



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.

A SERIOUS LOOK AT OUR WORLD

BY

MAX M. KAMPELMAN

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Our objective as human beings and the object of our government and our nation's diplomacy is to preserve our security and our values in the condition of peace. But, like all words, this proud word "peace" has historically run the risk of being corrupted. There is a peace of the grave; the peace that reins in a well disciplined prison; the peace that may plant with its terms the seeds of future war. It is peace with dignity that we seek. It is peace with liberty that is the indispensable ingredient for the evolution of Man from the species *'homo sapiens'* to the species *"human being."*

This is a goal easy enough to state, but difficult to attain. Men and women seem capable of mobilizing their talents to unravel the mysteries of our physical environment. We have learned to fly through space like birds and move in deep waters like fish, but how to live and love on this small planet as brothers and sisters still eludes us. In every age that has been the essence of life's challenge. Today, the immense challenge facing society is to define and develop the basis for lasting peace among the peoples of the world so that we might live in dignity. In this rapidly moving nuclear age, the significance of that goal cannot be overstated.

The world is changing so fast and so dramatically that we can barely see its details let alone its scope. The changes are beyond calculation, perhaps greater than have taken place in all of mankind's previous history, with newer greater scientific developments on the horizon that will probably make the awesome discoveries of our time dwarf by comparison.

In our lifetime, we have witnessed two successful titanic struggles by civilized society against totalitarian movements – that of Nazi fascism and of Soviet communism. Yet, at the age of 85, I have never been more worried about the future for my children and grandchildren than I am today. The number of countries possessing nuclear arms is increasing and terrorists are poised to master the nuclear technology with the objective of using those deadly arms against us.

Henry Adams wrote in 1909 that: “the world did not double or triple its movement between 1800 and 1900, but measured by any standard known,” he wrote, “the tension and vibration and volume and so-called progression of society were a thousand times greater in 1900 than 1800.” Using that measure, the pace of change between 1900 and today is totally beyond calculation.

Let me be more specific and more personal. During my days as a child, there were no vitamin tablets; no penicillin; no television; no refrigerators; no transcontinental telephones; no plastics; no manmade fibers; no fluorescent lights; no social security; no unemployment insurance; no pantyhose; no dishwashers; no electric blankets; no airmail; no airlines; no instant coffee; no refrigerators; no FM radios; no plastics; no manmade fibers; no fluorescent lights; no Xerox; no air-conditioning; no antibiotics; no frozen foods; no contact lens; no ballpoint pens; no transistors; no income tax. Indeed, bunnies were small rabbits and the term “making out” referred to how you did on your examinations.

During my lifetime, medical knowledge available to physicians has increased conservatively more than a hundred fold. More than 80% of all scientists who ever lived are alive today. More than one hundred thousand scientific journals today publish the flood of new knowledge that pours out of the world's laboratories. The average life span is now nearly twice as great as it was when my parents were born. The average world standard of living has, by one estimate, quintupled in the past century. Advanced computers, new materials, new biotechnological processes are altering every phase of our lives, deaths -- even reproduction.

We are living in a period of “information power” with the telefax, the computer, the terminal, the recorder, the copier, the satellite dish. Combining these instruments produces miracles. All the books in the Library of Congress can be stored in a computer the size of a home refrigerator. These developments are stretching our minds and our grasp of reality to dimensions of complexity that challenge our capacity to understand them. Moreover, as we look ahead, we must

agree that we have only the minutest glimpse of what our universe really is. Science today is a drop and our ignorance remains an ocean.

For the first time in human history, mankind is rapidly altering the basic physiology of our planet. We are altering its chemical composition. We are examining the biosphere and the geosphere at an unprecedented scale without fully understanding their consequences.

Our world is past the 5 billion mark in population. It took millions of years, our scientists tell us, to reach the first billion in 1800. It took only 130 years to reach the second billion in 1930; 30 years to reach the third billion in 1960; 15 years to reach the fourth billion in 1975; 12 years to reach the fifth billion in 1987. I understand that more than 15 percent of all the people who ever lived since the beginning of man are alive today. It is overwhelming to contemplate the consequences of these changes, let alone to fully understand them. We only have the minutest glimpse of what our universe really is.

It should not surprise us to find resistance to these changes because they threaten to undermine the belief structure of many in our world.

The result is an effort to stop the world. Many groups in our world don't like the changes; they don't trust the changes. Emotions are being inflamed by nationality and religious appeals. Many are not prepared for the new world that they are being dragged into and they want to resist those pressures and hold on with a determined frenzy to the familiar, the tribal, the traditional. What we are observing is that in addition to the sounds of freedom and democracy, the headlines of today are telling us that there is resistance to what we consider to be the inevitable movement imposed on us by technological and scientific developments.

It is obvious that we are in a determined and serious worldwide struggle. It would be a mistake to believe that the end point of mankind's evolution has been reached. But we must appreciate that "the devil too evolves." We cannot remain smug and content about our present strengths in the face of a strong resistance to change that is asserting itself. This must be taken seriously.

Nuclear weapons and the skills necessary to build them are no longer the exclusive possession of the super powers. Ominous chemical and bacteriological weapons are also today capable of being acquired by the irresponsible and the lawless. Our own society is regrettably one of vulnerable networks—electricity grids, pipelines, telecommunication links. All of these are vulnerable to acts of

sabotage and terrorism. We are vulnerable to catastrophic destruction and we remain uncertain as to the effectiveness of our evolving international community to meet those threats.

We must come to appreciate that just as the two sides of the human brain, the right and the left, adjust their individual roles within the body to make a coordinated and functioning whole, so must hemispheres of the body politic—North and South, East and West, Right and Left, Christian, Jewish, and Muslim learn to harmonize their contributions to a whole that is healthy and constructive.

This is a difficult challenge. It is a risky one. The aim of our diplomacy and the supreme achievement of statesmanship are patiently to pursue the peace with dignity that we seek, always recognizing the threat to that peace and always protecting our vital national interests and values.

The task we face today is a serious one—one that threatens us. Can we achieve the firm sense of purpose, readiness, steadiness, and strength that is indispensable for effective and timely foreign policy decisionmaking? Can our political community ignore the temptation of partisan politics and institutional rivalry as we develop the consensus adequate to meet the challenge that threatens our welfare and our survival?

The United States must face this reality head-on and undertake decisive steps to prevent catastrophe. As the world's predominant power, only the United States can exercise the constructive leadership necessary to address the nuclear threat; and the peoples of the world would welcome such leadership.

Global interdependence is today a reality - economically, technologically and politically. We are clearly in a time when no society can isolate itself or its people from new ideas and new information any more than one can escape the winds whose currents affect us all. National boundaries can keep out vaccines, but those boundaries cannot keep out germs or ideas, or broadcasts. Change is inevitable. Resistance to change is also inevitable. A part of us will always say, "Not so fast. Stop the world. We want to get off. We are not ready for this new world that we are being dragged into. We like the familiar, the tribal, the traditional." This obviously creates tension. It is a tension we cannot ignore, but we dare not succumb to it.

New developments are stretching our minds and our grasp of reality to the outermost dimensions of our capacity to understand them – and we must note that we have only a glimpse of what our universe really is. Global interdependence has

become a reality economically, technologically, and politically. One of its understandable consequences is the drive for human dignity and democracy, which continues to spread throughout our globe.

We are seeing political changes influenced by the dramatic changes we have noted. Authoritarian leaders and dictators are losing the glue that has sealed their power, namely, a monopoly of information. The Soviet Union learned that the Voice of America and BBC and Deutsche Wella reached within its prison walls. Leaders no longer have a monopoly of information and Freedom House now tells us that a larger percentage of the human race today live in democracies and near democracies than ever before in human history.

This movement toward human dignity is a threat to those who possess and enjoy power. It should not surprise us to find resistance to dramatic changes which undermine existing power structures. Many are not prepared for the new world that they are being dragged into and want to resist those pressures. This resistance cannot be ignored. It is obvious that we are in a serious worldwide struggle. It would be a mistake to believe that the end point of mankind's ideological evolution has been reached. We cannot remain smug in the face of a strong resistance to change that is asserting itself.

We are brought up to believe that necessity is the mother of invention. I suggest the corollary is also true: invention is the mother of necessity. 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 this produces consequences.

The struggle 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. I suggest that we are at risk if we remain smug and content about our present strengths and the hopeful weakness of our enemy.

The terrorist problem we face is complicated by its religious overtones, particularly in the Middle East where a number of Muslim theologians and political leaders remind themselves and their followers that in 1095 Pope Urban II launched the First Crusade by denouncing the Muslims as "a race utterly alienated from God". They seek revenge.

The Arab dominated Middle East is today influenced by religious leaders who desire to restore the historic and dominant role of the Muslims in Europe and in the Middle East. Some of them state that their objective is totally to remove Judaic and Christian influence from the Middle East. Indeed, one Islamic leader

justifying their search for nuclear weapons was recently quoted as saying that "everyone knows that the cure for cancer is radiation". Fortunately, we note that the world wide Muslim population is about 1.4 billion people living responsibly in 52 countries many of which are democratic governments.

We are not yet winning the war against terrorism and mankind's ideological evolution has not yet been reached to its maximum. We cannot remain smug and content in the face of the strong resistance to change that is asserting itself and must be taken seriously. Our vulnerability is apparent to all but the blind among us. Change is an inevitable part of human history— resistance to change is equally inevitable. We are experiencing that tension today and the stakes are high.

The genius in our scientific community learned the secret of the atom, translated it into a weapon and produced the defeat of Japan thereby ending World War II. We had every reason to feel secure with this weapon. But science and technology are not uniquely American. Scientists who spoke Russian learned to translate the technology into their language and into their armed forces, leading us to talk and negotiate with them on establishing limitations and restraints— which incidentally brought me into the process.

Both we and the Russians soon learned that other countries had good scientists with a capacity to produce nuclear weapons capable of massive destruction. We then read that a Pakistan scientist, a Dr. Khan, had mastered the technology and quietly offered the technology to those willing to pay for it— making him rich as well as ostracized.

When we learned that North Korea, led by a brutal and strange demigod, possessed the secret and was prepared to build nuclear weapons to advance and propel his brutal regime, after a long and torturous negotiation, we bribed him not to proceed. He did not stay bribed. We are again prepared to bribe him. Iran is proceeding to develop its capacity to acquire nuclear weapons. We and our European friends are trying to bribe Iran now as well. They will probably accept the bribe and then proceed with their program. The Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency estimates that more than 40 countries now have the capability to build nuclear weapons. With this reality, it is becoming impossible to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of international terrorists organizations.

I have not presented you with an exaggerated picture. There is no way, given this reality, that terrorist will not acquire these and other weapons of mass

destruction with a purpose of inflicting damage on us. It is this reality which dominates my concerns and that I share with you today.

How are we responding? I regret deeply when I say to you that our responses are unimaginative and inadequate. Our international diplomats are negotiating what we can consider to be the usual arrangements for bribery; our defense establishment is submerged in an effort to modernize our nuclear weapons, a desirable goal but irrelevant to the terrorist danger we fear.

Only the United States can exercise the constructive leadership necessary to address the nuclear threat and the peoples of the world expect that leadership. President Reagan instinctively understood this reality when he wrote "what a blessing (the elimination of nuclear weapons) would be for the people we both represent" and then proposed to Russian leader Gorbachev that we both lead the world to abolish all nuclear weapons. He believed that nuclear weapons add nothing to our security, that they were "totally irrational, totally inhumane, good for nothing but killing, possibly destructive of life on earth and civilization." His aide, Paul Nitze, one of America's most distinguished national security experts, wrote that nuclear weapons "add nothing to our security" and that we should rid ourselves of them.

We should urge the world through the United Nations to declare that all weapons of mass destruction be abolished and that violations, based on effective Security Council inspection rules, be considered international crimes subject to agreed upon drastic penalties against those criminal states that develop or possess them. Gorbachev, recently recalling his conversations with President Reagan, reaffirmed this goal of total elimination "given the new threat emerging at the intersection of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction." It is appropriate here to recall the words of President John Kennedy that "the world was not meant to be a prison in which man awaits his execution."

The challenge we face is a difficult and risky one. It is something like crossing a river while walking on slippery rocks. The possibility of disaster is on every side, but it is the way – the only way – to get across. The aim of our diplomacy and the supreme achievement of our statesmanship should be patiently to pursue the peace with dignity that we seek - always recognizing the threat to that peace and always protecting our vital national interests and values.

The task we face today is a serious one—one that threatens us. Can we achieve the firm sense of purpose, readiness, steadiness, and strength that is

indispensable for effective and timely foreign policy decisionmaking? Power in a democracy cannot be exercised effectively short of a broad consensus in support of that policy. Consensus – not unanimity – requires broad agreement and understanding and consultation. Can our political community resist the temptation of partisan politics and institutional rivalry as we develop the consensus adequate to meet the challenge that threatens our welfare and our survival?

Power in a democracy cannot be exercised effectively short of a broad consensus in support of that policy. Patriotism today, in the face of the struggles we face, requires that it is “democracy” rather than the ideological rigidities of either liberalism or conservatism that merits our loyalty and commitment. I quote the distinguished Protestant theologian Reinhold Niebuhr: “Man’s capacity for justice makes democracy possible, but Man’s inclination toward injustice makes it necessary.”

Our principles and survival are being threatened and are at risk by virtue of a religious movement called “terrorism.” Self-interest requires us to develop and participate in a concerted international effort to eradicate terrorism from the globe. None can be safe from this dangerous and destabilizing phenomenon. Yet, there is at present no effective international action in place to deal with this serious problem, and none appears to be surfacing.

The danger is real. If not stopped in time, terrorist movements will fashion governments of criminal and genocidal intent. Nuclear weapons and the skills necessary to build them are available to them. These, along with ominous chemical and bacteriological weapons, are today capable of being acquired by the irresponsible and the lawless. Our evolving international community does not yet appear to be capable of dealing with this catastrophic disruption. China and Russia, for example, as well as some of our allies in Europe and elsewhere are tempted to place economic considerations ahead of the need to establish international law, stability and peace.

It is easy to verbalize these dangers. It is much more difficult to challenge them. But, as it must under the laws of nature, today will soon be yesterday; and tomorrow will soon be with us. And the danger to us grows. Our diplomats and those responsible for our defense as a nation recognize that we face a serious threat, but they still cling to their tools of yesterday to defeat the new threats that endanger us.

It is time for our country once again to regain our well-deserved reputation as a moral leader and as a force for what is good and just in the world. Our

President understands this when he continuously identifies us with the spread of democracy and human rights. He and we began to lose that reputation when we became identified with brutality and vengeance. We must strive to identify ourselves with the aspiration for peace and human rights, a world free of weapons of mass destruction.

Effective diplomacy obviously requires the availability of power. Indeed, diplomacy without power is like music without instruments. Consensus and broad agreement and understanding are necessary between the President and the Congress. It is necessary with our politics. It is necessary with our world allies. Consensus – not unanimity – requires broad agreement and understanding, as well as a commitment to preserve and extend our values and aspirations. Neither the diplomat nor the politician in a democracy can afford to ignore the moral dimension of foreign policy. We ought not to be using yesterday's thinking to fight today's wars.

G.K. Chesterton summarized his extensive studies of our country by declaring that the United States is a "nation with the soul of a church." This must be understood as we seek the basis for national consensus in foreign policy. We require moral justification for our actions. In this complicated interrelated world of ours, that moral justification must also be understood and accepted by other nations and other peoples as they judge our actions.

Our national and international goal should be to criminalize and outlaw nuclear weapons of mass destruction throughout our planet and, at the same time, establish an international fuel bank which will purchase the weapons grade uranium and plutonium stocks and transform them into fuel for an energy hungry world which requires that fuel for survival in this new world we are entering.

Achieving the goal of eliminating all nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction will require the Security Council to adopt an effective and rigorous program of monitoring, inspections and verification to assure destruction of nuclear weapons and fissile material worldwide. Such a regime could include: a complete historical account of each nation's fissile material and nuclear weapons production, if any; an exchange of data regarding existing fissile material and nuclear weapons stockpiles; verification of existing fissile material and nuclear weapon stockpiles; verification of nuclear warhead and fissile material destruction; conversion of fissile material for civilian power generation; and monitoring of civilian power facilities and suspect sites. This should be accompanied by a system of severe penalties designed completely to isolate the criminal States from

international commerce, cultural relations and formal diplomacy. It is a challenge, but it is indispensable.

It appears as if the world economy is today running on a resource that is under the control of hostile forces. We depend very much on the Middle East and yet we know that they harbor established training centers for terrorist. Oil revenues obviously help support those hostile forces. Nuclear weapons are under development which can be made available to terrorist and we are apparently paying for them with oil revenue payments. It is estimated that by the year 2020 more than 90% of the world's petroleum reserves will be in the Middle East.

Today there are hundreds of millions of people in the world who suffer inhumanity, poverty and slavery. To most of these people, the United States has been, "a shining beacon of hope." We must not disappoint them. Many draw courage and inspiration from our moral fabric. We must realize and always remember that the American dream means a great deal to the peoples of the world. As citizens of this democracy the American people must come to appreciate that there is no room for moral neutrality. Let us say so.

Today, it is even more urgent that we rededicate ourselves to a bold vision of a world without nuclear arms. It is essential for our national interest and our survival; and it is the right thing to do for the peoples and nations of the world. Now is the time for us to re-identify ourselves with the aspirations of human beings all over the world.

What is missing today is a global political commitment to move from what "is" – a world with a risk of increasing global disaster– to what "ought" to be, a civilized world in peace and free of weapons of mass destruction.

The "ought" is an integral part of the political process. Our founding fathers proclaimed the "ought" of American democracy in our Declaration of Independence at a time when we had slavery, property qualifications for voting, and second-class citizenship for women. Yet, we steadily moved the undesirable "is" of our society ever closer to the "ought" and thereby strengthened our democracy. When President Ford signed the Helsinki Final Act in 1975, he was criticized for entering into a process originated by the Soviet Union. But the agreement reflected a series of humanitarian "oughts," and over the course of the next 10 years, Russia was forced by our European friends and us to live up to those "oughts" if they were to attain international legitimacy.

APRIL 26, 2006

I believe that the future lies with liberty, human dignity and democracy. I believe that we are evolving toward a higher form of community and that our human values provide the moral foundation to guide that journey throughout the world. This is a special responsibility that we cannot avoid because it directly relates to our survival as well. It is an opportunity that we should welcome. Our challenge is to move the dangerous "is" of our world closer to the constructive "ought" we aspire to reach a civilized world in peace and free of weapons of mass destruction.

When each of us were growing up we were taught not to be afraid of the dark. As society matures and fulfills its responsibilities, let us not be afraid of the light of liberty in our possession and where it can take us.

March 26, 2006

*U.S. Ambassador to the conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, 1980-1984; Ambassador and Head of the U.S. delegation to negotiate with the Soviet Union on Nuclear and Space Arms, 1985-1989; Counselor, Department of State, 1987-1989; Chairman Emeritus, American Academy of Diplomacy; Chairman Emeritus, Georgetown University Institute for the Study of Diplomacy.