

5-1-1982

## Law Day Address

Jimmy Carter  
*former U.S. President*

---

### Repository Citation

Carter, Jimmy, "Law Day Address" (1982). *Law Day Lectures*. Paper 10.  
[http://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/lectures\\_pre\\_arch\\_lectures\\_lawday/10](http://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/lectures_pre_arch_lectures_lawday/10)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Lectures and Presentations at Digital Commons @ Georgia Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in Law Day Lectures by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Georgia Law. For more information, please contact [tstriepe@uga.edu](mailto:tstriepe@uga.edu).

LAW DAY ADDRESS  
President Jimmy Carter

The University of Georgia  
School of Law  
May 1, 1982

Law Day Address

President Jimmy Carter

The University of Georgia School of Law

May 1, 1982

Well, as I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted on November 4, 1980 ... you have a great country and I'm very pleased to be part of it. I'm delighted to be here this morning with Charles Driebe, Jr., with Senator Herman Talmadge, with Bob Jordan, my good friend the Chief Justice, President Fred Davison, SBA President Tom Stoughton, and all of you.

This is a good time for me to come to address this distinguished group. As Charles pointed out, it's not my first Law Day speech. When I came here eight years ago, I was just a chauffeur for Senator Kennedy. He made the main address. He covered all the points that I had prepared to make in my own luncheon speech to a very small audience. I hastily made some new notes in a secretary's office, then went in and spoke in a very critical way about lawyers and about the legal system in our country.

My son, Jack, was graduating from the Georgia Law School that year and even he didn't enjoy the speech very much. But, as Charles pointed out, there was a man in the audience who enjoyed it. His name was Hunter Thompson. One of the reasons he enjoyed it was that he had a paper cup full of "wild turkey". He was following Ted Kennedy around. I could see Hunter every now and then refilling his paper cup out of a bag that he carried which people thought, as he was a journalist, was filled with notebooks and cameras. But perhaps, because of that, Hunter thought the speech was very good. And afterwards, he wrote to the University of Georgia and asked if anyone had made a copy of it. Either fortunately

or unfortunately, the Law School had very meticulously recorded the speech. They sent that speech to Hunter Thompson. He had a cassette made for his automobile tape deck and he told me afterwards that he played that speech often as he drove around in the mountains of Aspen.

I don't know how many of you know much about Hunter Thompson. He was a character from which "Duke" in Doonesbury was derived. I'm not sure that he would be carrying a group of tourists to the Falklands these days, but, just as peculiarly, he listened to my speech on a tape deck in his automobile. Later that speech became the centerpiece of a very fine article that Hunter Thompson wrote for the Rolling Stone. It helped me in my campaign for president to become known throughout the country.

In that luncheon speech, by the way, I quoted my mentors in law and justice. I only mentioned two of them. One was Bob Dillon and the other one was Reinhold Niebuhr. Niebuhr said, "the sad duty of politics is to establish justice in a sinful world." He also said that in order to have justice we must have laws and the laws must constantly change to stabilize the contending forces in any dynamic society. And he also said that the totality of those laws describes what our government is, and in a peculiar way it describes what we are.

After entertaining Hunter Thompson with this discourse, I finished up my four years as governor and went on to other things. I'm not saying more important things, but other things. Among them, of course, was serving four years in the White House in Washington. I'd like to make a confession to this audience. I'm not a lawyer and I didn't want that word to get around before the program started. I didn't want Dean Beaird to change speakers on me at the last minute. But while I was President I had a lot to do with law. I was the first president in history who served the full four years

without having a vacancy to fill on the Supreme Court. But I think I more than made up for that by appointing 265 federal, district, and circuit court judges. So at the present time about 40 percent of all the federal judges serving in this nation, including my friend, Abner Mikva, were appointed to their posts by me.

I was particularly eager to make appointments that had not been made in the past. We established merit selection boards in almost all the states. The lawyers that went on to be federal judges were selected in that manner. I am particularly proud of the fact that I appointed more women, more blacks, and more hispanics in four years than had been appointed by all presidents combined in the history of our country. In fact, I appointed five times more women than all the presidents combined in the history of our country. I have to admit, I also created some vacancies. The first woman who was ever appointed to a court of appeals post was Shirley Hofstetler, chosen, I believe, by President Johnson and I asked her to serve as the first Secretary of Education in this country. Another distinguished southern judge, Griffin Bell, was chosen by me to be Attorney General. Since that time, as you know, he has elevated himself into becoming a very famous author. Another one that I took off the bench and assigned another duty was William Webster who has recently been highly publicized for his role in the ABSCAM scandal. Luckily he was on the right side of the law and he is an excellent, notable, and I hope lifetime director of the FBI.

You can see that I could spend my allotted time talking about the judicial system and the interrelationship of a president with it. But I thought that today, in lieu of that, I would describe to you some of the unique things that a president does. Not just the evolution of

voluminous laws which is also a responsibility of governors, but how one has to forge agreements which sometimes even transcend the importance of many laws, and learn in the process how other people live, how other people think, how other people feel and how they look to the future.

I am now writing a book and I thought I would take just a brief time this morning to describe three or four brief episodes in my four years as President that are derived primarily from the book which I am now preparing to be published later this fall. I think each one of these subjects that I have chosen would be at least worthy of an entire lecture series and I will just outline them very briefly. And I hope that they might precipitate a few questions from the audience at the conclusion of my speech. I'm going to talk about four men, all of them different one from another.

The first one, because he's my favorite of all the foreign leaders whom I have ever met in my life, was Anwar Sadat. Sadat and his family became personal friends of ours. I know his wife, children, and his grandchildren. They visited us in Plains and we had many very close relationships as presidents and also as personal brothers. He had a breadth of vision that was almost breathtaking at times. One of the things I liked about Sadat was that his breadth of vision encompassed the southland of our country. He understood the South. In September of 1978 he and Prime Minister Menachem Begin and I were at Camp David. I was trying to act as a mediator between the two men and called them there so that they could talk to each other as long as necessary to derive a settlement for peace. After the third day, they were so absolutely incompatible, that for the last ten days we were at Camp David, they never saw each other although they lived in two cabins about 100 yards apart. The only exception was the

Sunday that we spent at Camp David. I took both of them, with me sitting in the middle, to Gettysburg, which is only 16 miles from Camp David. When we arrived there, I found that Sadat, General Dyhan, General Weismann, General Ali and others were all experts on the War Between the States particularly the Battle of Gettysburg. Prime Minister Begin was an expert on Abraham Lincoln and knew his Gettysburg Address by heart. It was a memorable visit for us. I had studied the battle and the interrelationships between the North and South thoroughly so that I could serve as their guide.

The next day the talks almost broke down completely. Both sides threatened to leave Camp David. The following morning, Sadat took his normal four-kilometer walk and I decided to join him and try to encourage him to stay at Camp David. He said, "My friend, President Carter, I'll stay because I trust you. One thing I would like to mention is that I trust you because you are a Southerner." In a special way, he said, "the only people in the United States who could possibly understand the special problems of the Middle East are Southerners. You are proud of your heritage, and your roots are deep in the history of your region. You know what it means to have suffered bloodshed and disappointment and suffering. You know what it means to have brother fight against brother. You know what it means to regain your strength, your integrity, and your self pride. You know what it means to make great progress. And I know you can understand what it means to us in the Middle East, living in a tiny, poor part of the world, for the sons of Abraham, whether Moslem or Jew--- brothers in the eyes of God to be separated so long from one another. We have suffered defeat. We have suffered disillusionment. We are now eager to repair the damage between us and to look to a better day." Sadat helped me, along with Prime Minister Begin, to arrive at the Camp David Accords which are now the only basis for peace in the Middle East.

How I wish that we still had the presence and the vision of a great man like President Sadat in the Middle East.

The next man I want to mention is quite different. His name is Leonid Brezhnev. Most of the news about Brezhnev now and then was that he is on his last legs. He can't last long. Who's going to replace him? It may be that President Brezhnev will outlive anybody in this audience. Who knows? But at the time we went to Vienna in 1979, I assumed one of the most important responsibilities that I had as President. We wanted to derive a way to control nuclear weapons. My policy as President was to cooperate with the Soviet Union whenever possible and to compete with them successfully whenever it was necessary.

You hear a lot of ugly things about people who are not well known to us, and I am not here as an apologist for the leaders of the Soviet Union. But I can tell you one thing. The most urgent single hope of Leonid Brezhnev is to prevent war coming again to his own country. Twenty million Russians died in the second World War. More Soviet citizens were killed around Stalingrad alone than all the Americans who have died in every war since our nation started. I recall this old, seemingly feeble gentleman as we had our first private conversation together. He had a hard time walking down the steps. When he began to talk, his upper and lower jaw wouldn't come apart quite far enough. But as he talked longer and longer, that speech impediment would go away. I felt particularly close to him at first, strangely, because as we went down the steps together---leaders of perhaps adversarial nations--- without any restraint he reached his hand out and placed his hand on my shoulder to steady himself as he went down the stairs. The first thing he said to me when we were alone was, "Mr. President, God will never forgive us if we fail." When we met in the general group, with the Russian Marshals, and with Foreign Minister Gromyko and others, I mentioned that to the group. Brezhnev was quite embarrassed



because I told the other Soviets that he had referred reverentially to God.

I told them that I wanted SALT II to be effective immediately, and that I wanted a five percent reduction every year for the five years that SALT II was in effect below the strict limits included in it. I said that we wanted to begin negotiations on SALT III immediately and I hoped that the level of nuclear weapon limits would be cut at least 50 percent. I was willing to sign with the Soviet Union a comprehensive test ban, to eliminate the testing of all nuclear explosives, to freeze the production of strategic nuclear weapons and to work toward a small invulnerable nuclear force that could only be used for deterring war; not to launch a preemptive attack.

If I were now active in the forefront of the anti-nuclear movement--my daughter, Amy, is a foremost anti-nuclear spokesman as proven by me in the debate with Ronald Reagan--I would adopt as a slogan "ratify SALT II" because that's the basis on which we can move forward with the Soviet Union to control nuclear weapons.

The third person I want to mention is, like Sadat, now dead. His name is Omar Torrijos, a friend of our country and a friend of ours personally. He was a tough sergeant---unappreciated, not very well educated, but brave, generous and perhaps the most patient leader I met in my four years. He had waited fourteen years to change the treaty known as the Panama Canal Treaty which, when it was signed in 1900 had never been seen by any Panamanian. There was a delegation of Panamanians on their way to Washington. They had arrived in New York by ship and they would be in Washington in two hours. Hurriedly, in the middle of the night, the Secretary of State, John Hay and a Frenchman named Nenow Veriah signed the treaty. Veriah signed on behalf of the Panamanians. He had not been in Panama in more than eighteen years. This treaty

was highly unfair. Had it not been changed, in my judgment, we would not have a Panama Canal today.

I recall when Omar Torrijos and I were assembled along with the natives of eighteen other foreign nations in this hemisphere. He and his wife, and Rosalynn and I were on the way into the ceremonies to sign the official documents. He turned to me with his chin trembling and he said, "Mr. President, there's no way for me to tell you how much..." and then he broke down and he wept like a baby. His wife put her arm around him and placed his head on her chest and he sobbed. I had tears in my eyes as well. I think even the critics of the Panama Canal treaties that we evolved would admit to you now that had it not been done and had this not been a basis for peace between us and the militants in Central America, that this entire region of our hemisphere would now be a Communist stronghold.

The last person I want to mention is Deng Xiaoping who is the leader of the People's Republic of China. I was thrilled with very few things that Richard Nixon ever did but one thing I liked was his visit to China. If any of you are enticed to read my book or buy it this fall, you will find that Richard Nixon was not the only famous American planning to go to China in 1971 or 1972. The Chinese wanted some who couldn't go and they didn't want some who could go. But, I'll let that mystery hang until you get my book.

But anyway, my first visit to China was in January, 1949 when I, as a brand new submarine officer, made a trip from Hong Kong all the way up the coast of China to Sing Ti. We had a chance to see China at least from the sea coast point of view. Chiang Kai Shek was still there with his nationalist forces but he had been forced back to the sea. All around the cities we visited, every one of them, you could see the campfires of Mao Tse-tung's Communist forces.

In January of 1979, exactly 30 years after Chian Kai-Shek left mainland China, we had Deng Xiaoping come

to Washington as the first leader of China to visit our capitol city. He was an associate of Mao Tse-tung and served as his political heir. I won't go into any detail about the substance of our talks, but he was an absolutely delightful little man. He wasn't quite as tall as Amy was then. He was a favorite of the children and vice versa and he brightened our entire country, you may remember, on his few days he spent here.

I remember that one of the major problems was that we wanted to have what's called "most favored nations" relationship between ourselves and other countries. But there was a provision in the law that prevented this special trade preference if any nation prevented the immigration of their own citizens to rejoin families. It was designed primarily to expedite the exit of Soviet Jews from Russia to other countries. I told Deng Xiaoping that we wanted to deal with China and the Soviet Union on an equal basis and that the "most favored nations" provision would prevent us from moving rapidly toward better trade relationships with China. He looked at me and smiled and said, "Mr. President, that doesn't apply to us. If it will help you to sell MFN, (as it was known) to Congress, I will send you ten million Chinese without any delay."

In a few minutes we were talking about freedom of speech and how foreign journalists were being treated and I said, "You offered to send me ten million Chinese, I'll send you ten thousand journalists." He said, "If you'll keep your journalists, I'll keep my Chinese." That evening we had a long talk about human rights, religion, and law. Deng Xiaoping had made a very meticulous study of the U. S. judicial system. He told me that at the conclusion of that study, he had decided that he did not want any lawyers in China. I was hoping he hadn't read the text of my 1974 Law Day speech at Georgia. But they were struggling with a way to provide more equity in the treatment of criminals and the settlement of disputes.

Later, as were concluding our talks, one of my associates- I think Dr. Brezinski, said to Deng Xiaoping, "The President, (referring to me) has had terrible attacks on him from certain states in the nation because he normalized relations with China and notified Taiwan that we would terminate the treaty." And he asked, "Did you have any adverse reaction in China?" Deng Xiaoping said, "Yes, we had very serious criticism from one province... (everybody listened attentively as he said) Taiwan."

Well, everybody who has been to China from my administration- including myself, Rosalynn, Amy and others--has been absolutely seduced by the tremendous welcome and the interest in the uniqueness of that great country. I can see why it is known as the most civilized nation on earth by some people.

Well, those were the four I wanted to mention to you in order to show some of the duties of a President, how we relate to other people, and how I as a non-lawyer had to use the skills in which you are trained much better than I to handle world situations. I talked with a lot of other people about the South, in addition to Sadat. I talked to many other leaders about God, in addition to Brezhnev. I laughed a lot with other leaders, in addition to Deng Xiaoping and I cried with some other leaders, in addition to Omar Torrijos. I am thankful that I had the opportunity, helped by many of you, to be the President of our great country, to see its past, to learn about its present and try to shape its future. I am grateful to have a chance to come here and meet with future leaders. I hope that you will join with me, not only in expressing gratitude for what we have received from God as our great blessings, but that you can help, after my time, in the fulfillment of your own, to keep our country committed to its unchanging principles even when the times and circumstances are in a fluid state. You will keep our country on the road to decency and truth, to law,

justice, to arms control, to peace, to human rights, and to human freedom. Thank you very much.

\*\*\*\*\*

Dean Beard: Thank you very much Mr. President, for that inspiring speech. President Carter has agreed to take some questions from the audience, and we are going to use the format of his famous "Town Hall Meetings" of a few years ago. Earlier, Barry Wood, our Public Relations Director, asked those in the audience who would like to ask some questions to come forward. We have their names here. At this time, Mr. President, with your permission, I will call on them. David Buttorff.

David Buttorff: President Carter, in your opinion, would not the reestablishment of metal backing to our currency such as gold and silver go a long way toward reducing excessive interest and inflation?

President Carter: No, I don't believe so. This was an idea that was pursued by my own economic advisors and I had to study it along with my other studies while I was in the White House. We had, as you know, the gold standard for a long time, and we had catastrophic circumstances throughout the world on occasion -- in Germany after the war, and with the high inflation rate in our own country following the Viet Nam war.

All of the very high interest rates in this nation were brought about, I think, by the prospect that the deficits during this present four-year term will far exceed all accumulated deficits in our nation since it was begun. The root of that deficit, in my judgment, is the enormous, and I think, unbalanced, tax reduction that was passed by the Congress as proposed by President Reagan last year. You can't take 750 billion dollars out of income for the federal

government which, in my judgment, is heavily oriented toward benefitting rich people, also adding an enormous increase in defense spending and expect the federal budget to stay in balance.

I pray that, aside from any partisan interrelationships, that the Congress -- Democrats and Republicans -- and President Reagan will now see the error of last year's ways and will correct these errors as rapidly as possible. I think we are faced with inevitable deficit spending for the next year. You can't put tight restraints on a nation already afflicted with recession with just the knowledge by the financial community and the average citizen that in 1983 and in 1984 and in 1985, we will begin to bring the deficits back down low as they were, by the way, when I was in office. Under those circumstances, I believe the interest rates will go down, inflation will stay under control -- primarily because of low oil prices, good conservation on oil and also, of course, good production of food (at too low prices, I might say, as a farmer). But I would not want to see us put a metal standard on this highly flexible, world economy whose primary basis has now shifted from gold to oil and ultimately, I think to food. I don't believe that would work. So, the gold standard is an attractive proposition in its simplicity. But in my judgment, the economic and financial circumstances around the world are too complicated to re-impose that standard which worked at times and also failed at times.

Dean Beaird: Mr. President, the second questioner is Ronald Cobb.

Ronald Cobb: Mr President, What's your opinion of the current movement for a nuclear weapons freeze?

President Carter: I think the movement to control the spread

of nuclear weapons is the best one that a citizen could espouse to make your lives and your influence meaningful. The best way to approach this, however, is not for a total freeze on the production of nuclear weapons. Let me tell you briefly why. I will outline very quickly the propositions that I made to Brezhnev in Vienna in 1979. I proposed at that time a total freeze on the production of all strategic nuclear weapons. That included the MX, and SS18's on both sides. In effect, a total freeze. Brezhnev rejected this and said that if he had equality absolutely with the United States, that the nuclear arsenals of France, Great Britain, and China would put the Soviet Union to a disadvantage.

Our present nuclear forces have prevented war on a major scale at least for the last 35 years. So, in Europe, we've got three choices: One is to maintain our strong nuclear forces as a deterrent. The second option is to have equality of conventional forces in Europe. The Soviets are now superior in tanks and other conventional forces. We can either build up or preferably have arms control on conventional forces. And, the third alternative is to accept inferiority by the United States and our NATO allies to the Soviet Union and depend on the good will and the generosity of the Soviets to preserve the freedom of ourselves and particularly our allies. SALT II provides equality. SALT II provides a practical freeze. It only permits one new weapon on either side by the United States and the Soviet Union throughout the terms of the treaty. SALT II also provides for the verification that both sides will carry out the terms of a treaty. You can't have a treaty with the Soviet Union unless you have a means to make sure that they are carrying out the terms of the treaty. SALT II builds that in. From SALT II, which is what I negotiated with Brezhnev, he and I had already agreed enthusiastically, I might say, to go directly to SALT III and to the control of the theatre

weapons in Europe. In the process, we asked Brezhnev to accept no new weapons, not even the one on each side, to cut the total weapon limit five percent every year for five years which would be a 25 percent reduction and in the meantime be negotiating SALT III with a 50 percent reduction. Brezhnev was very interested in that. The problem is (and I want this to be particularly partisan) President Reagan opposed and still opposes SALT II and without the full support of the President, it is unlikely that we will get two thirds vote in the Senate to ratify the treaty. Most of the provisions of the SALT II treaty are in effect, but the ones that require the Soviets to dismantle 10 percent of their total weapons is not. So, I think the best move is to ratify SALT II and move to SALT III with the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons completely from the face of the earth.

Dean Beard: Our third questioner is Kim Alexander of Athens.

Kim Alexander: Mr. President, Are you concerned by the apparent loss of momentum to the Camp David Accords? Since there was so much personal chemistry involved, can it be duplicated now? What would you suggest could be done to restore the momentum?

President Carter: Yes, I am concerned. You may have noticed in my talk I said that the Camp David Accords is the only basis for continued progress toward peace in the Middle East. I was very gratified that Prime Minister Begin very courageously carried out his portion of the agreement on the 25th of this past month and withdrew from the Sinai. It was not an easy thing for him to do. I talked to him the day afterwards, and also to President Mubarek, and Begin said it was a physical torture for him to see those Israeli settlers moved out of Yamid and the other places back in Israel. It was contrary



even to his religious beliefs.

Well now, the thing that is left is two-fold. To simplify a very complicated situation, one is to honor Palistinian rights. In my judgment, it is contrary to the character of Jews. It is contrary to the principles of democracy and human rights for more than one million Palestinian Arabs to live under military domination on the West Bank in Gaza by the Israelis. I am not the only one who feels this way. Foreign minister Dayan, General Weismann, who was defense minister and many other Israelis feel the same way. Prime Minister Begin signed the Camp David Accords which says that the Palestinian Arabs would be given full autonomy in the West Bank and Gaza. The Israeli military forces will be withdrawn. The permanent status of the West Bank will be determined after a five-year period once the governing body for the Palestinians is elected in free elections.

These are the kinds of phrases, and I'm quoting verbatim, that are already included in the Camp David Accords signed by Anwar Sadat, signed by Menachem Begin and signed by Jimmy Carter. So if we can now proceed with the carrying out of those kinds of commitments we will answer Palestinian rights to a substantial degree but not all they want. We will have to answer the question of land -- who is going to have sovereignty over that precious barren land in the West Bank? I know from experience that there is no way for the Israelis on the one hand, the Egyptians, and the Jordanians and Syrians and the Lebanese on the other hand, plus the Palestinians, to ever reach agreement on their own.

Those politicians run for office, or they assume office based on statements like, "I will never yield one inch, and so forth" or "the PLO are devils, they are enemies," "it would be a travesty of our religion and our commitment to honesty and so forth, to ever acknowledge their presence or their existence."

You have all kinds of statements made and you need somebody to say, "Well, if you will just do this, as it is spelled out in Camp David Accords and the Egyptian-Israeli Treaty, if you will just do this, you will have to change on both sides some of those previous statements. But look at all the benefits that you get from it -- peace, harmony, open borders, diplomatic relations, the right to use the Suez canal, your ships to travel freely, and an end to the four wars in twenty-five years."

But you have to have some way to bridge that gap. Not long before I became President, under both Nixon and Ford as Presidents and Henry Kissinger, the phrase "shuttle diplomacy" was born. When I took over, I did the same thing with Cy Vance, Ed Muskie, Sol Lenovitz and Bob Strauss and others. I got involved in it when I needed to. Since I left the White House that has not been done. Mubarek, is a darn good man, and Menachem Begin, is a good man-- strong, courageous, tenacious -- I differed with him many times -- but they need somebody at a high level to bring them together. There is no one trusted, no nation trusted, except the United States. That is why I have deplored the fact that neither the Secretary of State nor anyone else of a very high visibility is now performing that necessary role. It's not just to do Israel a favor or Egypt a favor, because our friendship with Egypt and Israel is a foundation for our own security in the Middle East and hopefully for future prosperity there and also future stability and peace. So I deplore the fact that this same fervor that existed under Nixon, Ford, and my presidency is missing. Perhaps after the Sinai withdrawal has been completed, there will be a refocusing of our own nation's attention on this crucial question. I hope so.

Dean Beaird: We have time for one more question. At this time we will call on Mrs. J. M. Alford.

Mrs. Alford: President Carter, Do you feel that the United States position in the Falkland Island situation is the best and, if not, what else should we do?

President Carter: Yes, I think that's been handled well. I have no criticism of Secretary Haig. As you know, we joined in along with every other nation in the Security Council except Panama in branding Argentina as an aggressor at the very beginning. They are aggressors. The Security Council called for their withdrawal, then called for Britain and Argentina to settle their differences through negotiation. Subsequent to that, I think uninvited by either country, Secretary Haig began his "shuttle diplomacy" between the two. It is a long way to shuttle, 8,000 miles, I think, between the two capitols. But he did it, I think in a heroic way. Unfortunately it was not successful. It wasn't his fault. Now the two nations are locked, just short of war, and I believe now it would be best for our country to turn the suggestions that have been evolved by Secretary Haig over to the United Nations and ask the United Nations Secretary General to appoint a committee to let Great Britain and Argentina try to work out their differences between them.

It may be that over a period of a long time Great Britain would acknowledge sovereignty over part of the Islands, or some other arrangement. I am not trying to write the script. And in return for that Argentina would withdraw her troupes and we could avoid a war. It's not an insignificant thing at all for our strongest ally, Great Britain, and Argentina, to be on the verge of war.

I might say, parenthetically, that all the time we were dealing with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the crucial things that were so troubling to me, we never had any stauncher friends, than Sadat on the one hand and Great Britain on the other. I appreciate Great Britain. Argentina has a government

that is abhorrent to us in some ways. It is a military dictatorship, one that allows an absolute deprivation of human rights, a great persecution of people in that country. They were Nazi allies during the Second World War and they didn't help us by retaining a grain embargo on the Soviets after the invasion of Afghanistan. There are many reasons I could condemn Argentina, but those are really secondary now. I think Haig did right to go there and work with the Argentines and say, "Let's prevent a shooting war." So to summarize my rambling answer, I would say that now is the time, since Haig acknowledged yesterday that he had failed, through no fault of his own, to turn the problem over to the United Nations and give Argentina and Great Britian a chance. Like I described a few minutes ago with Begin and Mubarek, they should forget their past adamant position and start negotiating a settlement without bloodshed.

I've got a lot to be thankful for. One of the things I am thankful for is that I am not still in the Navy and in the Southern Atlantic during winter time with 40-foot waves, not knowing what is going to happen next. I sympathize with the British troops, and I also sympathize with both nations who are really searching for peace. Let me say that I wish I had more time for questions, but I don't. I have enjoyed coming over here. You have been very gracious to me and may God's blessings be on everyone.

\*\*\*\*\*

