



## 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](http://www.mnhs.org/copyright).

MAX M. KAMPELMAN  
SUITE 800  
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004-2505

January 29, 1991

Ambassador Diana Lady Dugan  
Center for Strategic & International  
Studies  
1800 K Street, N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Diana:

I have just returned from a week in California to find your publication on "Broadcast Diversity in Eastern Europe" on my desk. I was pleased to receive it, but most unhappy about the fact that my talk was published without letting me edit it first. That has never previously happened to me. I was not at all aware that you intended to publish the talk as delivered. I learned a long time ago that it is quite different to deliver a speech than to have it read in printed form. In this case, I found grammatical errors and errors of other sorts as well as sentences that might have sounded good to an audience, but certainly don't read well at all. It seems to me Diana, that the appropriate thing to do is to fully inform the speaker that his remarks will be published and preferably then give the speaker an opportunity to make corrections on the text that comes out of the recording equipment. I am terribly sorry that this practice was not followed in my case.

Sincerely,

  
Max M. Kampelman

MMK:gs  
cc: Leonard Marks, Esq.

# **BROADCAST DIVERSITY IN EASTERN EUROPE**

## **Challenges for the 1990's**

This symposium is part of the two year International Communications Studies' Global Studio Project which commenced in the fall of 1990. It was hosted in conjunction with the formal launching of the International Media Fund. The following report includes edited highlights of over 600 pages of transcript.

Ambassador Diana Lady Dougan, Chair  
Michael O'Hara Garcia, Project Director  
Frederic Engel, European Fellow  
Nicholas Stevens, Research Assistant



**International Communications Studies Program**

**"Some Observations on Communications  
and Democracy"**

Luncheon Address by

**Max Kampelman**

**Chairman of the U.S. Delegation to the  
Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)**

**Introduction by Ambassador Diana Lady DOUGAN**

Ambassador Max Kampelman is one of the most revered senior diplomats in our country. I say that with only a little apology because he has more energy than most of the rest of us have ever had even if he has a few years on a couple of people in the room.

He has headed up America's negotiations in a variety of critically important areas. He has most recently headed the U.S. delegation to the negotiations on nuclear arms in space in Geneva. He is also Chairman of Freedom House and Chairman of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Association. He is a distinguished lawyer, diplomat, educator, and he was one of the founders of our own educational broadcasting station here in Washington. And, I might add, he also moderated "Washington Week in Review" and I believe was one of its principal architects, as well.

His role as Chairman of the U.S. Delegation to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, we believe, is extremely relevant to today's symposium.

The CSCE process is one that is essentially better known in Eastern Europe than it is in the United States. And it has only really been within the last year that there is a sense of its long term potential as a focal point in the broader and new context of Eastern Europe.

While many are aware of the Helsinki Accords in the context of security and human rights, little attention has been paid to its commitments regarding communication. The Helsinki accords and its recognition of the "rights of individuals to receive and transmit information regardless of national borders" is very important to the press and to anyone who values personal freedom. I have asked Ambassador Kampelman to join us today, first, as one of our most senior and respected diplomats in the United States and, second, as one of our most eloquent and effective champions of press freedom. Please join me in welcoming Ambassador Max Kampelman. Ambassador Max Kampelman is one of the most revered senior diplomats in our country. I say that with only a little apology because he has more energy than most of the rest of us have ever had even if he has a few years on a couple of people in the room.

The Helsinki accords and its recognition of the rights of individual to receive and transmit information across borders is very important to the press and to anyone who values personal freedom. We have asked Ambassador Kampelman to come today, first, as one of our most senior and respected diplomats in the United States and, second, as one of our most eloquent and effective champions of press freedom. Please join me in welcoming Ambassador Max Kampelman.

**Ambassador Max KAMPELMAN**

Thank you, Diana.

Perhaps it is best if I start by my telling you of an incident that experienced during the time

of the Madrid meetings of the Helsinki Final Act. While I was there, I noticed a news report to the effect that a man by the name of Josef Mendelevitch...I remember the name vividly...was just released from the Soviet jails. This was in the early 1980s. ~~And he~~ had been in jail as a dissident for 11 years. ~~And the~~ newspapers reported that he had been released and ~~he~~ had gone to Israel.

It so happened that later that week I left Madrid in order to come back to the States where I was scheduled to speak at a luncheon in New York. ~~So~~ I went to the hotel where the luncheon took place, ~~and~~ came a little early and went up to the dais to see where I would be sitting, ~~and~~ I noticed the name plate. ~~And, of course~~ I was curious to see who would be sitting near me. ~~And~~ I looked and next to me was the name plate of Mr. Mendelevitch. I thought to myself, it could not possibly be the same individual who just two or three days earlier had gotten released, ~~and the report was he~~ had gone to Israel and had been in jail 11 years. I thought ~~maybe it was~~ a brother or a relative of some kind and I sat down waiting, ~~and~~ then a gentleman came over and saw Mendelevitch and sat down and he looked to see who was sitting next to him, saw my name, looked at me, turned to me, kissed me, and started talking about the Madrid meetings ~~and~~ expressing appreciation for what the United States was doing on behalf of the victims of Soviet repression. And I, surprised that he was there, said to him, Mr. Mendelevitch, tell me, you have been in jail for 11 years. How do you know about these things that have been taking place in Madrid?

I will never forget the response in kind of broken English: "We in the jails, we know." And as we discussed it, it was very clear: Radio Liberty, BBC, Deutsche Welle, KohlIsrael, all of these radio broadcasts permeated that society. ~~And I~~ concluded then, of course, ~~that~~ how can a totalitarian society survive if it does not have a monopoly of information? And can a totalitarian society or any society have a monopoly of information with the developments of modern technology in the communications field?

I think we are here today within that context. We are within the context of experiencing, and I know it is trite to say, we are living in a changing world. ~~Every place you go, people tell you that we are living in a changing world. And we are, of course. But the fact of the matter is,~~ the changes in communication, technology and science have produced changes that decidedly have a political influence and not just an influence within their own parameters of power.

It might be useful if we could spend a few moments putting this communication development and the changing world politically which we are all observing within a context.

In order for us fully to understand the political developments that are taking place in the world, we need to be aware of the scientific and technological changes that have preceded these political changes.

I am convinced in my own mind that the changes that we have seen are insignificant compared to the changes that we are yet to experience in the field of science and technology and I want to say a few words about that.

Let us take my own lifetime. We who are living today have probably in our own lives experienced greater change than any other generation of the human race except, possibly, and I am not an expert in this, during the time fire was discovered.

Let us take the things we today fully appreciate and take for granted. I can tell you that in my day and in the early days of many in this room, we did not have vitamin tablets; we did not have antibiotics; we did not have trans-Atlantic airplanes; we did not have air mail. I recall in my home we did not have a refrigerator; we had ice boxes. ~~And we could spend an interesting evening with everybody.~~ No frozen foods. We could spend an interesting evening with everybody contributing to the list of things which in one lifetime have evolved that we are now taking for granted and that have serious and dramatic consequences on the way we live.

WE CAN

~~I would then add and say to you that you~~ <sup>FURTHER</sup> translate that, ~~for example,~~ into medical knowledge, ~~which has its effect on human lives.~~ I understand that medical knowledge has increased in the last century more than tenfold. I must say, I am not sure how one arrives at figures like this, but this is what experts say. Experts say that more than 80 percent of all the scientists who ever lived in the world are alive today. There are more than 100,000 journals, scientific journals, reporting on the discoveries that the world of science is coming up with daily all over the world.

~~And I guess~~ <sup>T</sup> this is why I say it is only the beginning. And we all know that biotechnological processes that have been evolving have a direct impact on our lives, on our births, on our deaths, even our methods of reproduction, ~~and our ability to predict on reproduction.~~

In many ways one could argue that what has been happening in the world of politics is an effort to catch up with the world of science and the world of technology. Using a phrase I remember that Henry Adams once used, our knowledge in this field is only a drop and our ignorance of the universe remains an ocean, which is why I suggest to you that there is a great deal more to come and more rapidly than we can possibly imagine.

I read recently in The New York Times a small item that a company in Japan has developed a micro-chip that can have 64 million bits of information on it, on one micro-chip. ~~And you can see, therefore,~~ <sup>MR. FORTIN</sup> the consequences of this ~~will flow decidedly.~~ <sup>AND THEN</sup> Our political and our economic institutions are now suddenly facing these changes, ~~the impact.~~ In economics, for example, in one day, a 24 hour period, more than one trillion dollars gets transferred from one part of the world to another part of the world. That is nearly as much as our total national budget here in the United States. And, of course, the economic consequences of that are very clear.

I was brought up to believe...that necessity is the mother of invention. I suggest to you the corollary may also be true. Necessity is not just the mother of invention, but invention is the mother of necessity. These inventions that we are increasingly becoming conscious of are requiring changes in our economy, as well as in our politics.



I think what we are witnessing politically is an effort to move our political relationships from the dark ages where they have been, ~~and in our lifetime where they have been when we consider the kind of international relations we have also experience in our lifetime.~~ It is an effort to move our political relationships to catch up with the brave new world, ~~really, that has been~~ presented to us by the world of science and the world of technology.

~~Communications play a very important part in this because today,~~ We know that the sound of a whisper or a whimper in any part of the world will instantaneously be heard in all parts of the world. ~~No way to isolate ourselves because of the changes that have taken place in the field of communication.~~

There is no  
The political changes are taking the form of a striving for human dignity, and I believe that, too, is perfectly understandable. ~~And we~~ see this striving for human dignity in all parts of the world: China, Chile, Poland, Paraguay, Soviet Union, Union of South Africa.

I used to teach a course called "Problems of Democracy" and I would give readings to my students. It is amazing how many of the books and articles on democracy that were written and have been written would say that democracy is only fit for the western world, the western civilization...for people who have grown up in our milieu and in our culture. The developments of the last year are showing that is not the case: different cultures, different languages, different backgrounds. In darkest Africa we see the beginnings of change and I suggest to you as an aside that the Middle East cannot escape these forces either and that will have consequences.

Today, Israel is the only democracy in that area. But they are beginning votes now in Algeria, in Tunisia, Egypt, Jordan. Not quite what we would like or not quite with the political party competition that we would like. But I have no doubt in my mind, at least, that ~~that~~ will evolve and that evolution will also produce change. ~~It has to produce change within those societies.~~

You heard that I am Chairman of the Board of Freedom House. Freedom House puts out an annual survey. It is the authoritative survey of freedom in the world. Once a year, we put out an authoritative inventory judging every country in the world on the basis of established academic criteria as to whether the practices, as well as the statutes are consistent with freedom as we define it, and I think we define it well.

The latest survey just came out a few months ago. It shows that 1989 was the freest year in any recordation of developments. Sixty-one countries and 50 territories were called free, governing more than two billion people. That is the largest number of people and it is the largest percentage of people that ~~we think~~ have ever experienced on this globe of ours - freedom as we know it.

In addition, there are 44 countries in which 1.2 billion additional people live with a relatively high, although a lesser degree of freedom.

I am convinced that the trend toward freedom and toward democracy is prompted not only



by a deep inner drive for human dignity which I think we all have. ~~I do not care whether it is a family that lives in darkest Africa,~~ I have no doubt in my mind that parents of ~~that~~ <sup>A</sup> newborn child have aspirations for that child which relate to the concept of human dignity. ~~Now, what happens is, and what has happened, is that~~ <sup>But</sup> practicality injects itself into the picture. What can we really attain? And so, the aspirations get altered and in many areas of the world, the aspirations turn into: "Let's hope he doesn't starve; let's hope there will be enough food."

But, again as a result of communications changes, these people soon learn that maybe an hour away or three hours away there are people enjoying refrigerators and antibiotics and comfortable living. And it is that which leads them to modify and raise their aspirations for their youngsters and it is what raises the aspirations of the young people.

This is why I believe these aspirations are universal and they are producing changes all over the world so that the Statute of Liberty can be found in Peking, as an illustration. Changes in Mongolia, Tibet...

What are governments learning from all of this? Governments are learning that if they want to respond to those aspirations, they must keep up with change. If they want to be part of the technological development which is affecting the world, they must keep up with change and that requires an openness to information and openness to new ideas and it requires also the freedom which enables ingenuity to germinate and to flourish. A closed, tightly-controlled society simply cannot compete in a world which is experiencing an information explosion that knows absolutely no national boundaries.

What we are learning is that national boundaries are being buffeted by change and that the nations of the world are becoming more and more interdependent. We are clearly in a time when no society can isolate itself or its people from new ideas and new information any more 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 and this suggests many changes. In the field in which I have been greatly engaged and now a little less so, the field of diplomacy. It produces changes. We have to reappraise our traditional definitions of sovereignty. The government of Bangladesh, for example, cannot prevent tragic floods in its own country without active cooperation from Nepal and from India. Canada cannot protect itself from acid rain without cooperation from the United States. The Mediterranean, I am told, is polluted by 18 different countries. To deal with that problem requires an interrelationship. ~~And~~ I am convinced that the requirements of our evolving technology are increasingly turning national boundaries into patterns of lace through which flow ideas, money, people, crime, terrorism, ballistic missiles, all of which know no national boundaries.

✓ Now, in response to this, nations are by agreement and perhaps without even fully understanding what they are doing, ~~They~~ are by agreement curtailing their sovereign powers. ~~And~~ many domestic and security matters that were once considered inviolate are today no longer inviolate. ~~But~~ nations are finding their power over them voluntarily being

restricted.

Under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and under the Helsinki Final Act, nations undertake to behave humanely toward their own citizens and they recognize the right of other states to evaluate their behavior.

Let me use an illustration again from personal experience. When I was in Madrid, at CSCE negotiations almost a decade ago, the West, not just the United States, but the west, took the lead in holding Soviet feet to the fire with respect to their violations of the Helsinki Agreement, particularly in the area of human rights, ~~and~~ the response of the Soviets, a firm response, was: "You're interfering in our internal affairs and you've got no right to do that under the Helsinki Final Act, itself." That was 1980...1983. Let me jump to 1986, just two or three years later. The first visit of Shevardnadze to Washington... a meeting with Shultz. We were to spend two days working on all of the areas between the two countries. Shultz invited Shevardnadze into his office on the 7th floor. Some of us joined him. We had hoards of people ready to go to work waiting in the reception areas. We were having coffee...chit-chat. This was the Shultz style; it was effective. Shultz turns to Shevardnadze and says: "Well, we have got people waiting outside waiting to go to work." "Let's see now, what's our agenda," Shevardnadze says. "Oh, we have an agreed agenda. Remember, the first item is human rights..."

Short period. Two years, three years. A recognized area of discussion. No longer, "stop interfering in our internal behavior."

Another experience in government, ~~Arms Control~~ <sup>VERIFICATION</sup>. For years, the great obstacle, as far as we were concerned, was the question of ~~verifying~~. Our experts were telling us, you cannot trust, correct? So you need to verify? Correct. But the only way really to verify is on-site inspection. Soviets for years...on-site inspection...impossible. It is an interference in our sovereignty. You will send CIA agents or what-not. Well, we now have an INF Agreement and it provides for on-site inspection. Again, a violation of traditional ideas of sovereignty.

I have no doubt in my mind but that this is really the beginning of our evaluation as to where we are heading in this brave new world of ours.

Well, I <sup>do</sup> not mean to speak this long other than to say that this field of communications in which we are now today and tomorrow engaged and examining and exploring has to be considered within the context of this whole. The communications revolution has the real potential of bringing democracy to all of us.

I went back to government service this year, <sup>FOR</sup> the month of June. I was asked to head up our delegation to a meeting in Copenhagen under the Helsinki Final Act: Thirty-five countries, all of the countries of Europe except for Albania, plus the United States and Canada. The changes we made in Copenhagen unanimously agreed to because every decision under that process has to be done unanimously.... The changes we made in Copenhagen, in my opinion, are as significant as the original 1975 Agreement itself ~~which broke precedent by talking by human rights~~. Why? Because in Copenhagen ~~what we did~~

~~is we took the 1975 agreement and took a giant step forward by saying that you cannot be assured of human rights and human dignity, which is what we believe is fundamental to European security. -We cannot be assured of that without having democracy.~~

We established two broad areas, one of rule of law. Specific; not just broad terms. Separation of the political party from the judicial system, separation of the prosecutorial from the judicial purpose, the right of an individual to counsel from the time of arrest...nineteen different specific formulations unanimously agreed upon which all of the countries undertook to put into statute and which all of the countries knew if they did not put under statute and if they did not behave in accordance with those rules, they would be accountable at the next meeting, which is the precedent we have now established.

Beyond the rule of law, the second basic principle for democracy that we ~~got~~ established, <sup>was</sup> the principle of political pluralism, free elections, the right of political parties to organize, to have equal access to communication...all of which is vital and some of which you are talking about here in these next few days.

~~So, I think that the timeliness of this subject being discussed now is evident to all of us and. I suggest to you that things develop a great deal faster than we think they are going to develop. This is a fast moving world now. I suggest to you, 10 or 15 years is much too long if you have any kind of an understanding of the processes that are at work.~~

*10/25/89*

I am not suggesting that these trends are particularly inevitable. I am suggesting we have to work to attain them. They are not going to happen simply by the forces of nature. But I think we have the tides working with us. We have ~~got~~ the opportunities now to capitalize on these things and bring about greater dignity to people who for many years have not had the joy of that dignity or the opportunity to exercise that dignity. Thank you very much.



*International Media Fund*

Center for Strategic & International Studies  
Washington, DC

January 7, 1991

The Honorable Max Kampelman  
Chairman, U.S. Delegation, Conference  
on Security and Cooperation in Europe  
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20004

Dear Max,

Enclosed is a complimentary copy of the report from our recent CSIS symposium. (Your luncheon speech was certainly one of the focal points. Thanks again!) The report summarizes and highlights remarks from more than 65 speakers and 600 pages of transcript. I think you may find it a useful reference piece -- and some interesting reading, as well.\*

An active follow-up is already rolling with the many participants who have a keen interest in keeping "the Diversity Network" concept going. Steven Stills, for example, will be pursuing the idea of mentoring the creative side of independent productions in Eastern Europe, and we will be working with foundations on specific project proposals.

We appreciate the additional information and suggestions we have been receiving and hope that you will continue to keep us informed of your concerns and activities. We at CSIS will continue to assist with follow-on activities and strategic analysis to nurture the foundations of broadcast diversity and self-sufficiency. Thanks again for your help in making the symposium such an outstanding success and please stay in touch in the coming months. I hope 1991 brings you a healthy mix of challenge and contentment!

Best personal regards,

Diana Lady Dougan  
Senior Advisor and Chair  
International Communications  
Studies Program

\* your luncheon speech added a very important focus on "democracy & change" - Max will want not have been nearly as effective. I'm delighted it worked out the way it did!

Center for Strategic & International Studies  
Washington, DC

1 February 1991

Dear Max,

I just received your note regarding your luncheon remarks at the "Broadcast Diversity" symposium. Alas, you are indeed owed an apology!

It's not clear how things fell through the cracks, because you were definitely supposed to get a copy to review. Ironically, if I had known, we could have caught the omission when I gave you a copy of the draft report at the December IMF Board meeting.

I realize it may be of little comfort, but a number of people (especially Eastern Europeans) have mentioned how inspired they were by your remarks. Again apologies.

With continuing admiration,

Diana