



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.

**United States
Information
Agency**

Washington, D.C. 20547

8/6/91
✓Called
w/ changes

SHD

8/7/91

Dave Pitts
European Wireless

File (P/PFE)

(202) 619-4115

Ambassador Max Kampelman
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ambassador Kampelman:

Thank you for the interview you granted August 1. I appreciated it very much. Enclosed is a byliner based on your comments. Our IO in Madrid tells me a Spanish magazine is very interested in your views. It may be published elsewhere in Europe also. In addition, it will be sent out on the Wireless File.

Please feel free to delete from, and/or add to, the enclosed copy. If you could get back to me by midweek, I would appreciate it since I'll be on vacation next week and I would like to send it to Europe before I leave.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Dave Pitts

UPCOMING MOSCOW MEETING TO FOCUS ON HUMAN RIGHTS
(Byliner on CSCE) (1440)
By Ambassador Max Kampelman

(The following is based in part on a recent interview given by Ambassador Kampelman.)

It has now been more than 15 years since the Helsinki Final Act was adopted in 1975. At that time of East/West rivalry and tension, few expected the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) would become a major force promoting human rights, military stability, and security, and economic cooperation.

But CSCE, the only organization composed of all the European states plus the United States and Canada, has not only survived, it has flourished. The humanitarian provisions of the Agreement have had a major impact on the whole continent, and the Helsinki standards are no longer questioned.

Recently I headed the U.S. delegation to the CSCE Conference on National Minorities in Geneva, which occurred when world attention was focused on the grave situation in Yugoslavia, a crisis that ~~is still far from settled~~. *POTENTIAL REPRESENTS DANGER FOR EUROPE*

Next month, I will head the U.S. delegation to the CSCE Conference on the Human Dimension in Moscow. The key element of the Moscow meeting, which takes place between September 10 and October 4, will be to inventory how well the human dimension provisions of the Helsinki Final Act and, in particular, the Copenhagen results are being executed. These include principles dealing with the rule of law, free elections, freedom for political parties, and political pluralism generally. That in itself is an extremely worthwhile effort.

But there will also be much attention devoted to the problem of ethnic tensions in Europe, which especially threaten the newly-created democracies in Eastern and Central Europe.

It is increasingly clear, as evidenced by the continuing Yugoslav crisis, that Europe has a stake whenever there is violence stemming from ethnic disputes, since many countries on the continent have restive minorities within their midst. *WE CANNOT FORGET*
and ethnic tensions have played such a destabilizing role in

THAT

SERIOUSLY

PAGE 2 KAMPEL2

European history. With the diminution of East/West rivalry, ethnic disputes have increasingly risen to the surface.

Since the stakes are high, Europe can no longer accept the notion that ethnic tensions are an internal matter. This is evidenced by the fact that the European Community (EC) sent a mediating group to Yugoslavia. However, the EC, as important an organization as it is, represents only 12 countries.

Depending on how you count them, there are 33 states in Europe, so CSCE, which represents all of them, can play an important role in helping to alleviate and solve these tensions. CSCE has a mechanism now that permits it to assemble, for example, whenever there is a sign of unusual military activity as there was in Yugoslavia. Having 33 countries as distinct from 12 adds a measure of strength.

At the meeting on minorities in Geneva, the United States *SUGGESTED* ~~submitted~~ a proposal for a mediation mechanism to help manage and solve ethnic tensions. Such a mechanism is not a panacea. But it would help alleviate these very difficult problems. I think the idea had broad consensus. I talked to many delegations. I did not find one delegation opposed to it.

We hope to bring up the proposal again in Moscow and I hope it will be sponsored by other delegations in addition to the United States. We've decided to submit the minority mechanism again not only because of the importance of helping to solve ethnic tensions, but because the Moscow conference has a broader agenda than the Geneva meeting and we feel there is a role for a mediation mechanism for other aspects of the human dimension as well as ethnic tensions.

The U.S. mediation proposal is based somewhat on our experience with labor relations, where mediation has played a major role in enabling labor and management to solve disputes. One approach would be for each country in a dispute to appoint an expert. The two experts would then select a third mediator from another CSCE country who would serve as chairman, much like a labor dispute might be solved in Western Europe or the United States. The mediating team would have the right to hold hearings, but they would not have the right to impose a settlement. *PARTY*

PAGE 3 KAMPFEL2

The Moscow meeting will take place just six months before the fourth main Follow-up CSCE meeting, which will be held in Helsinki. So a few thoughts about the future of the CSCE process might be in order. My personal view is that, in words, the Helsinki process is now very far along. The key issue now is implementation. I hope that in the future we will concentrate more on how to better implement the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

At the Helsinki meeting in 1992, I think you'll find a great emphasis on economic subjects. I think there will be an attempt to build upon the Bonn document that detailed areas in which there could be greater economic cooperation.

I also think we might see some changes in the whole area of confidence building measures and conventional arms control. Confidence- and Security-Building Measures (CSBMs) were strictly a CSCE activity in the past.

The Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) negotiation, ~~however~~, took place only among 23 parties -- the NATO countries and the members of the former Warsaw Pact. My judgement is that as we go into the next conventional arms control negotiation, CFE may very well be merged with CSBMs and become a CSCE-wide effort, which would mean you would have increased CSCE activity in the military area as well as the economic area.

Fundamentally, it is the economic and security issues that are basic to European welfare and stability, but progress in these areas will depend on the extent to which minority issues and the evolution of democracy reach a point of maturity.

The minority issues are potentially destructive and reflective of the old totalitarian Europe. As Western Europe was maturing and developing, Eastern Europe just stood still. The top has now been taken off the boiling kettle. I would hope that the steam escapes, but that people don't get scalded. People must think of themselves as human beings with common concerns, not as members of warring tribes.

From the beginning the strength, some would say the weakness, of CSCE has been the principle requiring consensus. There's something in the view that the consensus requirement limits CSCE. But I think that is its strength also. I would oppose

PAGE 4 KAMPEL2

changing that. All the member states have confidence in the CSCE process. They are comfortable with it and there is no point in changing a procedure that has worked.

In fact, CSCE has worked so well for Europe, that some advocate extending the process to other parts of the world -- a CSCE for Africa, for the Middle East, for Latin America, etc. Proposals have been made by Italy and Spain, for example, within the Helsinki process itself, to expand its horizons more broadly to include increased attention to the Mediterranean states and their problems.

✓ I think such ideas have limited usefulness, but I don't want to discourage their exploration. ~~However~~, different regions of the world have different problems and different cultures. Certain premises have to be shared. In essence, a community of interest must precede the decision to form a political community if it is to have a lasting dimension. Some people think the CSCE process is a panacea. It is not. But if they wish to explore it, I would encourage them.

Although I see a strong future for CSCE, let me make it clear I do not see it as an alternative to NATO. NATO exists because serious tensions still remain. They are much less in importance than they used to be. But there is still a very strong Soviet military, which keeps modernizing itself. The Soviets are still spending an inordinate amount of money on the military. I don't see NATO altering its approach while that is still the case. Should that problem disappear, I suppose NATO might want to re-examine its role. But if it ever turned out that there was no role for NATO in the security area, why would there be a role for CSCE?

The fact that CSCE is not an alternative to NATO, however, does not mean its role in helping to create a new stable and secure Europe is not essential. I think CSCE is as necessary now, perhaps more so, as it was in 1975 when the East-West landscape was far more bleak than it is today.
NNNN