



## 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).

AS READ

REMARKS BY  
MAX M. KAMPELMAN  
NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL  
AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

OCTOBER 29, 1983

It is a pleasure for me to be meeting with you today. I value my membership and my association with the Committee. Its fierce commitment to American democratic ideals and its deep faith in Jewish values justify its name and its indispensable role on our national scene. No private organization in this century has contributed more over a longer period of time to the strengthening of the American society than has the American Jewish Committee. A significant indication of this vital role on the American scene played by the American Jewish Committee is the presence on this dais of Rita Hauser and Jerome Shestack; and in this audience of Philip Hoffman, all three of whom, together with Morris Abrams and my partner and cherished friend, Dick Schifter, have represented our government at the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations.

It is only seven weeks since Madrid ended, but it is time for me to begin moving the focus of my attention away from the fascinating details and intricacies of those negotiations and direct them to the more significant picture of which Madrid was a part, the intensely troubling East-West relationship.

You have asked me specifically to talk about the outlook for human rights and religious freedom. I will not to ignore that assignment. We all here understand, however, that the

subject matter is only one aspect of the totality of our problems with the Soviet Union.

In recent months, Yuri Andropov, in addressing his Communist Party cadres, urged them to remember that there was a vital battle underway "for the hearts and minds of billions of people on this planet." Madrid was a serious battlefield in that struggle. We were able in that forum, working with a united West, to demonstrate that Soviet violations of the Helsinki standards were threatening the peace and stability of Europe.

In what has been characterized as the most thorough review of the Soviet Union and its crimes against humanity that has ever taken place in an international forum, a united Western group of nations, speaking in many languages but in one voice, documented the Soviet record of slave labor camps; the use of psychiatric hospitals for political punishment; government-sponsored anti-Semitism; armed aggression in Afghanistan and Poland; religious persecution of evangelical Christians, Baptists, Seventh Day Adventists, Pentecostals, Catholics; strangulation of scientific freedom; the decimation of cultural and national heritages; the defiance of agreements against the use of chemical and biological weapons.

The question has been raised by some experts as to whether confrontation is consistent with serious negotiations. Our side has not always been clear on this question. When the U.S. delegation, at Belgrade in 1977, under the leadership of our revered leader Arthur Goldberg, mentioned the names of six victims of Soviet repression, there was great concern as to the

propriety and desirability of such an approach. In Madrid, very much flowing from Arthur's pioneering efforts, the United States was not alone. We were among 14 states to mention the names of dissidents; and a total of 131 victims of repression were mentioned at our meetings. The first state to mention the name of a victim was Sweden, which mentioned Raoul Wallenberg. The first state to discuss Soviet anti-semitism was Belgium.

Negotiation without confrontation, where the objective facts require blunt talk, is not a serious negotiation at all; it is a charade. A purpose of negotiation is obviously to reach agreement. Where difficult issues are involved, however, that agreement may not be possible in the short run. Equally important, therefore, the negotiating process must be used to communicate concerns where they exist, so as to increase the likelihood of agreement in the future. Absent firmness, there is no reason for the other side to take seriously the message we are attempting to convey.

Jerry Shestak is with us today. I had asked him to join our Delegation during our early days and when he came to Madrid I asked him to speak in our behalf at a formal plenary session. With eloquence and specificity, he helped set the tone of our country's message when he said there had to be a human face to "detente" or there was no "detente".

I spoke of a united Western group in Madrid. This was an indispensable condition for whatever effectiveness we demonstrated there. Prior to the opening of Madrid, I made two trips to Europe to meet with our allies and to discuss our approach to

the Madrid meeting. Among the points we made was our decision to mention the names of dissidents. I hoped that, unlike Belgrade, we would be supported and emulated in this approach. You, of course, know from what I have said that, in the main, we were. But my West German colleague said to me that he could not do so. His country's approach, effective with the Soviet Union, he insisted, was to negotiate quietly; and they were in this manner able to obtain the release from behind the Iron Curtain of many whose freedom they sought. (Let me parenthetically state here that this was 1980. The 1979 figures for the release of ethnic Germans was about 50,000; Jewish emigration from the USSR was about 51,000. Today, Soviet Jewry figures are down to about 150 per month; and the ethnic German figures are about the same.)

We continue to talk, and I remember saying that I did not want to recommend any policy which would keep a single human being in bondage who would otherwise be released. But, like a symphony orchestra, someone must bang the drums and blow the trumpet, while somebody else plays the harp or touches the piano keys softly. What is important is that we make music together.

We did make music together at Madrid. This required effort on all of our parts. Our NATO group met three and four times a week, and sometimes three and four times a day when necessary. We consulted on all aspects of the meeting and kept one another fully informed. We worked closely with our neutral friends who shared our values. The West is stronger

in dealing with the Soviet Union when it speaks with one voice and gives one consistent message.

There is today sensitivity within the NATO alliance. Crises are ever present. There is always the potential for divisiveness when 16 free and sovereign states, governed by democratic principles and with differing histories and cultural backgrounds, attempt to formulate common policy. Our task is to raise the vision of the West above the minutiae of our relations, important as they may appear to be at any moment, to the realization that our values are at stake. Let us hope we can prevail in that effort in the face of a massive Soviet onslaught to divide and weaken the alliance.

Let me now make an assertion about dealing with the Soviet Union that is based on conviction and experience. The Soviet Union respects military strength. Its incentive for negotiating an agreement is greater when the positions taken by its negotiating partner have the added dignity of being supported by that military strength.

The leadership of the Soviet Union is serious. Its diplomats are serious and well-trained. The comment of one Soviet diplomat to one of our arms control negotiators: "We are neither philanthropists nor fools" tells much of their seriousness of purpose. Their response in a negotiation is motivated by one primary consideration: their perceived national self-interest.

There is a responsible view in our society which questions the effectiveness and desirability of our negotiating with the Soviet Union. It is troubled that one of the great international

changes of the past decade has been the achievement by the Soviet Union of at least nuclear parity with us. It believes, with good reason, that the Soviet Union remains committed to the Leninist principle that violence is both necessary and justified in the pursuit of their Communist destiny.

Thus, the Soviet Union -- an aggressive society seeking, with its massive military and police power, to expand its influence; and a repressive society determined to defend its totalitarian power, whatever the human cost -- is today the major threat to our security and values.

This view has no confidence in the bona fides of Soviet protestations for disarmament and peace. It knows that after the Second World War, while we and our allies rapidly demobilized, the Soviet Union preferred to keep its troops on a wartime footing, maintaining a large conscript army and large reserve forces. It knows that as we disarmed, the Soviets engaged in the most massive military build-up in the history of the world.

It is not useful to deny this reality. The task is, rather, how constructively to face this reality. I suspect that we and our friends who value freedom will pay a heavy price and suffer great anguish as we come to grips with this challenge. The integrity and character and strength of our society and of our people will undergo the greatest challenge of our history as we learn how to live with Soviet military power, meet it, challenge it, and simultaneously strive to maintain peace and freedom.

We still look upon ourselves as a young and developing



society, even though we are now one of the oldest, stable systems in the world. We did not seek the role of world leadership, and our people today still tend to shy away from it. At the end of the Second World War, however, our relative geographic isolation, our pursuit of liberty, our bountiful natural resources, and our productive people made us strong. We were somewhat like a young giant among nations. And, being a giant is not easy. It is not easy living with a giant, and our friends are learning that. It is hard to find shoes to fit if you are a giant; and the bed is always too short. Being strong, the giant can afford to be gentle, but he is also, at times, awkward. His good intentions are not always so interpreted by others.

We make mistakes because we are unaccustomed to and hesitant about the responsibilities of leadership. As a result, our behavior is at times one of fits and starts that frequently bedevil our foreign policy and confuse others.

We talk a great deal about values and about liberty. Some of our more sophisticated friends see this linkage of values with world real-politik as a form of naivete. We, of course, talk about the values of liberty because, to us, they are not abstract. We also know they are not abstract to those unable to enjoy them. We, therefore, champion them.

As we do so, however, we must understand that we thereby implicitly threaten the Soviet Union. Like any dictatorship, the Soviet ruling class is deeply concerned about the subversion of their power -- power accumulated not by agreement but by



military and police force alone. Where there is no legitimacy; where there is repression coupled with traditional national and cultural differences; where there is an obvious failure of the system to meet the needs of its peoples -- these obviously contribute to Soviet insecurity. The very fact neighboring free societies exist creates a powerful attraction for those who live under totalitarian rule. By example, democracies inevitably tend to subvert Soviet authority. The by-product of this inevitable threat is fear and this, in turn, leads the Soviet authorities to go to great lengths to restrain their own citizens.

Rarely in history has a nation lost so many of its greatest scientists, writers, artists, musicians and scholars through exile, imprisonment and execution. Hundreds of thousands have emigrated and many more would leave if they were permitted to do so.

Clearly, Soviet insecurity and fear, coupled with its aggressive and hostile ideology, present us with a dilemma, challenge, danger, and opportunity. There are some who may respond to the threat to us represented by Soviet military power and theology by ignoring or denying its importance. That would be fatal for us. There are others who are so overwhelmed by the difficulties as to place all of their trust in military power and its use alone. That view can be fatal to us as well.

We dare not and cannot blow the Soviet Union away. We cannot wish it away. It is here and it is militarily powerful.

We share the same globe. We must try to find a formula under which we can live together in dignity.

All responsible people understand that we must define our objectives consistent with Hobbes' first law of nature: "to seek peace and to follow it." We must engage in that pursuit of peace without illusion, but with persistence, regardless of provocation. Thus, in Madrid, we attended, talked, debated, negotiated, argued, dined, condemned, talked some more. We achieved some results in words. We have not yet achieved a change in patterns of behavior. That will only come, if it ever does come, when the Soviet Union concludes that it is in its interest to change.

The Soviet Union is not likely soon to undergo what Jonathan Edwards called "a great awakening." Yet, the imperatives for survival in the nuclear age require us to persist -- through the deterrence that comes from military strength, through dialogue, through criticism, through negotiation -- to persist in the search for understanding and peace.

Our objectives are clear. How to realize them is less so. How do we persuade Soviet authorities, who have a stake in stability, to comprehend that repressive societies in our day cannot achieve inner stability? Will they come to understand the need to demonstrate that cruelty is not an indispensable part of their system? Are they capable of understanding that the Leninist aim of achieving world Communism has no relevance in this nuclear age? Dare we hope that evolving Soviet leadership will in the long run see that it cannot survive without humanizing

its controls and its image in the world?

So often the excuse has been that one cannot make an omelet without breaking eggs. That is true, but Soviet leadership must come to understand that the road they have been following is filled with broken eggshells and we have yet to see the first omelet. Included in our message, therefore, must be the promise that new opportunities for cooperation with us on all levels can open widely if Moscow will live up to its international responsibilities so clearly delineated in the Helsinki Final Act and in the Madrid Concluding Document, whose words they accepted. What we made clear to the Soviets in Madrid, and what I trust they are pondering, is that just as their deeds undermined our confidence in their intentions, so must their deeds, and not just their words, begin to restore that confidence.

Today, the prospects for understanding seem remote. Soviet leadership appears frantic and disorganized. Threats, coupled with infrequent smiles, are traditional techniques of Soviet power plays. This time, however, the threats seem more frenetic:

- They threaten to destroy more civilian aircraft.
- They threaten Turkey with becoming a "nuclear cemetery."
- They threaten Japan with a "national disaster more serious than the one that befell it 37 years ago."
- They threaten the Scandinavian countries by warning they will "burn in the fire of nuclear war in the name of 'Atlantic solidarity.'"

-- And Yuri Andropov threatens Chancellor Kohl that if the Western missiles are deployed "the military threat to West Germany will grow manifold" and Germans will have to "look at one another through thick palisades of missiles."

And within the Soviet Union, repression continues. An intensive crackdown on Jewish activists and other dissidents is under way. Government sponsored anti-Semitism is becoming clearer. There is evidence of a major drive for greater ideological conformity and vigilance.

Three weeks ago, a Moscow Court sentenced a member of an unofficial Soviet peace group to one year in jail and five years of internal exile. He was Oleg Radzinsky, a 25 year old student. Tass reported that he had deeply repented "what he had done" which accounted for the leniency. But the sentencing was a clear warning that the authorities would not again want to be embarrassed by unauthorized peace activity.

A Lithuanian Catholic Priest, the Reverend Sigitas Tamkevicius, a founder of the Catholic Committee for the Defense of Believers' Rights, is soon scheduled for trial. He was arrested last May in Vilnius during the trial of the Rev. Alfonsas Svarinskas, another member of the Committee who was sentenced to seven years of exile and three years in a labor camp.

A Latvian dissident, Ints Calitis was recently tried and sentenced to six years in a labor camp.

And we were all outraged when Josef Begun, on October 14th, was sentenced by a court in Vladimir on charges of producing and distributing anti-Soviet literature. His penalty

was seven years in jail and five years of internal exile, the maximum under Article 70 of the criminal code. Begun, an electronic engineer, has for 13 years been denied an exit visa to go to Israel. His real crime was that unable to find work in his profession, after serving two periods of exile in Siberia, he has been earning a living by giving private Hebrew lessons.

These are the realities. The issues of human rights and Soviet Jewry cannot be examined in isolation. They are an integral part of Soviet objectives and regrettable pawns today in East-West relations. We would all welcome the day when we could be persuaded that a serious East-West dialogue can take place whose aim is stability and harmony. The Soviet Union fully understands that significant gestures by them to live up to their international responsibilities, particularly in the humanitarian area, would bring an affirmative response by us. There are no signs in that direction.

In the absence of that dialogue, the Soviets insist that an improvement in the atmosphere, i.e. silence by us in the face of their behavior and concessions by us to their demands, would produce returns that would satisfy our humanitarian concerns.

Fortunately, neither this Administration, nor the last one, have been attracted by this dangerous and disingenuous ploy. Our national response, therefore, has been to speak out and demonstrate the evil characteristics of the Soviet totalitarian society as represented by their cruelty and disregard for agreements entered into.

We can prevail if we will be steadfast. We can prevail if

we will be consistent. We can prevail if we will be patient. Our case and our cause, after all, are the superior ones. They are consistent with the requirements of our evolving civilization. They are consistent with the deep desires of "the hearts and minds" of the billions of people on this planet.

Thank you.



# NEWS COMMITTEE

FROM THE



**THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE** Institute of Human Relations, 165 E. 56 St., New York, N.Y. 10022, (212) 751-4000

The American Jewish Committee, founded in 1906, is the pioneer human-relations agency in the United States. It protects the civil and religious rights of Jews here and abroad, and advances the cause of improved human relations for all people.

MORTON YARMON, Director of Public Relations

**ANNUAL MEETING  
NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL  
October 27-30-1983  
Bellevue Stratford Hotel  
Broad & Walnut Streets  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
215-893-1776**

**CONTACTS:**

**Press:** Natalie Flatow  
Joyce Kaplan

**TV-Radio:** Amy Goldberg  
Haina Just

**PRESS ROOM: Blue Room  
Phones: 215-735-6184, 6991, 6992 & 6993**

**FOR RELEASE AFTER 12:30 P.M.  
SATURDAY, OCT. 29, 1983**

PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 29...Ambassador Max M. Kampelman, Chairman of the U.S. Delegation to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, declared today that Soviet untrustworthiness was "the most serious threat to the peace of the world."

Addressing the annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee's policy-making National Executive Council, which continues through Sunday at the Bellevue Stratford Hotel here, Mr. Kampelman reminded his listeners from across the U.S. that the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, signed by both the Soviet Union and the United States, contained "firm and unequivocal commitments supporting the principle of religious freedom and other humanitarian obligations."

"In spite of those commitments made by Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev," continued Mr. Kampelman, "in the Soviet Union today, members of various Pentecostal groups are being persecuted, anti-Semitism is being officially sponsored by the State and the party, Catholic priests are being imprisoned, and those who fight for the principles of liberty frequently find themselves committed to psychiatric hospitals."

"The most serious threat to the peace of the world is the continuing realization that the Soviet Union cannot be trusted to comply with the written commitments it has made," declared Mr. Kampelman, adding:

more.....

Howard I. Friedman, President; Theodore Ellenoff, Chairman, Board of Governors; Alfred H. Moses, Chairman, National Executive Council; Robert S. Jacobs, Chairman, Board of Trustees.

Donald Feldstein, Executive Vice President

Washington Office, 2027 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • Europe hq.: 4 Rue de la Bienfaisance, 75008 Paris, France • Israel hq.: 9 Ethiopia St., Jerusalem, 95149, Israel  
South America hq.: (temporary office) 165 E. 56 St., New York, N.Y. 10022 • Mexico-Central America hq.: Av. Ejercito Nacional 533, Mexico 5, D.F.



"The Soviet Union must be made understand in this critical period of international tension that its promises are suspect until it begins to live up to the agreements it has made under the Helsinki Final Act."

Speaking at the same session, Jerome J. Shestack, former U.S. Representative to the UN Commission on Human Rights and former President of the International League for Human Rights, called on the Jewish community to "go beyond self-interest and reaffirm the traditional Jewish commitment to universal human rights." Mr. Shestack also urged American Jewish Committee leaders to "speak out forthrightly on the important social issues facing us today."

Ambassador Kampelman and Mr. Shestack spoke at a luncheon session chaired by Rita E. Hauser, Chair of the Executive Committee of AJC's Board of Governors, former U.S. Representative to the UN Commission on Human Rights and former member of the U.S. Delegation to the UN General Assembly.

The American Jewish Committee is this country's pioneer human relations organization. Founded in 1906, it combats bigotry, protects the civil and religious rights of people here and abroad, and advances the cause of improved human relations for all people everywhere.

# # # # #

A, EJP, FOR, Z  
RTV-PHIL  
83-960-348  
A-83-10-21-020-PEI