

Excerpts From Address by President To the Society of Newspaper Editors

WASHINGTON, April 10 — Following are excerpts from today's address by President Carter to the American Society of Newspaper Editors convention, as transcribed by The New York Times through the facilities of ABC News:

I would like to discuss with you today some of the most urgent imperatives of American foreign policy, with special emphasis in one particular area of the world.

It's important that we take a hard, clear look together, not at some simple world of universal good will or of universal hostility, but the complex, changing and sometimes dangerous world that really exists.

It's not one world, but many. It's no longer a world that is structured and controlled by competition among colonial powers. It's a more complicated world where national, religious, and ethnic assertions are fragmenting — are fragmenting — old boundaries and old alignments.

Nations Ask Us for Leadership
It's a world of conflicting ideologies, of unequal wealth and of uneven resources. It's a world in which the capacity for destructive violence is at once alarmingly dispersed to every single small terrorist band — and awesomely concentrated in the nuclear arsenals of the superpowers.

In many languages and out of many unfamiliar cultures, other peoples constantly ask America for a response to myriad and often conflicting concerns. Nations ask us for leadership. But at the same time, they demand their own independence of action.

They ask us for aid. But they reject any interference.

They ask for understanding. Yet they often decline to understand us in return.

Some ask for protection, but are wary of the obligations of alliance.

A Challenge to U.S. Unity
Others ask for firmness and certainty. But at the same time, they demand flexibility required by the pace of change and the subtlety of events.

The world asks, with impatience, for all these things at once, but asks for them today, not tomorrow. Nowhere do we face the challenges I have just described more directly than we do in Iran. No single situation so aggravates the American people, so tests our maturity, so tries our patience, so challenges our unity as does the continued captivity of American hostages in the Tehran embassy.

No other single event seems so clearly to mirror the disorder of our times. This disregard for diplomatic propriety and for international law is a special threat to the small nation, the weak nation without economic or military or political power or influence. And it also comprises a part of the competing pressures on a great and a powerful nation like ours. This crisis calls on us to act with courage and also with wisdom that will both produce results and preserve life.

I'm deeply proud of the steady strength that has been demonstrated in America in dealing with the irresponsible Iranian authorities who've been unwilling to act or unable to carry out their frequent, solemn commitments. The leaders of the Iranian Government lack the cohesion and the resolve to

bring order to their own chaotic land or to decide on a basis for ending this illegal detention of hostages, which has created international crisis.

For long months, ours has been a restraint of strength, despite outrageous provocation. I do not regret that restraint, which was designed to protect American lives and to explore with Iranian Government officials and with United Nations officials and with mediators working with us a way to resolve this crisis peacefully.

But it has become necessary — because Iran would not act in accordance with international law and with their own interests — for us to act again. The steps I've taken this week to end diplomatic relations and to impose sanctions are firm and substantive, and we hope that they will be persuasive.

Legal Use of Power Vowed
America will continue the careful and considered exercise of its power. We will pursue every — and I repeat — every legal use of that power to bring our people home, free and safe.

But the hard, sad reality is that a small number of zealots engaged in a power struggle within Iran are using the innocent American hostages for their own advancement, with serious adverse consequences to all Iranian people.

In the interests of the people of Iran and of their possible future as a unified and peaceful nation living in freedom, it is imperative that the Iranian Government resolve this crisis.

With a return of rationality, international lawlessness need not be Iran's fate. Bankruptcy — political as well as moral — need not be Iran's future.

If interference from outside is a threat, the threat does not come from the United States.

Intersection of Historic Trends
The challenge in that area of the world — as in some others — comes from the intersection of two historic trends: One is the rising demand for development and for self-determination which is felt — and deeply felt — throughout what we call the third world. The United States responds with sympathy to that demand.

The other trend is Soviet expansionism — which we are determined to oppose. The reality of the world today is that Moscow exploits us — not to address a discontent that underlies that unrest, not to overcome the inequalities that give rise to unrest, but to expand its own dominion and to satisfy its imperial objectives.

In Afghanistan, the Soviet Union has revealed for the world the hypocrisy of its courtship of the third world. It has shown that it will not be deterred by principle or decency, or by international law, or by world public opinion, but by the opposition of freedom-loving and patriotic Afghans. And it has made this known in a region which is at once political volatile and economically crucial.

An Enormous Military Buildup
The subjugation of Afghanistan represents the first direct intrusion of Soviet armed forces beyond the borders of the Warsaw Pact nations since the Second World War.

The exploitiveness of this region, its great natural wealth, and the Soviet willingness to use the armed forces that have been developed during the Kremlin's enormous military buildup in the last 15 years — are what combine to make the invasion of Afghanistan so unsettling to the future of international peace.

We must not forget, and our allies in other nations must not forget, that today at this moment — everyday — the Soviet Union is violating human standards of decency and violating human rights in the grossest kind of way. Hundreds of Afghan freedom fighters are dying every week, some in brutal mass executions. Entire villages



President Carter in Washington yesterday as he addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors

are being wiped out. More than 800,000 people have fled the country. Terror tactics, including the use of chemical weapons, are the trademark of the ruthless attempt to crush Moslem resistance and to install a Soviet form of peace — a peace of brutal, armed suppression.

A Need for Unshakable Resolution
Earlier this year, 103 other members of the United Nations joined us in condemning the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and demanding the immediate withdrawal of the invading forces.

Soviet citizens have never been informed of this United Nations action. This unprecedented condemnation was significant, but — because of the principle at stake, because of the importance to Western security, because of the savagery of the Soviet assault which continues to now, and because of the Soviet Union's use of its own troops directly in such a conflict — it's imperative that we continue to meet the challenge of the invasion with calm and unshakable resolution.

The measures that I've ordered are designed to enhance peace. They include the embargo on further grain sales, tightened controls on high technology trade, limitations of fishing in United States waters, strengthening of our naval presence in the Indian Ocean, intensification of our development of rapid-deployment forces and our capacity to deploy them and to use them, and our offer to assist states in the region to maintain their own security. These are necessary steps on a course which we must and we will persist.

Challenging Times May Be Ahead
We cannot know with certainty the motivations of the Soviet move into Afghanistan — whether Afghanistan is the purpose or the prelude. Regardless of its motives, there can be no doubt that the Soviet invasion poses an increased threat to the independence and nations in the region and to the world's access to vital resources and to vital sea lanes.

But our interest in peace and stability in the region goes far beyond economics. We cannot wish away the fact that conflict and tension in the region could endanger the broader peace. And if the invasion of Afghanistan does indeed foreshadow a pattern of Soviet behavior then for the coming years, Americans must accept the truth that we are in for challenging and very difficult times. Our course is clear: by responding firmly, we intend to halt aggression where it takes place and to deter it elsewhere.

Let me underline for you this most

vital point in our policy. America and Americans are not motivated by relentless hostility, by a desire for indiscriminate confrontation or a return to the cold war.

Berlin Olympics Is Recalled
But for America simply to accept Soviet occupation and domination of Afghanistan as an accomplished fact would be a cynical signal to the world that could only encourage further aggression, further tension, and further danger to world peace. It's America's responsibility to register, and register in concrete terms, our condemnation of the Soviet invasion — for as long as that invasion continues.

It's extremely important that we not in any way condone Soviet aggression. We must recall the experience of 1936, the year of the Berlin Olympic Games. They were used to inflate the prestige of an ambitious dictator, Adolf Hitler, to show Germany's totalitarian strength to the world in the sports arena as it was being used to cow the world on the banks of the Rhine.

The parallel with the site and timing of the 1980 Olympics is striking. Let me call your attention to one compelling similarity between the Nazi view of the 1936 Olympics as propaganda victory and the official Soviet view of the 1980 Summer Games. I'd like to read to you a passage from this year's edition of the "Handbook for Party Militants" issued in Moscow for Soviet Communist Party activists, and I quote:

Quotation From Soviet Handbook
"The ideological struggle between East and West directly involved in the selection of the cities where the Olympic Games take place. The decision to award the honor of holding the Olympic Games to the capital of the world's first socialist state is convincing testimony of the general recognition of the historic importance and correctness of the foreign policy course of our country, and of the enormous service of the Soviet Union in the struggle for peace."

Let me repeat a part of that: "The decision to award the honor of holding the Olympic Games to the capital of the world's first socialist state is convincing testimony of the general recognition of the historic importance and correctness of the foreign policy course of our country, and of the enormous services of the Soviet Union in the struggle for peace."

A few weeks ago, I met with American athletes in the White House, I explained the Soviet stake in the Olympics and the moral and political rea-

sons why the United States will not send a team to the Moscow Games.

I understand the sacrifice that has been asked from these men and women for the sake of the security of their country and their world. The Soviet leaders certainly understand it. But our not sending a team to Moscow — this is far more than a symbolic gesture. It's a direct repudiation — in the phrase of their propaganda handbook — of the "correctness" of their foreign policy.

The United States does not wish to be represented in a host country that is invading and subjugating another nation — in direct violation of human decency and international law. If legal actions are necessary to enforce the decision not to send a team to Moscow, then I will take those legal actions.

All of these decisions do require sacrifice, and I've acted to assure that the burdens of those sacrifices are shared as equally as possible among all Americans. The American people have demonstrated that they are willing to bear their share of the burden. But it is also vital that the burden of sacrifice be shared among our allies and among other nations.

Neither we nor our allies want to destroy the framework of East-West relations that has yielded concrete benefits for so many people. But, ultimately, if for so many years, we continue to seek the benefit of détente while ignoring the necessity for deterrence, we would lose the advantages of both.

Neutral, Nonaligned Afghanistan
It is essential that our intentions be absolutely clear. The measures we have taken against the Soviet Union since the invasion will remain in effect until there is total withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. Then, and only then, we would be prepared to join with Afghanistan and her neighbors in a guarantee of the true neutrality and noninterference in Afghanistan's internal affairs. We support the restoration of a neutral, nonaligned Afghanistan, with a government that would be responsive to the needs and the wishes of the people of that country.

Although the Soviets have talked about the withdrawal of their troops, they have actually shown no interest in such proposals. There are no signs at this time of a Soviet as a matter of fact, within this last week, we have proof that the Soviets are moving additional troop units across the border into Afghanistan. We must be prepared to hold our course, and to impose the cost of aggression for as long as this is necessary.

Carter Declines to Rule Out Force To Get Hostages' Freedom in Iran

Continued From Page A1

ious claim that could only damage our own nation's prestige.

"I have no apology at all to make for our country or for the Administration which I head," he said.

Mr. Carter, in his talk, took no note of threats by the Iranian Islamic militants in control of the American hostages to kill them if the United States used military force against Iran. Today, one militant threatened to kill them if Iraq invaded Iran.

Possibility of Further Steps
But the President kept open the possibility that the United States might go beyond the economic and political steps announced on Monday. "America will continue the careful and considered exercise of its power," he said in his speech. "We will pursue every, and I repeat, every legal use of that power to bring our people home, free and safe."

In a question period that followed, he was asked to be more specific, but he said it would be "ill-advised" for him "to spell out any sort of detail and exact time schedule, or exactly what options are available to us."

But he added that under international law, "since we are an aggrieved nation, caused by not only the action of terrorists but also having the terrorists' actions condoned by and even supported by the Government, the breadth of the right that we have to take action to redress this grievance is quite extensive."

Iran is further isolated from the rest of the world," he said, "every day that the American Embassy remains a prison, pushes Iran further into lawlessness, down and down the spiral of disorder."

Powell Warns Militants
At the White House, Jody Powell, the spokesman, said today that the militants must have "better sense" than to kill any American. Referring to the militant's linking Iraq to the hostages, Mr. Powell said, "they should well understand if they kill any of our people, a border spat with Iraq will be one of the least of their problems."

Mr. Carter, in a comment on the attitude of the United States' allies, criticized those nations that "ask us for leadership but at the same time they demand their own independence of action." He said some nations "ask for protection but are wary of the obligations of alliance."

He said that up to now, "the support has been on occasion effective, on other occasions, we have been disappointed." Mr. Carter confirmed that the United States had asked its allies to carry out a ban on exports, except food and medicine, to Iran, as the United States did on Monday and to withdraw diplomats from Iran, even including breaking of relations.

Mr. Carter told you what those allies and other friends of ours might actually do," he said. "But we are putting as much proper effort as possible to induce the allies to act strongly and in a concerted way, hopefully to break the present deadlock and to resolve the crisis."

Mr. Kissinger also expressed disappointment with the reaction of the allies. "The Administration has been rightly disappointed in the conduct of many of our allies, in particular the Europeans," he said. "It is indeed dismaying that the industrial countries that are more threatened than we by the turmoil in the Persian Gulf are reluctant to accept the risks of a forward policy against the Soviet Union."