



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.

MAX M. KAMPELMAN
SUITE 800
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004-2505

July 7, 1995

Mr. Peter Huessy
National Defense University Foundation, Inc.
Marshall Hall, Ft. McNair
Washington, DC 20319-6000

Dear Peter:

Frank Gaffney was good enough to send me a copy of the summary you made of my remarks of June 20 to your seminar. You did a good job, although some clarification is required for accuracy.

I will begin with the fourth paragraph, where I would prefer for you to say "... strongly resisting the **modernization and globalization** changes"

In the next paragraph, I would add the word "reportedly" before the words "sold to Iran."

In moving to the next paragraph, and referring to the Vancouver meeting, I would add the following sentence after the words "protect against missile attacks": "This was a proposal he originally made at the United Nations in 1992."

Later on in that same paragraph, I would rephrase the reference to Clinton by saying: "President Clinton was reportedly not prepared to talk about that issue."

Finally in that paragraph, I wasn't talking about the U.S. purchasing "plutonium" from the Russians, I referred to "highly enriched uranium." I would end that sentence with the word "shipped", and leave out the remainder of the sentence referring to recent reports.

The most sensitive issue is found in the next paragraph. I would like the reference to say that ". . . we have to move beyond **debating** the ABM Treaty. . ." And then refer to "effective **theatre missile** defenses."

In the middle of that same paragraph, after the sentence ending with the word "disadvantage, " I would add the following sentence: "TBMs are permitted by the ABM Treaty and American leadership can overcome that unnecessary debate."

After the word "Israel" I would also add "Saudi Arabia" because I mentioned them both at the same time. In that same sentence we would then talk about protecting "those" countries, and instead of ending the sentence with "Israel", I would end the sentence with the word "them."

In the next paragraph, after the reference to American Indians, I would add "in an effort to minimize Soviet 'evil.'"

Jumping to the paragraph which begins with my further warning, I would note that the NPT "will **probably** not. . ."

I am sorry you had difficulty with the transcriber.

All my best.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'Max M. Kampelman', written in a cursive style.

Max M. Kampelman

**THE
CENTER
FOR
SECURITY
POLICY****FAX NUMBER: (202) 466-0518****PHONE NUMBER: (202) 466-0515**

DATE: 23 June 1995	NUMBER OF PAGES TO FOLLOW: 3
TO: Amb. Max Kampelman Fried, Frank FAX NUMBER: 639-7008 TALK NUMBER: 639-7020	FROM: Mr. Amir A. Morgan Associate 1250 24th Street, N.W. Suite 350 Washington, D.C. 20037 Tel: (202) 466-0515 Fax: (202) 466-0518
COMMENTS: Per your conversation with Frank Gaffney, to follow is a summary of your June 20 remarks.	

1250 24th Street, N.W., Suite 350, Washington, D.C. 20037 (202) 466-0515; FAX (202) 466-0518

Memo**To: Eric Thoemmes and John McGinn****Re: Remarks of Ambassador Kampelman, June 20, 1995, Capitol Hill Club Seminar on Ballistic Missile Defense: Its Role in Counter-Proliferation, Arms Control and Deterrence****Hosted by the American Defense Preparedness Association and the National Defense University Foundation****Summary of Remarks**

Ambassador Kampelman asserted that the US must remain engaged in the world. The changes in technology, economics and information have globalized relations between nations. National boundaries no longer strictly constrain the flow of information, technology and resources. Politics, however, is racing to catch up with these changes.

American leadership is critical to the successful management of the post Cold War world. And unfortunately, American leadership has been sorely lacking, as it has in Europe as well. The first and foremost "lesson" of the Cold War was that aggression does not pay and should not be allowed to pay. But in Bosnia, the first major test of the western powers of the new post Cold War era, the west has failed. We have failed to stand up for a cardinal principle of international relations.

And because of this failure, and because of the many flips and flops of US policy, other potential aggressors may conclude that they too can get away with aggression. We have rationalized away evil, Ambassador Kampelman noted. And it is not too much of a stretch to believe that generals in North Korea, Russia, or Iraq and Mullahs in Iran might very well conclude that aggression does pay. It is from such miscalculations that wars are made. And the lack of western leadership is "fostering a dangerous miscalculation".

At the same time, many of these rogue nations, as well as Russia, are strongly resisting the changes that we mentioned above. The acquisition of weapons of mass destruction is one way for nations to attempt to stop the changes they see undermining their hegemony. These weapons can be used for blackmail, coercion or terror. And given the apparent weakness of western leadership, we may be inviting the use of such weapons.

North Korea has already sold to Iran a hundred or so No Dong missiles with a range of 1200 kilometers. A next generation missile will no doubt be able to hit more of Europe and the Middle East, fired either from Iran or Iraq.

The American people rightly believe that the first order of government is to protect them from attack. They would be astounded to learn that the US is simply incapable of defending them against a ballistic missile attack. And they would be concerned to learn, as the Ambassador did, that Yeltsin himself proposed to President Clinton, at their Vancouver Summit, early in the Clinton Administration, that the US and Russia cooperate in deploying missile defenses to protect against missile attacks. These was precisely the vision of President Reagan. But as the Ambassador understands events, President Clinton rebuffed Yeltsin and did not want to talk about that issue. "We muffed it", said Kampelman, and since Yeltsin's proposal of over 2 years ago, we have not moved any closer to such cooperation. And similarly with Nunn-Lugar: although a sound agreement was reached for the US to purchase plutonium from the Russians, not even the first ton of material has been shipped, and recent reports are that the Russians do not wish to continue this program. Again, there has been a failure of US leadership. We over promised and under-delivered

The Ambassador further said that the while strategic stability is important, we have to move beyond the ABM Treaty and secure effective defenses--and only those defenses based in space can be effective. Now it is true that the Russians believe that we are trying to get a technological advantage over them by building missile defenses and they see any attempt to eliminate the ABM treaty as a first step in putting them at a strategic disadvantage. But leadership can overcome that. But space based systems are critical, said Kampelman, to provide for an effective defense. He specifically mentioned Israel--one cannot protect that country with solely ground based systems because of the short distance that missiles would be traveling that would attack Israel.

The Ambassador also warned against those who would use language to trivialize our defense needs. When Reagan called the Russians an "evil empire", many ridiculed the idea. They pointed to the US treatment of black Americans or American Indians. Kampelman said such talk is foolish--because it becomes an excuse to do nothing. How else could you describe a nation that kills millions of its own people but an "evil empire?"

And so it was that critics of missile defense called the program "star wars". By ridiculing the program, critics didn't need to seriously address the issue--once dismissed in this way, further substantive comment or debate was no longer even needed. And despite widespread and growing evidence of the threat to US allies and the US itself, critics of missile defense supported efforts to again and again cut funding for such a defense.

Ambassador Kampelman further warned: "By not expeditiously moving in the direction of capable missile defenses, we are encouraging others to believe that aggression is possible, including coercion, blackmail and terror." He further noted that the control over weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, is a dicey thing in the former Soviet Union. While he applauded the extension of the NPT, he noted that the NPT will not stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction in the third world. Should the US build robust defenses, including space based elements, we would be markedly changing the nature of things and actually discourage other nations from acquiring such weapons. "Failure to build such defenses will surely encourage the spread of such

weapons, and almost certainly their use."

KAMPELMAN CRITICIZES U.S. LEADERSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY. Max Kampelman, former head of the United States Delegation to the Negotiations on Nuclear and Space Arms, chided the American government for its "aimlessness and rootlessness" in foreign policy during a June 20 speech to the National Defense University.

Kampelman argued that developments in global communications have opened borders that were once closed. The world, he said, is much different now because of the ease with which information can be passed from one country to another. As a result, people throughout the world are able to recognize what other individuals have -- freedom and human dignity. In turn, he said, they desire what they do not possess.

Warned Kampelman, "we shouldn't isolate ourselves" from helping individuals achieve those wants and needs.

Due to America's lack of leadership in foreign policy, however, opportunities for global change have not been met, said Kampelman. This is best exemplified in America's management of the Bosnian crisis. "We have failed the first political challenge to this new opportunity for a better world," he said. Here, U.S. leadership has failed to heed the lessons of the past, when America was dragged into war because of reticence, said Kampelman, the current vice chairman of the U.S. Institute for Peace.

Kampelman pointed out that the U.S. has also erred in the area of ballistic missile defense systems. By failing to have a system that works, he said, the U.S. only encourages the proliferation of nuclear weapons, particularly by rogue states like Iran. Treaties are "not going to stop proliferation," said Kampelman. "Countries will see opportunities for development [of nuclear weapons] and they will" pursue those plans in the future.

NAVY OPPOSES DRAIN ON TOMAHAWK R&D RESOURCES. Navy sources close to the Tomahawk cruise missile program say they are opposed to a House measure that would take \$10 million from the research, development, testing & evaluation account for Tomahawk and the Tomahawk Mission Planning Center, and use these funds instead for development of a Joint Targeting Support System Testbed.

An amendment to the House FY-96 defense authorization bill offered by Rep. Randy "Duke" Cunningham (R-

CA) was passed as part of an en bloc amendment on Wednesday (June 14). The amendment would subtract the funds from the \$141.4 million Tomahawk r&d account for use in the proposed targeting testbed.

According to congressional and defense industry sources, the Joint Targeting Support System Testbed is a "demonstration program" which would capitalize on work already being done in the Navy on Tomahawk targeting support. The system, according to a description of the amendment obtained from Cunningham's office, would merge disparate targeting support systems "into a targeting workstation testbed," which "could provide the platform from which developers of data collection systems and weapons systems could refine user interfaces, requirements and operational concepts."

The system, says a congressional source, could conceivably have applications for other precision-guided weapons, including the Air Force's air-launched cruise missile (ALCM). The Cunningham amendment sees the testbed as "the foundation for a joint targeting support system which will be used across the DOD."

MARKEY AMENDMENT RESTORES LOWER TRITIUM FUNDING LEVEL. The Markey-Vucanovich-Ensign amendment was passed by the House of Representatives on June 15, cutting in half the funds allotted by the House National Security Committee for the construction of a new tritium production facility. The original version of the House FY-96 defense authorization bill provided \$100 million for a new multipurpose advanced light water reactor to serve as DOE's new tritium production site. The Markey amendment, which passed 214-208, cuts these funds in half, restoring the funding level requested by the Clinton administration.

The Markey-Vucanovich-Ensign amendment also allows the Energy Department to complete its study evaluating several technologies as the cleanest and most cost-effective tritium production alternative. The study, due in November, was preempted by the committee, which originally favored the advanced light water reactor design.

A key congressional source *Inside the Pentagon* said the House Appropriations national security subcommittee would likely stick close to the provisions outlined in the Markey amendment.

SUBSCRIPTIONS:
703-416-8500 or
Toll-free 800-424-9068

NEWS OFFICE
703-416-8534

FAX: 703-416-8543

Publisher: Donna Haseley
Chief Editor: Elaine M. Grossman
Associate Editors: Christopher Parent, Douglas Berenson
Contributing Editor: Daniel G. Dupont
Production: Justin Goudreau, Wendy Tull, Alexandra Tzoumas

Inside the Pentagon is published every Thursday by Inside Washington Publishers, P.O. Box 7167, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C. 20044. General Manager: Donna Haseley; Deputy General Manager: Richard Lardner. Subscription rates: \$745/yr in U.S. and Canada; \$795/yr elsewhere (air mail). Contents of *Inside the Pentagon* are protected by U.S. copyright laws. Reproduction, photocopying, storage or transmission by magnetic or electronic means is strictly prohibited by law without express permission of Inside Washington Publishers.