TTT

Interviewee: James E. Carter | Session #1 (video)

Interviewer: Sharon Zane | The Carter Center; Atlanta, Georgia

Date: September 15, 1999

Q: President Carter, I thought we could start by just having you talk a little bit about the genesis of the Carter Center, discuss its mission and your own personal commitment to it.

Carter: Well, after we left the White House, involuntarily retired after the 1980 election, we found that we were deeply in debt; we didn't have any job opportunities in Plains, Georgia, which only had six hundred people living in it. I decided to write my memoirs. I had a burden of begging around the world for $25 million to build a presidential library, which is a duty of former presidents these days, and I didn't really know what I was going to do in the future.

I was in my mid-fifties, about the same age that President [William J.] Clinton will be when he leaves the office. I finally came to understand that I had about twenty-five years of prospective life ahead of me, so what would we do with it? And my decision was to construct a program here that would capitalize on what I had learned in the White House and as a governor and as a state senator, as a naval officer, and use it in the most effective way for the benefit of our country and other people, and to do it in an interesting and exciting, I think, unprecedented fashion.

I was obviously still cognizant of a special commitment that we made to go to Camp David

and isolate myself and others for thirteen days in mediating an ancient dispute between Israel and Egypt. So our first concept was to build a small place here where we could bring in antagonists from other countries who might want to have an accomplished mediator resolve the dispute between them and maybe prevent a war or end a war. So we sought all the advice we could get. I wanted to associate myself, too, as a professor at Emory University, but to still have our Carter Center in a remote campus, not an integral part of Emory.

So I took on the task of being a distinguished professor at Emory University, which I still am, after writing my memoir to help pay off our debts; and beginning a program of conflict resolution here, basically. That took up a lot of my time, raising the money to build a library and evolving this concept more definitively. That's when I went to see David [A.] Hamburg at The Carnegie [Corporation], to seek his advice I did that with other people as well, but I respected him and his judgment, and he was always willing to give me whatever time I needed.

Q: You'd known him previously?

Carter: Yes, I had known him and his work previously, primarily in the health field. I knew he was interested in young people, but I also knew that he was conversant with international affairs. So we got a small grant from Carnegie, which increased over the years in the original subject that we assumed -- that is, conflict resolution and the prevention of conflict. Our decision was not to duplicate what anyone else was doing. If

the World Bank or the United Nations or the U.S. Government or Harvard University was doing something, we didn't interfere, we didn't compete with them. We went somewhere else, in effect, to fill vacuums in the world.

Over a period of time, obviously, our horizons expanded. We have officially evolved a very large program in health care. We tried to control the threat of handguns. We began to be involved in the holding of elections when a nation decided to move from a totalitarian dictatorship or to protect an endangered democracy. They would invite me, as a former president of a great nation, to come in, and -- in effect -- to guarantee, with a small cadre of knowledgeable observers, that the election was honest and fair, and to help ensure the safe conduct of it.

In all these areas of expansion, I worked very closely with David Hamburg and with the people at Carnegie. We became increasingly immersed in the problems, or you might say opportunities, in the developing world. We now have programs in sixty-five different nations, thirty-five of them in Africa, and we wanted to analyze what was going on in those countries.

At the Carter Center we evolved a quarterly newspaper, for instance, called *Africa Demos*, where we graded every one of the fifty-two or so countries in Africa about the stage of their evolution toward democracy. Carnegie gave us the first grant to originate this newspaper, which became kind of a bible for USAID [United Stages Agency for International Development] and for the World Bank and others. When they wanted to assess, "Should

we make a loan or grant to this country? What is the status of their move toward democracy and freedom?" they would read our newspaper.

So in almost everything that we did at the Carter Center, we had a helping hand from Carnegie -- either advice from their experts on a particular nation or a particular need in the world -- or in some notable cases, financial help to the Carter Center, sometimes as a base grant, which we could use to go to Rockefeller [Foundation] and [John D. and Catherine T.] MacArthur [Foundation] and Ford [Foundation], or sometimes just to finance a small program that we originated. So in all those arenas, we worked very closely with Carnegie.

Do you want to ask me other questions, or should I go ahead with --

Q: Go right ahead.

Carter: Well, later, when Carnegie, David Hamburg, and all of his associates saw what work the Carter Center was doing, when they undertook a massive program at Carnegie, they asked me to head up certain aspects of the work in dealing with the causes of conflict, in dealing with how to expand humanitarian programs in needy nations, and with the impact of scientific discoveries or developments on the humanitarian needs of people in deprived societies. In those kinds of questions, I was a ready volunteer when David Hamburg asked me to either head up a particular study or to participate with them.

One of the ones that took more time than I had ever anticipated was the analysis of foreign aid projects -- USAID and World Bank and other grant programs from around the world --

and the efficacy of them: how much money was actually used fruitfully, how much of the money was wasted, how much went to overhead, and the degree or comparison of the benevolence of the donors involved. I worked personally with about thirty-one or thirty-two different grant agencies in individual countries like Japan, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, as well as USAID and the World Bank, the IMF [International Monetary Fund], the American Development Bank, the African Development Bank, and others to see what was the degree of their commitment to humanitarian causes.

We concentrated a lot of effort on the effectiveness of American grants. There is still no way to ascertain, even from official government records, how much money the U.S. does give, because it's such a wide range of contributions. Our biggest benefactor from U.S. grants is obviously Israel, more than $10 million a day. Egypt is next, and in recent years, Russia, since the Soviet Union fragmented. We always had a formula of allocating money to Greece and Turkey so that we wouldn't let one get ahead of the other, and so forth.

But the United States, we discovered, is at the very bottom in benevolence, or generosity, to countries that are really in need. Related to our gross national product, we discovered that the U.S. gives less than 1 percent, by far the least of any nation in the world that is able to make any kind of grant. Those were the kinds of studies that I personally helped Carnegie do.

Q: Was this in conjunction with the [Carnegie] Commission on Science, Technology and Government?

Carter: Yes, it was. It was a special facet of it that dealt with grants and foreign assistance, or development assistance, as it was called.

Q: Did some of these findings impact the Carter Center?

Carter: Oh, yes, directly. Sure. In fact, some of the information that I was able to provide came from our own experience in these remote and forgotten and ignored nations where we were deeply involved in immunizing children, eradicating Guinea worm, controlling river blindness, or teaching them how to plant corn and wheat and rice and sorghum and millet and produce higher yields of their crop.

So as the Carter Center became officially involved inside these countries, out in their most remote villages, dealing with individual families, we had a direct base of certain information to feed back into official statistics and information that were published by governments and by lending and grant institutions. So we learned a lot from the generic approach that Carnegie sponsored, and also we fed into that study some of the practical experiences or observations that we had made.

Q: That's one very good example of an interface between the Corporation and the Center. Are there any others that come to mind that might be good illustrations of that?

Carter: Yes, I think one that we call the Global Development Initiative. This was originally sponsored by Carnegie after we had made the request, for instance. We had gotten increasingly involved, and still are, in helping conduct or monitor elections. One of the most notable examples was, we did three elections in a row in Haiti, and the final one,

in 1990, I believe, was a very successful one, when a thirty-five year old Catholic priest, [Jean-Bertrand] Aristide, was elected president.

But we didn't have an adequate program to stay in a country and to follow up with advice and counsel on the new government's establishment of priorities. So we breathed a sigh of relief, withdrew from Haiti, and it went down the drain, not only with maladministration of Aristide, but with the takeover of the government by a military group and the exile of Aristide. Much later, I went back into Haiti with Senator Sam Nunn and former Chief of Staff Colin [Luther] Powell and we negotiated a peaceful way for Aristide to go back into the country.

But out of that experience, we developed what we called a Global Development Initiative. Following a conference here at the Carter Center, partially sponsored by Carnegie, where the World Bank and the IMF and the ODA [Overseas Development Authorities], and Japan and Norway and Sweden and Canada and Great Britain and all the rest of them came, along with the new leader of Ethiopia and the newly elected president of Guyana on the northern coast of South America.

And out of that discussion, we decided to go into Guyana as a test case and to work with all the different elements that comprise that society. We had over three hundred meetings with labor groups, women, youth, indigenous Indians in the jungle, with producers of rice and sugarcane, with fishermen off the coast, with people who were interested in repairing the dikes that protect the capital of Georgetown from encroaching oceans, with elementary and high school and college students and teachers, and with the government structure itself.

And out of this extremely extensive consultation with the citizens themselves, many of whom had had very little, if any, relationship with the previous governments, we developed a comprehensive plan for Guyana to move forward, and that has now been basically consummated. In fact, the new president of Guyana is a young man who worked with us at the beginning. His name is [Bharrat] Jagdeo. In fact, he's the youngest president in the world now. He's only thirty-five.

So one of the things that came out of that, which is also of interest to Carnegie, is a foundation to protect the rainforest of Guyana, which is one of our studies. They have fairly substantial gold deposits up the rivers in Guyana, but they were destroying the quality of the river by dumping cyanide into the water, which was killing the fish. But it was impossible in that ill-developed nation, and in many others in the world now that need the same work, for the citizens to relate to each other. There was no way for people who worked in the forest to have any communication with people who were mining gold. There was no way for fishermen to relate to rice producers. So we brought all those people together. This Global Development Initiative was another program that evolved because of the interest and the partnership that we had with Carnegie.

Q: One thing we haven't really touched on is some of the domestic programs of the Carter Center that Carnegie has helped support. I believe there's The Atlanta Project. Is there anything that you'd like to say about that?

Carter: Well, one month I came home from extensive travels in Africa, very proud of the work we'd done among the poorest people on earth, and after discussion here, realized that

we had people within a few miles of the Carter Center, sometimes within a few hundred yards of the Carter Center, who were equally deprived of the basic necessities of life. Just across the highway from the Carter Center there were seven shacks out in a kudzu field where people were living, without electricity, without running water, without any sewage facilities, without any amenities of life.

So we decided to undertake a project that we named, as simply as we could, The Atlanta Project. And we took the 1990 census data and we projected on a screen some of the maps. One of the projections was a percentage of families that only had one parent, usually a mother. And we also overlapped on the same screen the number of babies born to teenage mothers, and there was a big red blob on the map in the southern part of Atlanta that encompassed parts of three counties.

And so, just on the spur of the moment, I decided that we would adopt that area as The Atlanta Project. To my dismay, a little bit later on, we realized or found that we had five thousand people living in that area and we had pledged, publicly, that we were going to take care of their basic needs. So we divided those five hundred thousand people up into twenty different communities. We called them Cluster Communities. Each one had about twenty-five thousand people. And we began to work with them, always with the help of Carnegie.

A couple of the things that we did that proved very effective were that we paired off with each one of those twenty Cluster Communities a major corporation. The first one that took one of the communities was Marriott Hotels and then IBM and Delta Air Lines, The Coca-

Cola Company, NationsBank, BellSouth. All the major corporations in Atlanta agreed, under my persuasion, to form a partnership with the poorest people in those communities.

So I required each one of the corporations to furnish me with a full-time vice-presidential-level executive, so the folks in those communities would know with whom they had to deal. And so when they had a need in education or welfare or transportation or health or jobs or safety on the streets, a corporate executive, backed by the entire corporation sometimes, would help to prepare a grant or to organize a committee or do whatever was necessary to deal with those problems.

The Atlanta Project became highly publicized, and we began to have floods of people from other communities around the country come here to Atlanta to ask us, "What in the world are you doing that seems to be working?" We had over three hundred communities who sent delegations here. We soon realized that the folks who were working The Atlanta Project were spending too much of their time just welcoming guests and repetitively telling them what we were doing, so we organized what we called The America Project, and that was a very small core group of people who devoted their full time just to educating or answering questions from the communities who were interested in our project.

In both those cases, Carnegie was the seed money for the grant. We finally raised a very large amount of money for that purpose from the corporate partners with the poor people and from other sources. So that was another thing that happened here on the domestic scene.

One thing that Carnegie has also done is to help my wife, Rosalynn [Smith Carter], who has

become, I think, the preeminent world leader in the promotion of mental health. She brings together now at the Carter Center about sixty or sixty-five different organizations who deal with different aspects of mental illness.

As you probably know, in the past and still, I think, to some extent, if a group of parents has an autistic child and another group of parents has a child with Down's Syndrome, they are really competitive with each other to get publicity for their plight or to raise money for their cause. Rosalynn is about the only one who has been able to bring those two groups, plus about sixty more, here at the Carter Center, to say, "How can we work in common purpose with all the other folks that have a mental problem and convince the public that mental illness is not something that should be stigmatized, but something that should be addressed in a constructive fashion?"

Well, Rosalynn's work in that field has certainly been helped by Carnegie, and since David Hamburg has long had an interest in the well-being of children and in mental illness problems, there was a natural partnership. That's our other major domestic program, but Rosalynn has now formed international committees of -- she started out with First Ladies in the former Soviet Union, all those republics, and in Eastern Europe and also in Latin America, but then she had some queens who wanted to join, so she's changed it to "Women Leaders" instead of "First Ladies," since she wanted the queens to be part of it. But promoting the concept of mental health in some nations that had always looked upon that as an embarrassing subject, not to be addressed at all, has been helped by Carnegie, working through the Carter Center.

Well, this is, I think, proof that a gamut of projects that we still are pursuing has found a

partner and a support, sometimes an instigator, even, in the Carnegie Corporation. There have been times in the past, for instance, when David Hamburg would come and say, "We've got a special project going on," say, in Boston or Los Angeles, or maybe in Ghana, "that we think is interesting and we need a different perspective. Do you think it would be possible for the Carter Center to help supplement what we're already doing with other grants?" And of course we've been willing to do it.

We have to reach out to other donors, obviously, but it's been very helpful sometimes when Carnegie might give us a very small grant, say, twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars. We can use that fact that Carnegie has confidence in us to go to other donors, and say, "Carnegie is helping us. Will you also help us?" And quite often they have said yes.

We get a good portion of our support from benevolent countries around the world on whom we can almost always call when we are promoting peace or freedom or democracy or human rights or environmental quality or the alleviation of suffering. Notably, the Scandinavian countries -- Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland -- and then on down to the Netherlands, Austria, and Canada are very generous in those elements.

For instance, every time an American citizen gives one dollar through our foreign aid program, a Norwegian gives twenty dollars. They have a very large commitment to humanitarian projects, and they have now seen that we at the Carter Center are a worthy donee. They can depend on us, we make full reports, and we have a very strict budgeting process. I call it zero-base budgeting. I had it when I was Governor and President.

When we take on a new project, we generally phase out an old one. We have a time limit on

what we do to help people. We have now, for instance, about six hundred thousand small farmers in Africa in a program to increase their production of basic food grains --mostly corn, but also rice and wheat and others.

Q: This is where in Africa?

Carter: Twelve different countries in Africa. This is a program that's financed entirely by a Japanese foundation. Carnegie has not been involved in this, but I go into the country and negotiate a contract with the president and his cabinet, and the contract prescribes that we will withdraw after five years, so they will not be permanently dependent on us, and we'll only send in one foreign expert from outside that country. They have to furnish all the workers and pay the workers. In agriculture, we have one extension worker for every twenty farmers. They pedal a bicycle from one farm to another. We furnish them a bicycle, but we make them pay for it.

This concept of limiting our involvement in a particular project, except under extraordinary circumstances, to five years' time, makes it possible for us to take on new projects without a massive increase in our bureaucracy here or in our total annual budget, and where we've had a need for advice on organizational structure or budgeting and so forth, if David Hamburg didn't have anyone at the Carnegie Corporation that was able to give us that help he would give us advice on where else to go. When Dr. Hamburg retired from Carnegie, it was natural for him to become a member of our board of trustees at the Carter Center, so we still have close ties.

Q: Which I think segues nicely into this whole question of the place of American philanthropy in life here, and how you see it and what you think maybe the proper roles for the various actors are in that context.

Carter: Well, our country is particularly blessed, more than any other country on earth, with the benevolence of private philanthropists, who, like Andrew Carnegie and [Henry] Ford and [John D.] Rockefeller and [John D.] MacArthur and others, and now [William Henry, III] Gates, have set up a funding source for projects in which they or their heirs have an interest. And because our nation is so reluctant to give assistance, compared to all the other nations in the world, that private source is crucial to us, particularly in the initiation of a new, unproven concept, such as some of those I've already described to you.

Sometimes a fairly small grant, say, less than one hundred thousand dollars, much less sometimes, will permit us to go and try out something, or at least to send a small delegation to a foreign country and explore the ideas with the leaders of that nation to see if they are interested, and then we can build upon that if I think it's wise to do so. In that case then we might go back to Carnegie and say, "This I think is a very good idea." It's important to have this system of private benevolent foundations.

We have rarely, if ever, modified the basic concept of the Carter Center just to accommodate what a particular foundation wanted to do. And as you know, a number of them restrict their benevolent causes just to their own geographical area around their international headquarters. They won't go outside the state, for instance. Carnegie and a few others, I would say, Ford and maybe the [Robert Wood] Johnson [Foundation], have been willing to look beyond the borders of our country, and, of course, most of the Carter

Center's projects do go into the most deprived Third World countries. The Atlanta Project, The America Project, and Rosalynn's mental health project are three examples where we have concentrated pretty much on this country. Most of ours are overseas.

Q: That's your main criterion in selecting?

Carter: Well, it's not the main criterion. The number-one criterion is the one that I outlined first. We don't duplicate what others are doing. There's no need for us to compete with the U.S. Government, USAID, the World Bank, the IMF. There's no need for us to do that. But we have found, obviously, that there are a number of causes, worthy causes, sometimes crisis problems, that governments won't address. And it's very difficult for a proud but suffering nation to call on the United Nations. It's an admission on their part that they can't handle a problem, and the United Nations is looked upon as an unwarranted intruder into the internal affairs of their country. So the Carter Center is a good alternative. They call on us if they have a real need to negotiate a peace agreement with revolutionaries, or to help hold an election, or to have some benevolent humanitarian project.

Another thing the Carter Center does, with help from Carnegie, is that we analyze every conflict in the world, every day. There are about 110 on our total list. Some of them are dormant, but about thirty erupt into violence each year. I think last year there were thirty-one. And we define a major conflict as one within which at least a thousand soldiers have been killed on the battlefield. In modern-day warfare, particularly civil wars, there are nine civilians who perish for every soldier killed. The civilians die from land mines, from stray bullets and bombs and missiles -- some of those times the missiles are dropped by the

United States -- from deliberate deprivation of shelter, food, medical care, being forced into exile from their home communities -- and they die in the process.

Those civil wars comprise almost all the wars in the world today. There are very rarely any wars between countries. And as you know, the United Nations was formed and still is designed to prevent wars between nations, but it's completely inappropriate, illegal, even, for a U.N. official even to communicate with revolutionaries who are trying to change a government that's a member of the United Nations.

Q: I'm afraid we have to stop there.

Carter: Okay. [Tape interruption]

It's inappropriate, even sometimes illegal, for a United Nations official even to communicate with revolutionaries trying to change or overthrow a government that's a member of the United Nations. And if an American ambassador is accredited in a country, it's not appropriate for the ambassador or the ambassador's staff to communicate with a revolutionary group who's trying to overthrow the government to which the ambassador is accredited.

So in almost all the wars in the world, this leaves a vacuum in dealing between revolutionaries and the ruling party. Quite often they call on us because we're completely unofficial, and the chances are that we've already been working to immunize the children or to eradicate Guinea worm in the areas controlled by the revolutionaries. They know us,

and maybe we were planting corn there and teaching them how to grow more food grain, so we were already there.

Also, our country has an unfortunate inclination, I think, to condemn a nation's government and then to sever all relationships with the people in that country who are already suffering under a despotic government. Well, we don't have any restraints about that. We go into the country and do our work, regardless.

One of the notable examples -- there are a lot of them -- but one of the most notable, I think, is Sudan, where our country's policy for the last number of years, and still, is to overthrow the government in Khartoum. We have an office in Khartoum. We work daily with the government officials, and we provide a bridge across which the officials in the government that are interested in health will work with the health offices in the revolutionary regime in southern Sudan, and so they meet with each other and actually plan how we can eradicate Guinea worm or deal with river blindness or trachoma.

So that's another example of what we do, and when they get ready to negotiate a peace agreement or cease-fire, quite often we're the ones who do the mediation work, most often without any publicity, because they don't want to acknowledge that they have an outsider, even me, come in and interfere in what they consider to be their own domestic affairs.

This is also an avenue to our ability to encourage elections. When, in all of these large numbers -- dozens -- of conflicts the time comes when, we'll say, the generals on both sides realize they can't prevail on the battlefield, we try to convince them to let us hold an election or monitor an election. It's a truism of politics that candidates base their efforts on

self-delusion. That is, every candidate believes that "If the people just know me and know these other jokers, surely they're going to vote for me. And if the election is honest, and I can depend on the results, I'll prevail." So we try to convince both adversaries, "Let us come in and help you hold an honest election, and we're sure that the people of your country will make the right decision."

So we are increasingly invited to go in and help with elections. In the last few months, we've helped with the election in Nigeria. We and the United Nations just finished an election in Indonesia. We were there when the East Timorese had their referendum. We've just finished voter registration in Mozambique, and my wife and I and a delegation will be going to Mozambique December the third and fourth, for an election there. The reason is that we've got a rice project in Mozambique; we've got a corn project in Mozambique. My wife and I were in Mozambique last year, so they know us.

So these are the kinds of things that we are able to do in conflict resolution, mediation, democratization, as well as humanitarian efforts. Sometimes a long-established democracy faces a crisis. Two elections that we did last year, for instance, illustrate this. One was Jamaica. Jamaica has had democratic elections for more than forty years, but the two opposing parties didn't trust the incumbent party to have an honest election, and they refused to participate in the constitutionally mandated election unless the Carter Center would come in and guarantee its integrity.

So after a lot of opposition from the incumbent prime minister, he finally agreed to change the constitution to permit us to go in, and we helped assure an honest and safe election. In

the previous election, over eight hundred people were killed in Jamaica. We didn't have that in the election we supervised last year.

Another challenge to democracy in this hemisphere was in Venezuela, where a former coup leader was looked upon as a likely winner of the election, and the other party leaders, who had been established as firmly as Democrats and Republicans in America, refused to cooperate in the election unless we would come in. So we did, and the election was completely honest and fair. The coup leader won, and now there's some uncertainty about democracy in Venezuela, but we were there and the election was honest.

So those are the kinds of programs that I think are quite beneficial and needed, in which the Carter Center and Carnegie have been partners. They have helped us see needs, and when we agreed on a common need, they provided advice and counsel and access to other sources of funding and some funding of their own.

Q: I guess my last question would be, these things that you were just describing are obviously strengths that a nonofficial organization, which is the way you describe the Carter Center -- the way in which it can operate. As also a former President, when you're operating under different constraints, how do you compare, if you can, how it's done and what the end effects are?

Carter: Well, you can only look at final results. When we did the election in Nigeria last February, at that time, in the thirty-eight years of their independence from Great Britain, they had only had a civilian government for ten years. They were always overthrown by military dictators. And then on the twenty-ninth of May, after the election in February, a

new president, [Olesegun] Obasanjo, was elected, and I think he's bringing a permanent commitment to civilian government to Nigeria.

We can't yet anticipate what the future will hold, whether that effort on our part and their part had permanent benefits. I think so. His wife was at the Carter Center yesterday to meet with me and to meet with my wife on some kinds of First Lady efforts that she has in mind. They talked to Rosalynn about those kinds of things.

We don't yet know what's going to happen in Indonesia. We spent a lot of time helping the election there on the seventh of June. Seven hundred members of the new parliament are being formed, and then in October they'll start electing a president, and we won't know until the fifteenth of November whether this whole effort has been successful. So you don't ever know whether it's going to be successful.

One of the things that Carnegie has helped us with is the eradication of Guinea worm. When we started out with this, now about eleven years ago, I think, we found 3 million people with this disease in twenty-two countries, including Asian countries, India and Pakistan and Yemen, and all across Africa. We've now cut that 3 million down by 98 percent. We have about seventy thousand cases. Most of those cases are in southern Sudan where the war still goes on and where we can't get to all the villages. So we haven't totally eradicated Guinea worm, which is our goal, and it will be the second disease ever eradicated from the face of the earth. But there are twenty-five thousand villages that have suffered from this horrendous disease since biblical times or before that will never see another case of Guinea worm. So I think that's a tangible result.

Q: Let me just -- [pause]. We have just returned from South Africa as a part of the Carnegie Oral History Project. Can you comment on the new democracy there?

Carter: Well, most people have given up on Africa or have decided to ignore Africa, but there are some notable accomplishments there. I've already outlined some of them in health care and democratization. One of the most famous, obviously, is the end of the apartheid regime in South Africa. Our oldest grandson is in the Peace Corps in South Africa, just north of Swaziland, and we visit him on occasion and have stayed conversant with him. And Nelson Mandela has worked side by side with us in some of our conflict resolution efforts and in some of our humanitarian or human rights efforts. Archbishop [Desmond] Tutu teaches here now with me at Emory University.

This is an interesting case, because it illustrates one point I made. We don't have a project in South Africa, because South Africa is such a popular place for every benevolent organization in the world to focus its attention, and that's very good. The United States has a massive aid program for South Africa, and the World Bank is eager to make loans to South Africa, and the IMF treats South Africa with special considerations because of the end of the apartheid regime and the attractiveness of what Nelson Mandela has stood for.

But instead of going to South Africa, we go to Liberia and we have an interest in Sierra Leone and Mali and Niger and Burkina Faso and Ethiopia and Uganda. So we are filled with admiration for what other people are doing in South Africa, but we would just be one more in a long list of organizations in South Africa if we decided to go there. But at the same time we don't underestimate the extreme significance or importance of other groups

going into South Africa to do work in agriculture and health and education, similar to what we have done in other nations.

Q: Thank you.

Carter: Sure.

[END OF INTERVIEW]