

...will not be independent."
Besides fumbling the "home-
and" question on several occa-
sions, Mr. Carter also has shown
singular lack of follow-through
in the question of Israeli settle-
ments in occupied Arab territory.
Shortly after Israeli Prime
Minister Menahem Begin's trip
here in July, the President said
he had "let [Begin] know very
strongly" that any new settle-
ments would cause the U.S. "deep
concern."

But a bit later, on Aug. 5, after
Begin continued to approve new
settlements and legalize old ones,
Mr. Carter told reporters: "I
think what he did was in con-
formance with the desires of the
Israeli people." That introduced
a new factor in the settlements
question which was manna to
Jews hungry for a show of

of a fully developed university
system?

The greater part of the editorial
is factually false. Tuitions
are (about \$500 to \$600 a year
study) are much cheaper than
in the United States. To live here
is cheaper also; and, with \$59
per flight, I am sure that it
is less to fly from Boston or
New York to London than to Los
Angeles. So the portion of the
editorial which talks about
wealthy parents' sending sons
abroad for "expensive" study is
false and in error. I believe
that tuition at one of your pri-
vate medical schools in Washing-
ton, D. C., is \$12,500 per year, plus
\$1,000 for books and room and
board.

The part about not needing
doctors is false also. From
a national newspaper from the
United States, the Tacoma News
tribune (Nov. 13, 1977), Mr. John
C. writes "Doctor Shortage:
Emergency Program Sought," and
tells us how short is Pierce Coun-
ty for doctors. If this holds true
in Tacoma, a suburb of Seattle,
I am sure that one could find
the same for most middle-
class American states and coun-

tries. I think, therefore, that the
editorial revealed an insularity
and which slurs those of us
who are doctors outside of the
United States, and also revealed
a lack of justice against changes in
our medical preparation.
Who are "foreign-trained"
doctors who enjoy American competi-
tion? Who dislike, however, Ameri-
can or rudeness. Could we
do better next time?

DR. A.R. REEL

tion.

...estimates that the decision will

Republican presidential nominat-
ing convention of 1980.

Amnesty International's Big Error

By William F. Buckley Jr. 9/1/78

NEW YORK—An announce-
ment by Amnesty Interna-
tional that it would hencefor-
ward devote its resources to a
campaign against capital punish-
ment is received by some of the
organization's advisers and sup-
porters with sadness. We are sad
at the stupidity of the move, and
at the inevitable sectarianization
of the amnesty movement.

The Amnesty International idea
began simply, and the organiza-
tion's growth and its support
from liberals and conservatives
reflected a general consensus
among civilized people that dissi-
dents who are not guilty of violent
crimes should not be tortured,
imprisoned, or killed. One would
think that such a program would
be quite enough to exhaust a full
budget of any man's compassion
for his fellow man.

Men and women who have
worked for Amnesty include the
most idealistic in this world, who
protest inhumanity whether from
the left or from the right. Am-
nesty's reputation for ten-
derous compassion arises in
part because it is a fact of life
that full-time bleeding hearts
tend to notice depredations from
the right while ignoring depreda-
tions from the left—it is a
congenital astigmatism. But it is
also a matter of the availability
of information.

Prestige, Prize

This is Monday. How many
people were tortured, imprisoned,
or killed Sunday in mainland
China? Not even the most
sophisticated Peeping Tom satel-
lite can give us the answer to
that question, let alone the brave
souls of Amnesty International.
But the entire board of directors
of Amnesty International can
travel to Argentina tomorrow, or
to Chile, or the Philippines, look
in the Yellow Pages under "Dis-
sent, Organized," and start as-
sembling their information. Not-
withstanding, Amnesty has ac-
quired prestige and, of course,
very recently was awarded the
Nobel Prize. Those of us who
have, with whatever reservations,
encouraged Amnesty, are now
dismayed by the news. Amnesty
has come out against capital
punishment.

Now there are perfectly respect-

able arguments against capital
punishment. The point, of course,
is that these arguments are un-
connected with the proposition
that one should not punish any-
one for the crime of expressing
himself nonviolently on any
question. That is the point of
Amnesty. So to speak, its call
letters. If someone is guilty of
violence—let us say, a hijacker,
or a terrorist—then that man
does not qualify for the sponsor-
ship of Amnesty. That man is
subject to the penalty of the law.

What penalty? A year in pris-
on? Ten years? Life? Execu-
tion? These are choices, open to
societies, which are variously
chosen. Why is it the business
of Amnesty International to in-
sert itself in quarrels over ap-
propriate forms of punishment? Why
should it be supposed that those
persons who give support to
Amnesty—whether by writing
letters in behalf of its adoptees,
or by sending money to defray
administrative expenses—for the
purpose of registering a vote in
behalf of freedom of conscience,
should automatically sign on in
an international drive against
capital punishment? What is the
nexus?

The American Civil Liberties
Union, which alas has been
heavily ideologized over many
years, recently did everything in
its power to stave the execution
of Gary Gilmore even though (a)
there was no doubt that he had
been extended every civil liberty

known to man; (b) that he had
been fairly tried; (c) that the
courts had authorized capital
punishment; and (d) that he had
asked to be executed. Why
should someone who favors civil
liberties understand himself to
favor the right of the state to
forbid a condemned man from
catalyzing the penalty to which
he has been legally sentenced?

The decision of Amnesty Inter-
national to go for the abolition
of capital punishment is stupid
in the most unforgivable sense of
the word. It is a triumph of
ideology over compassion. Be-
cause as things are left, those
who believe that capital punish-
ment is a legitimate exercise of
social authority, but who believe
that the punishment of the indi-
vidual conscience is not, are going
to have to suspend their support
of an agency that has done so
much, and could do so much, to
help lonely men and women in
every area of the world who have
never committed a crime but who
suffer for having expressed their
opinion.

Now suddenly they find that
they are in a common pool, labor-
ing over objects of the compas-
sion of Amnesty International
that include the Black September
or Japanese Red Army members
sentenced to death.

As a longtime member of the
Advisory Board of Amnesty
International, I step forward to
suggest the nature of the problem.
I resign.

INTERNATIONAL
Herald Tribune
Published with The New York Times and The Washington Post
Chairman: John Hay Whitney
Co-Chairmen: Katharine Graham
Arthur Ochs Sulzberger
Publisher: Robert R. Eckert
Editor: Murray M. Weiss
Managing Editor: William R. Holden
Harry Baehr, Senior Editorial Writer.

International Herald Tribune, S.A. au capital de 9 330 000 F.
R.O. Paris No 73 5 2112 21 Rue de Berry 75380 Paris Cedex 08
Tel.: 225-28-90. Telex: 280 950 Herald, Paris. Cable: Herald, Paris.
Le Directeur de la publication: Walter N. Thayer.
Daily except Sunday
In U.S.A.—Subscription price \$235 yearly
Second class postage paid at Long Island City, N.Y. 11101
© 1978 International Herald Tribune. All rights reserved
Commission Paritaire No 34.331

