



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.

OFFICE: BARRON NORTH: FOURTH FLOOR
PRESS: VANDERBILT SUITE: FOURTH FLOOR

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF B'NAI B'RITH
NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
WALDORF-ASTORIA, NEW YORK CITY
DECEMBER 6-9, 1979

SCHEDULE AND AGENDA

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6

2:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. NATIONAL LEADERSHIP ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
(BASILDON ROOM, THIRD FLOOR)

PRESIDING: DONALD R. MINTZ, CHAIRMAN

6:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m. NATIONAL LEADERSHIP ADVISORY COUNCIL
DINNER MEETING (CONRAD SUITE, FOURTH FLOOR)

SPEAKER: DAVID GARTH, MEDIA CONSULTANT

INTRODUCED BY DONALD R. MINTZ

6:00 p.m. ADL FOUNDATION DINNER MEETING
(LOUIS XVI EAST, FOURTH FLOOR)

PRESIDING: SEYMOUR GRAUBARD, CHAIRMAN

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7

8:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. ADL FOUNDATION BREAKFAST MEETING (TENTATIVE)
(LOUIS XVI EAST, FOURTH FLOOR)

PRESIDING: SEYMOUR GRAUBARD, CHAIRMAN

10:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. ADL BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING
(BARRON CENTER & SOUTH, FOURTH FLOOR)

PRESIDING: ROBERT H. NAFTALY, CHAIRMAN

12:30 p.m. ADL BUDGET COMMITTEE LUNCHEON
(HILTON ROOM, FIRST FLOOR)

8:30 p.m. RECEPTION IN HOME OF KENNETH J. BIALKIN
211 CENTRAL PARK WEST, APT. 6-E

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 8

8:30 a.m.-11:45 a.m.

ADL NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
(ASTOR SALON, THIRD FLOOR)

PRESIDING: KENNETH J. BIALKIN, CHAIRMAN

1) DEFERRED GIFTS REPORT - CHARLES GOLDRING

2) REPORT ON JEWISH/BLACK RELATIONS

A) ATLANTA JERRY DUBROF

B) BOSTON STEPHEN B. KAY

C) CHICAGO ROBERT B. NATHAN

D) DETROIT ROBERT H. NAFTALY

E) LOS ANGELES JOSHUA KHEEL

F) SUMMARY NATHAN PERLMUTTER

3) EUROPEAN OFFICE - DANIEL KROPP

4) GEOPOLITICS: AMERICA AND THE MIDDLE
EAST (IRAN AND MOROCCO) - MAX KAMPELMAN

5) ISRAEL REPORT - IRVING SHAPIRO

6) HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION - ARGENTINA
JACOBO TIMERMAN

INTRODUCED BY NORMAN WALL

7) U.S. LABOR PARTY UPDATE - LOU CRACO, ESQ.

INTRODUCED BY KENNETH J. BIALKIN

12:00 NOON

8) LUNCHEON (JADE ROOM, THIRD FLOOR)

PRESIDING: KENNETH J. BIALKIN, CHAIRMAN

SPEAKER: SENATOR WILLIAM S. COHEN (R) MAINE

INTRODUCED BY MAXWELL E. GREENBERG

NATIONAL CHAIRMAN'S REPORT -
MAXWELL E. GREENBERG

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 8 (CONTINUED)

2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m. ADL NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
(ASTOR SALON, THIRD FLOOR)

PRESIDING: KENNETH J. BIALKIN, CHAIRMAN

- 9) TASK FORCE REPORT ON ADL/NJCRCRAC RELATIONS -
NAT KAMENY
- 10) POLICY QUESTION ON TEACHING ABOUT RELIGION
IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS - BURNETT ROTH
- 11) REPORT ON THE KU KLUX KLAN - SEYMOUR REICH
- 12) REPORT ON PRIVATE CLUBS AND PUBLIC OFFICE
DISCRIMINATION - H. WILLIAM SHURE
- 13) ADL COMMUNITY SERVICE REPORT -
BURTON S. LEVINSON
- 14) ADL FOUNDATION REPORT - SEYMOUR GRAUBARD

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 9

8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m. ADL NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
(ASTOR SALON, THIRD FLOOR)

PRESIDING: KENNETH J. BIALKIN, CHAIRMAN

- 15) ADL NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT REPORT - DORE SCHARY
- 16) ADL BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT -
ROBERT H. NAFTALY
- 17) AFFIRMATIVE ACTION
 - A) REPORT ON QUOTA LITIGATION -
MEYER EISENBERG
 - B) ADL AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM -
LARRY LAVINSKY
- 18) GOOD AND WELFARE

"GEOPOLITICS: THE U.S. AND THE MIDEAST"

Remarks by

Max M. Kampelman

Anti-Defamation League

New York, N.Y.

December 8, 1979

Judaism and pacifism and Judaism and liberalism are not strangers to one another. The very essence of Judaism stimulates the flow of those values which abhor war and violence and which produce compassion, understanding, charity and justice.

Nevertheless, it is also a basic concept of ancient Jewish teaching that each of us not only has the capacity to stretch and evolve into a higher dimension of self, into a more God-like being, but we are also taught that there is in us, as well, the capacity for evil, for cruelty, for injustice. The Christian theologian Reinhold Niebuhr, called his book "Children of Light and Children of Darkness", and this dichotomy is based on the Hebrew maxim that within each of us there is the "Yaitzer hatov" and "Yaitzer hara", that in the heart there is that which is good and that in the heart which is evil.

I introduce the subject of geopolitics in the Middle East with this recollection of our faith, because I know how difficult it is for any of us to measure our self-interest in terms of armaments and defense.

Just as the Israelis have learned, however, that they must recognize military danger when it exists and either resist

it or be defeated by it -- so must we, as American citizens, understand that it is our duty to face the reality that the Soviet Union today represents a significant military danger to our security, to ourselves and to our values.

There is a story told of a man who ordered a pair of pants from a tailor. It was not ready when he returned in a week, nor was it ready in two weeks. When, after what appeared to be endless visits to the tailor shop, the pair of pants was finally finished, the man, in exasperation, asked the tailor: "It took God only six days to make the world; why did it require you six weeks to make this pair of pants?" The tailor walked his customer to the front window, pointed to the outside, and then quietly said: "Yes, but look at that world. And then look at this fine pair of pants!"

A look at our world is not a pleasant sight. I intend to do so now without eloquence or rhetoric, but more in the nature of a report.

The Soviet Union has rapidly been arming to the teeth at an unparalleled rate. ~~It is today rapidly becoming the dominant military force in the world.~~ Its conventional military power advantage ^{OVER US} seems unquestioned; and experts have been telling us during the recent Senate hearings on the ratification of SALT, that by 1981, and for a number of years thereafter, the Soviet Union will have a "window of opportunity", a decided advantage in the strategic nuclear area as well.

We are aware of the dramatic extension of Soviet influence in the Horn of Africa, Afghanistan, Southern Africa, and the Caribbean, matched by a declining American position in all of these areas.

At the risk of being buried in detail, let me try to be specific. The facts must be understood if our American society is to be shaken out of the ^{COMPLACENT BELIEF} ~~lethargy~~ that ~~somehow~~ the Soviet Union does not represent a threat to the free world, because the policies of detente proclaimed by Nixon and carried on by Presidents Ford and Carter, when coupled with our undoubted capacity to ^{DESTROY} ~~bomb~~ every Russian city, will assure us peace.

Let us start with Europe. On October 8, ~~Dr~~ ^{Dr} Middleton ^{CONCLUDED} ~~wrote~~ in The New York Times that the Warsaw Pact Nations "are well ahead" of NATO. They deploy 71 divisions in Central and Northern Europe as against 27 divisions in the West. They have a total of more than 4,200 planes, as compared to about 2,000 NATO planes. ~~THEY~~ ←

~~The Warsaw Pact Nations~~ deploy more than 20,500 tanks in that area of Europe, compared to 7,000 by the NATO nations.

Not only is the NATO force inferior in number, but it has lost the advantage it once had in the quality ^{AS WELL.} ~~of U.S. tanks, armored personnel carriers, ground support aircraft, surface-to-air and surface-to-surface missiles.~~ ^{9) A FURTHER} ~~Indeed,~~ the decisive element in today's Soviet military superiority in Europe is ~~the~~ ^{ITS}

Soviet advantage in medium-range ballistic missiles represented by its 100 SS-20's and its more than 80 backfire bombers.

MOVE
BELOW

[NATO today is flabby. The Russians are now in a position to apply political pressure in Central and Eastern Europe and to back that pressure by superior military forces.] It is estimated that the Russians are today able to immediately deploy more than 1,300,000 troops, 40,000 tanks, and 5,000 combat aircraft ^{FOR A} ~~to the~~ European ^{INVASION} ~~territory~~.

British intelligence estimates that 30-40 Soviet aircraft factories are producing annually more than 1,100 fighter and bomber aircraft as compared to our 500; and more than 900 helicopters compared to our 200. Soviet tank production averages 3,000 a year, compared to our tank production of about 650. (New York Times, April 18, 1976)

Let me put this another way. The Soviets have 31 divisions in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, and an additional 63 divisions within the European section of Russia. This is to be compared with roughly 16 divisions which the United States has scattered around the world.

→ INSERT

Traditionally, the Soviet Union has been looked upon as ~~an~~ essentially ^A land power. Since the 1960s, however, Russia has committed itself to a massive program of submarine and aircraft carrier construction, which has given it an immense capacity for amphibious operations and for controlling sea-borne commerce. The present Russian fleet has a naval force

level of more than 1,670 vessels; the total U.S. fleet is 418. Since 1962, the Soviet Union has built four times as many ships for its Navy as has the United States. They have 260 attack submarines, compared to our 79. The U.S. Navy today has the smallest number of ships since 1939.

This naval ^{DISPARITY} ~~understanding~~ is ^{SERIOUS} ~~essential~~ because the main purpose of Soviet naval strength is to ^{PROJECT} ~~protect~~ its own power and to cut our sea lines. ~~The Soviet Union is traditionally a land power.~~ We are a world island, the center of a vast maritime alliance. We need the seas to reinforce our strength overseas and to support our allies. We cannot isolate ourselves from the rest of the world because of our need to import energy and rare strategic minerals and ~~other~~ natural resources.

Reduced to its simplest form, we must be able to see that ^{AN} ~~our~~ oil tanker ~~X~~ gets all the way from the Persian Gulf to the port of New York, while the Soviet Union only has to sink that tanker once.

Let me remind this audience that during the Yom Kippur War we were only able to deploy 65 American warships to the Eastern Mediterranean, facing 98 warships there. We did not have a single U.S. Air Force aircraft available to support us, because the allied air fields were not made available to us. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, had the capacity to attack from the air fields of Egypt, Syria, Crimea and Yugoslavia.

Admiral Zumwalt has written of that period: "I know of no competent authority in the business at the time who did not share my view that had we gone to war with the Soviet Union in that confrontation, the United States Navy would have been defeated." It was within that context that the Soviet Union demanded of the United States ^{THAT WE} ~~and got us to~~ prevent the Israeli Army from surrounding the Egyptian Third Army.

The situation in the Eastern Mediterranean Since the Yom Kippur War, ^{FURTHER} ~~has~~ deteriorated for us. This ^{WAS} ~~has been~~ dramatically illustrated by the sad picture of an aircraft carrier having to be moved from as far away as the Philippines earlier this year in order to demonstrate some strength and military presence in the Middle East. The fact that we then sent it steaming in circles in the South China seas only served to heighten the impression of our impotence.

There are reports that the Administration is now prepared to request from the Congress appropriations so that we might finally have the capacity to organize a Middle East Task Force should that ever be necessary. I remind you, in that connection, that the Soviet Union has seven divisions of paratroopers available as a vast intervention force anywhere in Europe or the Middle East, in addition to its effective naval forces, as compared to an American single airborne and single air mobile division, both of which divisions are located in the United States.

The dramatic unfavorable balance of military power in the Middle East is further illustrated by a recent report from Israeli intelligence sources (Washington Star, September 23, 1979, page 3). Those sources reported that the Soviet Union recently carried out massive airlift manoeuvres around the strategic Horn of Africa region. Elements of seven Soviet combat divisions were airlifted from Southern Russian and Bulgaria to air bases in Ethiopia and South Yemen.

These manoeuvres took place over a two-week period, were extraordinarily successful and, at the conclusion, Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin paid a visit to both South Yemen and Ethiopia to commend those who participated in the exercise.

The Israelis report that the operation showed the capacity of the Soviet Union to extend its military power into the ~~vital areas that contain the~~ world's major shipping lanes for Mid East oil. It appears as if Russia is now capable of airlifting two fully equipped elite armies to the tip of the Arabian peninsula and the Horn of Africa in 36-72 hours.

The significance of this move is evident when we see that there is today a major Soviet base in Libya, with some 3,000-5,000 Soviet instructors, officers and maintenance personnel; and that the Soviet Union, on October 25, entered into a new Treaty of Friendship with South Yemen in effect, ^{SIGNIFICANTLY} adding to the 400 Russian personnel in that country, strengthening its

sophisticated communications and intelligence installations in that country, insuring Soviet ability to use the strengthened air and naval bases in that country, and increasingly integrating the already effective South Yemen army into the southern command of the Warsaw Pact operating out of Bulgaria.

It is no wonder that Saudi Arabia, responding to the growing Soviet strength in the Middle East and the October 25 treaty with South Yemen, called a meeting of its neighboring states to attempt a realistic and cooperative defense pact as a response to that military threat. Present were the leaders of Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Oman and the United Arab Emirates.

We can assume that the lessons of Iran and the Shah were not lost on the rulers of Saudi Arabia and its neighbors on whose continued cooperation we are today dependent to meet our energy needs.

It is necessary at this point to say a few words about our energy crisis and the Middle East.

Until 1970, the historical price of oil steadily declined in real terms. When, in 1971, with the exquisite assistance of our State Department, OPEC, under the leadership of the Shah and Colonel Qaddafi, whiplashed the oil companies and gained muscle, the price of oil began steadily to increase, doubling between 1971 and 1973. Following the October 1973 War, the price quadrupled; experts tell us, however, that the new price

levels were likely to have been reached in time with or without the Yom Kippur War and the so-called embargo.

The embargo was not effective. There is no reason to believe that OPEC can control the oil production of its member states. Those elements of a cartel simply do not exist. A few nations, primarily the Arabian sheikdoms, adjust their production levels in order to set the price where they think it should be, but the rest of OPEC primarily produces what it can and at the highest price that they can get.

Between 1974 and 1978, the price of oil again declined, until this year when it suddenly went up again. There was no economic justification for this recent rise other than the uncertainty about supplies created by the Iran revolution. The world was not short of oil. There were adequate stockpiles. But there was uncertainty about future supplies.

And here is the thrust of the problem. There is no reason to believe that the uncertainty concerning oil supplies will end.

This is our problem and this problem is totally irrelevant to the conflict between Israel and the Arabs, John Connally to the contrary notwithstanding. Peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors is essential and desirable in its own right, but we would be deluding ourselves if we thought that the peace would assure either stable oil prices or a secure supply.

The stability of supply is threatened by the internal divisions within the Arab and Moslem world. Iran, where the Arabs in Khuzestan could well try to secede from Khomeini is a cauldron of instability. The Kurds, who control much of the oil in Iraq, could try to get that away from Iraq. The Iraqis could challenge Kuwait or Iran or Syria. Iran can assert its rights to Bahrain. The rivalries are endless.

But equally important, where there is unbelievable wealth right next to abject poverty; where you have feudal structures adjacent to marxist movements; there you have instability.

And we must not forget that one or two ships accurately sunk in the Straits of Hormuz by unknown terrorists could effectively serve to disrupt the supply of oil to the West in a most devastating manner.

Whether military force can achieve stability in the Middle East is open to serious question. But it is highly unsatisfactory to know that the military option is not even available to us as an option for consideration or negotiation. It is no wonder that there are many in the world today who erroneously perceive our nation as a declining one. And, in that connection, I feel forced to observe that a nation that has no serious response when three of its ambassadors are murdered in Cyprus, Sudan and Afghanistan; and then orders the

marines guarding its Embassy in Iran to surrender to a mob without a fight, should not be surprised when other mobs treat those embassies and our diplomats with disrespect.

What does all this mean? Any examination of the world which acts on the assumption that the cold war has been replaced by some hopeful spirit of detente is tragically misleading and self-deluding.

The Soviet Union has always been clear about the meaning of detente. Izvestia has written that detente "gave a powerful impuse to the national liberation movement of colonial and oppressed peoples". (November 30, 1975) There is every reason to suspect that the Soviet union has viewed detente as a device to create a spirit of euphoria and relaxation in the United States which would accelerate the "shift in the coalition of forces". The Soviet leadership has never hidden its belief that this shift means providing it with a superiority in strategic weapons and conventional forces.

Finally, no discussion of the geopolitics of today can omit reference to the United Nations and the extent to which it is today an institution conquered by the PLO, working in harmony with the Soviet Union to attack and undermine America's reputation, strength and standing in the world. A recent article on this subject by our own William Korey presents that case impressively and supports well the conclusion of Senator Moynihan, who called the United Nations a "dangerous place", where totalitarian and authoritarian ideologies threaten to submerge the Western

humanist concepts that gave birth and meaning to that world body.

I not only refer to Israel's tenuous role in that body, where never, since the mid '60s, has an Israeli ever been selected as an officer in the plenary session of the General Assembly or any of its committees. The Security Council has never denounced Arab or PLO terrorism, but the U.N. General Assembly has adopted 66 resolutions carrying an anti-Israel thrust.

~~An examination of the resolutions submitted to and adopted by the General Assembly will now find that there is an automatic reference to communist terminology as descriptions of movements and nations with regard to facts or realities.~~

The General Assembly of the United Nations today is composed in the main of mini-states who, in Professor Hans Morgenthau's words, "are lacking in all or most attributes of nationhood . . . and who could not exist even in their precarious state without foreign subsidies."

There are today 152 member states in the United Nations, 70 of whom contribute only 1/100th of 1% each to the United Nations budget -- a sum of \$57,210. An additional 15 countries pay 1/50th of 1% each. More than 1/2 of the member nations pay a total of only 1-3/4% of the total United Nations budget. (I learned, incidentally, that a delegate making a 1/2 hour speech costs the United Nations \$6,000.)

What about Saudi Arabia and its great wealth? It pays the same to the ^{U.N.}~~U.S.~~ as Israel does, 1/4 of 1% of the total budget. And Saudi Arabia has a surplus of almost \$20 billion in its balance of payments, as compared to Israel's deficit of several billion dollars. In fact, all of the nine Arab oil-producing countries contribute together less than 1% of the total U.N. budget, and the contribution of the entire Arab world is about 1-1/4%.

Yet, these states, who do not pay their way, combine with the mini-states of the world, stimulated by the Soviet Union, and amass the majority which creates General Assembly committees, equates Zionism with racism and constantly undermines the United States, our values, and our standing in the world.

And who pays for these diatribes, for those speeches of hate and bigotry? Who pays for this safe harbor for large numbers of KGB agents? It is the United States that pays 25% of the total budget compared, incidentally, to the 11.6% paid by the Soviet Union. I suggest this requires some serious rethinking.

It is not my intent with these comments this morning to convey to you a sense of pessimism or a sense of defeatism. Indeed, my personal philosophy and my convictions are to the contrary.

Most importantly, there is unequivocal public opinion data now becoming increasingly evident to the effect that Americans are beginning to understand both the nature of the growing Soviet military strength, as well as the nature of our international responsibilities. Professor Sam Huntington, of Harvard, reports that 66% of the American people now believe that we have fallen behind the Soviet Union in power and in influence -- and they are unhappy with this relative decline. ~~In connection with this,~~ ^TThere is clear support for added military force and for the related instruments necessary to support a firmer stand against the Soviet Union. ^{Fewer} ~~Less~~ than 15% of the public now believes we are spending too much on military defense. The American people are not prepared to entrust their destiny to a world in which the Soviet Union has dominant military force.

The Wall Street Journal on November 7th, reported a gain in public support for the proposition that the United States should come to the defense of our major European allies with military force in the event that the Soviets attack. There is support for increasing our NATO commitment. There is majority support for our country's maintaining a dominant position as the world's most powerful nation, ~~and for increasing defense spending.~~

We must also appreciate as we analyze our position in the world that the economy of the Soviet Union is significantly weak. Their economic and social system is a failure. It is in the military and related areas that they excel. Russia~~n~~ has been spending more than 15% of its general gross national income on military expenditures.

Up until now, the West has been of significant assistance to the Soviet Union in its difficult task of excessively spending for military strength and at the same time attempting to meet its consumer requirements. We have helped with extensive grain supplies. We have helped by providing sophisticated technology. ~~We~~ have helped with large-scale, long-term Western government loans, at low interest rates, ~~And~~ we have been doing all of this without receiving political concessions in return.

In that connection, I quote from a memorandum dictated by Lenin on the relations which should obtain between the Soviet Union and capitalist states:

"... the so-called cultured strata of Western Europe and America are incapable of understanding either the present position of things or the real state of relative power. These strata should be regarded as deaf-mutes and our behavior towards them should be based on this assumption.... The deaf-mutes will believe us.... The capitalists of the whole world and their governments will shut their eyes to the kind of activities on our side that I have referred to and will in this manner become

not only deaf-mutes but blind as well. They will open up credits for us which will serve for the purpose of supporting Communist parties of their countries. They will supply us with materials and technology which we lack and will restore our military industry, which we need for our future victorious attacks upon our suppliers. In other words, they will work hard in order to prepare their own suicide."
(Detente, edited by G. R. Urban, Temple Smith England.)

A West determined to reassert its strength and to challenge the growing might of the Soviet Union for the sake of securing our humanitarian values must understand that it has strong economic, political and ideological weapons at its command today even in the face of the present military imbalance.

We have an immense reservoir of good will in the world. The governments of Western Europe, China, Japan and many other countries and the peoples of most of the world recognize that their security interests and our own are indivisible and that their hopes and aspirations are inseparable from ours. What the world looks for is a feeling of firm leadership and understanding from us.

Our record as a seeker of peace cannot be challenged, for it is we in recent years who have unilaterally restrained our defense spending without asking for commensurate reductions from the Soviet Union.

We know that we do not threaten world peace with expansionist activities. We know that we are not a racist or a

colonial power. We know that we have moved further and faster in eliminating racism in our country than any multi-racial society in the history of the world.

There is no need for us to be embarrassed or apologetic with respect to the third world. ⁷¹ Similarly, we must not confuse our friends and those who support us by encouraging our and their enemies. We must not be misled by the rhetoric of popular liberalism where it is not accompanied by the reality of democracy. Insurgency is not evidence of widespread popular discontent. Totalitarianism is no friendlier to us or more helpful to its citizens because it surrounds itself in the rhetoric of freedom. Liberal idealism is not masochism and there is no requirement for us to engage in self-flagellation.

~~{INSERT}~~

Irving Kristol, in a recent issue of The Wall Street Journal (11/26/79), urged that we ~~could only face the 1980s and the problems we will be confronting during this forthcoming~~ decade ^{OF THE 1980's BY} if we ^{INSTEAD} understand the primacy of foreign policy over domestic policy. The issue of inflation, he urges, is no longer the most important problem facing our nation today, in that it cannot be solved solely within a domestic economic context. It is military rearmament within the context of our international responsibilities that must be our first priority; and meeting that priority and our responsibilities will have beneficial economic, as well as political, repercussions.

What is necessary and hopefully inevitable is an American foreign policy in which power and the readiness to use it will play a far more central role than has ever been the case in our history. The defense of freedom and the defense of our national interests are noble objectives.

Only with strength and determination can we hope to avoid war and achieve the peace which we and the world must have to survive; and only with that strength can we then succeed in our efforts to achieve a mutual de-escalation and disarmament that will draw our attention away from the primitive notions of nation-state rivalries and toward a new international order.

The ADL BULLETIN

Published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

Lynne Ianniello
Executive Editor

December 19

Lily Edelman
Editor

Dear Max Kampelman:

We are most eager to feature your splendid paper in the January issue of the ADL Bulletin. Because of our space limitations, we have had to cut drastically. Our suggested version is attached.

Would it be possible for you to give me a call -- 212-490-2525 -- as soon as possible so that we may rush it to the printer.

Every good wish,

Lily Edelman

GEOPOLITICS: THE U.S. AND THE ~~MIDEAST~~ ^{NIDDLE}
~~by~~ ^{EAST}

Max M. Kampelman

Max M. Kampelman, Washington, DC attorney, also holds a PhD in political science. He is chairman of the Anti-Defamation League's newly created International Affairs Committee.

Just as the Israelis have learned that they must recognize military danger when it exists and either resist or be defeated by it -- so must we, as Americans citizens and supporters of Israel, understand that the Soviet Union today represents a significant military ^{threat} ~~danger~~ to our security and values.

There are reports that the Administration is now prepared to request appropriations so that we might finally have the capacity to organize a Middle East Task Force, should that again be necessary. We must remember, in that connection, that the Soviet Union ^{REPORTEDLY} has seven divisions of paratroopers available as a vast intervention force anywhere in Europe or the Middle East, in addition to its effective naval forces, as compared to America's single airborne and single air mobile divisions, both of which are located in the ^{U.S.} ~~United~~ States.

(more)

Indeed,

~~The fact is that~~ the Soviet Union has been arming to the teeth at a rate unparalleled in world history. Its conventional military power advantage seems unquestioned. In addition, experts reported during the recent Senate hearings on the ratification of SALT that by 1981, and for a number of years thereafter, the Soviet Union will have a "window of opportunity," a decided ^{FIRST STRIKE} advantage over the U.S. in the strategic nuclear area as well.

The dramatic unfavorable balance of military power in the Middle East is further illustrated by a recent report from Israeli intelligence sources (Washington Star, September 23, 1979), ~~stating that the Soviet Union recently carried out massive airlift manoeuvres around the strategic Horn of Africa region.~~ ^{stating that} Elements of seven Soviet combat divisions were airlifted from Southern Russia and Bulgaria to air bases in Ethiopia and South Yemen, where manoeuvres took place over a two-week period. ~~At their conclusion,~~

(more)

~~Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin paid a visit to both South Yemen and Ethiopia to commend those who participated in the exercise.~~

← According to the Israeli report, ~~the~~ operation showed the capacity of the Soviet Union to extend its military power into the world's major oil shipping lanes. ~~It appears as if Russia is now capable of airlifting two fully equipped elite armies to the tip of the Arabian peninsula and the Horn of Africa in 36 to 72 hours.~~

The significance of this move is evident when we see that there is today a major Soviet base in Libya, and that the Soviet Union, on October 25, entered into a new Treaty of Friendship with South Yemen. This adds significantly to the ^{EXISTING} ~~400~~ Russian personnel in that country, ^{and} strengthens its sophisticated communications and intelligence installations there, ~~and insures Soviet ability to use strengthened air and naval bases there.~~ It also integrates the already effective South Yemen army into the southern command of the Warsaw Pact operating out of Bulgaria.

(more)

Responding to this growing Soviet

Military strength in the Middle East, Saudi Arabia called a meeting of neighboring states to attempt a realistic cooperative, defense pact. Present were the leaders of Bahrain, Qatar, ^UK~~a~~wait, Oman and the United Arab Emirates, *on whom*

(The lessons of Iran and the Shah can hardly be lost, ~~on the rulers of Saudia Arabia and its neighbors, on whose continued cooperation we are today dependent to meet our energy needs.~~ Nor is there reason to believe that the uncertainty concerning oil supplies, dramatized by the current Iran crisis, will end. It must be noted ^{that this} ~~the~~ ~~problem~~ ~~is~~ ~~totally irrelevant to the conflict between Israel and the Arabs, John Connally to the contrary notwithstanding.~~ Peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors is essential and desirable in its own right, but we would be deluding ourselves if we thought that such a peace would assure either stable oil prices or a secure supply.

(more)

The internal divisions within the Arab and Moslem world pose the greatest threat. In Iran, a cauldron of instability, the Arabs in Khuzestan could well try to secede from Khomeini. The Kurds, who control much of the oil in Iraq, could try to get that away from Iraq. The Iraqis could challenge Kuwait or Iran or Syria. Iran can assert its rights to Bahrain. The rivalries are endless, and

✓ ~~one or two~~ ^{SOME} ships accurately sunk in the Straits of Hormuz by unknown terrorists

✓ ^{OR CONTROL OF THE STRAITS BY UNRELIABLE FORCES} could effectively serve to disrupt the supply of oil to the West in a most devastating manner.

Whether military force can achieve stability in the Middle East is open to serious question. But it is highly unsatisfactory to know that the military option is not even available to the U.S. for consideration or negotiation. Small wonder that many in the world today erroneously perceive our nation as a declining one. In that connection, I feel forced to observe that a nation that has no serious response when three of its ambassadors are murdered (in Cyprus, Sudan and Afghanistan), and

(more)

then orders the marines guarding its Embassy in Iran to surrender to a mob without a fight should not be surprised when other mobs stimulated by PLO agitators and Soviet encouragement treat American embassies and diplomats with disrespect.

What does all this mean? Any analysis which assumes that the cold war has been replaced by some hopeful spirit of detente is tragically ~~misleading~~ and self-deluding.

The Soviet Union has always been clear about the meaning of detente. seeing it as ~~having given "a powerful impulse to the national liberation movement of colonial and oppressed peoples"~~ (izvestia, November 30, 1975), ~~and as a device to create a spirit of euphoria and relaxation in the U.S. which would accelerate the "shift in the coalition of forces."~~ The Soviet leadership has never hidden its belief that such a shift ^{could} ~~means~~ providing the U.S.S.R. with a superiority in strategic weapons and conventional forces.

(more)

Fortunately, Americans are now beginning to understand both the nature of the growing Soviet military strength, as well as the nature of our international responsibilities. According to Professor Sam Huntington, of Harvard, some 66 percent of the American people now believe that we have fallen behind the Soviet Union in power and ~~in~~ influence -- and are unhappy with this relative decline. There is clear support for added military force and for the related instruments necessary to support a firmer stand against the Soviet Union. Fewer than 15 percent of the public now believes we are spending too much on military defense.

Moreover, The Wall Street Journal, (November 7) ~~reported~~ ^{has been reported} a gain in public support for the proposition that the U.S. should come to the defense of its major European allies with military force in the event ^{of a} ~~that the~~ Soviet attack. There is support for increasing our NATO commitment and for our country's maintaining a dominant position as the world's most powerful nation. President Carter's

(more)

recent call for 4.5 percent increase^s in U.S. military budgets for five years (N.Y. Times, December 13 1979) is a clear indication ~~of recognition~~ of this same concern.

We must also appreciate the fact that the Soviet Union's economic and social system is a failure. It excels instead in the military and related areas, spending more than 15 percent of its general gross national income on military expenditures.

Up until now, the West has been of significant assistance to the Soviet Union in attempting to meet its consumer requirements. We have helped by providing extensive grain supplies, sophisticated technology, and large-scale, long-term Western government loans, at low interest rates. And we have been doing all of this without receiving political concessions in return.

~~Since America's great strength is in food production, we have here a weapon of power and influence that has been underappreciated and undervalued.~~

In the coming decades we must understand the primacy of foreign over domestic policy. The most important problem facing our nation today is military rearmament within the context of our international responsibilities, which must be our first priority.

What is necessary is an American foreign policy in which power and the readiness to use it will play a far more central role than ~~has ever been the case~~ ^{before} in our history. Only then can we hope ^{to} ~~to avoid war and~~ achieve the peace which we and the world must ^{now} ~~have to survive,~~ only with that strength can we succeed in our efforts to achieve a mutual de-escalation and disarmament that will draw our attention away from the primitive notions of nation-state rivalries and toward a new international order.

Anti-Defamation League

823 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017

212-490-2525



of B'nai B'rith

LYNNE IANNIELLO
Director, Communications

NEWS

MAX K
M
A

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

(With the following credit lines:
"This article is reprinted from
the January, 1980 ADL BULLETIN,
national publication of the
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai
B'rith.")

GEOPOLITICS:

The U.S. and the Middle East

by Max M. Kampelman

Max M. Kampelman, a Washington, D.C. attorney, also holds a Ph.D in political science. He is chairman of the Anti-Defamation League's newly created International Affairs Committee.

Just as the Israelis have learned that they must recognize military danger when it exists and either resist or be defeated by it -- so must we, as American citizens and supporters of Israel, understand that the Soviet Union today represents a significant military threat to our security values.

There are reports that the Administration is now prepared to request appropriations so that we might finally have the capacity to organize a Middle East Task Force, should that again be necessary. We must remember, in that connection, that the Soviet Union reportedly has seven divisions of paratroopers available as a vast intervention force anywhere in Europe or the Middle East, in addition to its effective naval forces, as compared to America's single airborne and single air mobile divisions, both of which are located in the U.S.

Indeed, the Soviet Union has been arming to the teeth at a rate unparalleled in world history. Its conventional military power advantage seems unquestioned. In addition, experts reported during the recent Senate

(more)

hearings on the ratification of SALT that by 1981, and for a number of years thereafter, the Soviet Union will have a "window of opportunity," a decided first strike advantage over the U.S. in the strategic nuclear area as well.

The dramatic unfavorable balance of military power in the Middle East is further illustrated by a recent report from Israeli intelligence sources (Washington Star, September 23, 1979), stating that elements of seven Soviet combat divisions were airlifted from Southern Russia and Bulgaria to air bases in Ethiopia and South Yemen, where manoeuvres took place over a two-week period. That operation showed the capacity of the Soviet Union to extend its military power into the world's major oil shipping lanes.

The significance of this move is evident when we see that there is today a major Soviet base in Libya, and that the Soviet Union, on October 25, entered into a new Treaty of Friendship with South Yemen. This adds significantly to the 400 Russian personnel in that country and strengthens its sophisticated communications and intelligence installations there. It also integrates the already effective South Yemen army into the Southern command of the Warsaw Pact operating out of Bulgaria.

Responding to this growing Soviet military strength in the Middle East, Saudi Arabia called a meeting of neighboring states to attempt a realistic cooperative defense pact. Present were the leaders of Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Oman and the United Arab Emirates, on whom the lessons of Iran and the Shah can hardly be lost. The rulers of Saudi Arabia and its neighbors are meaningful factors in our energy needs. Nor is there reason to believe that the uncertainty concerning oil supplies, dramatized by the current Iran crisis, will end. It must be noted that this problem is totally irrelevant to the conflict between Israel and the Arabs. Peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors is essential and desirable in its own right, but we would be deluding ourselves if we thought that such a peace would assure either stable oil prices or a secure supply.

(more)

MOSLEM INSTABILITY

The internal divisions within the Arab and Moslem world pose the greatest threat. In Iran, a cauldron of instability, the Arabs in Khuzestan could well try to secede from Khomeini. The Kurds, who control much of the oil in Iraq, could try to get that away from Iraq. The Iraqis could challenge Kuwait or Iran or Syria. Iran can assert its rights to Bahrain. The rivalries are endless, and some ships accurately sunk in the Straits of Hormuz by unknown terrorists, or control of the Straits by unfriendly forces, could effectively serve to disrupt the supply of oil to the West in a most devastating manner.

Whether military force can achieve stability in the Middle East is open to serious question. But it is highly unsatisfactory to know that the military option is not even available to the U.S. for consideration or negotiation. Small wonder that many in the world today erroneously perceive our nation as a declining one. In that connection, I feel forced to observe that a nation that has no serious response when three of its ambassadors are murdered (in Cyprus, Sudan and Afghanistan), and then orders the Marines guarding its embassy in Iran to surrender to a mob without a fight should not be surprised when other mobs stimulated by P.L.O. agitators and Soviet encouragement treat American embassies and diplomats with disrespect.

What does all this mean? Any analysis which assumes that the cold war has been replaced by some hopeful spirit of detente is tragically self-deluding.

The Soviet Union has always been clear about the meaning of detente, seeing it as a device to create a spirit of euphoria and relaxation in the U.S. which would accelerate the "shift in the coalition of forces." The Soviet leadership has never hidden its belief that such a shift could provide the U.S.S.R. with a superiority in strategic weapons and conventional forces.

GROWING AWARENESS

Fortunately, Americans are now beginning to understand both the nature of the growing Soviet military strength as well as the nature

(more)

of our international responsibilities. According to Professor Sam Huntington, of Harvard, some 66 percent of the American people now believe that we have fallen behind the Soviet Union in power and influence -- and are unhappy with this relative decline. There is clear support for added military force and for the related instruments necessary to support a firmer stand against the Soviet Union. Fewer than 15 percent of the public now believes we are spending too much on military defense.

Moreover, a gain in public support has been reported (Wall Street Journal, November 7) for the proposition that the U.S. should come to the defense of its major European allies with military force in the event of a Soviet attack. There is support for increasing our NATO commitment and for our country's maintaining a dominant position as the world's most powerful nation. President Carter's recent call for 4.5 percent increases in U.S. military budget for five years (N.Y. Times, December 13, 1979) is a clear indication of this same concern.

Up until now, the West has been of significant assistance to the Soviet Union in attempting to meet its consumer requirements. We have helped by providing extensive grain supplies, sophisticated technology, large-scale, long-term Western government loans, at low interest rates. And we have been doing all of this without receiving political concession in return for our financial material assistance.

In the coming decades we must understand the primacy of foreign over domestic policy. The most important problem facing our nation today is military rearmament within the context of our international responsibilities which must be our first priority.

What is necessary is an American foreign policy in which power and the readiness to use it will play a far more central role than ever before in our history. Only then can we hope to achieve the peace which we and the world need. Only with that strength can we succeed in our efforts to achieve a mutual deescalation and disarmament that will draw our attention away from the primitive notions of nation-state rivalries and toward a new international order.