



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.

REMARKS BY
MAX M. KAMPELMAN
PLENARY SESSION OF THE
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW
"THE CRISIS OF LEADERSHIP IN THE NEW WORLD ORDER"

New York, New York

April 8, 1995

Thank you for your introduction and for permitting me to be a part of your rich program.

In the words of that immortal master of English rhetoric, Mr. Samuel Goldwyn, I have a few words to say before I begin to talk. My comments today repeat and refine themes I have expressed on other occasions, but this does give me the opportunity to assert that I know they are true because I have said them before. I am also aware that my talk is not quite what the organizers of this session want from me, but the letter of invitation stated that the "choice of topic" is mine and there was no time limit stated. This was a courageous act on your part, given my long and intense early relationship with Hubert Humphrey, whose wife, Muriel was once allegedly obliged to remind him: "Hubert, a speech need not be eternal to be immortal!"

I am not a professional diplomat and did not seek the career. When I was asked by President Carter in 1980 to head up the American delegation to the Madrid meeting, I wasn't even clear as to what was scheduled for Madrid. That

CSCE meeting, which Secretary of State Vance and his staff told me would last no more than three months, lasted for three years, for which the Soviets blamed me, claiming I was "stubborn." When President Reagan, in 1985, asked me to head up the American effort in the nuclear arms talks with the Soviet Union, it was after I had already told Secretary of State Shultz that I did not feel substantively qualified to deal with the subject matter. Yet, both events helped contribute to the end of the Cold War.

Nearly five years ago, as the Cold War was ending, I was called back to temporary Government service by Secretary of State Baker to work with Europe on how we could take advantage of the dramatic new opportunities that appeared to be at hand. Tom Buerghenthal and Ted Meron joined me in Copenhagen for that CSCE task and, you will not be surprised, played significant roles in developing the concluding document which John Norton Moore has called the most significant document of its kind since the Magna Carta.

The mood of that period was one of euphoria and self-congratulation. The Berlin Wall had been shattered; Communist regimes were falling; the Warsaw Pact was disappearing; the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was in shambles; democracy seemed to be spreading like wildfire. All of Europe unanimously agreed in Copenhagen and then at the CSCE Summit in Paris that political democracy and the rule of law, not as slogans, but with clear detailed specificity, were indispensable prerequisites to assure European security and cooperation. There was no doubt. We were entering a "new world order."

Less than two years later, I was called back to the government again to join President Bush at a CSCE Summit in Helsinki. The mood was decidedly

different. The euphoria was gone. Europe felt depressingly impotent, obsessed with challenges it could not face. Savagery had reappeared with ethnic strife and xenophobia dividing people, villages, neighborhoods. There was growing anti-Semitism, even where there were few or no Jews. The human race was once again demonstrating its capacity for cruelty, with "ethnic cleansing", violence and hundreds of thousands of refugees displaced from their homes. The ironic reappearance of Sarajevo as a symbol of war brought back awful reminders of yesterday. And all of this was then accompanied by a seeming inability to stop the violence and brutality. The mood and reality, I fear, is no better today.

Let me parenthetically here add that European failure was certainly not due to a lack of adequate international or regional structures designed to prevent and resolve such failures. It was due to a lack of political will, which was, in turn, encouraged by a lack of political leadership. The question is being asked: Instead of entering an age of democracy, a new world based on human dignity, have we not entered an age of disorder similar to the hatreds and divisions of yesterday? Let us put that in perspective.

We are living through extraordinary changes in our mode of living. I recall when there were no vitamin tablets; no television; no dial telephones; no refrigerators; no dishwashers; no electric blankets; no airmail; no instant coffee; no air-conditioning; no frozen foods. The list can go on.

In my lifetime, medical knowledge available to physicians has increased perhaps more than ten-fold. More than 80% of all scientists who ever lived, it is said, are alive today. The average life span keeps steadily increasing. Advanced computers; new materials, new bio-technological processes are altering

every phase of our lives, deaths, even reproduction. We are living in a period of instant information power, whose instruments produce near miracles. No generation since the beginning of the human race has experienced and absorbed so much change so rapidly -- and it is only the beginning. As an indication of that, more than 100,000 scientific journals annually publish the flood of new knowledge that pours out of the world's laboratories.

These developments are stretching our minds and our grasp of reality to the outermost dimensions of our capacity to understand them. Moreover, as we look ahead, we must agree that we have only the minutes glimpse of what our universe really is. We barely understand the human brain and its energy; and the endless horizons of space and the mysteries found in the great depths of our seas are still virtually unknown to us. Our science is indeed a drop, our ignorance remains an ocean.

It has been said that necessity is the mother of invention. The corollary is also true: Invention is the mother of necessity. Technology and communication are necessitating basic changes in our lives. Information has become more accessible in all parts of our globe, putting authoritarian governments at a serious disadvantage. The world is very much smaller. There is no escaping the fact that the sound of a whisper or a whimper in one part of the world can immediately be heard in all parts of the world -- and consequences follow.

But the world body politic has not kept pace with the dramatic scientific and technological achievements we see around us. Technology is working to turn us into a "global village," while history and politics have still left us with

the remnants of a tower of Babel. Just as the individual human body makes a natural effort to keep the growth of its components balanced, and we consider the body disfigured if one arm or leg grows significantly larger than the other, so is the world body politic disfigured if its knowledge component opens up broad new vistas for development while its political and social components remain in the Dark Ages. In that context, I note the positive development that in this decade of the 1990's, according to Freedom House, an organization I have the honor to serve as Chairman Emeritus, a larger part of the world's population is living in relative freedom than ever before in the history of the world. I suggest to you that what we have been observing and experiencing, where there has been a growth of democratic influence, is a necessary effort by a significant part of the body politic to catch up with the world of science and technology.

Whether that effort will be successful is not clear because what we have also been unexpectedly observing is a fierce resistance to that change. It is as if a part of us is saying: "Not so fast. Stop the world. We want to get off. We are not prepared for this new world we are being dragged into. We will resist the changes. We insist on holding on, even with violence, to the familiar, the tribal, the traditional!"

But we must not permit this resistance, important as it is, to overwhelm us. There are other stronger and more urgent sounds of impatient hope and expectation. The explosions we hear are frequently the sounds of escaping steam as the lids of repression are removed from boiling kettles. Fingers and faces that are too close get scalded. We must harness the energy of that boiling steam into a samovar of refreshing tea. The promises and realities of modern

technology for better living cannot be hidden and their availability cannot easily or long be denied. The communication age has opened up the world for all to see. The less fortunate are now aware that they can live in societies, including their own, which respect their dignity as human beings. From radio and television they know such societies are only hours away. They want that dignity and better living for themselves and for their children -- and they don't wish to wait.

Keeping up with scientific and technological opportunities requires openness to information, new ideas, and the freedom which enables ingenuity to germinate and flourish. A closed tightly controlled society cannot compete in a world experiencing an information explosion that knows no national boundaries. Peoples now trapped in the quagmire of ancient ethnic and national grievances and enmities may soon come to recognize that they are thereby dooming themselves, their children and their grandchildren to become orphans of history, lost in the caves of the past. There is room for ethnic, national, religious, racial and tribal pride. Much to the surprise of some, national boundaries, national flags, and national languages remain vital to large numbers of people. But we must insist that if that drive for self-identification is to produce respect and self-realization for the individual and the group, that drive must be peaceful and in harmony with the aspirations of others in our evolving inter-related world community.

National boundaries are buffeted today by scientific and technological change. The nations of the world have become ever more interdependent. We are clearly in a time when no society can isolate itself or its people from new ideas and new information anymore than one can escape the winds whose

currents affect us all. This also means that as the world draws closer, it will become more difficult to dehumanize "enemies." It also is intensifying the sympathy we feel for observable human suffering no matter how distant. National boundaries can keep out vaccines, but those boundaries cannot keep out germs, or thoughts, or broadcasts.

This suggests, among many other implications, the need to reappraise our traditional definitions of sovereignty without threatening the comforting loyalties that are associated with the term. The requirements of our evolving technology are increasingly turning national boundaries into patterns of lace through which flow ideas, money, drugs, people, crime, terrorism, nuclear missiles. One essential geo-political consequence of this new reality is that there can be no true security for any one country in isolation. This phenomenon helps to explain why world leaders increasingly believe they are forced to consult and coordinate with one another, with their own publics, with the media, and with a global audience. Power politics has changes its character. There are new rules.

The argument is heard in our society that we cannot be the policemen of the world. I respectfully suggest that no community -- and our nation is an integral part of an evolving economic, technological, scientific and political world community -- can survive, let alone flourish, without a police force. We have an obligation to be part of such a force.

The argument is also heard that our effort to foster democracy in other geographic areas is a misguided and doomed effort to transfer the values of our culture to other cultures not hospitable to those values. Our Western values, it is said, particularly by defenders of Middle East and Asian authoritarian systems,

are unique to our culture alone. Those values are, of course, a threat to their authority.

During the last 250 years the West produced two sharply differing systems defining the relationship between government and the governed, namely the Enlightenment ideas of democracy, on the one hand, and Leninism, on the other hand. The Chinese, as an example, made the wrong choice for themselves when they chose the Western-born Leninist alternative. It is their Leninism, and not their Confucianism, that is at the root of our differences and their misfortune. All dictators, whether in the East or West, fear and resist the spread of freedom.

It is true that the modern idea of democracy originated in the West, but it traces its roots to the Middle East. Judaism, Christianity and Islam originated in the Middle East and yet those ideas spread to all parts of the globe. The ideas of the Enlightenment need not be confined to Western Europe and North America. Westerners do not carry a democracy gene. We know, furthermore, that the ideology of the Enlightenment has established a bridgehead in all of the non-Western civilizations. Young people of today's Japan, for example, are in many ways culturally closer to their American and European contemporaries than they are to their grandparents. A few months ago, I had dinner with a Saudi Arabian friend, a Ph.D. in Political Science. He was indignant over what he believed to be a prevailing Western view that he, his people, his culture, his values were incompatible with the political principles of human dignity and liberty.

The struggle for human dignity is a continuing one. Aristotle taught us that all forms of government are transitional and vulnerable to the corrosion of time, new problems, and missed opportunities. Are we in the U.S. wise enough to know how to assist the developments now underway? Do we have the insight, discipline, unity and will to assume and fulfill our responsibilities?

We have, regrettably, not yet shown the maturity to fulfill those responsibilities and provide the leadership that the world requires. Our indecisiveness in many areas produces the confusing sound of an uncertain trumpet. With respect to the first post Cold-War challenge to a new world order based on stability and human dignity, that presented by the aggression in the former Yugoslavia, we have permitted Serbia, the aggressor, to shift the international discussion to the question of how much of the illegally and cruelly seized territory it can keep in a peace treaty, thereby making it clear to other potential aggressors that military aggression can be profitable -- a formula for catastrophe. The slogan "never again," which was originally meant as a call never again to permit another Holocaust, has now been diluted into a slogan for the opening of museums while we watch genocidal slaughter on television and concentrate on our creature comforts and whether our taxes are too high. Is it because it is Moslems or blacks that are the victims, not "one of us," not quite deserving of our commitment, just as Jews were not quite deserving of commitment during the Nazi regime?

We can do better. We must do better. The world needs our leadership. We must understand and fulfill our responsibility to champion the cause of human dignity and freedom from aggression. We cannot do it all or do it alone,

but we can lead and we can set standards. in the world. For this a new bipartisan consensus on the nature and dimensions of our post-Cold War foreign policy is urgently required. A serious dialogue is called for between Congress and the Presidency based on an appreciation of the dimensions of the changes that affect us and the new regionalism and globalism that is seeking to emerge.

Public policy is increasingly being shaped by public opinion, a process intensified by the astounding communication revolution. A healthy democracy requires a widely competitive information spectrum, one not limited to journalists alone. Criteria of national interest and morality must enter into the opinion forming equation. The entry of public officials, scholars, lawyers, other experts into the process will also offset the prevailing tendency on the part of the media to over-simplify and over-dramatize events and issues. The media tends to process information the way we too often eat -- on the run. Fast food and instant analysis produce short-run gratification, but neither is quite as nourishing as when the product is prepared with care and properly consumed and digested. Competition within the information spectrum is indispensable if public opinion is responsibly to exercise its influence on public policy .

Science and technology are today globalized and the results have been awesome in their benefits to the human race. Our economies are rapidly moving toward globalization and that, too, shows promise of dramatic improvement in the human condition. The world of politics lags behind and impedes our ability to absorb successfully the benefits of science, technology and economics. It is in our interest as a nation that we stimulate the development of regionalism, correct the inadequacies and strengthen our international institutions as we harmonize our national interest with the supra-national trends that surround us.

Our task is to achieve the firm sense of leadership, purpose, readiness, steadiness, and strength that is indispensable for our effective and timely foreign policy decision-making. Our political community must resist the temptation of partisan politics and institutional rivalry as we develop the consensus adequate to meet the challenge. I am convinced that the American people remain ready, as they have been in the past, for that leadership and would welcome that consensus.

Thank you.

50089