July 2, 1976

"I would like to see every pressure maintained on Russia to liberalize its emigration policies toward Jews. I think that can best be accomplished through private negotiations."

Business Week
May 3, 1976

"...the so-called 'Jackson Amendment' was ill-advised and I think in the long run proved to be exactly counter-productive."

National Democratic Issues
Conference
Louisville, Kentucky
November 23, 1975

Carter rejects requiring the Soviets to permit immigration of Jews and dissidents in return for "most favored nation" trade treatment.

Idaho Statesman
April 2, 1976

The continued U.S.S.R. military dominance of many Eastern European countries remains a source of oppression for the peoples of those nations, an oppression we do not accept and to which we are morally opposed. Any attempt by the Soviet Union similarly to dominate other parts of Europe -- such as Yugoslavia -- would be an action posing a grave threat to peace. Eastern Europe will not truly be an area of stability until these countries regain their independence and become part of a large European framework.

Democratic Platform
Congressional Record
July 2, 1976



Trade Relations

"Emergency food aid should not be used as a diplomatic tool. However, in trade discussions, like with the Russians, we should strive to obtain some diplomatic concessions in return."

Common Cause
Edition I
Issue Profile Number 10
February 1976

Carter said he would be "cautious about using food as a so-called weapon" in diplomacy. When asked to clarify the comment, he said he would not "single out food as a bargaining tool." Carter refused to answer when asked if he would use food as one of several bargaining tools.

Capital Times
Madison, Wisconsin
March 25, 1976

There cannot be a stable world order "when people of many nations of the world suffer mass starvation" and there are no international arrangements to supply the world food and energy needs.

Common Cause
Edition I
Issue Profile Number 10
February 1976

Where bilateral trade arrangements with the U.S.S.R. are to our economic advantage, we should pursue them, but our watchwords would be tough bargaining and concrete economic, political or other benefits for the United States. We should also press the Soviet Union to take a greater share of responsibility in multi-lateral solutions to such problems as creating adequate world grain reserves.

Democratic Platform
Congressional Record
July 2, 1976

Soviet Relations with Carter

Soviet officials had sought to meet with him (Carter) to discuss his foreign policy positions, but he rejected the overtures as "inappropriate."

He said he will not meet with any foreign officials until after the Democratic National Convention, and then only under controlled circumstances and after careful consideration of the implications.

Asked if the Russians' approach was an attempt to influence the election, Carter said, "It is inappropriate for them (the Soviets) to inject themselves into our political scene."

It would be wrong, the former Governor said, "if any foreign nation insinuated they were helping or hurting a candidate. The best thing they can do is stay out of the election process."

Carter said officials of "10 or 12" nations had approached his staff seeking meetings.

Washington Post
May 14, 1976

The official Soviet news agency gently chided Jimmy Carter today for what it said were "contradictory" aspects of his position on foreign policy.

Tass seemed pleased with the "positive view" the Democratic presidential contender expressed about U.S.-Soviet efforts to limit the arms race but was clearly disappointed with his statements about using economic leverage in dealing with the Soviets.

"He disregarded the fact that this constitutes attempts to interfere in other countries' internal affairs."

The article went on: "It should be noted, however, that Jimmy Carter did not support the U.S. Congressional decision on the discriminatory Jackson amendment to the trade bill." The amendment requires communist countries to liberalize emigration in return for most favored nation trade status with the U.S.

Tass said Carter agreed "there are some circumstances" in which he would use military force abroad but, on the other hand, he opposed using American troops in the Middle East in order to reach a settlement there.

AP
July 8, 1976

By most reports, Moscow feels more comfortable with Mr. Kissinger, a man they think they know, than with the uncertainties of Mr. Carter. But even the Russians have been diligently finding out what Mr. Carter believes, speculating on Mr. Kissinger's successors, looking to the future.

The New York Times
Leslie H. Gelb
August 15, 1976