



## 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).

Remarks by  
Max M. Kampelman  
Chief, U.S. Delegation  
Plenary Session, CSCE

Madrid

March 12, 1982

---

Mr. Chairman:

Our meeting in Madrid has been a difficult one. The current session which we are now closing has been a particularly sad one. The disturbing vibrations emanating from East-West tensions have clearly affected our deliberations. We end this phase of our meetings today fully conscious that the Helsinki Process is in danger.

Our meeting opened in September 1980 under the shadow of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the continued armed occupation of that nation. Each passing week of that meeting and of the main meeting which began in November of that year brought with it new tensions as we perceived Soviet behavior which could only be interpreted as disdain, if not defiance, of the Helsinki Final Act.

Soviet repression of human rights has taken place on a scale unsurpassed in recent years. During the period of our Madrid sessions there have been at least 248 new political arrests, most of them individuals attempting to exercise their religious rights. Fifty-two members of the Soviet Helsinki Watch Committees are in prison or in internal exile, fifteen of them having been imprisoned since we began our deliberations.

Even while Soviet delegates here were proclaiming their government's allegiance to the human contacts provisions of Basket III, emigration from the Soviet Union kept declining drastically. Last month, for example, fewer than 300 Jews were allowed to leave the Soviet Union, the lowest number in the last twelve years.

The jamming of broadcasts has been intensified--a defiance of the Act, but a useless and a costly gesture in the face of the knowledge that oppressors can no longer be hidden from the eyes of the outside world.

And then there was Poland. During the first week of this phase of our meetings, a month ago, nearly twenty foreign ministers spoke here, the largest such gathering since the Helsinki Agreement was signed in 1975. However differently and

eloquently they chose their words, their message was the same: The Soviet Union and the Polish authorities must respect and adhere to their commitments under the Helsinki Final Act if this meeting is to attain its objectives.

It is no wonder that we have been unable to proceed with our work on a substantive and balanced concluding document. The citizens of my country and of many others question the wisdom, the desirability and the responsibility of accepting new Helsinki Final Act promises from those who do not live up to their old promises of 1975.

But the conflict and the tension and the disdain are not all that can be said about our meeting. We are making a decision today to bring this phase of our meeting to an end. But we are also making a decision to reconvene on November 9, and that is significant. We do so, I suggest, because we appreciate the value of our dialogue. Our discussions are important in themselves. Understanding does not always produce agreement, but agreement is not possible without prior understanding.

We talk here, we have stayed here, we will return here, we try, we propose, we decry, and we try again. We do so because the stakes for us are the blessings of peace. These are stakes too precious for us to abandon. We therefore work to preserve the process. We work in spite of the frustrations, the disappointment, the lengthy meetings, the argumentation, and even the occasional personal calumnies that regrettably appear to be an inevitable part of the exchange.

The objective of our effort is peace.

Peace is a complicated idea. It is the supreme achievement of statesmanship. In one limited sense, it is the absence of war, and that in itself is a cherished goal. But in an important sense, however, it must be more than that. It must be a network of relationships based on order, on cooperation, and on law if it is to be lasting.

History, I am confident, will proclaim the Helsinki Final Act as one of our century's most important milestones on the path to peace. Its distinction is that it has established a set of standards, attested to by the signatures of all our Heads of State, whose fulfillment is indispensable to the achievement of peace.

Our modern age of diplomacy has been characterized by the striving for arms control agreements. These are important.

On our own agenda has been a conference on confidence-building measures to deal with our concerns over surprise military attack. Conscientious observance of the Helsinki Final Act, however, may well prove to be of greater importance in the search for peace. The disarmament agreements after the First World War did not prevent the Second World War. The SALT I Agreement and the SALT II Negotiations did not prevent the worst decade of the Cold War or halt the extraordinary buildup of the world's nuclear arsenal. We must seize every opportunity to negotiate for arms control and arms reduction. But the achievement of peace requires more.

The unique ingredient of the Helsinki Final Act is that it reflects the integrated totality of our relationships. The commitment to human rights, which all of us assumed in 1975, is as necessary to peace as is our commitment to respect one another's borders and to refrain from the use of force against any state. The emphasis of the Act on cultural and scientific exchange, human contacts, trade, emigration and the reunification of families represents essential components in the weaving of the fabric of peace.

The standards of the Helsinki Final Act are based on the principle that the human being is the center of it all. Our quest for peace is to preserve the human being and the civilization he is continuing to build. Alexander Solzhenitsyn said it this way:

"It is high time to remember that we belong first and foremost to humanity, and that man has separated himself from the animal world by thought and by speech. These, naturally, should be free. If they are put in chains, we shall return to the state of animals."

All of us and our societies fall short of our aspirations. We grow by stretching to reach them. Our own delegation has noted our own shortcomings. We have not hidden our faults. But we strive to fulfill our responsibilities to our ideals and to the Helsinki Final Act, and we are immensely proud of our accomplishments.

We are pleased at the fruits of our economic system, even with its occasional inadequacies; and we have confidence in our political and social systems. We know our strengths. We also know that six decades after a revolution that promised bread and freedom, the Soviet Union and its people enjoy neither. The search for a more abundant life for the many in the Soviet Union has yielded to the accumulation of military, political and police power in the hands of a few.

We need no walls, no rigid bureaucratic regulations, no threats of punishment to keep our people from leaving our shores. Millions come to us to become American citizens. I suspect that those who build walls of brick and paper know full well that a large number of their citizens would choose our way of life, the way of democracy and liberty, were they given the chance.

Our differing systems, Mr. Chairman, are realities with which we live and with which we must learn to continue to live. The Helsinki Final Act recognizes that we must interrelate with one another in peace. The competition between the systems, to the extent that it exists, must be one without violence if our objectives of peace and security are to be achieved. Our deep concern is that Soviet behavior puts in doubt its commitment to this essential ingredient of the Helsinki Final Act's formula for peace.

A few days ago, the distinguished head of the Yugoslav delegation made an impressive talk here, a portion of which made an important contribution to this discussion. In referring to the Yalta Agreement, he said that the Helsinki Final Act establishes a principle which rejects the notion of "spheres of influence." On New Year's Day, President Mitterrand of France, in a similar message, stated that it was time to consider "getting out of Yalta."

Historians frequently refer to the "myth" of Yalta. They say that to equate Yalta with spheres of influence is to misread history. The Yalta Agreement was based on the assumption that the peoples of Eastern Europe were to be guaranteed free elections so that they might choose their own governments and those governments would then be free to select their own alliances. That did not take place.

The partition of Europe along predetermined lines cannot and should not become a permanent part of our geopolitics. The myth of Yalta, together with its concomitant so-called "Brezhnev Doctrine," is a danger to peace. It stands in the way of necessary peaceful change and can only, if it remains, produce later upheavals which will threaten our stability, in the East as well as in the West. Change will come. Its winds will reach us as inevitably as do the winds of the seasons. It will come to the East as it comes to all of us, because life requires change. The great challenge is whether that change can come peacefully.

The provisions of the Helsinki Final Act were accepted by all thirty-five of us here, signed individually by each state.



There was no separate set of undertakings based on whether we were East or West. There were no two standards. The sovereignty recognized by the Act was the sovereignty of thirty-five nations whose independence was not modified by "spheres of influence."

Those of us who have faith in our societies and have a commitment to peace must find ways to harmonize with one another as we strive to accommodate our systems to the movements of civilization. I suggest that orthodox rigidities, ponderous military machines, and nightmarish fears produce heavy weights which inhibit the movement toward harmonization and accommodation so necessary for peace. Those so imprisoned by their immobility will be condemned by history.

Rulers who fear the people they govern end up fearing one another, fearing their nightmares, fearing the unknown, fearing the future, fearing for themselves and their states. They then try to instill fear in others. But fear does not produce loyalty. Affection and pride in one's government and in one's society must be earned by respect, not by fear. Peace cannot evolve in an atmosphere of fear. That, too, is a lesson implicit in the Helsinki Final Act.

The striving for economic and social liberty is on the agenda of the 20th and 21st Centuries; it joins the striving for political liberty which began in the 18th and 19th Centuries and continues today on its steady path. To believe that the economic and social needs of people can be achieved without political liberty, or that bread and circuses will satisfy peoples and make them forget about their need for liberty, is to make a serious miscalculation. To believe that political liberty can survive alongside economic and social deprivation is to be guilty of a similar grievous error. My own government is fully aware that these political, social and economic goals are complementary. To regard them as antithetical undermines and endangers our search for peace.

I dwell upon this because of a real concern that must be aired and considered. Those heavily influenced by the teachings of Lenin look upon the interests of the East and the West as irreconcilable. This belief in historic "irreconcilability" is incompatible with the stark reality of the nuclear age. I suggest that it requires earnest reconsideration. We reject the notion that world peace can be assured only after "just wars." To believe that only the ultimate defeat of capitalism, which will require violence, can bring about a "just peace" is in effect to challenge the Helsinki Final Act and to threaten world peace.

We for ourselves cannot accept declarations of peace as genuine if they are accompanied by a belief in the doctrine that war is a law of history and that there is a duty to prepare for, encourage and fight that war to inevitable victory over the existing order. That philosophy is inconsistent with the objectives and principles of the Helsinki Final Act. It has no place in a world envisaged by the Act. It certainly has no place in a nuclear age. It is a threat to our security and to peace.

I conclude, Mr. Chairman, with some frank observations about the future of our meeting and the prospects for agreement when we reconvene in November.

The concerns of many of us have been fully expressed. The transgressions against the Helsinki Final Act which have led to our current impasse have been fully documented. The only response has been an attempt to drown this conference with empty exhortations to work. But the sole objective of these urgings has been to make us forget the oppressive reality that has been imposed upon us by the Soviet Union. We do not forget that our commitment to genuine security and cooperation in Europe does not permit us to be lured by offers of easy but empty agreement, an agreement that would be dishonored at the moment of its signing.

The objective of the American delegation is to achieve agreement if we can thereby strengthen and advance our mutual security and our objective of peace and cooperation in Europe. We patiently await developments; we await concrete actions; only these will justify our renewed energies toward agreement when we meet again. To be offered only the narcotic of words while continued violence is perpetrated against the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act cannot produce the agreement we seek.

In the regrettable event that we cannot reach an agreement when we reconvene in the autumn, there will be only one reason for our inability to do so. It will be the fact of continued and repeated severe violations of the Helsinki Final Act. It will be due to the continued use of Soviet military power to subjugate its neighbors--directly, as in Afghanistan; and by blatant pressure which forces others to choose repression rather than compromise and conciliation, as was their method of dealing with the aspirations of the Polish people for greater freedom and dignity.

We seek the substantive concluding document that we and so many here have worked so long to achieve. We believe that RM.39, proposed to us by the eight Neutral and Nonaligned States after laborious and conscientious effort, can well provide the basis for such an agreement, amended, as it must be, by proposals that have already been noted, and supplemented, as it should be, by a reflection of what has transpired here since the paper was prepared.

Our delegation in November will be ready to continue the effort to achieve genuine security, cooperation and peace among all our peoples. We genuinely urge those who have jeopardized the work of this conference to take the necessary steps outside of this meeting that would permit the active and serious negotiation toward the constructive completion of our work in Madrid.

What we ask here is nothing more and nothing less than a genuine effort to comply with the Helsinki Final Act. We do not seek argument. What we seek is a joint and a genuine effort for peace.

Thank you.