Max M. Kampelman Papers

Copyright Notice:

Version 3
August 20, 2018

"THE GORBACHEV ERA: U.S. RESPONSES"

REMARKS

BY

MAX M. KAMPELMAN

FREEDOM HOUSE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK

APRIL 17, 1989

It has been less than three months since I left government service with its different, exciting and enriching challenges. As a traditional Democrat who served in a Republican Administration, it is useful for me to stand back and evaluate our country's evolving role as a leader in a world that is changing so fast and so dramatically that we can barely see its details let alone its scope. We who have committed ourselves as a nation and as a people on behalf of human values and freedom must come to appreciate the impact of these changes on our aspirations.

The pace of change in the world today is so rapid that any statement we make about tomorrow is likely to be obsolete even today. The pace of change between 1900 and today is beyond calculation, probably greater than has taken place in all of mankind's previous history combined. And newer scientific and technological developments on the horizon will probably make all previous discoveries, from the discovery of fire through the industrial and commercial revolutions, dwarf by comparison.

During my lifetime, medical knowledge available to physicians has increased more than ten-fold. More than 80% of all scientists who ever lived are alive today. The average life span is now nearly twice as great as it was when my grandparents were born. The average world standard of living has, by one estimate, quadrupled in the past century. Advanced computers, new materials, new bio-technological processes are altering every phase of our lives, deaths, even reproduction. These developments are stretching our minds and our grasp of reality to the outermost dimensions of our capacity to understand them. Moreover, as we look ahead, we must agree that we have only the minutest glimpse of what our universe really is. Our science is indeed a drop, our ignorance a sea.

We are brought up to believe that necessity is the mother of invention. I suggest the corollary is also true: invention is the mother of necessity. Technology and communication have made the world smaller. There is no escaping the fact that the sound of a whisper or a whimper in one part of the world can immediately be heard in all parts of the world. And yet the world body politic is not keeping pace with those realities.

What we have instead been observing is an intense fractionalization, as large numbers of peoples have had their emotions inflamed by nationality and religious appeals. It is

as if a part of us is saying: "Not so fast. We are not ready. Our religious and communal culture has not prepared us for this new world we are being dragged into. We resist the pressures by holding on tight to the familiar, the traditional; and we will do so with a determined frenzy!"

But the inevitable tomorrow is appearing. There are new dominant sounds and among those most clearly and loudly heard are the sounds of freedom and democracy. The striving for human dignity is universal because it is an integral part of our human character. We see it in Burma, Pakistan, Korea, the Philippines, South Africa, Chile, Poland. A larger part of the world's population is today living in relative freedom than ever before in the history of the world. Even in Latin America, a region of the world we grew up believing to be governed by military dictatorships and tyrannies, more than 90% of the people today live, though still precariously, in democracies or near democracies.

These changes in science and technology are producing fundamental changes in our material lives; and in our social and political relationships as well. The global trend toward democracy is a part of that dramatic change. When permitted, and sometimes even when not, people are choosing liberty.

This trend is prompted not only by an abstract love of justice -- although this is undoubtedly present -- but by the growing realization that democracy works best. Governments and societies everywhere are discovering that keeping up with change requires openness to information, new ideas, and the freedom which enables ingenuity to germinate and flourish. Free peoples and free markets go together. State-controlled centralized planning cannot keep up with the pace of change. A closed tightly-controlled society cannot compete in a world experiencing an information explosion that knows no national boundaries.

We are in a time when no society can isolate itself or its people from new ideas and new information anymore than one can escape the winds whose currents affect us all. National boundaries can keep out vaccines, but those boundaries cannot keep out germs or ideas. Economically, each of our nations is increasingly becoming a region of a global whole, with technology, savings, investments, production moving effortlessly across borders. One essential geo-political consequence of that new reality is that there can be no true security for any one country unless there is security for all. Unilateral security will not come from either withdrawing from the world or attempting national impregnability. Instead, we must learn to accept in each of our countries a mutual

responsibility for the peoples in all other countries. There can be no real security for the people of Iran, unless there is security for the people of Iraq. There can be no security for the Arabs of Palestine unless there is security for the Jews of Palestine - and vice versa.

In this world of increasing interdependence, the lessons for the United States and the Soviet Union -- the most important security relationship in the present era -- are evident. We cannot escape from one another. We are bound together in an equation that makes the security of each of us dependent on that of the other. We must try to learn to live together. Our two countries must come to appreciate that just as the two sides of the human brain, the right and the left, adjust their individual roles within the body to make a coordinated and functioning whole, so must hemispheres of the body-politic, north and south, east and west, right and left, learn to harmonize their contributions to a whole that is healthy and constructive in the search for lasting peace with liberty.

We are told by Soviet leaders that through the process of internal transformation that is demanded by the new technologies, the time is at hand when the Soviet system comprehends that repressive societies in our day cannot achieve

inner stability or true security; that it is in their best interest to permit a humanizing process to take place. Without doubt that leadership is totally absorbed with the urgent need for drastic internal changes if the Soviet Union is to be a significant part of the 21st Century we are about to enter.

The Soviet economy is working poorly, although it does provide a fully functioning military machine. Massive military power has provided the Soviets with a presence that reaches all parts of the world, but this military superpower cannot hide the fact that its economic and social weaknesses are deep. The Soviet's awesome internal police force has provided continuity to its system of governance, but a Russia which during Czarist days exported food cannot today feed its own people. Productivity is low. With absenteeism, corruption, and alcoholism, internal morale is bad. Contrary to trends elsewhere in the world, life expectancy is actually decreasing. It is estimated that a worker in the Soviet Union must work more than seven times as many hours as a Western European to earn enough money to buy a car.

The new leaders of the Soviet Union are fully aware of its problems. They are also aware of our strengths, reflecting the vitality of our values and the healthy dynamism of our system.

We hear the Soviet words with hope that the deeds and the reality will indeed follow the rhetoric. We hope the time is at hand when Soviet authorities, looking at the energy of the West, comprehend that repressive societies in our day cannot achieve economic health, inner stability, or true security. We hope Soviet leadership today realizes that its historic aim of achieving Communism through violence has no place in this nuclear age. We hope Soviet authorities will join us in making the commitment that our survival as a civilization depends on the mutual realization that we must live under rules of responsible international behavior. We hope -- and there are encouraging signs to bolster that hope. But as yet, we, regrettably, cannot trust.

But even as we cannot yet trust, we have a responsibility to ourselves to observe developments in the Soviet Union carefully and to do so with open eyes and an open mind. There have been significant changes within the USSR. President Gorbachev has shown himself in a dramatic way willing to reconsider past views. The words glasnost and perestroika have been repeated so extensively that the ideas they represent may well take on a meaning and dynamism of their own which could become internally irreversible.

When I began negotiating with the Soviet Union in 1980, under President Carter, human rights was beginning to be injected as a major item on our country's international agenda. The Soviet Union insisted that the discussion of the subject was an improper interference in their internal affairs. When President Reagan asked me in 1985 to return to government service as head of our nuclear arms reduction negotiating team, an extraordinary change shortly became apparent. Under the leadership of the President and the careful guidance of Secretary of State George Shultz, the United States enlarged upon what President Carter initiated, and incorporated the concept of human rights as a necessary and ever-present ingredient in the totality of our relations with the Soviet Union.

It does not denigrate the vital importance of arms control for me to assert that if arms reductions are to be real and meaningful, they must be accompanied by attention to the serious problems that cause nations to take up arms. Arms are the symptoms of a disease. Let's treat the disease: regional aggression and conflict, bilateral competitive tensions, and, of course, violence against human dignity. The latter, which undermine the very essence of trust and confidence between nations, have been at the root of much of our historic hostility toward the Soviet system.

Our arms negotiations take place with the objective of normalizing and stabilizing our overall relations with the Soviet Union. Last year, we signed and began to implement the historic INF treaty, the first agreement totally to eliminate all nuclear weapons with a range of between 300 and 3300 miles. The treaty provides a stringent regime for verification, including on-site inspection. The INF agreement also stands for the principle of asymmetrical reductions to attain equality; it calls for the Soviets to destroy missiles capable of carrying four times as many warheads as those destroyed by the United States. Equally important, it was a political statement by both States that a historic process should get underway.

Within this atmosphere of change, the prospects for increased trade and other economic contacts between our two countries must receive attention. A global economy is emerging. Today, in fact, the very process of production crosses international boundaries in ways that make it increasingly difficult to identify clearly the country of origin. Nevertheless, with respect to our Soviet economic relationships, our government takes a cautious and sober approach, albeit occasionally contradictory. Economic ties cannot be divorced from the totality of our bilateral

relations. Since the military power of the Soviet Union still poses a potential military threat to our country, we favor the expansion of non-strategic, mutually beneficial trade with the Soviet Union, but insist that national security controls on sensitive items should remain in place.

Let me also here note a related major concern in the economic area. Our objective is to help the Soviet society evolve toward joining us in becoming a responsible member of the international community. Soviet leaders unabashedly acknowledge the failure to date of their system to meet the economic and social needs of their people. Our hope is to encourage the Soviet system to move away from an emphasis on massive military spending and, with us, shift their resources to meet their vital domestic requirements. This means tough choices. But we must understand that this may not happen if Western capitalist countries rush with cheap credits and price concessions. These would defer the day of reckoning and permit the system to avoid making the necessary choices. As Senator Bill Bradley recently wrote: "What Moscow needs from the West is not cheap credits but a cooperative road map to a better economy and a safer world."

In his 1975 Nobel Prize speech that he was not permitted to present in person, Dr. Andrei Sakharov, said:

> "I am convinced that international trust, mutual understanding, disarmament, and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish, and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live."

The United States interacts with the Soviet Union in that context. We have faith in our principles as we intensify our efforts, through our negotiations, to find a basis for understanding, stability, and peace with dignity. To negotiate is risky. It is, in the words of Hubert Humphrey, something like crossing a river while walking on slippery rocks. The possibility of disaster is on every side, but it is the way to get across. The object of our diplomacy and the supreme achievement of statesmanship, is patiently, through negotiation, to pursue the peace with dignity we seek, always recognizing the threat to that peace and always protecting our vital national interests and values.

We have begun a historic process. It may be working. With the nature of our adversary and the complex issues we face, however, coupled with our own internal political stresses, even with a package of arms reduction agreements -- and we are trying

-- we will still be nearer to the beginning than to the end of that process.

The process, furthermore, is likely to be a difficult and murky one. The USSR is not apt easily or quickly to undergo what Jonathan Edwards called a "great awakening" or see a blinding light on the road to Damascus. Their heavy bureaucratic crust of tradition is thick and not easily cracked. The fundamental nature of their system is the reality that they and we must still face. During a recent trip to Moscow, I heard it said: "There have been many books written on the transition from Capitalism to Socialism, but not one on the transition from Socialism to Capitalism." We must remember that the lines in Moscow remain long and the food still very scarce.

We are also struck by the depth of ethnic nationalism that has survived the Marxist and Leninist revolutions in the Soviet Union. Week after week that nationalism appears to be tearing at the fiber of the Soviet empire. There is violence, demonstrations, curfews and the recurring question: "How tolerant can Moscow afford to be?" Can Glasnost survive this strain and onslaught? Can the Soviet Union, with 104 separate nationalities and widely disparate cultures living in 15 Union Republics, 20 autonomous Republics and 18 National Districts, contain these demands for local sovereignty?

Just as the strains must not blind us to the changes so should the changes not blind us to the difficulties that still remain. Yes, the changes are stunning - Soviet troops out of Afghanistan; Solidarity legally recognized and Poland to have free elections; the prospect of Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola; Vietnam's agreement to withdraw from Cambodia; Communist Party officials challenged and defeated in Soviet elections; the beginning of a two party system in Hungary; interesting Soviet proposals to reduce conventional arms along lines proposed by the West.

But the problems also remain: The Soviets and their allies continue to provide more than half a billion dollars a year in military assistance to Nicaragua; Cuba continues to receive $7 billion in Soviet support annually; the Soviet military budget has still not been reduced; we have still not been able to observe a promised shift in Soviet military philosophy from an offensive to a defensive posture; and, as a dramatic reminder of our need to be wary, the Soviet's sale to Libya of bomber aircraft capable of threatening and further destabilizing the Middle East. We could go on.

The great challenge to our diplomacy is how to adjust to a rapidly changing world without endangering our security values, at the same time as we recognize that history should not later

condemn us for missing a historic opportunity for peace with dignity.

Alexis de Tocqueville wrote in the nineteenth century that "It is especially in the conduct of their foreign relations that democracies appear to be decidedly inferior to other governments." With that observation in mind, our task is to achieve the firm sense of purpose, steadiness, and strength that is indispensable for effective foreign affairs decision-making. Our political community must resist the temptation of partisan politics and institutional rivalry as we develop the consensus adequate to meet the challenge of de Tocqueville's criticism.

Abraham Lincoln in his day said that "America is the last great hope of mankind." It still is! Our political values have helped us build the most dynamic and open society in recorded history, a source of inspiration to most of the world. It is a promise of a better tomorrow for the hundreds of millions of people who have never known the gifts of human freedom. The future lies with liberty, human dignity, and democracy. To preserve and expand these values is our special responsibility. We should look upon it as an exciting opportunity.

Thank you

MMK SCHEDULE

NEW YORK April 17, 18, 1989

2:30 CALL CHRIST

Monday, April 17

8:30 Depart DC via PanAm shuttle
9:30 Arrive LaGuardia
10:00 Freedom House Conference
University Club, One W.54th
4:30 Conference ends
Meet w/Rheim & McColm

Dinner w?
Reservations at Parker
Meridian Hotel, 118 W.56th
212-245-5000

Tuesday, April 18

DR. GOTTI

9:30 Dr. Rosenfeld, 125 E 72nd St.
212-628-6100
10:00 Jerusalem Foundation KAY UNGER, DEE
500 5th, Suite 1625
212-840-1101
12:00 Lunch w/Hal Rosen (where?)
3:30 Freedom House Board Mtg.
48 East 21st Street
212-473-9691
? Return to DC

JOEL SMILOW

DR. ANTONIO M. GOTTO, JR.
CHAIRMAN, DEPT OF INTERNAL MEDICINE
BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
METHODIST HOSPITAL
6565 FANNIN
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77030

632-167-5521 3732

CITIBANK - 695-5261
CHASE -

EMCOR - 647-6415