Max M. Kampelman Papers

Copyright Notice:

Version 3
August 20, 2018

AS READ

REMARKS BY

MAX M. KAMPELMAN

to

JEWISH INSTITUTE FOR NATIONAL

SECURITY AFFAIRS

Washington, D.C. November 6, 1989

To be at a JINSA meeting, speaking to a JINSA audience at a dinner honoring my dear friend and teacher, Eugene Rostow, gives me great personal satisfaction and pleasure.

JINSA is special to me. Fifteen years ago, my friend and law partner, Richard Schifter, now Assistant Secretary of State for Humanitarian Affairs, and I were having dinner with General Aharon Yariv of the Israel Defense Force. General Yariv was troubled that evening. After spending a few days at the Pentagon, he found his American military friends to be increasingly skeptical about Israel and very much puzzled about the attitudes of Israel's friends.

This was not new to Dick and to me. We, too, could not understand how some of Israel's prominent supporters, urging American military support for Israel, could hesitate about American military aid to itself. The people and democratic government of Israel, like the people and democratic government of the United States, were eager for peace with dignity, but for diplomacy toward that peace to be effective required the deterrence and protection that came from military strength.

Dick assumed the task of organizing JINSA to help advance that understanding and to coalesce the wide support for it which we knew existed in the Jewish community. A corrollary of that policy, of course, was the awareness that American security interests called for the support of a militarily strong Israel as a bastion of democracy and as a loyal friend of our country in the Mideast. With the help of Herb Fierst, Larry Goldmuntz, Saul Stern, and many of you in this audience, JINSA flourished and became a major influence in American public life.

It is appropriate that JINSA tonight should be honoring Professor Eugene Rostow and his wife, Edna. No person has been more influential in helping America appreciate that its responsibility to itself, to its values, to its allies, depends on its strength. We are all aware of the extraordinary changes

which have led us into our important explorations with the Soviet Union now underway. The dramatic events we see in Poland, Hungary, East Germany and the Soviet Union are not likely to have occurred were it not for America's strength, its example, and its leadership for human values.

Vision has been the hallmark of Gene Rostow's career. As Dean of Yale Law School, he fostered and encouraged a unique method of teaching and training which continues to make an indelible mark on American jurisprudence. As Deputy Secretary of State, Gene Rostow put himself frequently in positions to advance the Charter of the United Nations as the standard toward which the nations of the world must aspire and against which the behavior of other nations must be judged. At a moment of great sensitivity and danger to Israel, he helped create Security Council Resolution 242. I had personal reason to know of the special help that Gene later provided to the Camp David process as he brought his profound knowledge of international law to bear on a most difficult issue at a critical period in the negotiations.

Gene, 15 years ago, associated himself with the creation of JINSA and was instrumental in establishing the Committee on the Present Danger. These efforts helped forge the environment which made the historic developments of our day possible.

Should these developments lead to a process which reduces the risk of war and increases the prospect of peace -- and that may well be -- then history will correctly judge Gene, as I do, as a man of peace in our day.

The proud word, "peace", has historically run the risk of being distorted. There is the "peace" of the grave; the "peace" that reigns in a well-disciplined prison or gulag; the peace that may plant, with its terms, the seeds of a future war. Certainly those are not what our dreamers and philosophers yearned for. It is peace with dignity that we seek. It is peace with liberty that is the indispensable ingredient for the evolution of Man from the species homo sapiens to the species "human being."

The fundamental reality of today is that the world is changing so fast and so dramatically that we can barely see its details let alone its scope. When I was born, there was no Federal Reserve; no vitamin tablets; no refrigerators; no transcontinental telephones; no plastics; no Social Security; no airlines; no Xerox; no air-conditioning; no antibiotics; no frozen foods; no television. During my lifetime, medical knowledge available to physicians has probably increased more than ten-fold. More than 80% of all scientists who ever lived are alive today. More than 100,000 scientific journals

annually publish the flood of new knowledge that pours out of the world's laboratories. The average life span is now nearly twice as great as it was when my grandparents were born. 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 an ocean.

Economic, technological, and communication advances have made global interdependence a reality. Our political and economic institutions are feeling the stress of these pressures as they try to digest their implications. We have yet to settle on an international legal and regulatory framework to cope with a world where economic interdependence blurs the origin of products, and where international financial flows in a single day (about $1 trillion) equal our government's annual budget.

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. These developments are fundamentally altering our material lives; and our social and political relationships as well. There are new dominant sounds and among those most clearly and loudly heard today are the sounds of freedom and democracy. When given the chance -- and sometimes when not -- people across the world are standing for liberty. A larger part of the world's population is today living in relative freedom than ever before in the history of the world.

The trend toward freedom and democracy is prompted not only by a deep inner drive for human dignity, but by the growing realization that democracy seems to work best. Governments and societies everywhere are discovering that keeping pace requires openness to information, new ideas, and the freedom which enables ingenuity to germinate and flourish. A closed tightly-controlled society cannot compete in a world experiencing an information explosion that knows no national boundaries.

We are clearly 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 or broadcasts. This suggests, among many other implications, the need to reappraise our traditional definitions of sovereignty. The Government of Bangladesh, for example, cannot prevent tragic floods without active cooperation from Nepal and India. Canada cannot protect itself from acid rain without collaborating with the United States. The Mediterranean is polluted by 18 different countries. One essential geo-political consequence of this new reality is that there can be no true security for any one country in isolation. Instead, we must learn to accept in each of our countries a mutual responsibility for the peoples in other countries.

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. The Soviet Union, we must remember, is today the only country which can militarily threaten our nation. For nearly half a century, we have looked at international relations through the prism of our relations with one another. 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 are told by Soviet leaders that through the process of internal transformation that is demanded by the new technologies, they comprehend 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; and that their domestic requirements are their highest priority.

Without doubt, Soviet leadership faces the urgent need for drastic internal changes if the Soviet Union is to be a significant part of the 21st Century. The Soviet economy is working poorly, although it does provide adequate sustenance for itself and its 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. Ethnic nationalism at times appears to be tearing at the fiber of the Soviet empire, with violence, demonstrations, curfews, and the recurring question: "How

tolerant can Moscow afford to be?" Can the Soviet Union, with more than 100 nationalities and widely-disparate cultures living in 15 Republics, contain the demands for local sovereignty emanating from pent-up resentments and a long-desired opportunity to even things out?

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

We cannot be certain we understand ultimate Soviet intentions behind their search for "breathing space". Nevertheless, we have a responsibility to observe and respond to developments in the Soviet Union carefully and to do so with open eyes and an open mind. It will not be easy for many of us to change the prism of our accustomed spectacles for clearer viewing. It is difficult to believe what we see. Our need may well be to replace our microscope with a wide-angle lens. Vital changes are underway. We must not fear them. We must influence them.

Our ability to influence Soviet internal developments is likely to be limited, but we should not ignore the things we can do to encourage the evolution of Soviet policy in directions that are constructive and responsible. Our military

strength is obviously indispensable. But so is our role as a world leader and as an example.

The United States is the Soviet Union's principal adversary. We are also its standard for comparison. We thus have a responsibility to make it clear to the leadership of the Soviet Union what we expect and require for increased trust. In essence, we urge them to develop stronger legal and structural restraints on their power, both internal and external. We must insist that they abjure the use or threat of force in our own hemisphere and elsewhere. This means they and their allies must get out of Nicaragua. We must persuade the Soviet Union to join us in a commitment to "rules of the game" for responsible international behavior. This means a thorough and unmistakable rejection of terrorism and a joint effort to eradicate it.

The United States and the Soviet Union have begun a historic process. Given the nature of our adversary and the complex issues between us, we are still nearer the beginning than the end of that process. The process, furthermore, is likely to be a difficult and murky one. The fundamental nature of the Soviet system is the reality that they and we must still face. The great challenge to our diplomacy is how to adjust to an evolving Soviet Union in a rapidly-changing world without

endangering our security and our values. It is our responsibility to work toward that end. This requires a steady America, strong but confident, conscious of the reality of our own interest in a stable peaceful world.

Will we be able to play our part? Will we be sufficiently sensitive to the judgment of history and take heed lest future generations condemn us for having missed a decisive opportunity for peace with dignity? Will we be wise enough to know how to assist the historic developments now underway in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe? Will we be sufficiently alert and forthcoming to grab the opportunity presented to us? Are we adequately bold and imaginative to adjust our security interests to the new world we are entering? It is on the basis of these criteria that history will judge us.

Our task is to achieve the firm sense of purpose, readiness, steadiness, and strength that is indispensable for effective and timely foreign policy decision-making. Our political community must resist the temptation of partisan politics and institutional rivalry as we develop the consensus necessary to meet the challenge and the opportunity at hand.

Our country is today the oldest democracy in the world. Our political values and our character traits have helped us build the most dynamic and open society in recorded history, a source of inspiration to most of the world. It should be a source of inspiration for us as well. We cannot take it for granted. In fulfilling our responsibility as citizens of this democracy, there is no room for aloofness or moral neutrality. The idea that somehow power is bad, that superpowers are worse, with one superpower more or less as bad as the other, is a formula for self-defeat. There is an unmistakable difference between a prison yard and a meadow.

It is not arrogant for us to proclaim the virtues of our own system because it casts no credit on us. We are not the ones who created American democracy. We are merely its beneficiaries with an obligation to strengthen it for succeeding generations. The future lies with liberty, human dignity, and democracy. The changes stimulated by modern technology may well assist us to move in that direction, if we permit our democratic values to provide the guidelines for the journey. When we are growing up, we are taught not to be afraid of the dark. I say to you that as our societies mature, we must not be afraid of the light and where it can take us.

Thank you.

FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON
SUITE 800
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004-2505
(202) 639-7000

CABLE "STERIC WASHINGTON"
TELEX 892406
DEX 6500 (202) 639-7008
DEX 6500 (202) 639-7003
DEX 6200 (202) 639-7006
DEX 6200 (202) 639-7004

ONE NEW YORK PLAZA
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10004-1980
(212) 820-8000
TELEX 620223

725 S. FIGUEROA
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-5438
(213) 689-5800

3 KING'S ARMS YARD
LONDON, EC2R 7AD, ENGLAND
(01) 600-1541
TELEX 887606

MAX M. KAMPELMAN
(202) 639-7020

November 28, 1989

Ms. Janet Heller
5009 Falls Road
Baltimore, Maryland 21210

Dear Ms. Heller:

Thank you for your kind note of the 14th. I am pleased that you enjoyed the speech and I appreciate your comments.

Your question as to whether the United States is the world's oldest democracy is a good one. You are quite right that the founding fathers, for all their talents, were not the first to implement a functioning democracy. Certain Greek city states and, to the best of my belief, some Renaissance Italian city states effected various forms of democratic government long before the American revolution. They did not survive. Iceland, as you point out, enjoyed an era known as the "free state" from 930 A.D. until 1262-4 A.D. when it came under Norwegian monarchic rule and its democracy ended. Iceland retrieved its autonomy, of course, in 1944.

The United States remains the world's oldest <u>continuing</u> democracy, a distinction I shall try to remember in the future so as to retain my good graces with quick witted historians in the audience such as yourself.

Sincerely,

Max M. Kampelman

14 November

Dear Ambassador Kampelman,

I enjoyed the opportunity once again to hear you speak at the recent JINSA dinner. How fortunate we are to have men, such as you, serving our country so tirelessly. In your remarks you stated that

the United States was the world's oldest democracy. To my knowledge, Iceland can make that claim as its Parliament, the Althing, was founded in 930 A.D. I am willing to be convinced otherwise of course.

With all best wishes,

Janet Heller

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20319-6000

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

7 November 1989

Institute for National Strategic Studies

Ambassador Max Kampelman
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver, & Jacobson
1000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Max,

Thank you again for your generous and sensitive words. They touched chords of deep feeling, and I am grateful.

I liked and appreciated your speech, both for its substance and as a work of art.

On one point, may I recall a pitfall to be avoided. You spoke at one point about the possibility of reaching agreement with the Soviets on "the rules of the game", or some such phrase. When Acheson was Secretary of State, the U.S.S.R. made one of its perennial proposals for a non-aggression pact or the equivalent. Acheson commented that "we already have a non-aggression pact with the Soviet Union. It is called the United Nations Charter, and nothing should be done to qualify the power of its generality."

Yours, as always,

Gene

Eugene V. Rostow
Distinguished Visiting Research Professor
of Law and Diplomacy

GWBW

SEND COPY OF TALK TO HIM AFTER FACT. VPR

MILAN B. SKACEL
7301 Kennedy Boulevard
North Bergen, N. J. 07047

October 26, 1989

Amb. Max M. Kampelman
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver
& Jacobson
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Max:

I certainly would have enjoyed hearing your keynote address at the annual dinner of JINSA on November 6.

As you may perhaps recall, however, for the past ten months I have been closely associated with Jim Florio's campaign for governor of New Jersey. The JINSA dinner is on the eve of the election, and there is simply no way for me to get away.

I hope you are well, and I wish you continued success.

All my best.

Sincerely,

Milan

Milan B. Skacel

FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON
SUITE 800
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20004-2505
(202) 639-7000

CABLE "STERIC WASHINGTON"
TELEX 892406
DEX 6500 (202) 639-7008
DEX 6500 (202) 639-7003
DEX 6200 (202) 639-7006
DEX 6200 (202) 639-7004

ONE NEW YORK PLAZA
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10004-1980
(212) 820-8000
TELEX: 620223

725 S. FIGUEROA
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017-5438
(213) 689-5800

3 KING'S ARMS YARD
LONDON, EC2R 7AD, ENGLAND
(01) 600-1541
TELEX: 887606

MAX M. KAMPELMAN
(202) 639-7020

November 9, 1989

Mr. Michael V. Kostiw
Texaco Inc.
1050 17th Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Mr. Kostiw:

You obviously made a favorable impression on some of our firm's young lawyers who were present at the JINSA dinner on Monday evening. I thought I would drop you this note of thanks for your courtesies to them as well as for your very kind words.

All my best.

Sincerely,

Max M. Kampelman

11/6

OK

PENSIAC

Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs
1100-17th Street, N.W.
Suite 330
Washington, D.C.
20036
202-833-0020

29 August 1989

Ambassador Max M. Kampelman
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Max:

On Monday evening 6 November, JINSA will present the Henry M. Jackson Distinguished Service Award to Professor Eugene V. Rostow at our Annual Dinner. We hope to have our previous award recipients in attendance at the event. Your formal invitation will arrive in October, but we thought you would like as much advance notice as we could provide in order to save the date.

We are pleased by the opportunity to honor Gene, as his career has been devoted to security for the United States and a strong relationship between the U.S. and Israel. These principles were fundamental to Scoop Jackson and guide JINSA's work today. We know he would be pleased - as we would - to have you and the other Distinguished Service Award recipients join us on 6 November.

The reception will take place at 6:30 pm and dinner at 7:15 at the Four Seasons Hotel in Washington.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

Shoshana Bryen
Executive Director

SB/mpd

Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA)

1976

JINSA was founded shortly after the '73 Yom Kippur War. During the effort to encourage the wartime resupply of Israel, it had become apparent that the Jewish community had to address general issues of American security concerns and the relationship between U.S. defense and the security of Israel. JINSA was organized to achieve better understanding and communication between the American Jewish community and the foreign policy and defense establishment.

Among JINSA's numerous activities, to promote this vital interaction is an annual trip to Israel for 15-20 eligible American Generals and Admirals. The group meets with the Chiefs of Services, the Minister of Defense, commanders and soldiers in the field, prominent journalists and the top political leadership of Israel. These American officers leave with a much better understanding of the threats to Israeli security, Israel's defensive capabilities and the ways in which Israel can bolster American interests in the Middle East.

JINSA also sponsors a yearly Pentagon "Fly-In". Limited to 50 participants, the Fly-In program provides leaders of the national Jewish community an opportunity to meet with the highest echelon of our military and civilian defense establishment. Participants receive an in-depth look at key U.S. security issues and examine the benefits of a U.S.-Israel strategic partnership.

This year JINSA also inaugurated a lecture series which brings senior Israeli military and foreign policy experts to the states to meet with senior American defense officials. The first lecture was presented by Defense Minister Yitzhak Rabin.

In addition to these programs, JINSA publishes a monthly newsletter Security Affairs, hosts meetings in Washington and around the country with national security experts, provides a speakers bureau and recently sponsored a trip to Israel, focusing on security issues, for JINSA members.

In 1973 the perception in the Pentagon was that Israel was of limited value in helping to protect American interests in the Middle East. Today, that perception has changed dramatically. JINSA is hopeful that the role it has played in advancing this recognition of U.S.-Israel mutual interests concerns will continue to contribute to the security of Israel and the preservation of U.S. interests in the Middle East.

PFUPIC

JINSA

AGENDA

Annual Dinner, Washington, D.C., November 6, 1989

Reception - 6:30 p.m.
Dinner - 7:15 p.m.

2 Mins.	Mr.Dick.....	Welcome Acknowledgements
1 Mins.	Mr. Dick.....	Intro. Gen. Donald Babers
4-5 Mins.	General Babers.....	JINSA Officer's Trip
	Mr. Dick.....	Thank General Babers Call Rabbi Fishman to podium
1 Minute	Rabbi Fishman.....	Invocation & Ha Moetzi

Dinner - 45 Minutes

2 Minutes	Dr. Goldmuntz.....	Intro. Amb. Kampelman
// 10-15 Mins.	Amb. Kampelman.....	Keynote Address
2-3 Mins.	Mr. Cohen.....	Thank Amb. Kampelman Presentation of award to Prof. Rostow
5-10 Mins.	Prof. Rostow.....	Response
1-2 Mins.	Mr. Dick.....	Close dinner

Total Running time of Program with Dinner - 1 hour 40 minutes

NOTE: There will not be a dais. Participants will be seated at three front tables.

Participants:
Mr. Melvin Cohen, Dinner Chairman
Mr. Jerome Dick, Dinner Chairman
Lt.General Donald Babers
Rabbi Lyle Fishman-Cong. Or Kodesh
Dr. Lawrence Goldmuntz
Amb. Max Kampelman
Prof. Eugene Rostow

This program has been planned to run smoothly and with dispatch. All participants are respectfully urged to stay within their allotted time frames.

Thank You!

Marsha Halteman

11/6/89

Dear Sharon:

this guy sat next to me at dinner last night. He said he knew Max when he (Kostin) was in the State Department. He's very interested in current developments in the Soviet Union, and may be interested in retaining us for advice. Would it be worth Max's giving him a call?

thanks,

TJ