



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.

333 K - Speeches

"EAST AND WEST: HOW TO ACHIEVE PEACE"

REMARKS BY
MAX M. KAMPELMAN
UNIVERSITY OF TROMSOE
NORWAY
SEPTEMBER 10, 1982

My congratulations to all of you at the University of Tromsøe on your anniversary. My thanks to all of you for giving me this opportunity to discuss the subject of war and peace. It is also good to be in Tromsøe. I spent many years of my life teaching at the University of Minnesota, surrounded by Norwegians. I feel comfortable here.

The yearning for peace has been a distinguishing characteristic of the human race since the beginning of recorded history. And yet the vestiges of Man's other nature, that of conflict and struggle, remain strong.

Science has enriched us with profound knowledge and we are on the verge of even greater discoveries about ourselves and how to control and adjust to our surroundings. But we still do not have the wisdom to use that knowledge for peace. We have learned a great deal about life, but pitifully little about how to live with each other.

We continue to hate and fear and war with one another. Thus, even as we stand on the verge of a brave new world for mankind, we also stand on the precipice of a doomsday calamity for mankind.

The United States and Russia have much in common. The values which so many describe as Western have been strengthened

throughout history by Russian thinkers. Our two countries are both continental, sprawling across a vast landmass. We are both traditionally explorers, settlers, cossacks and cowboys, of many nationalities and ethnic backgrounds. Millions of Americans come from Russian stock. We have never fought a war with each other and were allies in the largest foreign war in which either of us has ever been engaged. And yet today, we glare at each other with an intensity of suspicion that must be understood if we are to join hands with mankind in an earnest search for peace.

For the sake of that understanding, it is vital to address the fundamental differences between Democracy and Soviet Communism; but with the determination that these differences should be resolved by the force and effective application of ideas and not by guns or soldiers or nuclear bombs.

Democracy, with its spiritual roots in the religious principles of human brotherhood, is based on the importance of the individual.

The Soviet system, with its origins in Marx and Lenin, is based on collective values, the "proletariat", the "party", the "state"; with their view of history justifying the subordination of the individual to this larger collective good. Thus, during our Madrid meetings, when I mentioned Andrei Sakharov, Anatoly Shcharansky, Helsinki monitors and other political and religious prisoners in jails, psychiatric hospitals, exile and camps, my colleague from the Soviet Union responded that they were "criminals", "scum", "throw-

aways of Soviet society".

These differences are fundamental. But they do not justify war, particularly in our nuclear age. We must find a satisfactory way of living with one another in peace.

Our peoples worked together in a strong alliance during World War II. We had a common foe. We were successful. Americans hoped that our common effort would mellow the harsh ideology of the early Soviet revolutionaries. We knew that Lenin's teachings urged the need to wage war against us as a "bourgeois" society; and that Stalin, as the Soviet system later revealed, was a brutal dictator. But we understood that the welfare of all of us depended upon our striving for "one world".

President Roosevelt was heartened by Yalta, which reaffirmed the "right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live". In the case of Poland, there was a specific pledge that "free and unfettered elections would be held as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and accurate ballot."

But our hopes were soon shattered. Stalin, who once wrote that "good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds", installed his own regime in Warsaw and used his armies to occupy all of Eastern Europe. The iron curtain was lowered. Europe was divided. Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968 demonstrated Soviet readiness to use its growing military strength to maintain control over its neighboring peoples.

NATO came into being as a defensive alliance in response to this forceful division. It has been a successful alliance, contributing to European stability for 33 years, the longest period of peace in Europe's history. But military deterrence, indispensable as it is to discourage adventurism, is not enough to achieve lasting peace.

The theory was advanced during intense discussion in my country that the growing Soviet arms program was a reaction to our own and that if we set an example of arms reduction, they would follow suit. A national policy was, therefore, begun based on the assumption that the long term interest of peace required the United States voluntarily to forego its military superiority. Within that context, the United States witnessed with interest the call by Soviet Chairman Brezhnev for a Conference on European Security. Mr. Brezhnev's initial thought was to exclude the United States from this conference, but that demand was unacceptable to Europe and the Helsinki Final Act was signed in 1975.

Peace is a complicated idea. It is the supreme purpose of statesmanship. In one limited sense it is the absence of war; and that in itself is a cherished goal. But the Helsinki Final Act recognized that peace must be a network of relationships based on order and on cooperation if it is to be lasting. The commitment to human rights is as necessary to peace as is the commitment to respect borders and to refrain from the use of force against any state. This formula for the relaxation of tension was for us the essence of "detente".

To our disappointment it soon became clear that "detente" as interpreted by Soviet authorities permitted their continued use of force to advance Soviet interests. We saw "detente" become a propaganda weapon and a camouflage rather than a set of principles to guide international behavior and achieve peace.

The principles of Helsinki were adopted for all of our peoples, regardless of our social systems. The men and women of Europe do not possess human rights because they are members of this or that social system. They possess human rights and the right to live in peace because of the "inherent dignity of the human person". The "Brezhnev Doctrine", which justifies military aggression to protect or advance Soviet ideology, imperils world peace.

In spite of Mr. Brezhnev's signature on the Helsinki Final Act:

-- There are today more than 100,000 Soviet troops in Afghanistan, where they do not belong, brutalizing the people of that society. Afghanistan casts a dark shadow over our relationship and over the prospects of peace. It threatens European security.

-- Western radio broadcasts are being jammed in violation of the Helsinki Act. Let me parenthetically note that Soviet broadcasts to the United States average, I am told, 222 hours per week and have never been jammed.

-- The rate of Jewish and other emigration from the Soviet Union has declined to a record low in 1982 fewer than 180 per month; and the heartless harassment of those who

apply for exit permits continues. The recent photographs of Soviet citizens on hunger strikes because of the refusal by Soviet authorities to permit them to join their husbands, wives and children in other countries are shameful reminders of Soviet cruelty and cynical contempt for Helsinki.

-- During the very period of our Madrid sessions, there were more than 250 new political and religious arrests, at least 127 since January. Among those arrested during our meeting was a courageous lady of 75 years of age, Oksana Meshko, a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Watch Group, who has since been shuttled back and forth between psychiatric hospitals and prison. During this same period a court in Odessa ordered that two young children, ages 4 and 12, of Baptist Marie Drumova be removed from her custody on the ground that she was giving her children a religious upbringing.

-- And then there is Poland, where Soviet threats led to the imposition of martial law; arbitrary detentions and beatings; interference with the free flow of information, ideas and people; repression of civil liberties; military control at the work place; violence against Polish workers and their trade union, Solidarity.

With all of this human repression and military aggression, the Soviet Union continues to use the rhetoric of peace. But they are only words used as a weapon of a propaganda war. We wait for the deeds.

Let me assure you that the United States looks at the world realistically. We do not work to undermine the security

of any other state. We wish to join the Soviet Union as partners in a genuine and joint effort to achieve security and cooperation among us all. But we cannot permit the Soviet Union to propagate its faith by the sword.

No state has special rights. All states, particularly the largest and strongest of us, have special responsibilities. The United States and the Soviet Union have the burden that comes from power. We ask from the Soviet Union only that which they have committed to perform, that which is possible and necessary for peace. If the Soviet Union will only ponder and act upon the implications of its Afghanistan aggression; if martial law will be replaced by dialogue in Poland; if families are permitted to reunite; if advocates of human rights are respected as such and released from prisons and psychiatric hospitals; if emigration restrictions become tinged with humanity; if, indeed, we could see a genuine effort to live up to the Helsinki commitments -- peace would be closer at hand.

We also have the responsibility to create confidence. This includes the negotiation of verifiable and significant arms reduction agreements. We have made three serious arms reduction proposals now being negotiated in Vienna and Geneva. But, disarmament agreements do not by themselves produce peace. We bitterly learned they did not prevent World Wars II. SALT I was followed by an unprecedented Soviet nuclear arms buildup. During the 1971-1978 period, while we reduced our defense spending in real terms by 2.7% on an average

each year, the Soviet Union engaged in the most massive military buildup in the history of the world. During this period of so-called "detente", while our defense spending declined 25%, the Soviets increased theirs by 40%. This is in our minds.

The fundamental competition between Democracy and Soviet Leninism should take place in the fora of ideas and performance and not through the use of military force. I suggest that those who resort to force portray their lack of confidence in the merits as well as the historic inevitability of their cause.

Let our societies serve as models to test which of our systems best meets the needs of our people. That kind of competition can help us all. The competition of armaments and the use of coercion and aggression has the potential of destroying us all.

If our critics wish to condemn us for our unemployment, fine. It may help us to perform better in meeting the needs of our people.

If they wish to condemn us for the vestiges of racism that remain in our societies, good. Racism is incompatible with our values.

And we will repeat our abhorrence of Soviet military aggression and human repression.

We in America do not shrink from the competition of ideas. We are as free to read the works of Marx and Lenin as to read the works of Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson. All of these works are readily available in our bookstores and in our

libraries as they are in yours. We are as free to vote Communist as to vote Republican. We are as free to listen to Radio Moscow as to our own networks.

Our ultimate task for peace is to find unity within our diversity. The human ingredient is common to us all. We must recognize that just as the left and right sides of the brain are united in one fragile human mind, so are the hemispheres, the continents and the nation states, left and right, united in one planet.

This is a simple truth, but far from a simple task.

We want to forge a joint effort for peace and understanding. But we do not know whether the Soviet Union shares that objective with us. The words of Lenin contribute in a major way to the complexity of our task. His belief in the historic "irreconcilability" of our systems is incompatible with the stark reality of the nuclear age. The notion that "a just peace" can be assured only after "just wars" joins the "Brezhnev Doctrine" as challenges to the Helsinki Final Act and as threats to world peace.

We find it difficult to accept declarations of peace as genuine if they are accompanied by a belief in the doctrine that war is a law of history, with a duty to prepare for, encourage and fight that war to inevitable victory. In that connection, let me quote from a statement by Soviet Chief of the General Staff Obarkov last January. "The party and government are guided by the well-known instructions of V. I. Lenin that 'we should accompany our steps toward peace with

maintaining maximum military preparedness, under no circumstances disarming our army'." That philosophy has no place in a nuclear age. It is a threat to the security of my country, your country and the Soviet Union. It must be dismissed as a relic of history.

Peoples seek freedom from hunger, but they also seek freedom from tyranny. This is a lesson which is becoming increasingly evident throughout Eastern Europe. The objectives of human dignity in all of our human relationships -- political, economic, and sociological -- are indispensable for the achievement of peace.

I conclude with a Norwegian proverb; "Heroism consists of hanging on for one minute longer".

Let us be patient and thereby heroic. Let us not lower our standards and accept less than peace with liberty. Let us not mistake the silence of intimidation for peace. Our human values and our aspirations for peace are universal. The Norwegian people want peace. The American people want peace. The peoples of the Soviet Union who lost 20 million human lives during the last war want peace. With determination, unity and consistency of purpose, with patience, with a deep conviction that we live up to our commitment we can and must reach that goal.

Thank you.

JS

in K - speeches
Rev 13

CLOSING DEBATE COMMENTS
BY
MAX M. KAMPELMAN
UNIVERSITY OF TROMSOE
NORWAY
SEPTEMBER 10, 1982

I enthusiastically thank the students, faculty and administration of the University of Tromsøe for making this interesting debate possible. I know we all look to the day when a free debate such as this can take place in the Soviet Union. It would bring peace closer.

The United States has no apologies to make for our steadfastness in the pursuit of peace, for our standard of living, for our performance in human rights, and for the capacity of our agricultural and industrial organization to meet the needs of our people. We are pleased with and have confidence in our system, in spite of its occasional inadequacies. We are certain of 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 in the West need no walls, no rigid bureaucratic regulations and no threats of punishment to keep our people from leaving our shores. 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, the way of peace, were they given the chance.

While men and women throughout the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe clamor to escape from the repression of their societies -- the war within -- we find millions of men and women from all over the world seeking to enter our shores and become Americans. In 1977, nearly 500,000 such people joined us; in 1978, it was more than 600,000; and more than a million and a half since. This practical expression of confidence provides us with an assurance that our course toward peace and liberty is the right one.

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 they then try to instill fear in others. But fear does not produce loyalty. Affection and pride in one's system of government must be earned by respect and not by fear. Fear, furthermore, is an enemy of peace.

There is no need to fear. There is a need to build for peace and understanding. It is appropriate that we have faith in our respective systems, but that faith must not blind us to the concerns of the rest of us if we are to achieve peace and understanding.

I recently heard the brief tale of two young shepherds, Peter and Ivan, who often grazed their flocks side by side. One day Peter said, "Ivan, my friend, we work with each other and we are good friends, but do you love me as a brother?"

"Of course I do" said Ivan. Peter went on: "Tell me Ivan, do you know what gives me pain?"

"How can I know what gives you pain" replied Ivan.

Peter sighed: "If you do not know what gives me pain, how can you say you that you are my brother?"

In our search for peace, we must come to understand what causes one another pain and tension. In that search, we must find ways to harmonize our systems, with one another and with the movements of civilization. Orthodox rigidity, ponderous military machines and nightmarish fears produce heavy weights which inhibit the movement toward harmonization and peace.

My country is charged with seeking "confrontation" when we state what causes us pain and concern. We are charged with interfering in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union when we note brutalities and other human rights transgressions. That is a misconception. We do not have the power to interfere. We do not interfere. We do have the right and the duty to observe, to evaluate, and, if necessary, to criticize a lack of commitment to agreements made. To withhold our observation, our evaluation, our criticism and our concerns is to make understanding impossible. Without understanding, there can be no peace. To withhold our criticism under the Helsinki Final Act is to mean that we do not take the Act and its commitments seriously. It would be a gross disservice to the cause of peace.

The United States and its allies in NATO are fully joined together in crying out for a drastic joint reduction in the terrible burden of arms spending and in the tensions produced by the massive instruments of death within our control. We want peace and understanding with the Soviet Union. We would like to believe this is also the objective of Soviet policy. I have tried to communicate the reasons for our doubts so that Dr. Arbatov might himself understand them and communicate them to his authorities.

When we see that the invasion of Afghanistan and the aggression against the people of Poland are coming to an end, then we will come to believe in the good faith of the Soviet Union's words for peace.

When we see the Soviet Union cease the relentless flexing of its muscles in order to intimidate others, then we will come to believe the words.

When we see the Soviet Union begin to reflect the warmth and compassion of its Russian heart in dealing with the human rights of its people, then we will believe the words.

We say to the Soviet authorities: "Listen to your people, listen to your workers, listen to your artists, poets, and writers who plead for dignity and emancipation from the depths of their souls. Do not put them away in prisons, in mental hospitals and in exile. Their voices will not thereby be stilled. Their voices will rather be heightened and sharpened with the contrast you create. The people have much to teach you and to teach us all. They know that the true worth of a

nation is not in its massive military forces. It is in the welfare and liberties of its people."

When Andrei Sakharov was awarded the Nobel Prize the citation read: "For him it is a fundamental principal that world peace can have no lasting value unless it is founded on respect for the individual human being in society". Andrei Sakharov should not be a symbol of discord between East and West. Andrei Sakharov should be the means by which we congratulate the Russian people whose culture and history and ideals gave him to humanity. This three-time recipient of his government's award as a "Hero of Socialist Labor", who is also a hero throughout the civilized world, should become the symbol of unity which unites our societies on the path to peace.

Thank you.

JS