



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.

August 31, 1995

Mr. Stanley Bogen
Sanford C. Bernstein & Co.
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10153

Dear Stanley:

Thank you very much for your letter of August 28 and also for sending me a copy of Provost Chodorow letter to you of August 18. Your suggestion, obviously, carries a great deal of weight with the University of Pennsylvania, and I am pleased at the prospect of lecturing at the University.

You might tell Dean Chodorow that I would be delighted to participate in a seminar and lecture class, as well as in informal discussions with students and faculty. That's one of the attractions to me of participating in a university program.

With respect to an appropriate date, I note that you and Roberta would prefer a date in November, even though the University would also consider a date in January or February. I can accommodate myself to either time, but, for the moment, let me give you the details as far as November is concerned, which, for the moment is far more convenient than a date in October, given the fact that in October I am scheduled to be in New Mexico, Arizona and Geneva.

It seems best that I tell you the dates that are inconvenient for me. I would not be available on November 1 or November 7, since I have conflicts here in Washington. I am also scheduled to speak at the Reagan Library in California on November 12 and 13 and at Christ Church in Philadelphia on the evening of November 14. On November 16 and 17, I have board meetings of the United State Institute of Peace, where I serve as Vice Chairman. I do not know whether the University schedule would permit my appearance on campus during the few days prior to Thanksgiving, but I would be available on November 20, 21 and 22. I would also be available on November 27, 28 and 29. I am also

scheduled to be in Los Angeles for a board meeting on the evening of November 30 and December 1 . It is my hope that this schedule provides the University with sufficient flexibility to be able to set a date for me in November.

January and February 1996 are, at this stage, relatively open. Maggie and I will want to go away for a few days during each of those months, but our schedule is still open, and we can be flexible.

Your letter refers to a "limited stipend," and I am, of course, curious to know what that means.

Maggie joins me in sending you and Roberta our warmest best wishes.

Sincerely,

Max M. Kampelman

FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON

A PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS

1001 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W., Suite 800

Washington D.C. 20004-2505

(202) 639-7000

FACSIMILE NUMBERS

(202) 639-7003

(202) 639-7004

(202) 639-7008

If you have problems receiving this transmission, please contact us at (202) 639-7125.

Confidentiality Note:

The information contained in this facsimile message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the addressee named below. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this telecopy is strictly prohibited. If you have received this telecopy in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the address above via the United States Postal Service. We will reimburse any costs you incur in notifying us and returning the message to us. Thank you.

**FACSIMILE COVER LETTER
(for Single Recipient)**

Date: September 6, 1995

Number of Pages (including cover sheet): 3

To: Stanley Bogen

Fax No.: 212-756-4202

Firm Name: Sanford C. Bernstein & Co.

Office No.: 212-756-4482

From: Sharon H. Dardine for Max M. Kampelman Ext.: 7020

Telecopy Operator Information Only

Time Started: 6:41

Operator's Initials: MAB

212-756-4202

~~099496~~

09995-810

1995 STANLEY BOGEN LECTURER

AMBASSADOR

MAX KAMPELMAN

Dinner

Tuesday, November 28th at 7 p.m.

The Palladium Restaurant

36th and Locust Walk

Guest List

Ambassador Max Kampelman

Stanley Bogen and family

Roger Allen

Professor of Arabic,
Asia & Middle East Studies

Stanley Chodorow

Provost

Jacques deLisle

Assistant Professor
Law

Will Harris

Associate Professor, Political Science
Director, Ben Franklin Scholars/General Honors

Heidi Hurd

Professor of Law and Philosophy

Mike Zuckerman

Professor,
History

Alvin Rubinstein

Professor,
Political Science

Jeffrey Tigay

Chair of Jewish Studies Program

Sara Gordon

Assistant Professor,
Law

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

BOGEN LECTURE

"ENTERING NEW WORLDS"

BY

MAX M. KAMPELMAN

Philadelphia, PA

November 28, 1995

This is my second appearance as a lecturer at the University of Pennsylvania. A number of years ago, then Dean of the Law School, Robert Mundheim, invited me to discuss the challenges and characteristics of negotiating issues of vital national importance with my counterparts from the Soviet Union, an experience which spanned more than ten years over two major fora, first human rights and then nuclear arms reductions. I am grateful to your University for inviting me back.

I also wish to use this occasion to note the presence of my friends, Roberta and Stanley Bogen, who endowed this University lectureship. Their generosity and their commitment to learning has been impressive throughout our long friendship.

It is with this theme of learning and experience that I introduce my talk. There is a wide-spread misperception: "He who can does. He who cannot teaches!" I have done both. My guess is that most of your faculty, at one time or another, have done both. I have no hesitation in saying that if those who do, do not pay attention to those who study and learn and think and write, there is

no assurance that what they do is what we need done, or that it will be done well and wisely.

I am using the occasion of this lecture and my meetings with some of your faculty and students to review for myself and for you where we have come from, where we are, and what we should strive to attain as we prepare to enter the 21st century.

This month, I noted my 75th birthday, an enriching time of my life. During my early childhood, strange as it may appear to the younger among you, there were no vitamin tablets, no antibiotics, no television, no dial telephones, no refrigerators, no FM radio, no synthetic fibers, no dishwashers, no electric blankets, no airmail, no transatlantic airlines, no instant coffee, no Xerox, no air-conditioning, no frozen foods, no contact lenses, no birth control pills, no ball-point pens, no transistors. The list can go on — all in one lifetime.

In my lifetime, medical knowledge available to physicians has increased perhaps more than ten-fold. The average life span, certainly in the West, keeps steadily increasing. Advanced computers, new materials, new biotechnological processes are altering every phase of our lives, our deaths, even our reproduction.

It has been said that necessity is the mother of invention. I suggest 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.

The changes that have characterized my moment in history have been so fast, so dramatic, so basic that we can barely see their details let alone their scope and consequences. The changes are beyond calculation, probably greater in this one lifetime than have taken place in all of mankind's previous history, with newer, greater developments on the horizon that will probably make the awesome developments of our time dwarf by comparison. And what we have seen and experienced is only the beginning. As an indication of the change yet to be seen, more than 100,000 scientific journals annually publish the flood of new knowledge that comes out of the world's laboratories. There is much more ahead. 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. It is for you and your generation to uncover. Our science is today indeed a drop, our ignorance remains an ocean.

But the world body politic has not kept pace with our dramatic scientific and technological achievements. 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.

It is perhaps a supreme irony of our age that we have learned to fly through space like birds and move in deep waters like fish. But, we have yet to learn how to live and love on this small planet as brothers and sisters. In every age, this has been the challenge, but it is today more urgent than ever as we realize that our continued existence as a species depends on a fragile thread.

Following my retirement from government service in January, 1989, I was called back to government service on a number of occasions to deal with the need and the mechanism for a new, united, and free Europe to evolve. At first, I found the prevailing mood of Europe to be 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 that political democracy and the rule of law were indispensable prerequisites to assure European security and cooperation. There was no doubt. We were entering a "new world order."

Within a year or two, the mood was decidedly different. Europe felt depressingly impotent, obsessed with challenges it could not face. It was not just that Saddam Hussein remained in power. It was also the savagery in too many areas of the world, with ethnic strife and xenophobia dividing people, villages, neighborhoods. It was the human race once again demonstrating its capacity for extreme cruelty, with hundreds of thousands of refugees slaughtered and displaced from their homes in a process of "ethnic cleansing", with the words "concentration camp" reappearing in our consciousness and consciences. All of this was accompanied by a leaderless inability to stop the violence and

brutality. We were reminded of Shakespeare's MacDuff: "And heaven looked on and would not take their part."

The question may well be asked: Are we entering an age of democracy, a new world based on the religious values of human dignity, or an age of disorder which repeats the hatreds and divisions and savageries of yesterday? In helping us to understand the dimensions of this urgent dilemma, we must appreciate that in addition to the fear felt by many who see an unknown future they do not understand, there are also forces and people now enjoying power and its fruits who see change as a real threat to their power and its privileges. This has produced a fierce resistance to the rapid change we are experiencing. It is as if a part of us is saying: "Not so fast. Stop the world. We want to get off. We are not ready. We are not prepared for this new world we are being dragged into. It is threatening our beliefs. We will resist the changes. We will hold on tight and with a determined frenzy to the familiar, the tribal, the traditional!" This is real and must be taken into account.

Equally important, however, we must understand that the explosions we hear are frequently the sounds of escaping steam as the lids of repression that characterized the Soviet system are removed from boiling kettles. Fingers and faces that are too close get scalded. How to harness the energy of that boiling water into a samovar of refreshing tea remains a great challenge and opportunity.

The promises and realities of modern technology for better living cannot be hidden and their availability cannot long be denied. Fundamentalism, nationalism, race and ethnicity are today making themselves increasingly felt,

but they face severe competition. 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 that such societies, which provide advantages of better health, improved sanitation, adequate food and water, economic opportunity, leisure for self-enrichment, are only hours away. They want that dignity and better living for themselves and for their children — and they don't wish to wait.

The less fortunate are increasingly becoming aware of a most amazing demographic fact, the dramatic decrease in the world's death rate. It took thousands of years to increase life expectancy at birth above the 20 to 30-year life span level. In the past two centuries, the length of life one could expect for a newborn in the advanced countries jumped from under 30 years to more than 70 years and it is going up. For example, among American males aged 65 to 74, death fell 26 percent from 1970 to 1988; and among females of that age, the decrease in the death rate was even greater. The life span in poor countries, as a result of advances in agriculture, sanitation and medicine, has also increased by 15 to 20 years.

People have since antiquity worried about running out of natural resources — flint, game, animals, oil. Yet, amazingly, all the historical evidence shows that raw materials have become less scarce rather than more. Food is an especially important resource. Despite rising population, per person food consumption is up over the last 30 years. The increase of height in the West is another mark of improved nutrition. Ten thousand years ago, only 4 million people could keep themselves alive. In the 19th century, the Earth could

sustain only 1 billion people. Now, more than 5 billion people are living longer and most are more healthy than ever before. A case can be made that this increase in the world's population represents humanity's victory against death.

The less fortunate, aware of the existing disparity, want to catch up with what is realistically at hand. The need is great and the challenge is formidable. We are told that of 5.3 billion inhabitants of the earth, half may still be suffering from inadequate nutrition. Life expectancy, which exceeds 70 years in developed countries, is still as low as 30 to 40 in parts of Asia and Africa. (Interestingly, while life expectancy is clearly rising in China, it is going down in Russia.) Hundreds of millions of people are afflicted by water-carried diseases for which preventative remedies and cures exist. Some 800 million adults in the world are believed to be illiterate. The disparity between affluent countries and the least affluent remains great.

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. Protected national boundaries can keep out vaccines, but they cannot keep out germs, or ideas, or broadcasts. Peoples now trapped in the quagmire of ancient ethnic and national grievances and enmities will 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, but 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 interrelated world community.

That is why Freedom House, an organization I have the privilege of serving as Chairman Emeritus, could report this year that in this decade of the 1990s, 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 in the growth of democratic influence is a necessary effort by the body politic to catch up with the world of science and technology. What is also becoming clear is that the wealth and power of nations is coming to depend more on intellectual resources than on natural resources.

As national boundaries are buffeted by change, the nations of the world 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. Canada cannot protect itself from acid rain without the cooperation of the U.S. The Government of Bangladesh cannot prevent its tragic floods without active cooperation from Nepal and India. To treat a polluted Mediterranean requires the active cooperation of the twenty countries that border that mass of water. To understand the New York Stock Exchange, we must follow the Tokyo and London stock exchanges.

This suggests, among many other implications, the need to reappraise our traditional definitions of sovereignty. The requirements of our evolving technology are increasingly turning national boundaries into patterns of lace through which flow ideas, money, people, crime, terrorism, missiles — all of

which know no national boundaries. Science has no national identity. Technology has no homeland. Information requires no passport. One essential geopolitical consequence of this new reality is that there can be no true security for any one country in isolation. We must learn to accept in each of our countries a mutual responsibility for the peoples in other countries.

The argument is made that we cannot be the policeman of the world. Nonetheless, I respectfully suggest that no community — and our nation is an integral part of an 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, with diplomacy our first responsibility and with the readiness to use our military as a reluctantly available and practical additional resort.

Let me at this point note the fact that the end of the Cold War, significant as it was in reducing world tension, has regrettably not ended the need for our country to maintain its military strength and its role as world leader.

The Charter of the United Nations and the Helsinki Final Act make it clear that to achieve peace and stability we must all insist that there can be no profit from military aggression. We and Europe failed to meet the first challenge to that principle when the Serbs in Europe moved militarily with brutality and hate against their former Yugoslav fellow citizens. Europe and we did not stop this drive toward ethnic cleansing and we have thereby undermined European stability. Our country is now belatedly attempting to correct our earlier lack of leadership in the Balkans and, if we can still succeed, it is clear we will need to contribute our own troops to a NATO force designed to protect that peace. I

support that effort, even though I believe that had we acted with diplomacy and available air power at the early stages of the conflict, we would have probably avoided that need for troops.

But it is not just the Balkans that call for our military strength. There are 24 nations with a ballistic missile capacity that can carry biological, chemical and nuclear weapons of mass destruction. Iraq, in recent weeks, has admitted to the United Nations that it has produced large quantities of biological poison weapons as well as 25 missile warheads and 166 bombs filled with those lethal agents. These missiles can today reach our friends and allies. They will soon be able to reach us. Advanced conventional weapons are proliferating the world through international suppliers, including American. Chinese military expansion and modernization, particularly naval, is awesome and serious. North Korea is also developing and selling modern missiles at the same time as it maintains a powerfully threatening conventional military posture. We also know that Russia's political and economic insecurities have strengthened its nationalistic extremists and weakened the ability of its government to control and regulate its massive military and nuclear arsenal at the same time as it continues to develop new and improved naval and air weapons.

The argument is also heard that our effort to foster democracy in other geographic areas is a misguided and doomed effort to transfer the religious 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 Judaic Christian culture alone.

It is true that the modern idea of democracy originated in the West. But Judaism, Christianity and Islam originated in the Middle East and those ideas spread to all parts of the globe. The ideas of freedom need not be confined to Western Europe and North America. Westerners do not uniquely carry a democracy gene. We know 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.

One Islamic scholar recently wrote, "In the new Muslim world order, Muslim political traditions and institutions . . . continue to evolve and are critical to the future of democracy in the Middle East." At a recent dinner conversation in our home, a young Saudi friend of ours, a Ph.D. in Political Science, expressed irritation at the arrogant thought that he, his family, friends and fellow citizens were unqualified to live in freedom and human dignity.

With this reference to human dignity, let me now address what some may consider to be an aside, but which is fundamental to me.

A few weeks ago I was invited to speak at the 300th Anniversary of Christ Church here in Philadelphia. This led me to think theologically and to begin by asserting that I had a life-long conviction that religion has the potential of providing the cement to bind us all together as Children of God. I say this in the full realization that too often religion has served to divide us from one another and that throughout history, including this very day, great injustices have been committed in the name of religion by those who were persuaded that

theirs was the real truth and that it was their duty to God to conquer and defeat those with other truths.

It is appropriate here to note an alleged experience of Bishop Fulton J. Sheehan who was scheduled to speak in Philadelphia at City Hall and decided to walk there from his hotel. He lost his way and was forced to ask some boys to direct him. One of them asked "What are going to do there?" "I am going to give a lecture," replied the Bishop. "About what?" the boy asked. "About how to get to heaven. Would you care to come along?" "Are you kidding" said the boy, "you don't even know how to get to City Hall."

The First Amendment to our Constitution, prohibiting Congress from making any law "respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof", was the earliest and most successful attempt, within the spirit of religion, to guard against those who might improperly use government power to corrupt it. Alexis de Tocqueville quickly grasped the significance of the separation of church and state, noting:

"Upon my arrival in the United States, the religious aspect of the country was the first thing that struck my attention; and the longer I stayed there the more did I perceive the great political consequences resulting from the state of things, to which I was unaccustomed. In France I had almost always seen the spirit of religion and the spirit of freedom pursuing courses diametrically opposed to each other; but in America I found that they were intimately united, and that they reigned in common over the same country . . . I found that they differed upon matters of detail alone;

and that they mainly attributed the peaceful dominion of religion in their country to the separation of church and state."

G.K. Chesterton, with that same appreciation, called America "A country with the soul of a church".

The ancient Hebrew tribes made a profound contribution to our civilization when they proclaimed that there was only one God. This was at a time when the prevailing view of their neighbors was that there were many gods. If there is only one God, then we are all of us His children and thus brothers and sisters to one another. The ancient Hebrews might not even be remembered today, except as a learned footnote in history, and certainly their offspring would have been lost in the vast chasm of history, had this new and astute insight not permeated our civilization.

Here, in this doctrine of human brotherhood, we have the spiritual basis of our evolving civilization. Here are the moral roots of political democracy, human rights, human dignity, the American dream. The notion that human beings are the children of God and that they thus have the potential for developing that which is God-like within them is clearly anathema to any political system which does not respect the dignity of the human being.

Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish social scientist, wrote many years ago that he was struck by the strength and depth of American values with their roots in religious ethics. They reflected themselves, he said, in the power of the "ought" as a guiding light for our actions. The "is" of our lives as individuals or as a nation, may not always be consistent with the "ought", but the "ought" is the

moving force in bringing us steadily closer to the values and ideals we proclaim. Achieving the "ought," however, requires effort and dedication.

The Book of Genesis states that Man was created in the divine image. This concept of Man's divine nature easily led to the philosophic and political emphasis during the Age of Reason that we were primarily rational and noble beings. Modern liberalism evolved out of that faith. The problem, however, was that the perception of Man as rational and God-like could not explain Man's continued capacity for cruelty against Man and Nature. Obviously, an image is by definition quite different from the original.

The philosophic notion of the coexistence of good and evil is found in many ancient civilizations, and remains even stronger as experience has seared our reality. The Jewish scholars taught that there is in each one of us an ingredient in the heart and soul which is good and God-like, but that there is also in each one of us an ingredient which is destructive and "evil". The Koran warns against the influence of Satan. The Protestant theologian Reinhold Niebuhr called it "Children of Light and Children of Darkness". The Catholics refer to "original sin". Freud and others based their understanding of Man on this insight. And, this dichotomy in Man means the good and the evil is also intrinsic to the societies created by Man.

How else can we explain totalitarianism except as an expression of that destructive drive? How else can we understand the Holocaust, or the cruelty of the Stalinist system? If there is one thing that history has taught us, it is that we ignore the dark side of Man only at our peril. We have the capacity to reach for the stars, but we do so with our feet deep in the dirt of the earth.

For me this means that the history of civilization becomes the effort to strengthen the light within us, our children, our families, the societies we create. This is the real meaning of the evolutionary challenge. One might say it is the evolution of the species Homo sapiens to that of the species "Human Being". This, in turn, suggests to me that it is not liberalism or conservatism with their ideological rigidities that define the political goal of human dignity. It is rather the political culture of democracy that we must strive to strengthen and maintain. Reinhold Nieburh wrote: "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but Man's inclination toward injustice makes it necessary."

We who believe that democracy works best for us must increasingly come to understand that it will work best for us only to the extent that it works well for others. We Americans, who today have the greatest power and influence, bear the greatest responsibilities. We are, therefore, destined to carry the flag of democracy, the rule of law, and human rights. We must remember that the struggle for human dignity is a continuing one. Are we wise enough to know how to assist the historic developments now underway? Do we have the insight, discipline, unity, and will to fulfill our responsibilities?

We were the moral as well as the military leader of the world, but we are in a deep moral slide. We are at or near the top of the industrial world in rates of murder, rape, drug use, divorce, child abuse. Much of our popular culture is violent, vulgar, mindless and perverse. As a result, our traditional confidence about ourselves and our mission has been undermined. We can do better. We must do better.

The United States is today the largest and oldest continuing democracy in the world. It is the political expression of our religious faith. Our task is to achieve the firm sense of purpose, readiness, steadfastness, and strength that is indispensable for our nation's 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. Our political and religious values and our character traits have helped us build the most dynamic and open society in recorded history, a source of inspiration to most of the world. We must come to appreciate what that dream means to the world and the burden that puts on us to advance the cause of democracy and human dignity for those who do not today enjoy that blessing.