



Max M. Kampelman Papers

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.

01C



*The President of the National Defense University
and Mrs. Lawrence
request the pleasure of your company
at the Capstone Graduation Dinner
on Friday, the twenty-fourth of May
at six-thirty o'clock
Rotunda
National War College
Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C.*

R.I.V.P.

475-1473

*Military Formal
Black Tie*

CAPSTONE

General and Flag Officer Course

Capstone teaches joint and combined operations at the highest level. The course is conducted by the Institute of Higher Defense Studies of the National Defense University at the direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The average class size is 23 and includes Coast Guard and State Department participation.

After Joint Chiefs of Staff approval in 1982, two pilot courses were conducted in 1983, and the first permanent course graduated on 8 June 1984.

The course has the primary objective of enhancing student understanding of the employment of US forces in joint and combined warfare. It provides significant personal interaction with Commanders in Chief and other senior US and Allied commanders responsible for the planning and employment of joint and combined military forces. Retired four-star general and flag officers are attached to each class as Senior Fellows to provide advice and guidance based on their perspectives and experience.

The Capstone course does not include formal writing or research assignments. Readings are modest in scope and are offered to illuminate specific joint and combined issues under discussion. However, the course requires intensive personal involvement on the part of each Capstone Fellow through participation in and leadership of seminars, panels, field trips, interviews and a decision game. The course objectives include building on and sharing the expertise and experience of the course participants, gaining new insights, broadening perspectives and understanding of joint and combined operations, and as a result, functioning more efficiently in the joint and combined arena.

The twenty-three diplomas presented tonight will bring the total number of graduates to ninety.

PROGRAM

Presentation of Colors
Pledge of Allegiance

Invocation.....Mr. John C. Leary

Dinner...Music by the Air Force Strolling Strings

Welcoming Remarks and
Introduction of
Distinguished Guests...LTG Richard D. Lawrence

Presentation of Award...GEN Lyman L. Lemnitzer
to ADM Thomas H. Moorer

Introduction of
Guest Speaker.....AMB Max M. Kampelman

Presentation of
Diplomas.....GEN Lyman L. Lemnitzer

Closing Remarks.....BG Charles E. Teeter

Music.....US Army Blues Combo

GRADUATES

Colonel(P) Richard D. Beltson, USA
Colonel(P) Craig H. Boice, USA
Commodore Thomas A. Brooks, USN
Colonel(P) Sherian G. Cadoria, USA
Brigadier General George E. Chapman, USAF
Colonel Maralin K. Coffinger, USAF
Colonel John P. Dickey, USAF
Colonel Albert A. Gagliardi, Jr., USAF
Commodore Dwaine O. Griffith, USN
Colonel Lawrence E. Huggins, USAF
Commodore Ronald H. Jesberg, USN
Commodore Robert L. Johanson, USCG
Mr. John C. Leary, Department of State
Commodore Anthony A. Less, USN
Brigadier General Gary E. Luck, USA
Brigadier General Glynn C. Mallory, Jr., USA
Commodore John K. Ready, USN
Brigadier General Henry C. Stackpole, III, USMC
Colonel Daniel A. Taylor, Jr., USAF
Commodore James E. Taylor, USN
Brigadier General(P) Charles E. Teeter, USA
Colonel Walter E. Webb, III, USAF
Colonel(P) Rodney D. Wolfe, USA

NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY

Institute of Higher Defense Studies



CAPSTONE

GRADUATION DINNER

Class of 1985

24 May 1985

FORT LESLEY J. McNAIR

WASHINGTON, D.C.

REMARKS BY

AMBASSADOR MAX M. KAMPELMAN

GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICER CAPSTONE COURSE GRADUATION

Washington, D.C.

May 24, 1985

General Lawrence, Admiral Moorer, members of the faculty, Fellows of the National Defense University, spouses, distinguished guests, friends.

It is an honor to have been asked to address this fourth General and Flag Officer Capstone Course Graduation. The honor is one that I cherish because of my strong belief that there can be no greater public service than that of participating in the defense of our nation. The role of the military officer and of the civilian and diplomatic components of our country's defense effort is vital and indispensable to our democratic institutions. No other American, be he or she member of the clergy, teacher, physician, or elected public official, plays a more significant role in preserving the values and liberties that we cherish. I am therefore particularly appreciative of the invitation to share this graduation service with all of you.

Reference has been made to my current role as head of our country's team to the Geneva arms reduction negotiations. You will, I know, appreciate that I will not talk this evening about the details of those proceedings. I do wish, however, to address the related issue of our country's responsibility as the most powerful democratic nation in the world.

Those of us who represent the United States are fully aware that the peoples of the world feel overwhelmed by the danger to all of us from the existence of nuclear arsenals. We must face that danger, but we cannot do so in the abstract. The arms control process is not a substitute for foreign policy. Nor is it a substitute for the defense that people of a democracy have every right to expect from their government. The problem of weaponry, whether conventional or nuclear, is an intimate part of the broader political relationships that exist in the world body politic.

Our world not stand still. We must learn to avoid mental rigidity as we face the problems arising out of our changing

world. The advent of technology has dramatically changed our daily lives. It must also affect our thinking. The world at the end of this century will be different from what it was when we were born. History never stops.

The fundamental fact that provides the background for our Geneva negotiations is the centrality of Soviet-American relations to the issue of world peace. Our great challenge is how to manage this relationship. How do we persuade the Soviet government that its ideology and historic national ambition to expand its power has no place in the nuclear age? How do we together control nuclear weapons and reduce the risk of war? Can we find the defenses through the new technology which will indeed make nuclear warfare impractical and nuclear arms obsolete?

These questions become formidable ones as we face the reality that the Soviet Union is an aggressive society, a major challenge to our security and values, seeking, with its massive military and police power, to expand its influence; and it is a repressive society determined to defend its totalitarian power, apparently whatever the human cost. The integrity and character and strength of our society and of our people will undergo the most serious challenge of our history as we grapple with the

problems of how to live with Soviet military power, how to meet it and challenge it, and how simultaneously to maintain the peace and remain constant in our ideals.

There are some who respond to the danger to us represented by Soviet military power and theology by ignoring or denying its existence. That would be fatal for us. There are others who are so overwhelmed by the difficulties that they place all of their trust in military power and its use alone. That view can be fatal to us as well. We cannot wish the Soviet Union away. It is here and it is militarily powerful. We share the same globe. We must try to find a formula under which we can live together in dignity.

We still look upon ourselves as a young and developing society, even though we are now the oldest, most stable system in the world. We did not seek the role of world leadership, and our people today still tend to shy away from it. By the end of World War II we were somewhat like a young giant among nations. Being a giant is not easy. It is not easy living with a giant, as our friends are learning. It is hard to find shoes to fit if you are a giant; and the bed is always too short. Being strong, the giant can afford to be gentle, but he is also, at times, awkward. His good intentions are not always so interpreted by others. America,

as that giant, has made mistakes because we were hesitant about the responsibilities of leadership. As a result, our behavior has sometimes been contradictory, and confusing to our friends as well as to our adversaries.

We talk a great deal about values and about liberty. Some of our more sophisticated friends see this linkage of values with world realpolitik as a form of naivete. We, of course, talk about the values of liberty because, to us, they are not abstract. We also know they are not abstract to those unable to enjoy them.

Our founding fathers, by cool calculation, informed by history and inspired by a passion for liberty, knew that idealism and realism were a tightly woven warp and woof. They made a sturdy constitutional fabric. We must again treat both idealism and realism as mutually reinforcing. Our values distinguish us from the totalitarians and authoritarians of the world. They are our strength, and they are indispensable to consensus in our democracy.

As we reaffirm our faith, however, we must understand that we thereby implicitly threaten the Soviet Union. Like any dictatorship, the Soviet ruling class is deeply concerned about

the subversion of its power -- power accumulated not by consent but by military and police force alone. Where there is no legitimacy; where there is repression coupled with traditional, national and cultural differences; where there is an obvious failure of the system to meet the needs of its peoples -- these obviously contribute to leadership insecurity. The very existence of neighboring free societies creates a powerful draw and attraction for those who live under totalitarian rule. By example, democracies inevitably tend to subvert Soviet authority.

We cannot accept the ground rules of Soviet international policy under which everything that has become communist remains forever inviolate, while everything that is noncommunist is open to change, either by pressure, subversion, armed aggression, or terror. Soviet military involvement in Angola and Ethiopia through Cuban proxy troops; the aggressive presence of 120,000 Soviet troops in Afghanistan; the subjugation of Cambodia by Soviet-armed Vietnamese troops; Soviet military presence in Cuba, South Yemen, and Vietnam; the encouragement of outlaw states like Libya by Soviet military equipment and intelligence coordination; intelligence, financial and training support for guerrilla movements and terrorists; and, yes, the imprisonment of Shcharanskiy, the exiling of Sakharov, the restrictions against

emigration, all in violation of the Helsinki Final Act -- all these exacerbate international tension just as significantly as does the arms race.

We seek mutual understanding and the relaxation of tensions in the world. But these can be founded only in a political agreement which recognizes the supremacy of the principle of mutual international stability and the integrity of agreements -- lived up to -- designed to civilize the international order.

The Soviet Union is not likely soon to undergo what Jonathan Edwards called "a great awakening," or see a blinding light on the road to Damascus. Yet, the imperatives for survival in the nuclear age require us to persist -- through the deterrence that comes from military strength, through dialogue, through criticism, through negotiation -- to persist in the search for understanding, agreement, peace.

The "correlation of forces" in the non-military sense has moved against the Soviet Union. The credibility of its system as a viable alternative has collapsed. The totalitarian cause would be a lost one, considering the added burden of its economic and social failures, were it not for the Soviet belief that the West

is divided, lazy, comfortable and increasingly pacifist. They doubt the will of the West to resist the intimidating power of its military bluster. Soviet submarines enter Swedish waters to warn and scare as well as gain intelligence. Soviet secret services train and finance terrorists all over the world to destabilize the rest of us. The apparent deep involvement of the Bulgarian secret police in the attempted assassination of the Pope, an involvement not possible without KGB complicity, is an illustration of that criminal irresponsibility.

They move to test us in our own hemisphere as well. In Central America, Soviet money, guns and personnel, operating directly and through Cuban and Nicaraguan proxies, seek further to enlarge their totalitarian influence and undermine the striving of these poverty-stricken people for economic and social justice and self-government. Thus, in our hemisphere too, in countries geographically nearer to many parts of the United States than those parts are to Washington, the totalitarians are flexing their muscles.

And yet the movement toward democracy is universal. In Latin America there is a steady advance of liberty. More than 90 percent of its people today live under governments that are

democratic. This is in sharp contrast to only one third in 1979. In less than six years popularly elected democracies have replaced dictatorships in Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Peru, Grenada, Brazil and Uruguay. There are strong signs that Guatemala is in transition to democracy.

Throughout the world we see a significant change away from guerrilla insurgencies led by communists against pro-Western governments toward popular insurgencies against communist regimes. This is certainly the case in Afghanistan and Cambodia, and many parts of Africa. Communist systems have uniformly proved themselves to be economic disasters.

Our task as a nation is to recognize, appreciate and responsibly encourage the steady advance of political democracy. Our national tradition is to support those who seek freedom. We must assert that as long as communist dictatorships act to aid and abet insurgencies in the name of "socialist internationalism," the democracies that are target of this violent threat must defend themselves in the cause of democracy itself.

American foreign policy is driven and must continue to be driven by the positive goals of peace, democracy, liberty and

human rights. We seek a world based on racial justice, economic and social progress and rule of law. We know that these goals inspire peoples and nations around the world. We know that these goals could turn out to be the organizing principles of an international order that embraces the vast majority of mankind.

George Washington did indeed advise his countrymen to steer clear of permanent alliances, but that was in the day when there were hardly any other democracies in the world. We were among the first democracies, and we had good reason to be wary of entanglements with countries that did not share our democratic principles. It is understandable, therefore, that we today define our strategic interests in terms that embrace the safety and well-being of the democratic world.

Those of us who champion liberty are flowing in the mainstream of the onward movement of civilization. We are living in the midst of a technological revolution which brings with it massive increases in opportunities for communication and information. Totalitarian societies will find that they cannot stifle these new technologies. — Indeed their efforts to do so will lead them to fall further behind the curve of evolving technological change. That change will inevitably erode

totalitarian control, which is based on information and thought control.

Dr. Charles Malik, the distinguished Lebanese scholar and patriot, commented in The Wall Street Journal on the role of the West in his country:

"A civilization constituted by Homer, Plato and Aristotle, by the Old and the New Testaments, by Cicero and Augustine, by Shakespeare and Goethe, by Newton and Einstein, by Pushkin and Dostoevski, and by the joy and zest and adventure and freedom of the great American experience, and all that these names concretely mean -- can such a civilization lack supreme values for its conviction and burning fire for its will? Who else has anything comparable with this incomparable heritage?

"America and the West underestimate their immense potential. Lebanon would never have been a problem if the West itself were not a problem. And the West is not only the problem but also the solution. That is its singular greatness. And the solution is to be true to the deepest value of the West: the primacy of the spirit and the freedom of the soul...."

The future lies with freedom. There can be no lasting stability in societies that would deny it. Only freedom can release the constructive energies of men and women to work toward reaching new heights. A human being has the capacity and the right to aspire, to achieve, to dream, and to do. He cannot be permanently prevented from stretching his muscles to enjoy his

freedom and strive toward new heights of accomplishment for himself and his children.

In a letter smuggled to the West from his exile in Gorky, where his own life and that of his wife Elena Bonner continue to be in jeopardy, Andrei Sakharov warned that "the world is facing very difficult times and cruel cataclysms if the West does not now show the required firmness, unity and consistency in resisting the totalitarian challenge...." I believe that we have recognized the danger in time, and that together free societies will be able to survive the multiple assaults of totalitarianism and establish the conditions for genuine peace.

The true peacemakers of this world are those who stand up openly and honestly against totalitarian repression and aggression. The true peacemakers are those who strive for peace with human dignity. We can take great pride in being among them. Your role, members of this National Defense University graduating class, is indispensable to our efforts and our success.

Thank you and my congratulations to the class.



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20319

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

Office of the President

14 JUN 1985

Ambassador Max M. Kampelman
United States Mission
Geneva, Switzerland

Dear Mr. Ambassador:

Please accept our heartfelt thanks for being our graduation speaker for the fourth General and Flag Officer Capstone Course on May 24 1985. The class was unanimous in its praise for your ability to express so clearly the difficulties facing the U.S. team in Geneva and for the better insight you gave them into the make up and philosophy of the Soviet negotiators.

Your fine speech was given at the zenith of our course, and the fellows have told me how grateful they were that you could take the time to be with them during your action packed Washington schedule. Thank you again and we all wish you every success in the ongoing negotiations.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Dick", is written over the typed name.

Richard D. Lawrence
Lieutenant General, U. S. Army
President



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20319

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

Office of the President

16 APR 1985

Ambassador Max M. Kampelman
United States Mission
Geneva, Switzerland

Dear Ambassador Kampelman:

✓ We at National Defense University are pleased to learn from Ambassador Jack Scanlan that you will be able to speak to the Fellows and guests at the fourth General and Flag Officer Capstone Course Graduation at Fort McNair on 24 May 1985. The evening will begin at 1830.

As Ambassador Scanlan may have told you, Capstone is an eight-week course aimed at discussing the issues and process of joint and combined operations at the theater level and above. Our course "instructors" are the U.S. and Allied Commanders of the joint and combined forces both in the United States and the European and Pacific theaters. Other "faculty" include leaders of U.S. agencies and organizations that support the mission of joint and combined operations. I have enclosed a 1985 syllabus for your information.

✓ The formal graduation evening will include: dinner and music by the Strolling Strings, a special presentation of the first annual General Lyman Lemnitzer Award for sustained superior performance in joint and combined operations to Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, USN (Ret), your remarks and presentation of the diplomas. Your talk should run approximately twenty minutes plus ten minutes for questions. The topic may be one of your choice befitting this distinguished group. I am sure the graduates will be very interested in your perspectives on the recent peace talks including a few of the tough issues in the U.S.-Soviet negotiations.

// The invited guests will include chiefs of the five uniformed services and their spouses plus six retired former generals and admirals who have served in key joint and combined jobs and assist the Capstone Course through discussion, insights and seminars. There will be approximately 100 people including one foreign service fellow, Mr. Jack Leary. We hope your wife will be able to accompany you.

I have asked the Director of the Institute of Higher Defense Studies, Colonel Bob Butterfield, telephone (202) 475-1473, to be your point of contact. He will make any arrangements for you.

Again Sir, thank you for supporting this important program.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Richard D. Lawrence", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Richard D. Lawrence
Lieutenant General, U.S. Army
President

Enclosure