

BASKET III: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND
COOPERATION IN EUROPE
NINETY-FIFTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS
VOLUME IV

SOVIET HELSINKI WATCH, REPORTS ON REPRESSION
JUNE 3, 1977

U.S. POLICY AND THE BELGRADE CONFERENCE
JUNE 6, 1977

Printed for the use of the
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1977

92-302

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

DATE: 10/10/54

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

DATE: 10/10/54

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island, *Co-Chairman*

DICK CLARK, Iowa	JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York
PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont	PAUL SIMON, Illinois
RICHARD STONE, Florida	SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey	JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
ROBERT DOLE, Kansas	MILLICENT FENWICK, New Jersey

SPENCER OLIVER, *Staff Director and General Counsel*
ALFRED FRIENDLY, Jr., *Deputy Staff Director*
ESTER KURZ, *Staff Assistant*
MAG DOLOVAN, *Staff Assistant*
SUSAN PEDERSON, *Staff Assistant*
CATHY COSMAN, *Staff Assistant*
HELEN SEN, *Staff Intern*
LYNNE DAVIDSON, *Staff Intern*
MARIO LA TORRE, *Coordinator*
ANNE SIEGEL, *Coordinator*

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

SOVIET HELSINKI WATCH, REPORTS ON REPRESSION

Friday, June 3, 1977:		Page
Williams, Edward Bennett, counsel for Aleksandr Ginzburg-----		5
Alekseeva, Lyudmila, a founding member of the Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R.-----		29
Voronina, Lidia, assistant to the Group to Promote in its investigation of the persecution of Fundamentalist Christians-----		29
Kline, Edward, sponsor of Khronika Press, assisting in translating Alekseeva and Voronina's testimony-----		29

U.S. POLICY AND THE BELGRADE CONFERENCE

Monday, June 6, 1977:		
Vance, Cyrus R., Secretary of State, accompanied by O. Matthew Nimetz, Counselor to the Secretary of State-----		86
Sherer, Albert, Jr., Ambassador, Head of the American delegation to Belgrade Review Conference-----		86

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Friday, June 3, 1977:		
A collection of materials and communications submitted by Edward Bennett Williams from the U.S.S.R. protesting arrests of Aleksandr Ginzburg and Yuri Orlov-----		17
Freedom for Aleksandr Ginzburg;		
Statement of Support for the Ginzburg Family;		
Other letters of support for Ginzburg;		
A letter from Irina Sergeevna Zholkovskaya to Amnesty International;		
A letter to the Heads of the Participating States of the Helsinki Agreement;		
Excerpts from an open letter written by Yuri Fedorov;		
Summary translation of the Christian Committee for the Defense of Rights of Believers in the U.S.S.R.;		
Statement by the Council of Evangelical Christian Baptists (Pentecostalists) in the U.S.S.R.;		
An appeal from Vladimir Shelkov, chairman of the All-Union Church of Faithful and Free Seventh-Day Adventists, to the President of the United States, Jimmy Carter;		
Statement to the Workers of the Renault Factories of France;		
Declaration by I. S. Zholkovskaya;		
Statement to the press from I. Valitova and I. Zholkovskaya; and Excerpts from an open letter from Tatyana Khodorovich and Victor Nekipelov.		
A Pre-Belgrade summary document submitted by the Public Group To Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R.---		39

IV

APPENDIX

Friday, June 3, 1977:

An appeal to World Public Opinion on behalf of Yury Belov, by the Working Commission for the Investigation of the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes. issued February 15, 1977-----	Page 59
Document No. 2 by the Public Group To Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R. on the "Interruption of Human Contact in the Sphere of International Postal and Telephone Communications" issued on June 27, 1976-----	61
Submission for the record by Dr. Andrew M. Sessler, director, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory: a statement on the arrest and detention of Prof. Yuri Orlov, a telegram to the U.S.S.R. Academy of Science signed by 225 scientists, and a biography of Prof. Yuri Fyodorovich Orlov -----	64
Documents of the Ukrainian Public Group To Promote Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, Kiev, Ukraine: Memorandum 4-9 and other letters-----	69

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS: SOVIET HELSINKI WATCH, REPORTS ON REPRESSION

FRIDAY, JUNE 3, 1977

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Washington, D.C.

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, at 10 a.m., Hon. Dante Fascell, chairman, presiding.

In attendance: Commissioners Fascell, Simon, Dole, Fenwick; Buchanan, and Bingham.

Also present: R. Spencer Oliver, counsel and staff director; Alfred Friendly, Jr., deputy director.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. The Commission will come to order. Today is the first anniversary of the creation of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the occasion of the 13th public hearing the Commission has held on implementation of the 1975 Helsinki accords. It is entirely fitting that this hearing should be devoted to the work and the plight of the first individuals to utilize those accords as instruments for advancing international respect for human rights.

Those men and women live in the Soviet Union. They belong to the Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R. in Moscow, or to similar Helsinki-watch organizations established in the Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia and Armenia. Merely for trying to inform the public and leaders of the 35 signatory states about violations of the accords in the U.S.S.R., they have been subjected to continued and increasingly severe official attack.

Many of them have been pushed into exile.

Seven have been jailed.

And this week, we learned that Anatoly Shcharansky, one of their most courageous spokesmen, faces treason charges as groundless as they are ominous.

Mr. Shcharansky is a young Jew who has been waiting 4 years for permission—repeatedly denied—to move to Israel, where his wife has lived since 1974. But while he was forced to stay behind in the Soviet Union, he gave his energy and his talents to a cause that went beyond his personal struggle or even the struggle of his fellow Jews for the right to emigrate. He dedicated himself to confronting repression with publicity.

For that, he and his fellow Helsinki-watchers are paying now with their own freedom. Anatoly Shcharansky could be made to pay with his life.

The idea that he and other Jewish "refuseniks"—a group of people under constant KGB surveillance—could be engaged in espionage for the CIA is transparent nonsense. The charge against him is an attempt to inflame the old spectre of anti-Semitism. To make such a charge on the eve of the Helsinki signatories' first meeting in Belgrade is to display utter contempt for the principles of the Helsinki accords.

The campaign of arrest, exile and harassment also seems to be part of a renewed Soviet effort to stifle all domestic dissent, to persecute and intimidate the advocates of human rights into silence and conformity. The remarkable continuation of the work of the Soviet Helsinki-watchers—in the face of such repression—is proof that their spirit has not been broken.

The second collection of their reports which the Commission is issuing today is tangible evidence of their endurance, and convincing documentation of the evils they seek to combat. The reports speak only of violations of the Helsinki accords, but the act of compiling those reports speaks of a great dedication to the accords themselves.

That dedication should give us fresh encouragement to press on with the task of making the Helsinki accords work—work for a decent world where men and women, like the Helsinki-watchers in the Soviet Union, will no longer have to suffer for their ideals and ours.

Senator Dole, do you have some opening remarks?

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER DOLE

MR. DOLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a very brief statement that I would like to submit. I commend you for your outstanding job as a chairman. As the newest member, I would like to commend the members of the staff and the chairman for their excellent work.

I have a conflict this morning. The first American pilot shot down in Laos is being buried this morning in Arlington Cemetery and I have to attend that ceremony.

I tried to glance very quickly at the statement of our illustrious witness, Mr. Williams.

I share the comments just expressed by the chairman and I consider the Soviet decision to bring Anatoly Shcharansky to trial for treason the most flagrant in a series of Helsinki Final Act violations yet perpetrated by the Soviet Union. For me, and I think for many other Americans, this action is an outrage. A number of my colleagues—Senate colleagues—and I signed a letter to Secretary Brezhnev protesting the arrest of Anatoly Shcharansky last March.

I met with Mrs. Shcharansky when she was in the United States recently and I was moved by her sincerity and the manner in which she presented her husband's case.

I have also signed letters to Brezhnev on behalf of Mykola Rudenko and Oleksiy Tykhy, members of the Helsinki monitoring group in Kiev and Yuri Orlov and Aleksandr Ginzburg, members of a related group in Moscow. When two more members of the Kiev group were arrested in April, I protested that action. I have written to Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin requesting information on the Yakirs, a Jewish

family that requested and were refused exit visas. I am aware of the efforts of members of this Commission and many other Members of Congress who have written similar letters on behalf of other refuseniks. To my knowledge, none of our letters have received a response from the Soviet Government.

Along with other members of the Helsinki Commission, I have sat through numerous hearings listening to testimony which underscored Soviet violations of those Helsinki Final Act provisions which addressed such issues as free emigration, family reunification, religious liberties, and rights of national minorities.

The Soviet decision to hold a show trial for Shcharansky with phony evidence and counterfeit witnesses combined with the earlier arrest of members of Helsinki monitoring groups in Russia, Ukraine, and most recently, in Georgia, remind me of the Stalinist purges of the 1930's.

Since all of these actions are occurring now, on the eve of the Belgrade Conference, the only conclusion I can reach is that the Soviet Union is engaging in deliberately provocative behavior designed to test America's commitment to human rights.

We cannot allow the Soviets to scare us into adopting a softer posture at Belgrade. The Helsinki Commission and the Congress of the United States must stand behind President Carter and demonstrate to the Soviet Union that human rights is not a transitory political ploy to be negotiated away in return for other favorable considerations, but a principle that lies at the core of the American concept for a just world order.

With Belgrade less than two weeks away, I believe it is time that the members of this Commission insist on the inclusion of human rights violations on the Belgrade agenda. We must urge our U.S. delegation to reiterate in precise and unequivocal terms the commitment of the American people to human rights in the context of an ultimate enlargement of human freedom throughout the world.

It is with these reasons and thoughts in mind that I have introduced—along with Mrs. Fenwick in the House—a resolution which would reflect the attitude of this Commission and which would at the same time underscore the commitment of the Congress and the American people to human rights.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you very much.

Mr. FASCELL. Congressman Simon.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN SIMON

Mr. SIMON. I would concur, first of all, Mr. Chairman, with your excellent statement and that by Senator Dole and I would just add one other point.

I think it is very easy for others to misunderstand our system of government and how we respond to criticism. The Soviets have not hesitated criticizing some things in our society, and sometimes they have needed criticism. And we have of late properly criticized the Soviets when they have failed to comply with Basket III.

If they think by these severe measures that they have taken in recent weeks that they can silence the Government of the United States, or this Commission, or this Congress, they badly misread the reaction.

What they are doing is throwing flames on the fire rather than putting the fire out.

There is one way to silence us, to silence our criticism, and that is to move ahead in compliance with the spirit of Helsinki.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mrs. Fenwick.

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER FENWICK

Mrs. FENWICK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the Soviets have not hesitated to say quite clearly that they will continue the ideological struggle, that they feel entitled to move, with tanks and troops if necessary, in protection of that struggle wherever they feel it threatened. They say that quite calmly and at the same time, say that they do want to have an exchange between the nations of the West and themselves.

I think with equal calmness, with equal determination, and with equal confidence, we must proclaim that the basis of our actions and of our laws is a deep and true concern for the individual and his rights. That is what divides the two societies. In one, the state dominates and the individual is a tool, in the other, the individual and his rights are considered sacred.

I think that we have every right to uphold this principle, to make it the basis of our actions and of our speeches in the same way that they do—this does not mean an end to détente. What is the alternative? A vicious cold war. But it does mean that we are not going to stop any more than they are. We are not going to stop and we do not expect them to stop. We know what we are dealing with and they had better know what they are dealing with. We have an equal right to stand firm on something that I think is our greatest strength—I do not like to use the word weapon—our greatest strength in the world. If we really mean it—if we really care about people and are prepared to stand up for them—I do not think that that can fail to have an echo in the minds of people in the free and third worlds.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. Do we have a vote now?

Mrs. FENWICK. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. We will stand in recess for a few minutes and we will be right back.

[Short recess taken.]

Mr. FASCELL. The Commission will come to order. Our first witness, Edward Bennett Williams, is a distinguished Washington trial lawyer. In a great tradition, he certainly is an "attorney for the damned."

He has defended such unpopular men as the late Senator Joseph McCarthy, the late Representative Adam Clayton Powell, financier Louis Wolfson and labor leader Jimmy Hoffa. Among his clients in the sixties were two Soviets accused of espionage in the United States. His book, "One Man's Freedom," is an eloquent statement of a basic tenet of our civil liberties: The right of even the most detested individuals to the best possible legal defense.

Mr. Williams appears as our first witness today on behalf of another outcast, Aleksandr Ginzburg, a leader of the Soviet Helsinki Watch,

for 3 years the representative in Moscow of the Solzhenitsyn fund to aid political prisoners, and now—for the third time, in his 40 years—a political prisoner himself.

This Commission, of course, is not the courtroom in which Mr. Williams would wish to appear, but he has been barred from conducting Aleksandr Ginzburg's defense inside the Soviet Union.

We welcome you, Mr. Williams, as an advocate, not just for a man, but for a cause—and for respect for the Helsinki accords. We are delighted to welcome you here today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD BENNETT WILLIAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I wish to thank you for inviting me to be here with you today.

As you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, I represent Aleksandr Ginzburg, a brave, heroic, young fighter for freedom inside the Soviet Union whom I have never had the honor or the privilege to meet and it appears that there are those who are not in any hurry to see me get that honor or privilege.

It has been world-wide news that Aleksandr Ginzburg was arrested just 4 months ago today. The manner of his arrest I think gives us some very unsettling insights into the Soviet system of criminal justice.

On the night of February 3, he left his apartment in Moscow to make a phone call because he had been deprived of any phone service as a member of the Helsinki Watch Group.

He was arrested and he was spirited off to Kaluga Prison some 200 kilometers away from Moscow. And although his wife and his children were in that apartment house awaiting his return, they were never told that he been arrested. They were never told that he had been taken off to prison. And so Mrs. Ginzburg, on that night, hurried into the streets going from police station to police station to ask the whereabouts of her husband. She suspected that he had been arrested, but she was told everywhere that they had no knowledge of his whereabouts. It was not until the next morning that she was told by the KGB that he had been "detained."

Since that time, Aleksandr Ginzburg has been in Kaluga Prison. He has had communication with no one outside its walls. He has had communication with no member of his family because his family has been deprived of the right to see him or visit him. He had had communication with no lawyer because no lawyer has seen him. He has been deprived of the right to have counsel, nor have any charges been preferred against him.

You do not have to be Sherlock Holmes to deduce why Aleksandr Ginzburg was arrested. He was arrested because he embraced the cause of human freedom, because he believed in the right of free expression, because he believed in political expression, because he believed in the right of peaceable assembly and because he was presumptuous enough to believe that the Soviet regime meant it when they signed the Helsinki accords on August 1, 1975. That is why Aleksandr Ginzburg was arrested.

He had become well known in the West because in 1967 when Sinyavsky and Daniel were tried as the earliest political dissidents in the Soviet Union, he covered that trial and he wrote about that trial in his now famous "White Book." That book was circulated in the West after he had submitted it to the Supreme Soviet authority. He was charged with a violation of the infamous article 70 of the Soviet Criminal Code because he prepared the "White Book." That article 70 makes it a crime to slander the Soviet regime. Slander, of course, we would interpret in English as criticize—to criticize a regime because it does not accord any of the basic rights of human freedom.

Aleksandr Ginzburg criticized the Soviet regime, they said, when he published the "White Book." All observers agree that the White Book was a fair and accurate and objective report of the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial.

He became well known in the Soviet Union. He was sentenced to 5 years in prison and 5 years in exile for that effort. Small wonder, members of this Commission that he cried out for a lawyer from the West after the experience he had in that trial. He had a lawyer named Boris Zolotukhin who did the unprecedented, arrogant and presumptuous thing of asking the Soviet tribunal to acquit his client instead of behaving like a mendicant and suppliantly asking for mercy. For those efforts, Boris Zolotukhin was suspended from the Soviet Bar and expelled from the Communist Party.

When Aleksandr Ginzburg was sentenced at that time, he said this—and I want to read you the quote. He said:

I know you will convict me, because no one indicted under article 70 has ever been acquitted. That is one thing about a trial under article 70—the trial lawyer does not have any anxieties about the outcome because they are always foregone conclusions. We know the result. The only question is the sentence. He went on to say, My conscience is clear as I go to serve my sentence. You can send me to prison or to a labor camp, but I am convinced that no honest person will condemn me.

Thereafter Aleksandr Ginzburg became the principal administrator in the Soviet Union of the Russian Social Fund. The Russian Social Fund, members of the Commission, is a fund made up of the royalties from Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's book, "The Gulag Archipelago." All of the royalties since he left the Soviet Union have been diverted to help the families of the dissident prisoners within the Soviet Union and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn has administered that fund and has distributed some \$350,000.

Everything was done to discourage that fund. First it was taxed at 35 percent and last year the tax was raised to 65 percent so that only one-third of those funds could reach the families of the dissident prisoners.

But more recently, Aleksandr Ginzburg became a member of the Helsinki Watch Group to Promote the Observance of the Helsinki Accords. Now we know what the fate of the members of that watch group has been from looking at the press during the past 4 months. Two days after Ginzburg was arrested, Mykola Rudenko and Oleksiy Tykhy of the Ukrainian branch of the Helsinki Watch Group were arrested. One week later, Doctor Yuri Orlov, the founder and leader of the group, was arrested. And then, of course, Anatoly Shcharansky,

who we learned this week will be tried for treason in the Soviet Union for speaking out for the cause of freedom, for speaking out for the cause of Jewish emigration, for embracing the cause of political expression—he will be tried for treason, we are told, within the next month.

It is interesting to note that although Mr. Shcharansky was arrested only 2 months ago, they have prepared the case against Mr. Shcharansky and are preparing to move on the treason count. Aleksandr Ginzburg still languishes in jail. I tell you that tells the story, because they know that he is in such fragile health that he may die and they hope to break him and get a confession.

Most recently, two members of the newly formed Georgian branch—Zviad Gamsakhurdia and Merab Kostava—were arrested as members of the watch group.

My involvement in this matter came about this way, members of the Commission. After a call and a letter, I visited Mr. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn in Cavendish, Vermont and I spent 1 day with him. And I must confess to you that I became a convert to a belief that I think all of you have. I am a dedicated convert to it now. I know now the Soviets understand and respect strength, and they have contempt for vacillation and ambiguity. I believe that as long as we keep the searchlight of world opinion on their treatment of the dissidents, the cause of freedom will benefit to the maximum inside the Soviet Union.

After talking to Mr. Solzhenitsyn, I came back to Washington and I had a call from Mr. Ginzburg's wife who was able to make a phone call—one phone call to me, away from her home and we talked for 10 minutes. The first 8 minutes was clear. She begged me to come and counsel with her—she begged me to come and help her to the maximum of my ability within my limitations and to confer with her husband in Kaluga Prison and I agreed, of course, to do that.

I suppose—and this is pure speculation and not fact—that after the call had been monitored for about 7 minutes, the significance of the call was realized because it was forthwith jammed and suddenly a Soviet operator came on and said your 10 minutes is up. That was the last time that I have had communication through orthodox channels from Mrs. Ginzburg. It was the last telephone call that was made, although she has tried to call me. She is now under surveillance and can make no further calls.

I applied for a visa. I talked to the Soviet Ambassador, the Honorable Anatoly Dobrynin. I asked for the right to see him. He would not see me, but he talked to me on the telephone and he told me that my request was “unprecedented, presumptuous and arrogant,” but that I should reduce it to writing and it would be submitted to Moscow. I did do that. I complied. I wrote a long, formal request for a visa and I waited in respectful silence for an answer.

I believed that because the Soviets had embraced the spirit and letter of freedom in the Helsinki accords that I would get it. But I believed my application would be granted for another reason. Back in 1960, when Igor Y. Melekh, a Soviet attaché of the United Nations mission of the Soviet, was arrested for espionage, the then Soviet Ambassador asked me to defend him. That was not a popular cause which I was seeking to embrace, but popular misunderstanding is the

license fee that a trial lawyer often must pay to ply his trade. The defense of the unorthodox and the unpopular and the degraded for trial lawyers is a post of honor.

I had been all over the United States talking to law students and telling them this, and so the time had come for me to perform; and I believed that the canons of ethics and the sixth amendment to the Constitution required me to perform, and I did so vigorously.

I must tell this Commission that every principle of the American Bill of Rights was accorded to Igor Melekh; every procedural safeguard guaranteed by the criminal procedures of the United States was accorded to Igor Melekh and if I had wanted a Soviet lawyer to sit at my side to see that the proceedings were fair, there was no doubt that I could have had a Soviet lawyer there—the U.S. Government would have welcomed him—to see the fairness of the treatment which Igor Melekh received.

So successful was that defense that they came back—they came back again in 1968 with the case of Igor Ivanov—another one of their citizens charged with espionage. And once again, I did not think this was the way to win friends or influence people across the Nation to stand in the court beside a Soviet citizen charged with espionage, but once again, I believed it was my obligation as a lawyer to do that within the limits of integrity and decency and fairness—and I did it. Once again, I did it vigorously and once again, all of the safeguards were given to Igor Ivanov and also once again, after a vigorous defense, we had a success.

I belong to an old-fashioned school—I believe one good turn deserves another and so I was naive enough to think that when I called Mr. Dobrynin that he would say, “Of course, you can go visit Mrs. Ginzburg. Of course, you can go counsel with her. Of course, you can go help her select counsel.” But I was peremptorily denied that right. I asked for reconsideration and I thought naively that perhaps when I made the case again, they would understand. But this week, once again, I was peremptorily denied the right to travel to the Soviet Union.

I want to say to this Commission that I have practiced law for 32 years. I have been in a lot of cases that the members of the press have been interested in. I have never held a press conference in my life. All of the people who have covered trials that I have been in will tell you that I am the most difficult person in the world to talk to during a trial because I believe that a case should be tried in the courtroom and not on the courthouse steps. I believe that even-handed justice and fairness are realized by offering evidence before an impartial judge and an impartial jury or an impartial tribunal—not by talking about the case to the media—print or television.

But I have been deprived of the right to speak on behalf of Aleksandr Ginzburg. I have been deprived of the right to present his case or to assist in presenting his case in a courtroom, to be of assistance to his lawyer. I have been deprived of the right to confront his accusers. I have been deprived of the right even to see whether or not my client receives a fair trial.

So I now know that the only place that I can help Aleksandr Ginzburg and that brave band of men and women who have em-

braced the cause of freedom in an atmosphere of total repression, at great cost to their freedom and their lives—the only courtroom that I have is the courtroom of world opinion. I believe that it behooves me and all other members of my profession to speak out on this because the cause of liberty and freedom is an indivisible cause. It is like the central nervous system of the human body—you cut it in one place and you damage the whole—and maybe you kill the whole.

It is not important whether Ed Williams goes to Moscow, but it is important that some American lawyer be allowed to go. Somebody ought to be able to go over there and view these proceedings and see if they are conducted with minimum fairness or whether they are just a charade. I will tell you that the volunteers to do this are many. So I hope—I hope that the Soviet Ambassador will reconsider. If he will not let me go—it is not important that I go—it is important that someone goes and sees and witnesses and reports to the world whether Anatoly Shecharansky has a fair trial or whether Aleksandr Ginzburg has a fair trial or whether Aleksandr Ginzburg will be held without charges, without communication, and without a lawyer for another 4 months until perhaps his health is so destroyed that the case will have mooted out.

On August 1, 1975, along with 34 other participating States, the Soviet Union signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Article VII of that act pledges that:

The participating States will respect human rights and fundamental freedoms including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

They will promote and encourage the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural and other rights and freedoms all of which derive from the inherent dignity of the human person and are essential for his free and full development. [They] will act in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

On August 1, 1975, Secretary General Leonid Brezhnev solemnly signed his name to that pact and when they arrested Aleksandr Ginzburg 4 months ago, they broke it.

On August 1, 1975, they said that they embraced the idea of free movement of men and ideas across their borders. When they denied me the right to go into their country, they broke that commitment.

On August 1, 1975, they reaffirmed the Declaration of Universal Rights which said: "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest." (Article 9.) "Everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal." (Article 10.) "Everyone charged with a penal offense has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty." (Article 11.) Not to be held incommunicado in a prison 200 miles from his family. "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression." (Article 19.) That is what they said. When they said that, did they mean it? They violated that pledge; they breached it when they arrested Aleksandr Ginzburg.

They have a constitution, members of this Commission. I think the greatest political document written in the annals of human expression is the American Bill of Rights. The only document that I have ever seen that rivals it in its libertarian scope is the Soviet Constitution. You must read the Soviet Constitution on free expression, on fair trial, on impartial tribunal, on the rights of the accused—it is a thrilling

document, designed to stir the soul of the lawyer who loves liberty. But when they arrested Aleksandr Ginzburg 4 months ago—when they denied the visa application, they turned their backs on the Helsinki accords. They turned their backs on the United Nations' Charter. They turned their backs on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They turned their backs on their own Constitution.

The thing that concerns me most deeply about this case is not just the freedom of Aleksandr Ginzburg and Anatoly Shcharansky and Yuri Orlov and all of those brave men and women who have stood in an atmosphere of repression and spoken out for the essential dignity of human beings, but the thing that concerns me most deeply is that Aleksandr Ginzburg was a desperately ill man when he was taken to Kaluga Prison on February 3. He had been hospitalized for pneumonia and they discovered that he was tubercular and he was released with a high fever. When he was whisked off to Kaluga Prison, he had a high fever and he was in fragile health.

I had the experience of a long, long session with Vladimir Bukovsky who told me something about Soviet prisons and about Kaluga Prison, in particular. So I have grave fears as to whether Aleksandr Ginzburg can withstand the rigors of incarceration at Kaluga Prison. His wife has not been able to bring him the normal rations of food that are given to the ordinary prisoners. She has been frustrated and thwarted in this endeavor by the authorities.

I am gravely concerned over whether Aleksandr Ginzburg can withstand this much longer.

But I do know one thing. I read yesterday in the "Washington Post" that one of the pundits wrote: "The freedom movement in the Soviet Union is dead. The political dissidents are finished." Well, I do not believe that.

I would like to read to you what Aleksandr Ginzburg said shortly before he was arrested. "It is easy to foresee that new obstacles will arise along the way. This always happens in our country when the public hears not the glorification of the authorities but bitter testimony as to the results of their power. But I share Solzhenitsyn's conviction that the right of might must inevitably yield to the might of right. And of goodness."

As long as the Andrei Sakharovs, the Aleksandr Ginzburgs, the Yuri Orlovs, the Aleksandr Solzhenitsyns live, the fires of freedom will burn in the Soviet Union. As long as 325 brave Soviet citizens will put their names on a petition and send it to me saying "Right on—right on," I believe the fires of freedom shall burn in the Soviet Union.

As for myself and the members of my law firm, I will tell you that we will never count the cost and we will never seek respite until we have accomplished something for those brave people in the cause of human freedom.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams. Not only some writers, but others in and out of governments, have felt that any kind of effort in the world court of public opinion is counterproductive, that it would not only be destructive of civil rights movements in the Soviet Union, but that it would have a spill over effect with respect to all other matters that the signatory governments to the Helsinki accords might be interested in. What is your view on that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe, as I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, that the Soviet Union respects strength and resolution of purpose. They respect determination. They respect vigor and they have total contempt for vacillation and ambiguity and qualification and withdrawal.

I think that as long as we keep the searchlight of public opinion on their treatment of the dissidents, that we will render maximum benefit to the cause of freedom inside the Soviet Union and maximum benefit to the cause of freedom inside the Soviet Union, by my lights, is maximum benefit to the cause of world peace.

Mr. FASCELL. So then you are in accord with the efforts of this administration to keep that spotlight on the cause of human rights.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am. I was thrilled this morning to read that once again the spokesman for the President and the spokesman for the State Department have spoken out in a forthright, unambiguous manner with respect to the case of Anatoly Shcharansky and with respect to the Helsinki Watch Committee inside the Soviet Union. I believe that that resolution and unwavering demonstration of purpose is the maximum benefit that we can confer upon these brave people.

Mr. FASCELL. The Soviet Union has expressed in a variety of ways—and some other people have also—that they do not want the Belgrade Conference to be a shouting match of rhetoric, recrimination and fingerpointing. It occurs to me that the dynamics that bring that about or at least raise the level of the issue originate in the very actions of the Soviet Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think so, too, Mr. Chairman. I think that when we sign a treaty or an accord with a foreign power, we have the right to believe that they are going to live by it. If we signed a disarmament treaty, then we would monitor this disarmament factor of the treaty. Well, we signed a human rights accord and I think we ought to monitor the human rights aspect, section VII of the Helsinki accords.

I do not know what we, as a nation, have been doing about monitoring it, but thank goodness there is a band of freedom lovers inside Moscow and inside the Soviet Union who take the Soviet regime's commitment seriously and are watching everything they do about it. I think the way that we can demonstrate the resolution of purpose that I think is needed is to make sure that on June 15, the first order of business is to put compliance with article VII on that agenda for Belgrade. I hope and expect the representative of the American Government will do just that so that our performance is consonant with our commitment.

Mr. FASCELL. It is certainly on the agenda, Mr. Williams. It might not be in specific terms, but the agenda has been set, of course, because it is the Helsinki accords which is to be reviewed. That means all of the Baskets. I do not see any way around that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope it is not so far down in the Basket, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot see it and that you have to feel way down in order to find it because I think it ought to be right up there on the top of the Basket. It appears to me that the rest of the Helsinki accords have been pretty carefully complied with by the signatories from the West.

Mr. FASCELL. Mrs. Fenwick.

Mrs. FENWICK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we were all very much moved by your statement. Certainly I was. Sometimes we wonder, in defending principles, whether we forget the individuals to whom those principles apply, but I think you have made it so clear that

in the long run it is only principles that defend people, and that unless we stand for those principles, there is no hope for the helpless who are condemned to suffer these outrages.

Certainly at Belgrade—perhaps not in the agenda conference which will be more technical, but in the October conference—what we know and what this Commission has learned must be made useful. We have been monitoring compliance since we were established in June 1976. The legislation was introduced in September 1975 and this Commission has been working under our able chairman ever since the law was signed. We hope that these efforts will be useful. We intend that they shall be. But the problem is that we have no sanction to compel compliance. What sanction—what power have we?

Yesterday speaking on the floor of the House about Anatoly Shcharansky, I asked what can Congress do? What sanctions have we? We can say that they are not living up to the accords and we know that is true, but how to make that effective? The same thing is true, frankly, about the military provisions in Basket I. What is the alternative—war? We can, of course, stop interchanges and détente, but détente at least allows us to have an interchange. Détente means that some of the Voice of America will get through. If the jurists do as I hope they will and take up the cudgels as you have suggested, they too can be a very powerful voice. International associations of scientists and jurists and psychiatrists and writers—all of these organizations, independently of what we do, should be involved in this.

What suggestions have you, Mr. Williams?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think, Mrs. Fenwick, that we can never underestimate—and maybe we are underestimating—the importance of world opinion to the Soviets. I think it is of tremendous importance to them not to have world opinion turned against them. If we have a continuation of the repressiveness that has been manifested to the Helsinki Watch Group, I believe that world opinion can be marshaled against them so that they will feel a serious detriment flowing from it.

They did sign an agreement. They had signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They are going to have a new Constitution. I think we should all look at that Constitution with great interest. Obviously, it cannot be more repressive in tone. It must be more libertarian. If it is more libertarian, it will be a marvelous document to read because we will then take that new Constitution which will be promulgated very soon and just compare it with the treatment of Shcharansky and Ginzburg and Orlov and see whether we can find any points of incidence.

Mrs. FENWICK. But, you know, Mr. Williams, this is where the frustration comes. Clive Barnes testified before this Commission. He was concerned with a famous dancer who had defected and had tried to get his wife out. Mr. Barnes said, "You can rally public opinion on behalf of the well known." But I am thinking of a garage mechanic and his desperate wife who came before us—not important people; not big names of any kind. These are the people that break your heart. How do we get the mechanic out; or another woman in Israel with a child born handicapped mentally and physically, and a husband who cannot get out? Unknown people. This is where the effort has to be,

as you say, the appeal to principle. Otherwise they are lost—they have no notoriety that will attract famous and important people to come to their defense.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mrs. Fenwick, Mr. Solzhenitsyn says that for every one of the brave people who have spoken out in the cause of freedom or who have demonstrated in the cause of freedom on the streets of Moscow, there are 100,000 who are thinking these thoughts and who are longing to join, but who have not mustered the courage. It may take one electric flash—it may take one incident to spread that cause of freedom through Moscow. Mr. Simon said earlier when he spoke that everytime that we give encouragement to the people who are speaking out, we are pouring kerosene on the flames of liberty inside the Soviet Union. I believe we are.

The worst thing that I believe we could do would be to let those people who have embraced the cause of human freedom inside the most repressive society in the history of the world believe that they are alone and forgotten and that no one cares and that no one is willing to speak out for them.

Mrs. FENWICK. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the worst thing we can do and that is why I think that the work of this Commission is so important and if you can rally the kind of support that I believe is necessary to demonstrate to them that they are not alone—that they are not forgotten—that people all over the world care about them, respect them, admire, revere, and love them, this Commission will have done the greatest service that anybody can do for the Congress of the United States.

Mrs. FENWICK. Thank you, Mr. Williams.

Mr. FASCELL. Congressman Simon.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I rarely feel like applauding when a witness finishes.

Mrs. FENWICK. I do, too.

Mr. SIMON. I do not like cheering, but I felt like cheering. I concur in what you had to say and I think what you have just said in response to Mrs. Fenwick is extremely important. If nothing else, we owe these people the right to let them feel someone out there cares and is concerned. If we do nothing more than that, we have done something constructive. But I think we can do more than that if we just keep that spotlight on.

I have just one question. I am curious about when you talked to Ambassador Dobrynin. Was he the one who contacted you on either one of the previous occasions to ask you to serve as counsel?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. No; he was not.

Mr. SIMON. Was he aware of your involvement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I certainly made him aware of that.

Mr. SIMON. All right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I made him aware of that both orally and in writing at some length, just in case he had forgotten. If he had forgotten, it would be because of retrograde amnesia. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMON. I have no further questions. I commend you on what you are doing. I think this country and the world are fortunate for your services.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Williams, I am constrained to say that it is apparent to me that George Allen is not the only reason the Redskins tend to be winners.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Mr. BUCHANAN. As one American—as one member of the Commission, I am confident as to what the court of world opinion will rule on this matter. I just want to thank you for your most effective testimony and also for your continued effort on behalf of the cause of justice and human freedom.

It is my profound hope that the Soviet Union will reconsider its decision on your most reasonable request and will at least, in this small way, begin to honor its own Constitution.

Thank you very much.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Bingham.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry that I was a little late getting here and I missed a good part of your testimony, Mr. Williams, but I heard enough to certainly want to join the others in applauding your testimony and your efforts.

I do have a specific question in looking over your prepared statement. What happened in the initial case when Mr. Ginzburg was sentenced to 5 years—you do not mention whether he served the 5 years?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He served the 5 years, Mr. Bingham, and he was serving his 5 years in exile. He served 5 years in prison and he has served a total of 7 years in prison during his life—5 of them under that article 70 charge when he reported the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial. It was regarded as a crime to report the procedures that were followed in trying Sinyavsky and Daniel and before you got here, Mr. Bingham, I told the Commission that he had a very unusual lawyer in the Soviet Union. The lawyer was courageous enough to ask for his acquittal which was an unprecedented thing.

Mr. BINGHAM. I see that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is not supposed to happen. You are supposed to ask for mercy in those courts, but he was treated rather shoddily for having asked for his client's acquittal. Ginzburg was sentenced. He was tried with another defendant and he stood before the court at the time of the sentence and he asked the court to do one thing. He said, "Do not sentence me to a lighter sentence than my codefendant. I want everything he gets." There was some suggestion that because of his fragile health he might get something less. So he got 5 years and he served the 5 years and he was doing 5 years in exile—he was not allowed in Moscow except occasionally for visits during the period of exile.

He is now not in Moscow, as you know, Mr. Bingham. He is up in Kaluga Prison which is about 150 miles out of Moscow.

Mr. BINGHAM. Do you know whether this article 70 charge which has been made against him is the same kind of charge that has been quite frequent in the past as distinguished from the charge of treason, which has been made against Mr. Shcharansky, and which I understand to be virtually unique since the Stalin days.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He has not been charged with anything yet. He was charged for doing the White Book on the Sinyavsky-Daniel trial with an article 70 offense. As of now, we cannot find out what he is charged with and I suggested to the Commission, wholly apart from my prepared statement, that if you want to look for a charge, you have to assume that he has been charged for embracing the cause of freedom inside the Soviet Union and for being part of the Helsinki Watch Group.

Mr. BINGHAM. Were you given any reason for a denial of your visa?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I was given no reason.

Mr. BINGHAM. I certainly thank you for your efforts. We all do. I think that this Commission is grateful to you for highlighting this matter. We are going to try as we proceed in matters such as this to keep such matters before the court of world opinion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Williams, Vladimir Bukovsky, as I recall, was also charged and tried and sentenced under article 70 and as I recall, in his case, he was once sent to a psychiatric institution for political dissent and then because he had an interview with CBS, they sent him to jail. When we received him here and heard his testimony, it struck me as unusual that here under Soviet law a man was branded as an insane criminal and yet we were fortunate to provide him a forum to speak out without going to jail. But this raises the issue, as do all of these cases, as I see it, of the Soviet argument that under the Helsinki accords all of this is really interfering in their internal affairs and is nobody's business. From a legal standpoint, how do you view that argument?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that they made it our business when they induced us by the considerations that were given to sign the Helsinki accords. They exacted a very heavy quid pro quo for embracing the principles of freedom and for embracing the freedom of motion for ideas and men across their borders when they signed the Helsinki accords. I think that they made it our business. We have a right to expect that signatories to accords will comply with what they promise. We have a right to monitor that. We have the right to look at that and if they do not do it, then we should learn a very, very important lesson about dealing with them in the future. Up to now, it seems we have not learned that lesson.

Mr. FASCELL. They take the further position, of course, that the accords are not a treaty of any kind and not binding on anybody.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I suppose the same would apply to the respect for the integrity of their borders.

Mr. FASCELL. Which they put great stock in under these same accords.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The same accords.

Mr. FASCELL. It seems to me a rather reasonable position to take—you cannot have it both ways under the same agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mrs. Fenwick said earlier in a very, I thought, eloquent statement, the difference between their government and their form of government and ours. I have always thought that the difference is most dramatically symbolized in the fact that they keep under

glass at the Kremlin for everyone to see the corpse of Lenin demonstrating that theirs is really a government of men. But if you walk up the street here at the National Archives, you will see what we have under glass. We have the American Bill of Rights showing that ours is a government of laws and principles and rules. I think that is the difference between the two societies and that is what we are talking about here this morning.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Williams, you say you have a petition here and we would be glad to receive it for our files.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a number of communications that I think might be interesting for your files, Mr. Chairman, and I will make them available to your staff, if I may.

Mr. FASCELL. Without objection, we would be very happy to receive those for the files or the record.

Materials and communications submitted for the record are printed at the conclusion of Mr. Williams' testimony.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If I may just take 1 final minute—I think I have trespassed on your time too long—but for those people who are writing and saying that the cause of the political dissidents is dead, I would like to submit to this Commission the following communications that I have received from people inside the Soviet Union about the case of the political dissidents.

An appeal by a Moscow physicist, Yuri Mnyukh, a member of the Helsinki Group who was not afraid to write; a letter from a group of political prisoners from the labor camps in Mordovia; an appeal from an astronomer, Kronid Lyubarsky, recently freed from a labor camp; an appeal to world opinion and to the governments who signed the Helsinki agreements in defense of Aleksandr Ginzburg, signed by the members of the Helsinki Monitoring Group, including Mrs. Sakharov; an appeal by Doctor Sakharov and Igor Shafarevich; an appeal signed by 325 people inside the Soviet Union who were courageous enough to put their names on a document embracing the causes of Yuri Orlov and Aleksandr Ginzburg; an appeal by the Christian Committee for the defense of and rights of religious people; an appeal by the Union of Evangelical Christians; an appeal by General Grigorenko and his wife requesting the authorities to release Aleksandr Ginzburg, signed by Mrs. Sakharov, asking that he be kept by them provisionally until trial because of his bad health. A number of other petitions and letters that have come to me—I say that anyone who says that the cause of freedom is dead in the Soviet Union and that the fires of political dissent are out has gravely miscalculated the mood of the political dissidents in the Helsinki Watch Group.

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Williams. I want to thank you for your appearance here today and your testimony.

Mr. BINGHAM. May I ask a question?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Bingham.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would just like to ask one more question. As we go to Belgrade, would you not agree that it would be very important that we should make efforts on our side to see that as far as possible our hands are clean. For example, the fact that we still do not permit—do not issue visas to those with Communist connections, or at least that is the provision in our law. We ought to move to repeal those

laws to the extent that we violate the Helsinki act—they may not be comparable to what the Soviets are guilty of, but should we not at least try to see that our hands are clean?

Mr. WILLIAMS. My experience in the last couple of months, Mr. Bingham, is that that policy at the State Department in that respect has been greatly relaxed. I do not know enough about the statutory predicate for the regulations and the policy being implemented by the Department, but my experience is that that policy has been greatly relaxed in the last 60 days.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you. There was the well-publicized case of the labor group which was denied entry a couple of months ago. It is true that waivers are easy to obtain, but there are still cases—.

Mrs. FENWICK. I would hesitate to debate this distinguished attorney, but I think what is important about our law is not only that it provides a method, which is absolutely essential—but its purpose is the protection of individual rights. That is what is important.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Williams, thank you very much. You have made a very substantial contribution to our record of this Commission, but also to the record of the whole world on this very important matter and we appreciate very much your coming here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, members of the Commission.

[Materials submitted by Mr. Williams follow:]

A COLLECTION OF MATERIALS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE USSR PROTESTING
THE ARRESTS OF ALEKSANDR GINZBURG AND YURI ORLOV

BULLETIN

In February 1977 in Moscow, two prominent representatives of our country's independent public opinion were arrested: Aleksandr Ginzburg, main representative of the Russian Social Fund to help political prisoners and their families, member of the Moscow Helsinki Agreement Monitoring Group, and Yuri Orlov, president of the Helsinki Monitoring Group in Moscow, well-known physicist, corresponding member of the Armenian Academy of Science. The high repute and the good deeds of these two men are now known not only in the U.S.S.R., but in the entire world.

International public opinion and government circles of several countries which signed the Helsinki agreement, understandably felt that these arrests were a flagrant violation of that agreement's provisions and an attempt to suffocate on the eve of the Belgrade Conference all free voices speaking out in defense of human rights in our country.

Our authorities try to counteract such a reaction from world public opinion—most unpleasant from their point of view—by asserting that the arrests of human right defenders are "an internal affair". One of the authors of the documents in this bulletin relevantly replies that it is not our internal affair (meaning the country's) it is your internal affair (meaning the regime's) which makes the country blush. The arrest of an innocent person cannot be anybody's internal affair.

The outcome of the "cases" of A. Ginzburg and Yu. Orlov will be of fundamental significance not only for our country. Harsh and merciless reprisal against these two individuals may well be a sign of deterioration of the internal situation that will inevitably reflect on international relations.

Today numerous people are following the fates of Aleksandr Ginzburg and Yuri Orlov, while Soviet propaganda endeavors to besmirch their names. Truthful and exact information on all the circumstances connected with their "cases" is particularly important at this time. The purpose of submitting this bulletin to your attention is precisely to supply you with such information. It will be published again as more documentary materials are gathered.

FREEDOM FOR ALEKSANDR GINZBURG!

Aleksandr Ginzburg has been arrested.

This man, who in the last few years has given his life to lofty and self-sacrificing civic service by helping political prisoners and their families, has been deprived of freedom. This news pained the hearts not only of those who knew Ginzburg well, but also of those hundreds of people whom he supported in difficult moments, through his kind and generous endeavors as representative of the Solzhenitsyn Fund.

This is the third arrest in the life of Aleksandr Ginzburg, who not long ago turned forty.

In 1960, he was arrested for publishing the typewritten poetry magazine, *Syntax*. The sentence—2 years in prison camps. In 1967, he was arrested for compiling the widely-known "White Book," a collection of materials on the trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel. The sentence—5 years in prison camps. And now again, a new arrest. And possibly, another term . . .

The years Ginzburg has spent in prisons and camps have broken his health. A whole range of stomach ailments is an indelible reminder of those years. Not long before his arrest, he had been discharged from a hospital with a medical certificate stating that he had uncured pneumonia, and a constant temperature, under instructions to go to a tuberculosis clinic for cure. The KGB staff who took him to Kaluga Prison knew about this . . .

In the course of several years, the civic activity of Aleksandr Ginzburg was accompanied by slander from Soviet information agencies. The latest publication (in particular, the shamelessly false TASS announcement of February 4 leaves no doubt that a frame-up of Ginzburg is being devised. Petrov-Agatov has already spread his dirty evidence (for what Judas-like payment?) over the pages of the *Literary Gazette*. The trial, if it takes place, will be the revenge the authorities take on a brave man for his charity and goodness. And the sentence, if it is pronounced, will amount to the murder of the father of two small sons.

We demand the immediate release of Aleksandr Ginzburg!

We appeal to the leaders of all countries who signed the Helsinki Agreements to recognize clearly that the campaign against Aleksandr Ginzburg, member of the Group to Promote the Observance of the Helsinki Agreements, signifies the creation of a political and social climate in our country of a kind bound to lead to serious international repercussions. We appeal to you to do everything within your power to put a stop to this campaign! We appeal to all humanitarian, legal and religious association to come forth in the defense of Aleksandr Ginzburg! We appeal to world-wide public opinion to support us to the full.

February 4, 1977.

(Signed:)

1. Pavel Abramovich, engineer. 2. Mark Azbel, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences. 3. Lyudmila Alekseeva, philologist. 4. Mikhail Alekseev, mathematician. 5. Vladimir Albrecht, mathematician. 6. Boris Altshuller, physicist. 7. Iosif Andryukhin. 8. Elena Armand. 9. Sh. Arutyunyan (Armenia). 10. Eduard Arutyunyan (Armenia). 11. Aleksandr Babenyshev, mathematician. 12. Sarra Babenysheva, literary critic. 13. Dzhemma Babich (Leningrad) physician. 14. Tatyana Baeva. 15. Aleksandr Barbanov, physicist. 16. B. Batis (Lithuania). 17. Vyacheslav Bakhmin, mathematician. 18. Beglar Bezhuashvili (Tbilisi), art critic. 19. Boris Beilin, physicist. 20. G. Blinas (Lithuania). 21. Larisa Bogoraz, philologist, 22. Aleksandr Bolonkin (Buryat A.S.S.R.), Candidate of Technological Sciences, political exile. 23. I. Volunchavichyus (Lithuania). 24. Elena Bonner, physician. 25. Ruf Bonner, pensioner.

26. Vadim Borisov, historian. 27. Leonid Borodin, historian. 28. Viktor Brailovsky, Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences. 29. Irina Brailovskaya. 30. Nadezhda Vasilievna Bukharina, pensioner. 31. Irina Valitova (Orlov), art critic. 32. S. Valyukenas (Lithuania). 33. Varsonofy (Khaibulin) archdeacon. 34. L. S. Varshavskaya. 35. Marat Veksler, psychiatrist, poet. 36. Kseniya Velikanova, biologist. 37. Tatyana Velikanova, mathematician. 38. Larisa Vilenskaya. 39. Nikolai Vilyams, mathematician. 40. Elizaveta Vins (Kiev), Baptist. 42. Natalya Vins (Kiev), Baptist. 43. Pyotr Vins (Kiev), electrician, Baptist. 44. Vladimir Voinovich, writer. 45. Vladimir Gaenko, chemist (Leningrad). 46. Zviad Gamsakhurdia, Candidate of Philological Sciences (Tbilisi). 47. K. Garutskas (Lithuania). 48. Yuri Gastev, mathematician. 49. Valis Gayauskas (Lithuania). 50. Aleksandr Gvinter.

51. Maria Gel (Lvov). 52. Sergei Genkin, mathematician. 53. Vladmir Gershuni, writer. 54. Irina Gildengorn. 55. Grigori Goldshtein, engineer (Tbilisi). 56. Isai

Goldshstein, engineer (Tbilisi). 57. Yuri Golfand, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences. 58. Aleksandr Golyashev, engineer. 59. Zinaida Grigorenko, pensioner. 60. Pyotr Grigorenko, general. 61. Yuri Grimm. 62. Elena Grin, translator. 63. Teimuraz Dzhanelidze, teacher (Tbilisi). 64. Zarina Dzyboeva. 65. S. Dobrovolskis (Lithuania). 66. Elena Dubyanskaya. 67. Venedikt Erofeev, writer. 68. Yuri Zharkikh, artist. 69. A. Zhilinskas (Lithuania). 70. Vladimir Zhiltsov, philologist (Gorky). 71. Father Sergei Zheludkov, priest (Pskov). 72. I. Zdebskis (Lithuania). 73. Lidiya Zadnovskaya, proofreader. 74. Asafya Zdanovskaya, watchman. 75. Tatyana Zaochnaya.

76. Yulia Zaks, chemist. 77. Boris Zaks, member of the Union of Journalists. 78. Leonid Ziman, teacher. 79. Lidiya Aleksandrovna Ivanova. 80. Nikolai Ivanov, art critic (Vladimir Province). 81. K. Tokubonis (Lithuania). 82. Veniamin Iofe, chemical engineer (Leningrad). 83. Olga Iofe. 84. Valeriya Isakova (Davydova), geologist (Leningrad). 85. Sofya Vasilievna Kallistratova, lawyer. 86. Ivan Kandyba, lawyer (Lvov). 87. Viktor Kapitanchuk, chemist. 88. Irina Kaplun, proofreader. 89. Meri Kaplan, teacher. 90. Lyudmila Kardasevich, office worker. 91. Iosif Kiblitky, artist. 92. Yuri Kiselev, artist. 93. Lyudmila Klimanova, chemist (Leningrad). 94. Evgeni Kokorin. 95. Nina Komarova, chemist pharmacist (Vladimir Province). 96. Vladimir Kornilov, member of the Union of Writers. 97. Aleksandr Korchak, Doctor of Science, physicist. 98. Lev Kopelev, literary critic. 99. Merab Kostava, art critic (Tbilisi). 100. Elena Kosterina, biologist.

101. Valentina Kropivnitskaya, artist. 102. Aleksandr Lavut, mathematician. 103. Bronislav Lainer. 104. Malva Landa, geologist. 105. Vera Lashkova. 106. L. Laurinskas (Lithuania). 107. Ilya Levin, philologist (Leningrad). 108. Rakhil Levitanaitė. 109. Veniamin Levich, Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences, physicist. 110. Tatyana Levich. 111. Dimitri Leontev. 112. Evgeni Liberman. 113. V. F. Livchak, physician. 114. Nina Lisovskaya, biologist. 115. S. Lukauskalte (Lithuania). 116. Levko Lukyanenko, lawyer (Chernigov). 117. Kronid Lyubarsky, astrophysicist, Candidate of Science (Tarus). 118. Valentina Mashkova (Osipova). 119. Marinovich (Kiev). 120. Anatoli Marchenko, writer, worker (Chuna). 112. Matusevich (Kiev). 122. Igor Melchuk, linguist, Doctor of Science. 123. Boris Mikhailov, art critic. 124. Yuri Mnyukh, Candidate of Science. 125. Raisa Moroz (Ivano-Frankovsk).

126. Mark Morozov. 127. Sergei Moshkov, chemist (Minsk). 128. Lyubov Murzhenko. 129. Victor Nekipelov, chemist-pharmacist (Vladimir Province). 130. Evgeni Nikolaev, biologist. 131. Tatyana Osipova. 132. L. E. Ostrovskaya, artist. 133. Vladlen Pavlenkov, teacher of history (Gorky). 134. Svetlana Pavlenkova, teacher (Gorky). 135. Ninel Panfilova, physicist. 136. Ya. Petkyavichene (Lithuania). 137. Vyacheslav Petrov, worker, exile (Tomsky Province). 138. Vladimir Sirotnin, chemical engineer (Krasnoyarsk). 139. Gali Petrova-Zhuravleva, pensioner. 140. A. Petrusyavichus (Lithuania). 141. Leonid Efimovich Pinsky, writer. 142. Aleksandr Podrabinek, doctor's assistant. 143. Pinkhos Podrabinek, physician. Candidate of Science. 144. Larisa Poluektova, thermal engineer. 145. Vitali Pomezov, philologist (Gorky). 146. Elena Ponomaryova, philologist. 147. Sergei Ponomaryov, philologist (Gorky). 148. Vladimir Prestin, engineer. 149. I. Protoslyavichus (Lithuania). 150. Valeri Prokhorov, actor.

151. Viktoras Pyatkus (Lithuania). 152. Aleksandr Rabin, artist. 153. Oskar Rabin, artist. 154. Lev Regelson, physicist. 155. Vitali Rekrubratsky, biologist. 156. Grigory Rozenshtein, physicist. 157. Natalya Rozenshtein, architect. 158. Vyacheslav Rodionov (Aleksandr). 159. Valeri Ronkin, chemical engineer (Leningrad). 160. Ivan Rudakov, mathematician. 161. Mykola Rudenko, writer (Kiev). 162. Viktor Rukhiladze (Tbilisi). 163. Galina Salova, astronomer. 164. A. Svarinskas (Lithuania). 165. Nadiya Svetlichnaya, philologist. 166. Feliks Svetov, writer. 167. Tatyana Semenova, philologist. 168. Feliks Serebov, metal craftsman. 169. Maiya Serkova, architect. 170. Mariya Petrenko (Podypolskaya), geologist. 171. Vladimir Slepak, electronics engineer. 172. Valeri Smolkin, chemist (Vilnyus). 173. Aida Simolyanskaya, pensioner. 174. Boris Starostin, worker. 175. Pyotr Starchik, composer.

176. Saida Starchik. 177. Nina Antonovna Strokato (Karavanskaya), physician (Tarus). 178. Lev Talyanner. 179. A. Terlyatskas (Lithuania). 180. Leonard Ternovsky, physician. 181. Lyudmila Ternovskaya, physician. 182. Viktor Timachev, geologist. 183. Sara Tverdokhlebova, pensioner. 184. Valentin Turchin, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences. 185. Tatyana Turchina, engineer. 186. Roksana Urban, philologist. 187. Kirill Uspensky (Kostinsky), translator (Leningrad). 188. Mikhail Utevsky, engineer. 189. Natalya Fyodorova, economist.

190. E. Finkelshtein, physicist (Lithuania). 191. Sergei Khodorovich, programmer. 192. Tatyana Khodorovich, linguist. 193. Igor Khokhlushkin, restorer. 194. Valentina Chikatueva, engineer (Luga). 195. Leonid Shabashov. 196. Nadezhda Shatunovskaya, pensioner. 197. A. Sheduikis (Lithuania). 198. Mikhail Shepelev. 199. Bella Shlifshtein, pensioner. 200. Aleksandr Shuster, mathematician.

201. Sergei Khakhaev, chemist (Leningrad). 202. Anatoly Shcharansky, mathematician. 203. Vadim Shcheglov. 204. Nadezhda Elskaya, artist. 205. Natalya Yuryshva. 206. M. Yuryavichyus (Lithuania). 207. Irina Yakir. 208. Rimma Yakir. 209. Father Gleb Yakunin, priest. 210. Efrem Yankelevich, physicist. 211. Elena Akimenko (Krasnodar Territory), Pentecostalist. 212. Aleksandr Bibikov (Krasnodar Territory), Pentecostalist. 213. Vladimir Bibikov (Krasnodar Territory), Pentecostalist. 214. Esfir Bibikova (Krasnodar Territory), Pentecostalist. 215. Nikolai Bobarykin (Krasnodar Territory), Pentecostalist. 216. Alla Bobarykina (Krasnodar Territory), Pentecostalist. 217. Valeri Galushkin (Krasnodar Territory) Pentecostalist. 218. Lidia Galushkina (Krasnodar Territory) Pentecostalist. 219. Varvard Goretaya (Krasnodar Territory) Pentecostalist. 220. Enokh Goretoi (Krasnodar Territory) Pentecostalist. 221. Nadezhda Goretaya (Krasnodar Territory) Pentecostalist. 222. Nikolai Goretoi (Krasnodar Territory) Pentecostalist. 223. Irina Matyash (Krasnodar Territory) Pentecostalist. 224. Vasili Patrushev (Krasnodar Territory) Pentecostalist. 225. Inokenti Patrushev (Laruk).

226. Evgeni Patrushev (Primorsk Territory, city of Nakhodka). 227. Vasili Patrushev (Primorsk Territory, city of Nakhodka). 228. Boris Perchatkin (Primorsk Territory, city of Nakhodka). 229. Nadezhda Pishchenko (Krasnodar Territory, Pentecostalist). 230. Anatoli Pishchenko (Krasnodar Territory, Pentecostalist). 231. Fyodor Sidenko (Krasnodar Territory, Pentecostalist). 232. Yera Sidenko (Krasnodar Territory, Pentecostalist). 233. Vera Shukina. 234. V. Yaugyalis (Lithuania). 235. Naum Meiman, Professor of Mathematics. 236. Dmitry Dudko, priest. 237. Vladimir Shilkov, Evangelical Christians-Baptists (Ryazan). 238. Mikhail Murkin, Evangelical Christians-Baptists (Ryazan). 239. Leonid Murkin, Evangelical Christians-Baptists (Ryazan). 240. Rostislav Galetsky, Evangelical Christians-Baptists (Ryazan). 241. Ivan Kuz, Evangelical Christians-Baptists (Ryazan). 242. Valeri Maresin, biologist. 243. Ari Mizyakin. 244. V. Fain. 245. Iosif Begun. 246. Povorkov. 247. I. Kosharovskaya. 248. A. Mai. 249. L. Godlin. 250. Orleansky.

251. M. Zeleny. 252. A. Shatov. 253. V. Faerman. 254. Yuri Kublanovsky. 255. Irina McClellan. 256. Vladimir Skvirsky. 257. D. Genov. 258. Aleksandr Ivanchenko. 259. G. Livshits. 260. Oleg Vorobev (Tarusa). 261. Stefaniya Shabatura, artist, political exile (Kurgan Province). 262. Oksana Meshko (Kiev). 263. Ada Nikolskaya. 264. Aleksandr Yakir. 265. Evgeny Yakir. 266. Dina Beilina. 267. Iosif Beilin. 268. Kirill Podrabinek, loader. 269. Aleksandr Lerner, physicist, Doctor of Science. 270. Ida Nudel. 271. L. Schastlivaya. 272. F. Gandel. 273. G. Abrina. 274. Semyon Ginzburg. 275. Aleksandr Verkhman (Kiev). 276. Iosif Markov. 277. Viktor Lavrinenko. 278. Ivar Zhukovskis (Latvia). 279. Viktor Kalnynsh (Riga). 280. Yuris Ziemelis (Latvia). 281. Natalya Mikhailova. 282. Tatyana Drozhina. 283. Aleksei Smirov. 284. Valentina Savinkova. 285. Sergei Levin (Leningrad). 286. Irina Kastire, artist. 287. Viktor Golovin, engineer. 288. Mikhail Kaplan. 289. Leonid Tymchuk (Odessa). 290. Anna Golumbievskaya, 291. Emiliya Ilina, engineer (Leningrad). 292. Faina Koss, biologist (Leningrad). 293. Vadim Baranov, chauffeur. 294. Galina Baranova, housewife. 295. Mariya Slepak, physician. 296. Sanya Lipavsky, Candidate of Medical Sciences. 297. Lev Gendin, worker. 298. Elena Sirotenko. 299. Vladimir Sheinker. 300. Arkady Polishuk, journalist.

301. Viktor Elistratov. 302. Boris Chernobylsky, radio engineer. 303. Evgeni Pashnin, political exile (Vorkuta). 304. L. L. Pertsev. 305. A. A. Pertseva. 306. Iosif Dyadkin, physician. 307. I. E. Sofieva. 308. Leonid Siry, worker (Odessa). 309. Valentina Siraya (Odessa). 310. Adel Naidenovich. 311. Vs. Radionov. 312. Yuri Mashkov (Aleksandrov). 313. Anatoli Ivanov. 314. Rait Mukhamedvedov. 315. Irina Kristi, mathematician. 316. V. B. Sosinsky, writer (Odessa), National Hero of France. 317. Lyudmila Komm (Leningrad). 318. N. Kistyakovsky, translator. 319. Yuri Gorodentsev. 320. Vasili Barladyanu (Odessa). 321. Elena Danielyan (Odessa). 322. Viktor Borovsky. 323. Sergei Shevchenko. 324. Genrikh Altunyan. 325. Aleksandr Shtelmakh. 326. Yuri Avrutsky.

STATEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR THE GINZBURG FAMILY

On February 2, the weekly *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, which specializes in slanderous campaigns against "dissidents", published an article under the title "Liars

and forgers," signed "former member of the Union of Writers, A. Petrov Agatov. This article, which is actually a denunciation, was aimed primarily against A. Ginzburg and Yu. Orlov. Those who realize how close the link is between the Soviet press and the organs of repression immediately realized that they are in real danger.

The well-known human right defender, General Petr Grigorenko (who spent many years in a psychiatric ward because of his determined defense of all those oppressed and was released recently thanks to the pressure of world public opinion) wrote with his wife Zinaida the following open letter:

When our organs of repression want to get even with human right defenders, they often fabricate "criminal charges" against them. The first step in the fabrication of such an affair against Aleksandr Ginzburg, was the publication of the article "Liars and forgers" in the weekly *Literaturnaya Gazeta* on February 2, 1977.

Aleksandr Ginzburg, in his capacity as representative of the Solzhenitsyn Fund, performs a great task in taking care of political prisoners and their families. There is no such thing as help to political prisoners in the budget of the Soviet Red Cross. The old Russian tradition of helping them has been eradicated from our daily life. Political prisoners are tortured by hunger, impossibly hard work and by persecution of their families. To counteract all these measures of repression, Aleksandr Ginzburg organized moral and material aid to prisoners of conscience and their families. This is why he is being persecuted by the regime.

However, it is not so easy to try a person because he performed humanitarian activity, especially in a country where so much is written and said about humanism and about mutual help. Thus it becomes necessary to use slander. The mechanism has already started working: currency dealer, alcoholic, immoral individual, hoodlum etc., etc.

We know the Ginzburg family very well: They are loving and hard-working. We know Aleksandr's mother, Lyudmila Ilyinichna, retired from work, we know his wife, Arina, mother of two small sons, and of course we know Aleksandr himself. After release from prison, he was ordered to live in the town of Tarusa, 130 km. far from Moscow where his family lives.

We were witnesses to all the difficulties Ginzburg had looking for a job in state-owned enterprises and how he was fired soon after he finally found work. In order to provide a living for his family, he worked at all sorts of temporary jobs and those for whom he worked always were most grateful to him for the excellent work he did. They were astounded at his efficiency, at his many qualifications and at his skill. He is a locksmith, a carpenter, an electrician, a radio-technician, and he performs every job with great love and thoroughness. Our people used to say that such craftsmen have "hands of gold". But where can we publicly say what we know and what we think of him? Where can we publish our opinion? Is there one single publication, in all of the Soviet Union, which ever published one word of truth about those who speak out in defense of human rights in the Soviet Union?

This is why we appeal to the progressive media of the world asking them to speak out in defense of an honest man, a good man, former political prisoner Aleksandr Ginzburg, who is again threatened with arrest and with a prison term as punishment for humanity, for charity, for help to political prisoners and their families.

To conclude this letter, we want to say a few words about the author of the article in the *Literaturnaya Gazeta*. After his release from camp in 1975, A. Petrov went to Ginzburg and he visited other families, among them ours. Everybody tried to help him. Religious groups (Pentecostals) considering him to be a new member of their community, collected eleven thousand rubles for him so that he could buy a house—which has never been bought because the money is no longer there. Petrov's wife, who has a baby on her hands, is compelled to sell her old things to feed her family. But the author of the letter (who by the way did not work for one single day after his release from camp) has lots of wine. He certainly should not accuse other people of drinking. It hurts one to see the downfall of a man, although it is not the first time we witness it. A Petrov likes to speak of the devil. We would like to ask him for how much he sold his soul to him.

ZINAIDA GRIGORENKO.
PETR GRIGORENKO.

February 3, 1977.

OTHER LETTERS OF SUPPORT FOR GINZBURG

In addition to the letter by General Grigorenko and his wife, several letters were written by people who knew Petrov-Agatov, the signer of the slanderous article in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, intimately and denounced his lies. Among these letters, there is one by a group of political prisoners of the Mordovia labor camps (19 signatures), a letter from a former labor camp inmate, Ponomarev, and a letter from astronomer Kronid Lyubarsky, released from labor camp in 1977. All these people knew him personally.

To: The International Organization, Amnesty International.

From: Irina Sergeevna Zholkovsky.

On February 3, 1977, in Moscow, my husband, Aleksandr Ilich Ginzburg, was arrested by organs of the KGB (on the day following the publication in the *Literary Gazette* of an article slandering him). The brutal circumstances of his arrest oblige me to ask you for help.

For the last three years my husband has been representative of the Social Fund to Aid Political Prisoners and Their Families, which was founded by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. In the three years of the Fund's activity, more than 900 families of political prisoners have received help and support. In May, 1976, my husband joined the Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R. There is every reason to believe that it was precisely this work of his which enraged the authorities in our country and provoked their decision to arrest him.

My husband has already been arrested twice by Soviet authorities: in 1960—for the publication of a type-written collection of poetry: "Syntax"; in 1967—for the compilation of a collection of materials on the trial of Sinyavsky and Daniel. This collection, entitled "*White Book*", was published in the West.

My husband is now 40 years old. Altogether he has spent seven years in prison and in camps. These years adversely affected his health. He suffers from intestinal and duodenal ulcers and gastritis. Not long before his arrest, my husband was discharged from the hospital where he had spent 20 days under treatment for bronchial pneumonia with incipient tubercular inflammation. He was sent for continued treatment to a tuberculosis clinic, showing a continuous high temperature and carrying a "certificate of unfitness for work".

On the evening of February 3, my husband, dressed in light clothing, went out to a telephone booth (The authorities had long before disconnected our apartment phone). He went out—and did not return. They grabbed him at the doorway of our building and considered it unnecessary to inform me about it. Leaving my two small children in the apartment, and ill myself with a temperature, my friends and I rode around all night to police stations until finally, in the reception room of the KGB, I was told that my husband was being held on their instructions.

On the following day, it became clear that "held" meant arrested. And on that very night, February 3, personnel of the KGB, knowing full well about my husband's illness, took him away to Kaluga Prison. (Kaluga is located 200 kilometers from Moscow.)

It is not hard to imagine how damp, cold, prison cells can affect the health of a man with uncured pneumonia and incipient tuberculosis. It is also well known how harmful the diet in Soviet prisons is even for a healthy man.

I fear for my husband's life.

I ask for your help!

February, 1977.

NOTE.—A. I. Ginzburg is imprisoned at the following address: Kaluzhsky sledstvenny isolyator, Klara Tserkin Street, No. 101, P/Ya 1Z 37-1.

The address of the Kaluga KGB office: 248610 Kaluga, Lenin Street, No. 72, Telephone 7-23-31.

TO THE HEADS OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES OF THE HELSINKI AGREEMENTS

I appeal to you in the capacity of representative of political prisoners detained in Vladimir Prison. Only several days ago I myself was one of them, a situation which gives me the moral right to speak in their behalf. I also have been formally authorized by the majority of the prisoners to make a statement in their behalf.

I know the grief with which the Vladimir political prisoners will react to the news of the arrest of Aleksandr Ginzburg, prominent activist of the Soviet Democratic Movement. These prisoners and their families have, over the course of several years, felt the beneficial results of Aleksandr Ginzburg's untiring activity as distributor of the Solzhenitsyn Fund for assistance to political prisoners. Few others have done as much to alleviate the physical and moral conditions under which prisoners-of-conscience are kept in the Soviet Union. Few others are so deeply loved and respected among political prisoners. Aleksandr Ginzburg's boundless selflessness in his work and his total unselfishness are widely known. We are humbly grateful to him.

Active in the Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR since the moment of its creation, Aleksandr Ginzburg has fully demonstrated his qualities as a battler for human rights and a confirmed democrat.

Now his noble labors have been rudely cut short. Once again he is behind bars. Physical reprisal is not the only threat to this ill man. Attempts are being made to blacken his pure name in a slanderous press campaign.

This should not be tolerated. In behalf of the political prisoners in Vladimir Prison, I appeal to you to stand up quickly and effectively in defense of Aleksandr Ginzburg, to use all the means at your disposal to expedite his release. Your actions should not be the result of an opportunistic judgment of today's political and diplomatic situation; nor should their immediate effectiveness be a major consideration. The matter at hand is a humane act, and only moral considerations should play a part in your decision.

The action of the Soviet punitive agencies against Aleksandr Ginzburg is distinguished by its particular impudence and cynicism, since it was carried out precisely at a time when world-wide indignation is being directed at governments of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the German Democratic Republic as a result of their treatment of dissenters.

This is a challenge which cannot go unanswered. This is a challenge not only to us, but to you as well.

Aleksandr Ginzburg must be released.

KRONID LYUBARSKY,
Astronomer; political prisoner (1972-77).

February 4, 1977.

EXCERPTS FROM AN OPEN LETTER WRITTEN BY YURI FEDOROV

Inmate of Labor Camp ZHKH 385/1-6 in Mordovia, USSR. (Fedorov was tried and sentenced together with the Leningrad group which purportedly planned to hijack a plane in order to go to Israel, at the time when the emigration had not yet started).

... On the eve of the Belgrade conference, the administration of prisons and labor camps and in particular that part of it which manages our political sector for "criminals particularly dangerous to the state" initiated a new period of unprecedented terror and blatant violations of all rights, as if they were planning to make use within a short time of all the possibilities of physical and moral pressures against the political prisoners. This obviously reflects a general trend of the regime's policy with regard to the dissenters, as confirmed by the jailing of those defending human rights in Moscow and by a simultaneous spreading of terror throughout all the forced labor camps for political prisoners ...

... In the camps and prisons of the Soviet Union, Stalinist conditions are reappearing. Laws are no longer taken into consideration, only special instructions by the Ministry of the Interior are being carried out. Every time a prisoner dares mention an article of the law to defend his rights, he is told that the law has been outruled by a subsequent "internal instruction" ...

... During the past three months (January, February and March 1977) without any stated reason I have been deprived of the right to purchase in the camp store not only food products but even soap, tooth powder and tobacco. I am constantly being threatened that they will put handcuffs on me, although I am not guilty of any violence. The camp management has created a group of criminals who are under its protection and who are being used against the political prisoners, beating them up and threatening to murder them. Human rights? No, gentlemen, now it's a question merely of survival ... A senior camp

official not long ago told me: "of course, it's my personal opinion, but I would simply shoot all such as you. It wouldn't be a great loss anyway. Twenty persons in this camp: not even worth talking about". Others don't say it, but they think it. . . . I request all persons concerned and all the competent international organizations to discuss the creation of a commission to investigate the situation in the camps and prisons of the USSR. And I ask that an International Court be created to try *in absentia* all those who are guilty of cruelty to prisoners, of mental and physical terror, of assassination of political prisoners. And at the same time I beg all those who know me and have compassion for my fate to take care of my family should I perish. I beg all the Christians in the world to pray for the salvation of my soul. God forgive me. Amen.

YURI FEDOROV.
MORDOVIA.

"Special regime" camp (meaning particularly strict and cruel conditions of life and work).

THE CHRISTIAN COMMITTEE FOR THE DEFENSE OF RIGHTS OF BELIEVERS IN THE USSR

(summary translation)

On February 3, in Moscow, Aleksandr Ginzburg, member of the Group to Promote the Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR and representative of the Russian Social Fund founded by Solzhenitsyn for the assistance of political prisoners and their families, was arrested by the KGB.

A. Ginzburg is a believer, an Orthodox Christian. All his noble and self-sacrificing activity was the embodiment of the Saviour's commandment to love one's fellow man.

As a member of the Helsinki Group, he has helped people who have suffered because their civil rights were violated, and has fought for the actual implementation of these international agreements in our country. The Helsinki Group has received letters from individuals who are suffering all over the country, and A. Ginzburg has assisted them as much as he could.

He has also helped believers whose rights have been violated by government agencies. Among the documents confiscated during the search of Ginzburg's apartment on January 4 were ones concerning the violations of rights of believers in the USSR.

Political prisoners and their families especially need assistance in our country, and Ginzburg became the representative of the Solzhenitsyn Fund. Two hundred and seventy thousand rubles have been transmitted to political prisoners and their families.

Ginzburg was well aware of the possible consequences of the assistance he gave. He had already served 8 years in a prison camp for his civic activity. And now again, ill, he is ready to go to prison for helping his fellow man. Very few are capable of such Christian love. Yuri Galanskov died in camp from stomach ulcers—A. Ginzburg suffering from the same disease, is again prepared to go to camp.

On December 25, on the eve of the founding of the Christian Committee for the Defense of Rights of Believers, he had told us about the searches that had been conducted at the apartments of members of the Ukrainian branch of the Helsinki Group during which those conducting the search had planted pornography, foreign currency and even a rifle! Ginzburg then knew that his turn was next.

And we know that Ginzburg had no dealings with the foreign currency that was supposedly found in his apartment. One of the principles of Solzhenitsyn, who was sending money through the mail for the support of political prisoners and their families, was that all transactions be conducted according to Soviet law. Ginzburg acted strictly within the framework of these requirements.

How is it possible to imprison a man whose activities fall strictly within the law, who is honest, selfless and self-sacrificing? In order to do this, slander is essential. On February 2, in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, there appeared an article by Petrov-Agatov containing vile slanders on Ginzburg. Ginzburg was arrested the following day. He has been accused of dealing in foreign currency and of political crimes in our country, where there are "no political prisoners".

Thus the campaign against Ginzburg has begun!

In his Christmas message, Ecumenical Patriarch Dmitri issued a call to heads of state, the Church hierarchy, religious activists, and believers of all faiths to make 1977 "the year of religious freedom."

Aleksandr Ginzburg has made a great contribution to the struggle for human rights and religious freedom; yet now he is in prison and threatened with a lengthy term. And his sufferings began in 1977—"the year of religious freedom."

We, the members of the Christian Committee for the Defense of Rights of Believers, turn to all Christians who will hear and respond to Patriarch Dmitri's call: Remember the imprisoned Christian Aleksandr Ginzburg in your prayers and actively fight for his release.

May your prayers and actions help towards his release!

(signed)

FATHER GLEB YUKUNIN.

ARCHDEACON VARSONOFY (KHAIBULIN).

VIKTOR KAPITANCHUK.

February 7, 1977.

STATEMENT

THE COUNCIL OF EVANGELICAL CHRISTIAN BAPTISTS (PENTECOSTALISTS) IN THE USSR

It is known all over the world that the persecution of Christians and other dissenters has not ceased in the Soviet Union. The latest arrest of Aleksandr Ginzburg testifies to this fact.

We, believers of good will, who have made no compromise with monstrous atheism, and who hold fast to uncompromising service to Our Lord Jesus Christ, united in one brotherhood as the Council of Evangelical Baptists, commonly called Pentecostals, raise our voice in defense of Aleksandr Ginzburg against the campaign of the KGB.

By the grace of God, in the USSR there are not less than one hundred and fifty thousands of us. Because of the constant persecution and terrorization of Pentecostals in the USSR, we will not place our signatures, but we all unanimously raise our voice in the defense of Aleksandr Ginzburg not only before the world community, but we also pray for him to the Lord.

We call upon believers of the world to raise their voices in prayer to God in defense of Aleksandr Ginzburg.

February 9, 1977.

THE COUNCIL OF EVANGELICAL CHRISTIAN BAPTISTS.

APPEAL TO PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES JIMMY CARTER FROM VLADIMIR SHELKOV, CHAIRMAN OF THE ALL-UNION CHURCH OF FAITHFUL AND FREE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS

(SUMMARY)

As representative of the Seventh-Day Adventists in the Soviet Union, Vladimir Shelkov issued an appeal February 23, 1977, to President Carter to come forward in defense of A. I. Ginzburg, Yu. Orlov, A.D. Sakharov and others actively engaged in the struggle for human rights.

"I appeal to you, most respected President Carter, to turn your attention to these individuals waging an ideological struggle for God-given rights and freedoms, boldly protesting all forms of repression and discrimination. They are completely innocent of the accusations heaped upon them by our atheistic government; they have committed no crimes before the Constitution, since the Constitution itself has proclaimed and legally secured the inalienable rights of man—freedom of conscience, belief and conviction, freedom of speech, press, assembly, demonstration, etc. . . . Nor have these men committed any crimes before their fellow countrymen . . . whose rights they are struggling to defend even at the risk of imprisonment and death . . ."

Shelkov emphatically underscores the humanitarian activities of Ginzburg and Orlov, active in the Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements and management of the Solzhenitsyn Fund (Ginzburg). This, as proclaimed in the Appeal, is moral Christian activity of the highest order, and these men must be defended by people of conscience around the world.

The five-page appeal urges President Carter to give the matter of human rights first priority:

"Do not allow the economic ties of your country with ours, all the technical, scientific, cultural and other such arrangements, to take precedence and therefore interfere with this holy Christian and humanitarian obligation."

The appeal asks President Carter, as an authoritative state leader and as a Christian, to take all steps possible in the defense of Ginzburg, Orlov and others, actively involved in the struggle for human rights in the USSR.

ADDRESSED TO THE WORKERS OF THE RENAULT FACTORIES OF FRANCE

On March 2, *Pravda* quoted Mark Quen, (?) General Manager of the Renault factories: "Today nearly one-fourth of our machine-tool construction is taken up by Soviet orders." We welcome the strengthening of economic and cultural ties between our countries and hope that they will be useful to the workers of France. Such strengthening and deepening of ties means that people in one country cannot remain indifferent to what is going on in that other country. We attach great significance to the public opinion among workers in the whole world and to their voice on the problems of international politics. We know that the Soviet government also places great importance on this voice. Therefore we address to you the following request.

Recently, 5 members of the Public Group for the Observance of the Helsinki Accords: Yu. Orlov, M. Rudenko, A. Ginzburg, O. Tykhy, and A. Shcharansky, were arrested in our country. The activity of this Group consists of the collection and making public of information about the ways in which the USSR is fulfilling the humanitarian articles of the Helsinki Agreements. At the same time, those arrested are being accused of slander and obviously they will be brought to trial for this accusation.

The humanitarian articles of the Helsinki Agreement play an extremely important role in the development of the process of detente and in the strengthening of cooperation between peoples. The fate of the arrested members of the "Helsinki" Group is inseparable from these problems. Taking all this into account, and simply addressing ourselves to your feeling of justice, we call on you not to rely wholly on Soviet or Western press for information on our opinion on this matter, but to form an authoritative committee of workers which could:

1. Study all essential information about the work of the "Helsinki" Group; in part, so as to get acquainted with the documents of the Group and so as to distribute to the governments of those countries which signed the Helsinki Agreement.

2. To get informed about materials connected with the arrests of the members of the "Helsinki" Group who were named above.

3. To send representatives into the Soviet Union so that they can be present during the trial (or trials) of the members of the "Helsinki" Group.

Through you, we address ourselves to the entire working class of France and we ask that you consider the matter of the arrested members of the "Helsinki" Group in all the gravity which the problem of human rights and international security requires.

With respect,

V. Albrekht, Boris Altshuller, E. Andronova, Mark Antonyuk, Vycheslav Bakhmin, Elena Bonner, Vladimir Borisov, Tatyana Velikanova, Rostislav Galetsky, Sergei Genkin, Zinaida Grigorenko, Petr Grigorenko, Yuri Grimm, Zarina Dzyboeva, Iosif Dulsky, Natalya Dulkina, Father Sergei Zheludkov, Lidiya Ivanova, Nikolai Ivanov, Aleksandr Ivanchenko, Olga Iofee, Irina Kaplum, Sofya Kalistratova, Evgeny Kokorin, Nina Komarova, Elena Kosterina, Maya Kremer, Ivan Kuz, Dmitri Leontev, Grigory Livshits, Vera Lashkova, Tatyana Likhacheva, Naum Meiman, Igor Melchuk, Mikheeva, Yuri Muyukh, Mikhail Murkin, Leonid Murkin, Valentina Mashkova (Osipova), Yuri Mashkov, Ada Nikolskaya, Viktor Nekipelov, Adel Naydenovich, Vitaly Pomozev, Mark Popovsky, Svetlana Pavlenkova, Vladlen Pavlenkov, Sergei Ponomarev, A. Romanova, Vyacheslav Rodionov, Pinkhos Podrabinek, Kirill Podrabinek, Aleksandr Podrabinek, Feliks Serebrov, Vladimir Slepak, Andrei Sakharov, Tatyana Semenova, Nina Strokotova, Skvirsky, Dimitri Starikov, Oleg Solovov, Vladimir Svirsky, Leonid Ternovsky, Valentin Turchin, Vladimir Tselkov, Nadezhda Shatunovskaya, Vadim Shcheglov, Natalya Yurischeva, Father Gleb Yakumin, Efrem Yankelevich, Irina Yakir, Rimma Yakir, Evgey Yakir, Yu. Yarym-Agaev, Vladimir Kornilov, Vladimir Voinovich, Malva Landa, Tatyana Khodorovich, I. Sivak, Aleksandr Barabanov, I. Levin, V. Isakova, Kronid Lyubarsky, Galina Salova, Yuri Gastev.

TRANSLATION OF DECLARATION OF I. S. ZHOLNOVSKAYA, MOSCOW, VOLGINA STREET,
APT. 31 TO THE COMMANDANT OF P/YA IZ-37/I KUZNETSOV

Today, April 5, I brought a regular parcel to my husband, Aleksandr Ginzburg, who is in your prison. I bought foodstuffs in Moscow from among those marked on the list which hangs in your office for parcel deliveries. However, almost half of those foodstuffs which I brought were rejected, although they had been accepted twice before in your Kaluga prison and are always accepted in other prisons, including those in Moscow. No one explained to me the grounds for not accepting this food from me. I wanted to clear the matter up by meeting personally either with you or with investigator Osyelkov. But neither you nor he wished to meet with me. All of this I consider to be a profound breach of legal procedures and an especially cruel treatment of Ginzburg, who is seriously ill.

I will complain of your behavior to higher authorities, in the press and everywhere that I consider necessary.

I. ZHOLKOVSKAYA.

APRIL 5, 1977.

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS

From: I. Valitova (Orlova) and I. Zholkovskaya (Ginzburg).

Two months have already passed since Aleksandr Ginzburg and Yuri Orlov were arrested. All this time they have been kept under investigation in KGB cells (in Kaluga and Moscow) under the strictest isolation. We have no official reports whatever on the status of their cases. We know nothing about their physical condition (Ginzburg was very ill at the time of his arrest). We have not been informed under which article of the Russian Federation Criminal Code they are charged.

Moreover, in Moscow ominous rumors have recently circulated that Ginzburg and Orlov will be tried for breaking foreign currency laws. There is every reason to suppose that these rumors are consciously inspired by the KGB with the aim of demoralizing those who stand up in defense of the prisoners.

The various references in the Petrov-Agatov article to foreign currency hidden in the Ginzburg apartment, the fact that so much money and so many valuables, were confiscated from Ginzburg and Orlov. (On the last, the third, robbery-search of Irina Orlova, 3.3 pounds of wool were even taken; and before that, after a search, the Ginzburgs were left with only 38 kopecks to support their two small children.) All this forces us to fear that the authorities have decided to mount a criminal, not a political, case against the prisoners.

In many Moscow enterprises and scientific institutes "informational" meetings are conducted on the subject: "Who are the dissidents?", during which Ginzburg and Orlov are frequently referred to in an ugly context.

We express our deep anxiety over the fate of our imprisoned husbands. No matter how hard the authorities try to tag the work of Orlov and Ginzburg with a criminal label, we want everyone to know that the authorities are persecuting them only for their noble humanitarian work and charity.

I. VALITOVA (ORLOVA)

I. ZHOLKOVSKAYA (GINZBURG)..

APRIL 13, 1977.

EXCERPTS FROM AN OPEN LETTER WRITTEN BY TATYANA KHODOROVICH AND VICTOR
NEKIPELOV

Excerpts from an open letter written by two well-known Russian dissidents, Tatyana Khodorovich and Victor Nekipelov, portraying the present situation of the dissidents in the Soviet Union. The letter bears the title "Political reprisal by means of the Criminal Code". It is dated April 30, 1977, in Moscow.

Following the same pattern, Malva Landa's "case" is being fabricated somewhere. On December 18, 1976, there was a fire in her room in the town of Krasnogorsk, in the Moscow region. The fire broke out under circumstances strange enough to make one suspect arson. Now the authorities appear resolved to take advantage of that fire in order to get rid of one more member of the Helsinki agreement monitoring group in the USSR.¹ Malva Landa is being prose-

¹ As stated in document No. 1, Malva Landa, together with Tatyana Khodorovich, is one of the persons who undertook to carry on A. Ginzburg's activity for the Russian Social Fund.

cuted for violation of articles 99 and 150 of the Criminal Code of the Russian Republic, based on the fact that the damage caused by the fire allegedly amounted to approximately 3000 rubles—this amount was calculated arbitrarily and is much higher than the actual damage. If Malva Landa is sentenced based on violation of these articles, she can get up to three years in labor camp.

. . . State violence and reprisal against dissidents and human right defenders is assuming exceptionally wide proportions. The regime has adopted violence as its ideology and has thus become a gangster. And the fight against dissenters it uses gangster-like methods of reprisal of a criminal pattern. Political and ideological dissenters and simply people performing humanitarian, charitable activity are being charged with criminal offenses and jailed; people are being beaten up, killed (Dr. Sakharov denounced five cases of mysterious assassinations which could well be political revenge) their windows broken, their telephones cut off, threatening messages placed in their mail-boxes, etc., etc. They beat up Jews who ask to emigrate to Israel, Volga Germans who ask to go to Western Germany, Crimean Tartars who want to return to their homeland. The 70-year-old academician Likhachev was beaten up for refusing to sign a letter against Sakharov and a few months later "unknown persons" tried to pour gasoline under the door of his flat in order to set it on fire . . .

. . . At the same time, a violent "press campaign" is being conducted against all the dissenters. This huge propaganda effort to present them all as criminals obviously is based on the idea that if one slanders someone enough people will eventually believe it. But never before in history has it happened that the state considered its political adversaries and even its moral opposition as a criminal element to be dealt with by gangster-like methods. Look at the case of Oksana Meshko, from Kiev, a member of the Kiev Helsinki monitoring group: She is 70 years old. The prosecutor conducting the search at her home entered through the window—breaking the glass—and when the old woman refused to submit to a body search, (because there was no warrant for it) he twisted her arms and held her by her wrists, while his woman-assistant stripped her naked to search her.

It must be difficult for people in the West to even imagine that such situations exist. People in the West have been brought up to respect the law and to believe in the authority and fairness of state justice. Such people may become indignant about "violations of human rights" in the countries of Eastern Europe, but they do not understand the problem fully. In fact, one should not speak of "violation of rights", but of the total lack of any and all rights. There are no rights. There is no violation of the laws by the state, laws are simply disappearing—yielding their place to a blind, insane criminal ideology. But people in the West do not understand this and therefore they shake hands with the criminals, greet them during assemblies, smilingly sign commercial treaties, sell the wheat, etc.

Now, we are not asking for anything and we are not even trying to protest. We would only wish that for once people in the West make an effort and try to imagine how terrifying is the world in which we live. Our writer Belinsky said that "a crook is strong because he treats honest people as crooks, while they treat crooks as honest people". This is still true. We want to call your attention to this problem. And we hope that somebody will begin drawing up a full and exact list of all the criminal actions committed by the ruling regime in the Soviet Union in order to suffocate dissent. It is an unpleasant task but it is historically indispensable, for the coming righteous moral judgement of the Soviet hangmen of the 70's.

Mr. FASCELL. We have another vote on the floor of the House now.

Mr. SIMON. It is a quorum call.

Mr. FASCELL. Then we will go right on. Our next witnesses this morning are Lyudmila Alekseeva and Lidia Voronina. They are both scholars whose search for truth has led them into dissent, discussion, and criticism.

Mrs. Alekseeva is a historian, a specialist in archeology, who worked as an editor in the publishing house of the Soviet Academy of Sciences until she signed a petition on behalf of Aleksandr Ginzburg in 1968 and was expelled from her job and the Communist Party. She went back to work in 1971 as a clerk-typist in an institute of sociological re-

search, where Miss Voronina was working as a research assistant, and rose to an editorial position at the institute before leaving her job last year.

Both of our witnesses have been active participants in the Moscow Helsinki Group. Mrs. Alekseeva, a founding member, is authorized to speak for the group in the West. Miss Voronina served the group as a field investigator, traveling to the Caucasus and the Far East last December to visit the unofficial Pentecostalist congregations whose members suffer continual persecution for their beliefs.

They can report firsthand on the harassment of the Helsinki watchers and the remarkable work the Public Groups have done despite such severe repression.

They are accompanied here by a remarkable American businessman, Edward Kline, head of the Kline Bros. chain of department stores and sponsor of Khronika Press, the New York publishers who have done so much to channel to the West the voices of dissent speaking in the Soviet Union. Mr. Kline has given great energy, wisdom, and compassion to the cause of human rights. He is also going to help us out this morning as a translator.

We are delighted to have all of you here this morning. You may proceed.

**STATEMENT OF LYUDMILA ALEKSEEVA AND LIDIA VORONINA,
ACCOMPANIED BY EDWARD KLINE**

Mrs. ALEKSEEVA. The Moscow Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R. has entered its second year. Analogous groups in the Ukraine, Lithuania, and Georgia have also been at work during the last 6 months.

I want to speak about the work of the Moscow Group, of which I am a member—specifically, how and from whom the Group receives information about human rights violations in the U.S.S.R.; how the group insures the reliability of the information it uses; and how this information is passed on.

Excuse my pronunciation—Mr. Kline will read the rest of my statement.

Mr. FASCELL. Your English is excellent.

Mr. KLINE. This is especially important now, since the Soviet authorities have demonstrated that they consider the activity of the Helsinki Groups intolerable, and have tried to stop it any way they can.

Since the moment these groups were formed, their members have been under continuous KGB surveillance. They have been followed, their telephones bugged, their correspondence inspected. In December of last year, searches at the apartments of members of the Helsinki Groups began—first in the Ukraine, then in Moscow, Lithuania, and Georgia; the arrests began in February.

In the last 4 months, nine members of the Helsinki Groups have been arrested. In Moscow—Yuri Orlov, Aleksandr Ginzburg, and Anatoly Shcharansky; in the Ukraine—Mykola Rudenko and Oleksiy Tykhy, and in Georgia, Zviad Gamsakhurdia and Merab Kostava, Mykola Matusевич and Myroslav Marynovich were detained in the Ukraine in April, and their present status—whether or not they are currently in prison—is unclear.

At the present time, neither we, nor the relatives of those who have been arrested, know what charges have been made. It appears, however, that the Soviet authorities are reluctant to try them openly for their activity in the Helsinki Groups. Because of today's international situation, it seems more likely that they will try to fabricate criminal charges, such as the reported treason accusation against Anatoly Shcharansky about which we learned only 2 days ago. The searches and campaign of slander in the press testify to this.

Just 2 days ago, another founding member of the Helsinki Groups, Malva Landa, was sentenced to 2 years internal exile for negligent destruction of property and an accidental fire in her apartment. She has appealed that decision.

I will begin now with general remarks.

Our group is the natural offspring of the human rights movement in the U.S.S.R. which emerged around 1965 in conjunction with the protests inspired by the arrest and trial of Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel.

All Helsinki Group members are participants in the human rights movement which is essentially a moral, not a political movement. Human rights activists are persons with differing political views, ranging from socialists to monarchists, but they all share the belief that society can only develop through the effective exercise of elementary human and civil rights. They all renounce violent methods of struggle as a matter of principle, and they condemn such methods. These characteristics apply equally to the Moscow Helsinki Group.

The group's members agree that two factors have contributed to the success of the group's work. First, the text of the Helsinki Conference's Final Act, including the provisions affecting human rights, was published in Soviet newspapers and thus became widely known. Second, information on the creation of our group, including its goals and the names of its members, was broadcast by the four most popular foreign radio stations transmitting to the Soviet Union: Radio Liberty, Voice of America, BBC, and Deutsche Welle. Prof. Yuri Orlov, the chairman of our group, has calculated that 1 out of 5 adult Soviet citizens listen to broadcasts of these Radio stations. Thus our group became known from the day of its formation, and this encouraged a stream of information from different regions of the Soviet Union and from representatives of different social classes.

In announcing the formation of our group, we declared our intention to strive for genuine fulfillment by the Soviet authorities of the Final Act's provisions affecting human rights. In order to promote this goal, we intended to collect information on violations of these provisions and to communicate such information to the people and governments of those countries which had signed the Helsinki Final Act, including the Soviet Government and public.

Our name can be translated as the Group to Encourage Fulfillment of the Helsinki Accords in the U.S.S.R. That name was chosen in order to underline our members' loyalty to our government and the members' desire to work together with the authorities toward conscientious fulfillment of the human rights obligations undertaken at Helsinki.

The group's activity, by its very nature, had to be completely legal, in form and substance. We announced our group's formation publicly

at a press conference where Andrei Sakharov introduced the group to foreign correspondents. At the same time, we mailed the statement announcing the group's formation to Leonid Brezhnev's chancellery. In this statement, we declared the group's aims and listed the names and addresses of its members.

Since its formation, the group has issued about 100 statements, appeals, and bulletins on violations of the basic rights of Soviet citizens. Twenty-two of these statements have been numbered documents analyzing various categories of common violations.*

Material for these statements had, to some extent, been accumulated by group members prior to the group's formation. For example, as participants in the human rights movement, we had known for some time the information on Mustafa Dzhemilev's trial used in the group's first document and the facts on the treatment of prisoners of conscience in Soviet labor camps and prisons used in Document 3.

But most of our information was received from sources outside of the group itself. Sometimes the information was passed along in a chain, from one person to the next, and the chain could have many links. Sometimes, much to our surprise, complaints pertinent to our work arrived through the mail. Occasionally, telephone calls from other cities got through to us with news about searches, arrests, the confinement of dissenters in psychiatric hospitals, and so on.

People also came to us to present their complaints in person, sometimes after traveling great distances. We called these people *khodoki*, an old Russian word which literally means walkers, but which once was used to denote messengers who delivered petitions addressed by the peasants to the authorities. Some messengers reported violations of their own rights or of the rights of friends or relatives, for example, the right of emigration. Others arrived as representatives of significant groups such as the Pentecostals who number about 500,000 persons in the Soviet Union. And a few arrived as representatives of entire peoples such as the Crimean Tatars and the Meskhetians.

The stream of messengers has swelled with the Group's fame. And talks with these messengers occupied us, and especially Professor Orlov, for several hours a day, or even for whole days at a time. The messengers arrive unexpectedly, often at inopportune moments, and few of them are able to state the essentials of their case concisely. During these meetings, they tend to relate their own life stories and to ask for advice on questions completely irrelevant to the Group's activity. Their tales require scrupulous analysis to separate emotional exaggerations and inaccuracies from the facts of the case. Despite the burden involved in such contacts, the stream of messengers is a gratifying phenomenon since we regard it as an indication that Soviet citizens from many walks of life recognize the need for the group's work.

The messengers come from various social classes. The majority are blue-collar and white-collar workers and peasants. Document 13 was compiled on the basis of workers' statements. The authors live in widely separated places, they do not know one another, but their requests coincide: they cannot support their families by honest labor in

*Documents 1, 3-14, and 17 as well as other Public Group Reports were published in English translation by the Commission on February 24. Documents 15, 16, 18-20 as well as other Public Group Reports and Appeals were published in English translation by the Commission on June 3. In addition, document 2 and an appeal issued by the Working Committee to Investigate the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes appear in the appendix to this hearing.

the U.S.S.R., and Soviet trade unions offer them no avenue for a collective struggle to improve their lot. Document 13's appendix contains four appeals of this sort, but other, similar statements reached us after we had published this document.

Document 9, which also concerns emigration, is based on the statement of a messenger sent by peasants of the village of Ilinka in the Voronezh region.

In addition to the streams of emigration known in the West—the Jews and ethnic Germans—the numbers of people who wish to emigrate for economic or political reasons are rapidly growing. These would-be emigrants include Russians, Ukrainians, and members of other Soviet nationality groups. It is at the present time difficult to determine how vigorously the Soviet authorities will oppose the departure of these various groups of emigrants, but I believe, that under any conditions, the numbers of emigrants leaving under the auspices of the Tolstoy fund should increase noticeably. The most prevalent motives for emigration, apart from those noted in Document 13 on the economic and political problems of workers, are reunification of families; persecution for religious beliefs; discrimination on the basis of nationality; and discrimination on the basis of political views or other opinions.

Document 4 relates some of the more dramatic refusals in family reunification cases. Document 9, which I have already mentioned, concerns the collective farmers of Ilinka, denied the right to emigrate on the grounds that no one would be left to work their collective farm. Document 11 concerns Pentecostalist congregations numbering about 1,000 persons who wish to emigrate to escape persecution for their religious beliefs. Pentecostalists are almost all Russian and Ukrainian peasants and blue-collar workers or clerks since their refusal to conceal their religious beliefs has, in effect, barred their children from receiving higher education over the past 60 years.

Document 12 concerns the families of Ukrainian political prisoners who want to emigrate from their homeland. For them, the motivation is the persecution which continues even after prisoners have served their full terms and which affects the families and friends of former prisoners of conscience as well as the ex-prisoners themselves.

Document 20 is also devoted to the problem of emigration, and particularly to the renunciation of citizenship which has become a widespread phenomenon.

Thus, 7 of the group's 22 numbered documents concern the individual's right to choose where he wishes to live, in our judgment, a basic human right.

The attention we have given to the problem of emigration does not reflect any exaggerated interest on the part of the group members. Instead, it is a consequence of the many complaints and requests for help which we have received.

I can say the same for our other documents. Their topics were dictated not by the members' personal tastes, but by the materials which we received. We simply organized these materials and checked the reliability of the information presented.

A substantial portion of the group's output deals with persecution for religious beliefs, although only one of the Group's founding members is a religious believer. But Baptists and Pentecostalists, Jehovah's

Witnesses, Roman Catholics and Russian Orthodox believers send us appeals and documentation of persecution. Complaints about the treatment of religious believers have been so numerous that a special Christian Committee for the Defense of Believers' Rights has been formed, separate from our Group. The three members of this committee—Father Gleb Yakunin, Deacon Varsonofy Khaibulin, and Viktor Kapitanchuk—are all Russian Orthodox, but they are defending the interests of other Christian faiths as well. The committee works closely with our Moscow Group. The other Helsinki Groups which have been formed in the national republics of Lithuania, Georgia and the Ukraine, have also published material on religious persecutions.

Our documents concerning violations of the right of national minorities to equality before the law were compiled from information supplied by representatives of the Crimean Tatars and the Meskhetians. The Crimean Tatars were deported from the Crimea to Central Asia in 1944. The Meskhetians are ethnic Georgians of the Moslem faith who lived near the Turkish border until their deportation by the Soviet authorities in 1944.

Let me explain how the group checks the reliability of the information which we receive.

The easiest case is when the petitioners substantiate with official documents the authorities' violations of civil rights. An example is Document 5 on the persecution of religious families which cites cases of Baptists' being deprived of their parental rights because they educate their children in their own faith instead of in the spirit of Communist morality as prescribed by the Soviet Law on Marriage and the Family. Document 5 quotes from court verdicts, resolutions adopted workers' collectives, and character reports given to children at school. These authentic documents were furnished to our group and served as the basis for Document 5. A second example is the case of Vladimir Pavlov, a taxi driver from Maikop in the North Caucasus, who was convicted for his beliefs. Pavlov's case is described in an appendix to Document 13. The group received the text of the court verdict in the Pavlov case and the Russian Republic Supreme Court's reply to Pavlov's appeal.

Occasionally, our assertions of human rights violations have been based on the texts of unpublished instructions intended only for official use. Document 3 contains information on the dietary norms in Soviet prisons and labor camps and also describes the punishments inflicted in those institutions. Our group received bits of unpublished instructions from former political prisoners who had collected them from the replies of prison and camp administrations to prisoners' complaints about poor food or punishments. Some of these replies included references to or even citations of the pertinent instructions. For several years, we had also collected testimony from ex-convicts who had served time in political camps and prisons about the regimen, diet and punishments in places of confinement. This extensive material confirmed the accuracy of the texts of instructions which we cited in Document 3.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Kline, we will have to interrupt you here because we have to go to the floor of the House to make a vote. We will be right back. We will stand in recess for a few minutes.

[Short recess taken.]

Mr. FASCELL. The Commission will come to order. Mr. Kline, you just finished telling us about Document 3, so you can pickup from there and conclude your testimony.

Mr. KLINE. Before we do that, Mrs. Alekseeva just wants to say a few words.

Mr. FASCELL. Certainly.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Mrs. Alekseeva regrets very much that her colleagues in the Moscow group cannot be here to see and to listen to what you are doing because she knows how much she appreciates it—how much they would appreciate it. Since they cannot be here to thank you in person, she would like to thank you for the time and attention you have given to human rights problems in the Soviet Union.

And now I will go back to the statement.

The unpublished sections of the instructions which govern residence permits for former political prisoners who have completed their sentences are used to restrict such ex-prisoners in their choice of domicile inside the U.S.S.R. The sections which we cited in document 6 had been summarized in "A Chronicle of Current Events", No. 34. The accuracy of the text used is supported by the fact that all political prisoners, after serving their sentences, have been restricted in their choice of domicile in accordance with these instructions. A partial list of the persons whose choice of domicile has been limited by these instructions is included in Document 6.

It has been hardest for us to check information on those cases where no documentary evidence does or could exist because violations of human rights occurred on the basis of a telephone call, from "upstairs", for example—and not on the basis of official regulations or documents. This is a very widespread phenomenon in our country.

In such cases, we have sought on-the-spot oral testimony.

Reports of religious persecutions related to our group by Pentecostals, for example, were checked out by Lidia Voronina at our group's request. Lidia Voronina is here today, and she can tell you about her 2-week journey to visit several Pentecostal congregations in the North Caucasus and the Far East.

I myself visited Lithuania in order to check information received from Lithuanian Catholics about religious persecutions. This information formed the basis for our group's document 15 and the Lithuanian group's document 1, co-signed by the Moscow group.

Let me explain how we checked the evidence for document 15 in order to give you some idea of our methods.

We received information that seven boys had been excluded from the senior class of a Vilnius high school. We were told that the cause of their exclusion was their attendance at church services and their visits to the home of the prominent Lithuanian Roman Catholic layman, Viktoras Petkus. Petkus is a founding member of the Lithuanian Helsinki group.

Secondary education is obligatory in the Soviet Union. Everyone knows how difficult it is to secure the expulsion of even those students who have, in fact, dropped out or who pose serious disciplinary problems. but in this case, seven boys were expelled from a single school and they were all seniors.

Taking a list of the expelled students, I visited the office of the Lithuanian SSR Minister of Education, A. Rimkus. I was accompanied by Tomas Venclova, a poet and well-known Lithuanian dissident, who later became a founding member of the Lithuanian Helsinki Group and who testified before your Commission earlier this year.

I explained to the minister that I was a member of the Moscow Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R., and that I was interested in the reasons for the exclusion of seven students from the Vilnius school.

Apparently, the minister does not listen to foreign broadcasts, and so had not heard about our group. He probably assumed that some sort of official group had been formed for window-dressing and asked: "To what agency is your group attached?" I answered: "It is a public group." "Who directs it?" "Dr. Yuri Orlov, a corresponding member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences."

The minister decided that with a man of such academic rank heading the group, it deserved his confidence and he agreed to provide an explanation. He stated that the expelled students were hooligans. But he could not tell us the precise actions which had led to the exclusion of each of the seven boys. "I only know the general outlines of the case", he told us.

"Probably the school's directors could answer my question", I suggested, and the minister agreed, emphasizing that everything was "strictly legal" in this case. He meant that minutes existed of a session of the school's faculty council which has the right to petition the local board of education to exclude students from the school. The minutes should describe the students' actions which prompted the petition and record the vote of the faculty council.

We left for the school in order to study the minutes.

The academic principal of the school, Dobinas, met us. I explained: "I am from Moscow. We just visited the Minister of Education at his office concerning the exclusion of seven boys from your school. He recommended that we visit the school to find out the facts." I then asked to see the minutes of the faculty council meeting, but the principal said the minutes were not at the school. "The secretary took them home to rewrite them," the Principal told me, even though more than a month had elapsed since the students' expulsion. "Couldn't you send someone for the minutes?" "No, I know that no one is home now at the secretary's house."

The principal summoned four teachers and I asked each of them to explain the reasons for the expulsions. They gave confused and contradictory explanations. It was impossible to clarify the real facts of the case from their statements.

Afterward, I met with the boys who had been expelled and with several of their classmates. They told me that during the previous school year these seven students had been summoned from their classes by the principal, sometimes at the request of KGB Senior Lieutenant Verbitsky and sometimes at the request of Police Captain Semyonov. Verbitsky or Semyonov took them away for interrogations where they were all asked similar questions: "Do you go to church?" "Do you listen to Radio Vatican broadcasts?" The boys were also asked to explain why they visited Viktoras Petkus.

In the police station, Captain Semyonov shouted at the boys, lacing his speech with obscenities. In the KGB, Senior Lieutenant Verbitsky

was polite. But both Semyonov and Verbitsky threatened that the boys would not be admitted to college unless they gave compromising depositions against Petkus. They even frightened one boy, Bogushes, by threatening to send him to a reform school.

The boys declined to give false testimony and declared that they would not stop going to church.

When the boys declined and then showed up at school after the summer holidays, they were told that they had been expelled, but neither they nor their parents could get anyone to show them the decision of the faculty council.

Document 15 was compiled on the basis of all these conversations. It states: "There are grounds to believe that this expulsion was conducted by order of the KGB."

In concluding, I shall explain how our group circulated its documents. At first, we typed 35 copies of each document. We have no other way of reproducing materials. We sent these copies by registered mail, return receipt requested, one copy to Leonid Brezhnev's chancellery and the other copies to the appropriate embassies in Moscow. We followed this procedure for our first six documents. But we received only six return receipts—all from Brezhnev's chancellery. The other 224 envelopes never reached their addresses. So we stopped using the Soviet post for sending mail to the embassies and started investigating the possibility of passing on our materials through persons with access to the ambassadors of the Helsinki Conference states. We succeeded in transmitting our documents to the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and the Federal Republic of Germany. We did not send them by mail, but our method of transmittal violated no Soviet law.

We also forwarded our documents by means of other than the Soviet mail to public organizations of the Helsinki Conference countries. To Amnesty International, we sent information on arrests, on confinements in prison psychiatric hospitals for political or other beliefs, and on conditions of detention of prisoners of conscience. To the World Council of Churches, we sent materials on persecutions for religious beliefs. To Jewish organizations, we sent documents on the Jewish movement for emigration to Israel; and so on.

The Helsinki Groups have become the organizational centers and the voice of the movement to defend human rights in the U.S.S.R. The members of these Groups and their sympathizers are striving toward one goal only: the honest fulfillment of the commitments the Soviet authorities made on human rights—undertakings they gave in the presence of representatives of all the countries who signed the Final Act. Therefore, the support and defense of the members of the Helsinki Groups is the direct responsibility of the governments which signed the Helsinki agreement, and the moral duty of all the citizens of these countries.

Based on all of this, I, as representative of the Moscow Helsinki Group abroad, will press to make the release of the arrested members of the Helsinki Groups the foremost human rights issue at Belgrade. We must realize, that without their release, any human rights agreement reached by the Soviet Union will be simply a worthless scrap of paper.

The Helsinki Groups are continuing their activities despite these arrests. Two new members have joined the Moscow Group, Dr. Naum Meiman and Yuri Mnyukh, and one new member, Petr Vins, the Ukrainian Group. The Working Committee to Investigate the Misuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes has also been functioning since January under the auspices of the Moscow Group. A new Helsinki Group was formed in Armenia in April.

The most recent document of the Helsinki Groups received in the West is dated June 1. And the group in Moscow released it on June 1 through Mr. Sakharov. But now Lidia Voronina, sitting next to me, will read some extracts from the document.

Mr. FASCELL. Miss Voronina.

Miss VORONINA. This is a very important document and I will not read the full document, but just some of it.

In the summary documents of June 1, members of the Group answer three questions. First, is the Soviet Government fulfilling the obligations to human rights set out in the Final Act? Second, what influence has the Final Act had on human rights in the U.S.S.R. and the countries of Eastern Europe? Third, what is the outlook for the Belgrade Conference?

The first question is answered in the negative. The group declares that there is no freedom of emigration, no freedom to choose one's place of residence and no freedom to exchange information, in effect, no freedom of the press. In the U.S.S.R., the violation of the freedoms is the "norm reinforced both by unwritten tradition and written governmental regulations. . . . And it would have been naive to expect and unrealistic to demand that the situation of human rights in the U.S.S.R. change on the day after the signing of the Final Act. But it was possible and proper to expect that the situation would improve, at least slowly and gradually. The Soviet Government could at least have displayed some intention to improve the situation in regard to human rights."

Now I want to ask you to excuse me for my very bad English and I ask Mr. Kline to continue.

Mr. KLINE [continuing]. The report mentions the violations of human rights already set out in documents the Group has issued and stresses, "The clearest evidence of violation of the Helsinki accords is the repression set in motion against the Groups to Promote the Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in Moscow, in the Ukraine and in Georgia."

On the second question, the members of the Group consider that the Helsinki accords have had a positive influence on human rights in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe: "The signing of the Final Act gave citizens of those signatory states grounds to demand that their own governments respect fundamental human rights. It also gave them reason to count on the support of Western public opinion and government officials, since the human rights issue had been linked to the security of 35 countries in Europe and North America and to recognition of the inviolability of Europe's frontiers.

The historic significance of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe lies in the fact that for the first time respect for human rights was declared to be a necessary element of interstate relations designed

to preserve peace and develop cooperation. This idea lies at the very heart of the Helsinki accords. No matter how successfully this idea may have been implemented or what its effect has been up till now, we believe that it has become a permanent issue in international politics. This represents a giant step forward for mankind on the road toward securing individual liberties and toward collective security.

Finally, in assessing the prospects for Belgrade, the members of the Group start from the conviction that the Soviet Union has not made a good faith effort to honor its Helsinki obligations. Yet, in all probability it will be the Soviet representatives at Belgrade who claim that the U.S.S.R. has implemented the Final Act, while the West has not. This argument is made easier by the fact that the Final Act lacks formal criteria for observation of the human rights commitments. Because of the absence of these criteria even the Western representatives, if they so choose, "could pretend to be 'almost satisfied' with the state of affairs and could express the hope that 'isolated incidents' of violations of the human rights guarantees would quickly be corrected. We consider that it would be pure hypocrisy to take such a position in the face of the obvious truth. To do so would do irreparable injury to the cause of human rights as well as to European security. It would simply facilitate the flagrant violation of the Helsinki pledges and turn the Final Act into a laughing stock."

At the same time, the members of the group hold that by recognizing the full, overt Soviet violation of its human rights obligations, the West will not necessarily provoke the collapse of the Helsinki idea. They do not advocate that the West repudiate the Helsinki accords because of the violations committed by the East, since to do so "would aggravate international tension, increase arms spending and diminish the chances for a stable peace and genuine international cooperation."

But under no circumstances can there be a retreat on the human rights issue. "That would be an enormous blow to human rights not only in the U.S.S.R. and the countries of Eastern Europe, but also in the developing world. Politically, any kind of 'security and cooperation' achieved at such a cost would be illusory."

In the opinion of the members of the Moscow Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R.—

The only way out of this impasse is to establish agreed criteria for the evaluation of the facts. But if the Soviet Union refuses to accept concrete, measurable criteria by which human rights implementation can be measured, then its action would be a unilateral demolition of the Helsinki Agreement.

Arguments about fulfillment of the human rights obligations that were assumed center primarily on two concepts: 'interests of state' and 'interference in internal affairs.' Therefore, the permissible limitations of individual liberties in the name of national security and the specific actions of other countries with respect to human rights which would constitute interference in another state's internal affairs should be spelled out.

Since "Soviet authorities now look upon any exchanges of information not initiated by them as contrary to their state interests," the members of the Group propose, first of all, that agreement be reached on criteria for the dissemination of information. It is essential to establish a list of categories of information which cannot be considered state secrets and can, consequently, be freely disseminated. In particular, it is essential to agree that there can be a free flow of information about court proceedings and prison conditions. Moreover, there should be specific agreement on questions of emigration. "The

existence of verifiable criteria for implementation of the Final Act implies as well the creation of international bodies to collect and analyze pertinent information" on implementation.

In conclusion, the Moscow Group declares that no matter what international criteria are adopted, it is clear that it is impermissible to imprison anyone for seeking to fulfill international accords. For that reason, the very first step in discussing any aspect of human rights has to be the immediate liberation of all arrested members of the Helsinki Groups.

Thank you for your patience.

[The summary document of June 1 follows:]

THE PUBLIC GROUP TO PROMOTE OBSERVANCE OF THE HELSINKI AGREEMENTS
IN THE U.S.S.R.

A PRE-BELGRADE SUMMARY

The Public Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR was formed in May, 1976, at the initiative and under the leadership of Professor Yuri Orlov. According to the statement on its formation: "The aim of the Group is to promote observance of the humanitarian provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. . . . The Group hope that its information will be taken into account at all official meetings which are provided for in the Final Act under the point Follow-up to the Conference.

"The members of the Group to Promote base their activity on the conviction that humanitarian issues and access to information have a direct relationship to the problem of international security. We appeal to the citizens of other participating States of the Helsinki Conference to form their own national Groups to Promote which would assist in the full implementation of the Helsinki Agreements on the part of the governments of their countries."

In the course of its existence, the Group to Promote has issued 22 documents and more than 40 separate statements, among them an evaluation of the results of the first year after the signing of the Helsinki Agreement ("An Evaluation of the Influence of the Helsinki Agreements as They Relate to Human Rights in the USSR", July 22, 1976). All these materials have been given to correspondents of western information agencies and sent to the governments of a number of States participating in the Helsinki Agreement. We hope that these Group to Promote materials will be studied and discussed at the Belgrade Conference. This document is not a systematic summary of Group to Promote materials; it is an evaluation of the results achieved over the first two years of the Helsinki Agreement and the Agreement's prospects, compiled on the basis of Group materials.

Our goal was to answer the following three questions:

Is the USSR observing the humanitarian articles of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe? What influence have the Helsinki Agreements had on human rights in the USSR and countries of Eastern Europe? What is the outlook for the Belgrade Conference?

I. Is the Soviet government observing the human rights provisions outlined in the Final Act?

In the section of the Final Act entitled "Questions relating to Security in Europe", within the "Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States", we find Principle VII, in which the participating States commit themselves to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms. Here, in part, the Final Act states:

"The participating States recognize the universal significance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for which is an essential factor for the peace, justice and well-being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and cooperation among themselves as among all States."

With this provision, respect for fundamental human rights is included among the obligations accepted by the participating States with the goal of insuring cooperation and security in Europe. The last paragraph of Principle VII leaves

no doubt that human rights and basic freedoms in the Final Act are understood to have the same scope as they do in the generally recognized fundamental documents on human rights: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the U.N. and International Covenants on Human Rights.

In the section "Cooperation in Humanitarian and other Fields," the Final Act contains a series of provisions dealing with human contacts and the exchange of information which are also related to human rights and which, if honestly fulfilled, necessarily include respect for human rights.

It is generally recognized that when the Final Act was signed on August 1, 1975, violation of fundamental human rights in the U.S.S.R. was not limited to separate, exceptional incidents, but actually represented the norm, reinforced by unwritten traditions and written governmental regulations. It is sufficient to set forth three obvious instances of continuing violations:

1. In the Soviet Union there is no freedom to leave the country. Even for a tourist excursion abroad, character references must be procured from one's place of employment; these are not issued every time they are requested and always issued under the strict control of Party agencies. The citizens of the U.S.S.R. are prisoners of their own government.

2. In the Soviet Union there is no freedom to choose one's place of residence (the "registration" system).

3. In the Soviet Union there is no freedom to exchange information, no freedom of the press. This is evident from the fact that in the country nothing is or can be printed independent of governmental and Party control.

It would have been naïve to expect, and unrealistic to demand, that the situation change the day after the Final Act was signed. But it was possible and proper to expect that the situation would improve, albeit gradually and slowly. The Soviet government could have at least displayed some intention to improve the human rights situation.

Nonetheless, this did not occur. The results a year after the Helsinki Conference were summarized in a Group to Promote report in the following words:

"The Soviet government does not intend to fulfill its international obligations in human rights."

"As before many hundreds of political prisoners—people sentenced merely for political, ethical or religious beliefs or for attempts to provide the public with independent information—are languishing in prisons and camps. In some respects the conditions of their confinement have become more brutal over the years.

"The practice of psychiatric repression has been neither condemned nor curtailed.

"Both in the question of free emigration and in the more particular question of reunification of families there have been no changes for the better. The number of "refuseniks" known to us has even grown over the year.

"All forms of independent information are persecuted."

With even greater assurance we can repeat our statement 2 years after the Helsinki Conference. The materials of the Group to Promote indicate the numerous violations of human rights. We would, first of all, like to call attention to the following examples:

1. The denial of the right to emigrate and the reunification of families (cf. Group Documents No. 11-14). We note, in particular, the obstacles set before a large group of Pentecostals and Baptists (over a thousand individuals) who have collectively stated their desire to emigrate (Document No. 20). This mass demand for freedom of emigration by Pentecostals also testifies to the violation of another basic personal freedom—the freedom of religion—since the Pentecostals have documented their demand with convincing descriptions of gross violations of this right (also see "Report on the Trip to Pentecostalist Communities," December 1, 1977).

In addition, we note the struggle for the right of emigration by Soviet Germans (Document No. 22) and Jews. Relative to the reunification of families, we can refer to Document No. 4 which contains a list of separated families making efforts to reunite (Document 4 lists only the most dramatic cases of separated close relatives and is far from complete). In the meantime, the number of persons publicly stating their desire to leave the Soviet Union forever or temporarily is steadily growing. They are very often refused. In many cases they become victims of repressions and are subjected to loss of employment, confinement in psychiatric hospitals, arrests on trumped-up charges, etc.

This we can judge by the growing number of statements sent directly to the Group to Promote or, through the Group, to the Heads of State who signed the Final Act. We know, however, that the vast majority of statements (concerning the desire to emigrate, the renunciation of citizenship, the necessity of leaving the country temporarily) does not reach the Group. A very great number of those desiring to emigrate are simply unknown to the Group.

The Soviet government consistently reduces the full content of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act to a single point: reunification of families. Moreover, it denies any Soviet violations in this area. It would like to impose this position on other governments just as it imposes it on its own citizens.

In June of 1976, the director of All-Union OVIR, Vladimir Obidin, explained that the Soviet agencies responsible for granting permission to leave the U.S.S.R. will be "strictly guided by" the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and will grant visas only for the purpose of reuniting families; but family is defined only as spouses and their unmarried children, according to the Marriage and Family Code. Refusal for reasons of "insufficiently close kinship" is becoming as widespread a phenomenon as refusal based on knowledge of "state secrets." In this manner the authorities are attempting to use the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference to restrict emigration.

2. Discrimination on the basis of nationality. The Final Act of the Helsinki Conference states:

"The participating States on whose territory national minorities exist will respect the right of persons belonging to such minorities to equality before the law, will afford them the full opportunity for the actual enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms and will, in this manner, protect their legitimate interests in this sphere."

In the meantime, the Crimean Tatars in the U.S.S.R. have for many years been waging a fruitless struggle for the right to live in their native Crimea, the land from which they were exiled as a result of a monstrous act of genocide in 1944 (cf. Document No. 10 for a detailed description of discrimination against Crimean Tatars.) The Meskhetians face a similar situation (cf. Document No. 18, January 14, 1977). Facts related to discrimination against Jews are well known.

3. The violation of the right to exchange information and ideas freely, including such exchanges with participating States of the Helsinki Conference.

Telephones are still being disconnected if individuals carry on undesirable conversations—undesirable from the KGB's point of view—in particular, with individuals abroad (Document No. 2 cites 43 names). We note that this testifies to the continued and widespread monitoring of telephone calls. Letters and telegrams crossing the Soviet frontier are painstakingly censored and often delayed or withheld. As before, non-Communist foreign newspapers can be purchased in Moscow only with luck and great difficulty; it is totally impossible to buy informational magazines such as *Time* and *Newsweek*. Not only has the policy on exchanging information with political prisoners not become more liberal since August, 1975, but quite the opposite: it has become harsher to an extreme. Correspondence with political prisoners and their relatives is detained on the most absurd pretexts; for example, the censor can discover some "hidden meaning" in a letter and not even bother to explain what it is. Even the political prisoner's state of health is restricted information and cannot be divulged.

Soviet propaganda and the mass media continue to consider ideas coming from the West carriers of infectious disease and drill into Soviet man the idea that it is his duty to prevent their spread. Any article printed in the Soviet Union on this topic offers convincing proof of this. For example, in the mass-circulation, youth-oriented newspaper *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, an article entitled "Wrong Side Up" on May 5, 1977, asserts that "the bourgeois mass media" seek the right to wage "psychological war" on the territory of the socialist countries and to interfere in their internal affairs. "Resounding calls for ideological disarmament and intrusive demands to open the borders of the socialist world to the so-called 'free flow of information' are all pursuing just this goal," states the article. "But what will free flow bring to our shores? The NATO Bulletin *Nouvelle Atlantique* fully clarifies this issue: A free flow of information is the creation of conditions for penetration of Western ideas into socialist countries."

In this manner, *Komsomolskaya Pravda* calls not for a struggle against Western ideas through opposing ideas (which, as with any struggle of ideas,

would only be welcome), but for physical barriers against the penetration of Western ideas. In this manner, the free flow of ideas, which appears in quotes in *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, is presented as a conscious fraud with no chance to exist. *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, like all other Soviet newspapers, does not express its own opinion, but simply reiterates the position adopted by higher governmental and Party bodies. The reason for this hostility towards the free flow of information is clearly stated by the newspaper: it would create conditions for the penetration of Western ideas. How is this position compatible with the obligation "To promote fuller mutual access by all to the achievements—works, experiences and performing arts—in the various fields of culture of their countries . . ." assumed in the Final Act subsection entitled "Access" by the governments of the participating States at the Helsinki Conference? It seems that "Western ideas" are not a part of Soviet ideologists' concept of "Western culture".

Official Soviet agencies' practices fully correspond to the theory expounded in propaganda. The measures employed against the International Symposium on Jewish Culture can serve as typical models. This symposium was to have opened on December 21, 1976, in Moscow, and was to last three days. There were 55 papers on the agenda of the symposium, 14 of which were to be given by foreign guests. In response to this, the authorities undertook the following measures (cf. Document No. 19):

1.) All foreign scholars invited to the symposium were denied entry visas. Even tourists suspected of interest in the symposium were refused entry. At least three U.S. citizens who informed Soviet officials of their interest were expelled from the U.S.S.R.

2.) Members of the organizational committee, as well as persons associated with them, were subjected to searches and lengthy interrogations. All literature in Hebrew and Yiddish, right down to dictionaries, texts of reports and materials for the symposium were all confiscated.

3.) 19 persons had their telephones disconnected.

4.) On December 21, members of the organizational committee and the majority of individuals slated to present reports were arrested. In the course of the next three days they were detained either under home arrest or at interrogations.

5.) In Riga, Kishinev, Tallin, Leningrad and other cities, individuals attempting to leave for the Moscow symposium were detained.

4. Repressions against the Helsinki Groups.

The clearest evidence of violation of the Helsinki Agreement is the repression set in motion against the Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in Moscow, the Ukraine and Georgia. From February through April the following people were arrested:

Three members of the Moscow Group: Yuri Orlov (leader), Aleksandr Ginzburg, Anatoly Shcharansky.

Four members of the Ukrainian Group: Mykola Rudenko (leader), Oleksiy Tykhy, Myroslav Marynovych, Mykola Matusevych.

Three members of the Georgian Group: Zviad Gamsakhurdia (leader), Merab Kostava, Viktor Rtskhiladze (Rtskhiladze was soon released for health reasons after signing a note stating that he would not leave Tbilisi.) He was nonetheless subjected to many hours of interrogation.)

Certain individuals close to the Groups to Promote (V. Barladian, I. Terelya) were arrested or confined in psychiatric hospitals. Members of the Groups who have not been arrested and individuals in contact with them are under great pressure and under threat of arrest.

Even though charges against those arrested have not yet been disclosed, there can be no doubt the arrests are directed against the activity of the Helsinki Groups and seek to destroy the Groups. In May, 1976, immediately following the creation of the first Helsinki Group headed by Yuri Orlov, the authorities attempted to halt the Group's activity. On May 27, 1976, Yuri Orlov made the following statement: ". . . I must note, that the continuing persecution of free information is a fundamental violation of the spirit and letter of the Final Act of the European Conference.

"In part, this persecution is now directed against the activity of the Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R. itself.

"The Group to Promote, completely open and positive in the nature of its activity, was officially labeled an illegal organization by the authorities—al-

though this sounds mad, and also a provocational and anticonstitutional organization. A huge number of KGB agents almost ostentatiously follow my every move as well as those of certain other Group members, no doubt in anticipation of an arrest warrant. One would assume, that there is no greater danger for the government than public efforts for the fulfillment of the Helsinki agreements.

"... Peaceful struggle for the observance of fundamental personal rights, against cruelty, for religious and social tolerance and for the free movement of information sets the foundation for trust and peace—a foundation more stable and long-lasting than one simply based on political endeavors. Problems of security in today's world are inseparable from humanitarian problems. This is the obvious point of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act. By the very nature of this issue, all peoples and all governments are interested in their fulfillment.

"If, then, the collecting and relaying of information on the violation of these articles qualify as state crimes, the very basis of the agreements is undermined—they no longer have any real content or inner logic.

"For this reason I am appealing to the governments and parliaments of all countries who participated in the European Conference, including the U.S.S.R.

"I request that you take steps to protect the rights of the Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements to pursue its stated reasonable and useful activity. I ask you to protect its members from persecution."

The crushing of the Helsinki Groups on the eve of the Belgrade Conference can only be viewed as a demonstrative refusal by the authorities to fulfill their human rights obligations in the future and as proof of their resolution to punish those citizens who convey information about these violations.

II. The influence of the Helsinki Agreements on human rights in the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe

The preceding section shows that the signing of the Final Act by the Soviet government has not had a direct effect on the human rights situation in the USSR, in the sense that the government has not demonstrated an intention to make those improvements in the situation which might have been expected from the provisions of the Final Act.

However, the signing of the Helsinki agreements has had a definite, if indirect, influence on the human rights issue in the U.S.S.R. and in the countries of Eastern Europe.

First of all, the signing of the Helsinki agreements by the governments of these states gave citizens grounds to demand that their own governments respect fundamental human rights. It also gave them reason to count on the support of Western public opinion and government officials, since the human rights issue had been linked to the security of 35 countries in Europe and North America and to the recognition of the inviolability of Europe's frontiers. In response, the Soviet government and certain other countries of Eastern Europe have intensified repressions against those who struggle for human rights.

Secondly, the gross and flagrant violation of the human rights commitments undertaken by the Soviet Union has evoked widespread indignation in Western countries and has opened people's eyes to the gravity of the human rights situation in the Socialist countries and to the absence of any sort of progress in this area.

III. The outlook for the Belgrade Conference

The historic significance of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe lies in the fact that for the first time respect for human rights was declared to be a necessary element for interstate relations designed to preserve peace and develop cooperation.

This idea lies at the very heart of the Helsinki accords. No matter how successful this idea has been implemented or what its effect has been up till now, we believe that it has become a permanent issue in international politics. This represents a giant step forward for mankind on the road toward individual liberties and collective security.

Addressing ourselves toward the realization of the concepts put forth on August 1, 1975, we note first the non-binding nature of the human rights commitments made by the participating States. These commitments resemble declarations of intent. They lack agreed criteria to measure the fulfillment of these intentions. This form of agreement presumes the presence of good faith for its fulfillment.

The events of the past two years have clearly demonstrated the absence of such good faith on the part of the Soviet government. The Belgrade Conference may or may not acknowledge this fact; if it does, it may either continue attempts to realize the basic idea of the Helsinki Conference, or it may abandon such attempts. Consequently, there are three logical possibilities and, in the concluding portion of our report, we shall comment on these possibilities.

1. In all probability the Soviet representatives at Belgrade will claim that the USSR is implementing the humanitarian articles of the Final Act, and that, if anywhere, human rights are being violated in Western countries. The Soviet representatives will either denounce the Groups to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements or simply ignore them. Beyond that, they will no doubt cite various figures testifying to the great (and possibly growing) number of tourist excursions, cultural exchanges, foreign books being translated in the Soviet Union and so on. All these statistics, of course, have no relation to human rights since they refer to projects undertaken at the initiative and under strict control of state agencies. These statistics do not testify to human rights, but to state rights—and no one has any doubt about the existence of those.

However, due to the absence of formal criteria governing observance of the humanitarian commitments in the Final Act, Western representatives, if they so chose, could pretend to be "pretty well satisfied" with the state of affairs and could express the hope that "isolated incidents" of violations of the humanitarian commitments would be corrected in the near future. We believe that it would be pure hypocrisy to take such a position in the face of the obvious truth. To do so would do irreparable injury to the cause of human rights as well as to European security. It would simply facilitate the flagrant violation of the Helsinki pledges and turn the Final Act into a laughing stock.

2. In acknowledging the total and flagrant violation of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act by the Soviet Union, the Western countries may conclude that the idea of linking human rights to international relations has failed. This conclusion allows two logical possibilities, both with highly tragic consequences. One: Western countries may repudiate the Helsinki Agreements since they have not been observed by the opposite side. This would aggravate international tension, increase military expenditures and diminish the chances for a stable peace and genuine international cooperation. Two: Western countries may retreat on the human rights issue by excluding such points from the Helsinki Agreements either formally or by ignoring them in practice at the same time preserving the remaining articles of the Agreements and specifically the guarantees for the inviolability of frontiers. This would be an enormous blow to human rights not only in the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe, but also in the developing world. Politically, any kind of "security and cooperation" achieved at such a cost would be illusory and would simply result in the demolition of the Helsinki agreement.

3. We feel that talk of the collapse of the "Helsinki idea" is premature and we put our hopes in a third logical possibility—specifically, that the Western countries will detail Soviet violations of humanitarian commitments and will conclude that the only means of preserving the Helsinki Agreement would be the establishment of agreed criteria for evaluating the facts. The Soviet government may choose not to recognize the fact of its own violations of its commitments, but it will have to recognize that the only way out of an impasse resulting from the presence of two opposing points of view is to establish agreed criteria. If the Soviet Union refuses to accept concrete, measurable criteria for the evaluation of the facts, then its action will have the force of a unilateral destruction of the Helsinki Agreement.

No matter what the criteria for measuring the implementation of an international agreement, one thing is clear: it is impermissible to imprison anyone for monitoring that agreement. We feel that Western representatives should pose as a preliminary condition for any discussions at Belgrade the immediate release of all arrested members of the Helsinki Groups. As long as they are imprisoned, any discussion of criteria for fulfilling the Helsinki Agreements would be an insulting farce and a mockery of reason.

Disputes about fulfillment of humanitarian commitments center primarily on two concepts: 'interests of state' and 'interference in internal affairs'. Therefore, the permissible limitations of individual liberties in the name of national security and the specific actions of other countries with respect to human rights which would constitute interference in another state's internal affairs should be spelled out. The Soviet authorities now look upon any exchanges of information

not initiated by them as contrary to their state interests. If the Soviet government refuses to establish criteria to evaluate violations of state interests in the area of human rights, this will signify that there is a deep and irresolvable contradiction between the observance of human rights and Soviet state interests and that the existing practice will continue. If this is the case, the Soviet government should not have signed the Helsinki Agreement. In a similar vein, it stands to reason that if any criticism of one country by another for the violation of human rights or any demand to present pertinent information are viewed as interference in internal affairs, such a country should not be a participant in the Helsinki Agreement.

We would like to note the following as concrete aspects of this problem.

A definition of state interests should include international codification of the concept of state secrets; a list of categories of information which *cannot* be considered state secrets is even more important. Views on this subject were expressed by Yuri Orlov in a proposal for an international conference on declassification of information which we attach below.

Freedom of emigration occupies an especially important position among all human rights because of its international aspect. An individual desiring to emigrate from a country sooner belongs to mankind as a whole than to the citizenry of a given country: For this reason mankind as a whole is responsible for him. We deem it necessary that every government pledge either to allow the immediate departure of a person wishing to emigrate or to give a concrete response in written form as to the reasons for delay and the length of time the delay will continue. Copies of such responses should be sent to international organizations.

There is no basis to categorize the dissemination of information about court proceedings and prison conditions as contrary to state interests, nor the request for such information by other governments as interference in internal affairs. The participants in the Helsinki Agreement should give guarantees for the free access of foreign representatives to all trial proceedings and places of detention.

The three examples we have cited by no means fully elucidate the problem. In addition to agreements and obligations assumed by the participating States, establishing verifiable criteria for implementation of the Final Act implies as well the creation of international bodies to collect and analyse pertinent information. Taking into consideration the limited opportunities at the disposal of the citizens of the USSR and Eastern Europe, the representatives of such bodies should be able to visit these countries and accept statements from individual citizens.

The Soviet Union's violation of the humanitarian provision of the Helsinki Agreement creates a difficult situation with respect to relations between countries participating in this Agreement. The future of Europe and the whole world may depend on the resolution of this situation. But to ignore the fact of the violations would be the worst possible solution.

After the arrest of Aleksandr Ginzburg on February 3, 1977, Helsinki Group leader Yuri Orlov issued the following statement:

"Having acted in this way, the Soviet government has plainly discarded its recent international human rights obligations.

"Are there any guarantees that it will not discard other obligations when the time is right?

"I direct this question to Western governments.

"I direct this question to the Soviet government, as well."

The Soviet government's response to this question is evident—it has thrown Yuri Orlov behind bars.

What will be the response of the representatives of Western governments when they gather at the Belgrade Conference?

February 27, 1977.

Members of the Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the USSR: Elena Bonner, Pyotr Grigorenko, Malva Landa, Naum Meiman, Yuri Mnyukh, and Vladimir Slepak.

Members of the Group to Investigate, the Misuse of Psychiatry for Political Purposes: Vyacheslav Bakhmin, Irina Kaplum, Aleksandr Podrabinek, and Felix Serebrov.

VALENTIN TURCHIN,
Chairman, Amnesty International.

APPENDIX

PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON DECLASSIFICATION OF INFORMATION

I propose that Western governments work out, in general terms, a project for an *international conference on declassification of information* during the period of preparation for Belgrade.

This would be a worthwhile development of the Helsinki Agreements in a key direction.

The goal of the conference should be an international agreement as to the permissible level of classification of information. At the same time an agreement should be reached on follow-up steps to reduce the scope of classifiable information by stages.

I feel that, at the *first stage*, the classification of information dealing with the following subjects should be forbidden:

- (1) Abject poverty
- (2) Epidemics and statistics on disease
- (3) Statistics on crime
- (4) Living standards—provision of food, clothing, housing, etc.
- (5) The extent and nature of violations of international human rights obligations.

In view of the history of Soviet suppression of free information, there should be protection for the right of individuals to publish information for purposes of discussion without the threat of criminal prosecution for erroneous information. This protection would extend to an agreed list of free (unclassified) information. There should also be agreement that loss of credibility is sufficient punishment for a careless or dishonest source of information. I believe that this last principle, at least with respect to point 5 of the above list, could be agreed to in Belgrade.

This proposal develops an idea advanced by Professor Naum Meiman on the need for an international agreement defining the permissible level of classification of scientific information.

YURI ORLOV.

Leader, The Group To Promote.

FEBRUARY 8, 1977*

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Kline. And thank you, Miss Voronina, for the recommendations and suggestions that you have gives us and also thank you, Mrs. Alekseeva, for spelling out to us the very careful approach made in verification of information. This is a very substantial contribution to our interest in this matter and we are delighted to have what appears to be a very scientific approach to a very difficult problem.

In the search of Professor Orlov's apartment in January, police took away some 200 pages of documents on what he calls "The Persecution of Children of Religious Parents" in the Ukraine and in Central Asia.

Can you tell us what those documents reported?

Mr. KLINE. Mrs. Alekseeva will answer.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. During a search of Orlov's apartment, they confiscated the originals of the documents which were used in the Group's Document No. 4 which deals with taking children away from the Baptist believers and turning them over to the state because the parents were educating them in religious beliefs. That document is in the possession of the Commission and has been translated, I believe.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. They also confiscated during the search a whole volume containing signatures of the Meskhetians, the Georgian people who want to return to their homeland on the Turkish border.

*Professor Orlov was arrested in Moscow, Feb. 10, 1977.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. But on the basis of that information, the Group had prepared Document No. 18 which is also in the possession of the Commission.

Mr. FASCELL. As you know, we have published today the reports of the Helsinki Accord Monitors in the Soviet Union, volume 2, of the documents of the Public Groups.

Is the practice of denying parents their parental rights still continuing?

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. The last case that I know of took place in Ryazan on February 14 of this year. There was a court decision depriving parents of their parental rights.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Since the adoption of the Helsinki accords, there have been court decisions depriving parents of parental rights. But despite these decisions, the authorities have often left the children with their parents. This is a precarious situation where the child could be taken away at any moment because the court has so decided and delivered a verdict to that effect.

Mr. FASCELL. Is this practice widespread or limited to small and remote towns?

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. She says Ryazan is not such a small town. But there have not been such cases in Moscow or Leningrad. They are more prevalent in smaller towns.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Miss Voronina just observes that there have been changes—interesting changes in Soviet policies with respect to deprivation of children. Some years ago, the Pentecostals were the chief victims—that is this policy was directed mainly at Pentecostal children. Now their attention has been focused on Baptists, especially a group called the Initiative Baptists, in depriving them of parental rights. But it is hard to predict which group might be next. It is a changing thing, but the practice has persisted for several years—for a number of years.

Mr. FASCELL. At this point, I had better ask Mr. Buchanan if he has any questions.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You mentioned several aspects of repression of religious groups and the formation of a committee, because of the number of these cases, to zero in on these problems.

One of our previous witnesses has described persecution of both religious and nationality groups as being subjected to what he called religious genocide or cultural genocide—an effort to stamp out all such diversity in the creation of Soviet man and Soviet woman. Would you say that either pertaining to nationality or ethnic groups or religious groups that you found evidence of this kind of pattern in the policies of your government?

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. It is not a direct answer to your question, but Miss Voronina says that since she left the country, which was in January, the group in Moscow has received 10 new documents about

religious persecution not only against Pentecostalists and Baptists, but persecution of Jehovah's Witnesses and other groups. But Miss Voronina says, the help from the West and interest from the West is not harmful to these groups—it will not increase Soviet repression directed against religious groups. She pleads that the West help with emigration where religious believers have requested it. The West can also help by focusing attention on problems of religious liberty so that believers will be allowed to practice their religion inside the U.S.S.R.

She feels that attention from the West will help to achieve those ends.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. She is afraid that if interest fades in the West, then it could result in the total destruction of those religious sects by the Soviet state which is opposed to them in principle and now accords them a limited tolerance.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Mrs. Alekseeva is again answering another question, but she feels that the fact that some of the people have been allowed to emigrate who were earlier subjected to religious persecution is helpful because the Soviets are afraid of emigration en masse and they do not want to permit millions of people to leave. Here you are dealing not with Jews or Germans who are relatively minor nationalities—you are dealing with Russians and Ukrainians. The authorities do not want to be faced with mass appeals for emigration and the fact that a few religious believers have managed to emigrate makes the authorities fear further demands. This might result in some lessening of repression within the Soviet Union in order to encourage these religious individuals and groups to stay in the U.S.S.R. rather than to ask for emigration.

Mr. BUCHANAN. May I ask about one particular case of a leader of the dissident Baptists, which I understand you testified, would be the group where the deprivation of parents of their children has been prominent in recent years.

Georgi Vins is the leader of that group and has been in a Siberian prison and is in poor health.

We passed a resolution in Congress last year in both Houses on his behalf calling for his release. I wonder if you know anything about that case?

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Georgi Vins is still in the prison camp and from all reports, his health is very poor. An interesting fact is that his son, Peter Vins, just a month ago, joined the Ukrainian Helsinki Watch Group. But there has been no substantive change in Vins' situation; he is still in his labor camp.

Mr. FASCELL. Senator Dole.

Mr. DOLE. I apologize for missing part of the testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I guess the basic question that all of us have is which is the best approach—quiet negotiations which have allowed some dissidents to leave—Bukovsky is probably the most recent example, or public pressure, letters to Sakharov and others.

In the opinions of these two ladies, which way is the best way to let

the Russians know how we feel about dissidence and to bring about the proper results?

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Mrs. Alekseeva does not think that one method excludes the other, she believes that it is possible to use both methods, but since she was a member of the Public Group to Encourage Fulfillment of the Helsinki accords, her own feelings speak for themselves—that is her own activity was directed toward public efforts to clarify the facts and public appeals.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. They have no objection in principle to quiet diplomacy as a supplement to public statements, particularly in the case of arrests, such as the arrests of Orlov and Ginzburg and Shcharansky. Sometimes a combination may prove effective, whereas one method without the other may not.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. With respect to the Soviet Union, Mrs. Alekseeva believes that quiet diplomacy can only succeed against a background of a public interest, if open and overt public interest is maintained.

Mr. DOLE. Based on that response, I would guess it would be the view of the witnesses that we should insist on a discussion of Soviet violations of the Helsinki Final Act when we go to Belgrade.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. In the document just received which Miss Voronina read from, the group's position has been that before there are any discussions about human rights at Belgrade, a preliminary condition should be the release of the arrested members of the Helsinki Watch Groups.

I would like to make clear from my prior talks with Mrs. Alekseeva that the Moscow Group believes that discussions on Baskets I and II—that is on security and economic cooperation, should go ahead. The release of Yuri Orlov and the other group members is not a precondition to discussions for Baskets I and II. But it would be condoning a sham if one proceeded to discuss human rights provisions while members of the group who committed no crime other than trying to encourage the fulfillment of the Helsinki accords are in prison.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Any declaration, no matter how good, about human rights will remain a scrap of paper while the people who fought for human rights remain in prison.

Mr. DOLE. Then I think Miss Voronina, you knew Anatoly Shcharansky well in Moscow, right?

Miss VORONINA. Yes.

Mr. DOLE. I believe that you were storing his personal letters from his wife in Israel until the KGB seized them. Based on your knowledge, what do you think of the report that he is being charged with treason since the investigation has not been completed—do you think the Soviet authorities will actually proceed with such a charge?

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Miss Voronina feels that the charges which

have been reported against Shcharansky are totally false and are provocative in their nature.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. She feels that the only crime that Shcharansky is guilty of is one which the Soviet Union may consider to be a crime against the state. It is that Shcharansky spoke the truth and what is worse, he spoke it in English. He spoke English very well and acted as an interpreter for many of the dissidents.

Mr. DOLE. Does she think that they will proceed with that charge?

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. The basis for reporting that charge is a letter received by Shcharansky's mother from a Soviet official.

There have been precedents where the preliminary charge has been changed—changed at the time of court proceedings. That happened in the case of General Grigorenko and in the case of Vyacheslav Igrunov in Odessa so it is not certain that that will be the charge in court.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Miss Voronina thinks that the result of that trial will depend in great measure on the degree of support he receives from people here.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Mrs. Alekseeva points out that in the case of General Grigorenko the charges were increased when his case came to court—they were made more severe—whereas in the case of Igrunov, the charges when he came to court were reduced. What happens depends a great deal on the pressure from the West and Western reaction.

In the case of Shcharansky, it is hard to see them increasing the severity of the charges against him.

Mr. DOLE. The degree of aid she speaks of is public pressure?

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. She is speaking of public pressure and any other means that you or anyone else can think of to help.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. She feels that there is some possibility that silent diplomacy can help, but only if it is backed up by very strong public outcry and pressures.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Miss Voronina would like to point out that the type of information Shcharansky collected is well explained by the report of Mrs. Alekseeva which she read to you—that it was all open information and he did it all openly. He was very effective in collecting information. One of Shcharansky's crimes in Soviet eyes was that he was never afraid of anything—he was never afraid because he knew he had never done anything criminal and the authorities do not like people who are not afraid.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Mr. Shcharansky was under constant surveillance by the Soviet authorities day and night. A prerequisite to be a spy or at least a successful one is to be able to do things secretly. Everything that Mr. Shcharansky did transpired under the unwavering gaze of the Soviet authorities so it is hardly credible that he could have been engaged in any kind of spying activity.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. She is just describing that when she met with Shcharansky, they were followed by two cars, each with four men in it, who openly were holding hearing devices or bugs—you know, like walkie-talkies. On the street, there were other people—one on each side of them—who were within earshot. Would it be possible in such circumstances to carry on espionage activities?

Mr. FRIENDLY. There were four people across the street holding recorders.

Mr. KLINE. Yes, four people on the other side holding recorders.

Mr. FASCELL. Mrs. Fenwick.

Mrs. FENWICK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have several questions. First, just out of curiosity, I note on page 4 that various religious groups came to meet with the committee. There is no mention of Jewish groups. Do they not come to you?

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Jewish groups did come, but No. 1, the Jewish groups have their own contacts with the West and their own method of getting the attention of Western correspondents. The Jewish group did make some contacts with the Helsinki Watch Group. Shcharansky, a Jewish activist, is a member of the Helsinki Watch Group. The reason that Mrs. Alekseeva stresses the people from the deep provinces and the Christian Groups and Russians and Ukrainians is because that was such an unexpected and unusual phenomenon in the Soviet Union. The Jewish problem was already fairly well known, but the Group members themselves were amazed at the distances traveled by some of these other people.

Mrs. FENWICK. That is my next question. I am interested in what Madam Alekseeva called the khodoki. How did they know where to come?

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. The fact that the group existed and what its functions were, they heard by radio. When these people came, the Group members asked how they had learned of the groups existence. They replied—by radio, Voice of America, BBC and so on. They would ask these people and most of them would answer sort of casually, we heard it on the radio.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Over the radio, they broadcast the name of the group and even the name of Doctor Orlov as director and names of members, but they did not broadcast addresses. Even so, people found them and in the case of the taxi driver, Vladimir Pavlov from Maikop, he told the group how he found their address.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Pavlov came to Moscow. He went to one of Moscow's main streets, Gorky Street, and he stopped several well-dressed people, deciding that if they were well-dressed and were wearing a hat, then they were members of the intelligentsia.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. And he stopped them and said, "Can you give me the address of Sakharov or Orlov?"

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Well, people that he stopped also listened to foreign radio and knew what he was talking about.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. One of the people took him in a taxi to an acquaintance of his—Pavlov did not even know his name—and that acquaintance gave him the address of Yuri Orlov.

Mrs. FENWICK. I see. I have one or two more questions. One is about the Solzhenitsyn fund for the families of prisoners. How is that administered—have either of these ladies ever taken part in this? How does it help the families of political prisoners?

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. On the very eve of Ginzburg's arrest when he knew that he was about to be arrested, he felt that he was about to be arrested, he called a press conference in February and gave some of the details of his administration of the fund.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Ginzburg said that in the 3 years that he had been giving help to families of prisoners, he had distributed approximately \$200,000 which he had received from Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and an additional \$70,000—rubles, I should say—an additional 70,000 rubles which had been collected in Russia itself.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. And that each year, in that 3-year period, approximately 600 families of political prisoners had received some support from the fund.

Mrs. FENWICK. I suppose they lose their jobs and the fund helps them to live.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. There is the problem you mention—some families lose their jobs. Very often the wife is left alone with small children and either has no income or a very small income so that it needs a supplement.

Mrs. FENWICK. How did these ladies get out?

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Mrs. Alekseeva was under pressure from the KGB to go. They were pressing her rather hard—they were more anxious for her to leave than she was to leave herself. They wanted her out.

Can I mention something?

Mrs. FENWICK. Yes.

Mr. KLINE. There has been one thing for which the Soviet authorities deserve compliment—there has been a reluctance to arrest women although they have not been excluded. Professor Orlov was arrested in Mrs. Alekseeva's house and at the time, the police said "you, too" and you know why we are here. It was clear to Mrs. Alekseeva that the choice was to go west or go to jail.

Mrs. FENWICK. What role did Madam Alekseeva have or play in this fund?

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Lidia Voronina would like to say that 3 years ago, her husband was permitted to emigrate to Israel. She asked to emigrate with him. She was denied that permission for 3

years. After she made her trip to visit the Pentecostal communities and the day after there had been a search in her house, she was given permission to leave.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Mrs. Alekseeva was occupied with collecting money for prisoners' families before the formation of that fund, from 1968 to 1972. There was no help from outside and her job or her responsibility was to gather money from Soviet citizens.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. In those years, in the institutes and factories where dissidents worked, there were a lot of people who sympathized with them even though they were not open dissidents. The dissidents would talk quietly to people whom they knew were sympathetic and say, "if you do not want to do anything else, you can give 1 ruble or 5 rubles." And every 2 weeks when employees received their paychecks, they would collect maybe \$1 or \$5 from these sympathizers.

The situation was somewhat different then and in a way, better, because not only could one provide help to the prisoners' families, but in those years you could still send parcels—food parcels and other parcels to the prisoners themselves. So some of this money was spent to buy food parcels and other things for the prisoners.

Mrs. FENWICK. When did that stop?

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Mrs. Alekseeva collected between 600 and 900 rubles a month, which at that time, was equivalent of about \$700.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Instructions for internal use were adopted in November, 1972, which ended the right to send food parcels to prisoners. But Mrs. Alekseeva wants to tell about the first time when Ginzburg was in prison. In addition to sending food, bouillon cubes, medicine, and other things to prisoners, they sometimes put money inside the packages of dehydrated soup or food because there is some use for money even inside the camp. Ginzburg told Mrs. Alekseeva that the first time they received such a package, with money hidden inside a soup envelope, they almost cooked it. They nearly destroyed it because they did not have any idea that the money was there. Later they learned to look for money in the parcels.

Mrs. FENWICK. I have one final question which cannot be answered, I suppose. And that is where do you get the courage to act in defiance of such a regime—to inspect the Pentecostals and their children, to collect for those who are in trouble—where does such courage come from?

We are lost in admiration.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. She says being a dissident looks different here than there—more formidable than it does from there. There are many people who want to remain self-respecting people. And if you want to maintain self-respect, these are the things you do. From inside, it does not appear as quite as courageous maybe as—

Mrs. FENWICK. I understand.

Mr. KLINE. That is what she is saying.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Mrs. Alekseeva believes or hopes that any self-respecting citizen or person from here who found himself in those conditions, if he wanted to remain self-respecting, would act exactly the same way.

Mrs. FENWICK. You know what Archibald Cox said: "I know what I admire. I know what I hope I would do."

Mr. FASCELL. Miss Voronina wants to speak.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. You would understand better if you yourself had visited a Pentecostal community. These are very hard-working, simple Russians. The most remarkable thing about them, which is not usual for Russians, is that they do not drink. They have large families which is also remarkable in these days. They are just simple, God-fearing people and you have to sympathize with them and help them in their work.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would have to say that I, like my colleague, am lost in admiration for your courage and work. If I were an historian, writing of this era, I probably would not even give a footnote to many of the political figures, whether in our Government or in your government, but I must say that people like those of your Group would be right toward the top of the list of the heroes of our time.

Miss VORONINA. Thank you very much.

Mr. KLINE. They both thank you and you have embarrassed them.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You mentioned, both in your formal statement and in your answers to questions, the role of broadcasting and Radio Liberty, specifically, and the Voice of America, which you describe as two of the most popular foreign radio operations in the Soviet Union. I wonder how you would evaluate these stations as to their listenership and their programing and how you would rate them in importance in perpetuating this human rights movement in the Soviet Union.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Thank you for your kind words—that goes back to your earlier statement. They are not politicians, but they very much need the help of politicians to accomplish their aims.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. The human rights movement is not a political movement. It is hard to find any direct or exact comparison in American life, but Mrs. Alekseeva believes that the moral fervor and intensity can best be compared to perhaps the civil rights movement of America which coincided to some extent with their own movement in the Soviet Union in time.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Professor Orlov is a physicist. He made personal surveys and calculations and he estimates that one-fifth of the adult population in the Soviet Union listens to foreign radio broadcasts.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Foreign radio is the only widespread source of what you might call counterinformation or unofficial information in the Soviet Union. It is their primary source.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. And you have to understand, since it is the only source, not only dissidents and not only those who sympathize with dissidents, but anybody who is interested in public affairs and world affairs, including officials, tend to listen to foreign radios because it is their only source of news and much that is happening.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Many of the people who listen have a thirst for true information since Soviet information is distorted or false in many cases. Even if people do not agree with the aims of the stations, even if they look on them as hostile stations, people will listen just to hear the information that is contained in their broadcasts to give them some view of the outside world.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Foreign radio broadcasts have become necessary just for civil life—and not just for the dissidents. Foreign broadcasts have become a normal part and an important part of the Soviet scene for anyone who is interested, and not just intellectuals. Quite a few ordinary people, workers and so on, listen, too. It is a form of both entertainment and information.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. But that raises some questions about how much more the radios could do than they are already doing and because of the radios' importance, Mrs. Alekseeva has firm views on that subject.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Why do the radios pay so little attention and so infrequently cite the Chronicle of Current Events, which is the basic information journal of the Soviet movement for human rights? That is not the journal that is published here, but the one that is compiled in Moscow by the dissidents themselves.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. When they raised this question with Western journalists and correspondents, they always said, "Well you know, the news is rather out-of-date by the time it gets to the West. It has to go through channels and be typed," but Mrs. Alekseeva points out that it may be old news in the West, but to the Soviets, it is very important. Even though an event happened a month ago, it is news to them and that is what they want to hear. So she wishes there were more broadcasts.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. You might—Miss Voronina says you might think that the Pentecostalists who are religious people would not listen to the radio, but they listen very avidly. It has almost become a part of their religious ritual—the same as saying their prayers. Miss Voronina was amazed how attentively they listened to foreign radio.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. When Pentecostalists would hear by radio about the actions of Sakharov or Orlov or the U.S. Government, or the Helsinki Commission after that, they would fall on their knees and pray because they felt that it was due to the providence of God that such people and such institutions exist and they would thank God for these things.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. I have two quick questions on which I would like to get the opinion of both ladies. American journalists and others have recently expressed the opinion that the human rights movement in the Soviet Union is dead. Is that an accurate assessment from their viewpoint?

Miss VORONINA. No.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian—a lengthy response.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. The—

Mr. FASCELL. I think that she said it is not true.

Mr. KLINE [continuing translation]. The first answer is that it is completely not true. In the past, there have been waves of harsh repression alternating with waves of less repression. During a wave of harsh repression, there has usually been some falling away from the movement. People have left the movement out of fear or for some other reason. But what most distinguishes the current wave of repression is that people have not abandoned the movement. The Helsinki groups have added new members. New people have added their signatures to petitions. Even though there has been an intensification of repression, it has not at all diminished the interest and if anything, it seems to have heightened it.

In Mrs. Alekseeva's long-term judgment the movement will exist as long as those problems exist which the movement is trying to deal with; the problems of freedom of information, freedom of speech, and so on, must be solved in Soviet society. Until they can be solved, there will always be a movement in defense of those civil freedoms.

Mr. FASCELL. Miss Voronina.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Mrs. Alekseeva knows more about the history of the movement, but Miss Voronina speaks for the younger generation of which she is a representative herself.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. She can, from her own experience, bear witness to the fact that there are a great many potential dissidents among her generation. When her fellow students or co-workers at the institute found out about Miss Voronina's activities, they did not ask her why she engaged in such hopeless activities—why she bothered about human rights. Their immediate reaction was to justify themselves as to why they themselves were not taking part in these activities and why they were not yet involved in the movement.

This need for self-justification indicates that they understand the importance of the human rights movement.

Mr. FASCELL. One final question. I would like each of the ladies to comment on what their opinion is as to why the Soviet Union picked this particular time, on the eve of the Belgrade Conference, when, as far as I know, everybody else is trying to put on their best suit, to be particularly harsh and repressive.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. She believes it is a test of nerves of those governments who signed the Helsinki Agreement. Usually, in the past, Western governments have made concessions when faced with Soviet complaints. Mrs. Alekseeva prays to God that this time the governments will stand firm and defend human rights. She thinks that, in essence, it is a deliberate test of nerve of the Western governments.

Mr. FASCELL. Miss Voronina.

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. The Soviet Union wants human rights only on paper and not for the people. Their attitude towards the human rights of the individual is the same as their attitude towards the national rights of the Union Republics which they created and which are, in theory, independent, but which are under the strict control of the central government. Just as their promise of land to the peasants which was made during the revolution was never fulfilled, so the Soviet Union is willing to make promises about human rights, but is very reluctant to fulfill them.

Mr. FASCELL. Does she agree that this particular activity now on the eve of Belgrade by the Soviet Union is a test of strength or is there some other reason?

[Miss Voronina speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. I think that Miss Voronina does not want to answer directly to your question probably because she feels that she does not know or is not qualified to respond. But regardless of the answer, Miss Voronina's point is that the progressive forces of mankind and the people who care should persist in defending human rights regardless of the Soviet motives. We should know what we want to do which is to insist on fulfillment of human rights.

Mr. FASCELL. I just was wondering whether there was some nebulous thought process in the Soviet mind that I did not understand.

[Mrs. Alekseeva speaks in Russian.]

Mr. KLINE [translating]. Mrs. Alekseeva feels that the Soviet Government is not acting out of self-confidence—it is not the way a self-confident government would behave. They are acting more out of weakness and fear. Their reaction to their own nervousness is to try to frighten the governments who are coming to Belgrade to negotiate with them.

Mr. FASCELL. I felt there has been an overreaction on the part of the Soviet Government myself and that they are acting out of fear, but I wanted to hear it from somebody who lived there and understands the Soviets.

Let me thank you, Mr. Kline, very much and both of you ladies. Your testimony has been extremely valuable. We admire you and your courage and the people you represent. We will hope and work for the best and try to join you in the very fine things that you have done.

The Commission stands adjourned. The next Commission hearing is at 2 p.m., Monday, June 6, 1977, in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, at which time we will hear the Secretary of State.

[Whereupon, at 1:15 p.m., the hearing was concluded.]

--APPENDIX: June 3, 1977--

WORKING COMMISSION FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF THE
ABUSE OF PSYCHIATRY FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

APPEAL TO WORLD PUBLIC OPINION

FEBRUARY 15, 1977.

Individual dramatic cases of psychiatric persecution attract world public attention. However, there are many prisoners of conscience in Soviet psychiatric hospitals, whose fate is known about neither at home nor abroad.

Today the Commission directs the attention of those who cherish the ideals of freedom and humanism to the tragic rate and difficult circumstances of Yury Belov, who is interned in the Krasnoyarsk Regional Psychiatric Hospital.

Yury Sergeyevich Belov was born in 1941. He is a christian, a Catholic. In 1958 he became a student at the Philological Faculty of Leningrad State University. In 1960 he was expelled from the University for belonging to V. Sosnovsky's "anti-Soviet" group. Under the pseudonym Yury Ark, he worked with Radio Liberty (on the reports "Out of 3 Stalinists, 5 Leninists", "Apes, communism and parasites", and other broadcasts).

In 1961 he was called up for military service and completed the regimental course. While serving in the army, he was accused of participation in the "Shlyanters affair" (an attempt by a group of soldiers to leave the USSR via Finland and Sweden). In 1961 he underwent a forensic psychiatric examination at the Leningrad Military Medical Academy and was diagnosed as having a "psychopathic personality". The case against Belov was dropped and he was dismissed from the army.

In 1962 he was deprived of his residence permit and banished from Leningrad as an "anti-social element".

He entered the Faculty of Historical Philology at the Pedagogical Institute in Kaliningrad, (formerly Königsberg), studied esperanto and in 1963 took part in an esperanto congress in Cracow (Poland). There he obtained a transit visa to the FRG and at an esperanto conference in Munich he made a speech in which he criticized the policy of the Soviet leadership. After his return to the Soviet Union, he was attacked in the Soviet press; in 1964 he was expelled from the Institute and subsequently arrested. He was charged under Article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code ("anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda"). He was sentenced to 3 years' deprivation of liberty which he served in the Mordovian camps, and 2 years exile, which he began in Ust-Abakan, in Siberia. In camp he went on hunger strikes 5 times and was placed in a punishment isolation cell on 15 occasions.

Once in exile, he composed a report on the subject of the organized crimes against political prisoners and sent it to the UN Commission on Human Rights. His "Report from the Darkness" was published in the FRG.

In 1968, as a result of the treacherous, provocative activity of an employee of the W. German radio station "Deutsche Welle", German Fuchs, the organs of the KGB discovered the identity of the author of "Report from the Darkness" and Yury Belov was once again arrested. He spent over a year in an investigation prison awaiting trial. He was charged under the same Article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and sentenced to 5 years' deprivation of liberty in a special regime camp. He served his new sentence in the Mordovian camps and in Vladimir Prison.

During a search of his cell in Vladimir prison, he was found to be in possession of "anti-Soviet material" and he was again charged with setting up an anti-Soviet organization and with betraying the fatherland (Articles 70-2; 72 and 64 of the RSFSR Criminal Code). He was given a psychiatric examination (the examining doctors were Ilinsky, Taltse, Turova) at the Serbsky Institute of Forensic Psychiatry in Moscow and diagnosed as suffering from: "pathological

development in a psychopathic personality". By a court order Yury Belov was sent for compulsory treatment.

From May 30, 1972, he has been undergoing the most severe punishment in the Sychovka Special Psychiatric Hospital of the MVD USSR, where he has been subjected to the effects of neuroleptic drugs.

On January 7, 1976, Belov was transferred to the Smolensk Special Psychiatric Hospital and on September 3 to the Krasnoyarsk regional ordinary psychiatric hospital, where he is at the present time.

After nine years of isolation from the outside world, Belov was at last permitted a visit. On January 7, 1977, Aleksandr Podrabinek visited him in the hospital. After Podrabinek's departure, on January 19, Belov was suddenly transferred to a regime of strict isolation, and compulsory "treatment" with neuroleptic drugs was started. There were no medical grounds as far as we know, for these measures. The Commission possesses information which shows that the strict measures of confinement and the "treatment" which is having disastrous effects on Belov's health, were a direct consequence of his meeting with Podrabinek.

The Commission is of the opinion that the fact that someone visited Belov and gave him warm clothing, food and a transistor radio cannot serve as grounds for taking such measures.

The Hospital administration does not reply to our telephone queries about Yury Belov's condition, nor has a reply been received to Aleksandr Podrabinek's open letter to the chief doctor Boris Spiridonovich Gladkikh. Since approaching the administration brings no results, **THE COMMISSION CALLS ON ALL PEOPLE OF GOOD WILL TO RAISE THEIR VOICES IN DEFENCE OF BELOV.**

Aleksandr Podrabinek's open letter to the chief doctor of the Krasnoyarsk Psychiatric Hospital, the address of the hospital, the names of the doctors and their telephone numbers in the hospital are attached to this document.

Address of the Hospital

SSSR.

RSFSR.

Krasnoyarsky kray.

Nizhne Ingashy raion.

Poselok Poima-Tiny.

Krasnoyarskaya Kravevaya Psikhiatricheskaya Bolnitsa.

Chief Doctor.—Boris Spiridonovich Gladkikh. tel—1-45. Deputy chief doctor in the medical department: Tamara Aleksandrovna Kuzmina, tel—1-56. Head of the first section (where Belov is) : Anatoly Demyanovich Odezkin tel—1-16. Doctor in charge of Belov : Vladimir Vasilievich Myasnikov. tel—1-16.

To the Chief Doctor of the Krasnoyarsk Regional Psychiatric Hospital, Boris Spiridonovich GLADKIKH.

Open Letter

Since 3 September 1976, Yury Sergeyevich Belov has been under compulsory treatment in your hospital. He was transferred there from the Smolensk Special Psychiatric Hospital of the MVD USSR, (USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs).

At the beginning of January this year I visited Yury Sergeyevch; I also talked with some of the Hospital doctors, in particular with yourself and with the doctor treating him, V. V. Myasnikov, about his health, his conditions of confinement and about the possibility of discharge.

I am deeply convinced that Belov is mentally quite healthy and therefore the fact that he wasn't being subjected to harmful "treatment" or being subjected to a regime of restraint left me with a relatively favourable impression of your hospital and its doctors.

Myasnikov, the doctor in charge of Belov's treatment, told me that at the moment Yury Sergeyevich is not socially dangerous and does not need to be a compulsory confinement any longer. I could have answered that he never needed psychiatric help—however, the evaluation of a person's psychic state is the prerogative of psychiatrists and I did not enter into fruitless arguments on this subject then; but now I intend to prove that I am correct. My own deep conviction that he is in perfect mental health is enough for me; an impartial, objective psychiatric examination of Yury Belov is a matter for the future.

However, at that time, on 5 January 1977, Yury Belov's doctor assured me

that he would recommend his discharge and that the case would be referred to the Nizhne-Ingashsky district People's Court.

I left your hospital with the hope that Yu. S. Belov's 9 years of imprisonment was coming to an end and that in the near future my next meeting would be with Yury Sergeyeovich as a free man.

However the facts which have become known to me during the last few days have aroused in me feelings of indignation and apprehension. Indignation at the actions of the medical staff and apprehension about the health and the life of Yu. S. Belov. I have learned that on 19 January, Yury Sergeyeovich Belov was put on a regime of strict isolation; "treatment" with haloperidol, triftazin, and motidendepo was prescribed (and has begun), and the writing materials and the transistor radio which I had given him were taken away. I also found out that these actions were taken on account of the fact that on 7 and 8 January Belov met me, that he had not altered his convictions and that "he should be put in prison" in any case.

There is a fantastic irony in your words and deeds. Do you want take it out on him because I visited him in your hospital, on my own initiative and without any plea or invitation from him? Are you reproaching him with the fact that I gave him some food, warm clothing and a transistor radio? You do not wish that more such visits may take place in the future? If so, then punish me for this, not Belov. I went to visit him on my own initiative, during my official vacation. Bring criminal charges against me, if you can. I am ready to answer for my actions.

What do you expect to gain? To make Belov conform to that model in whose image you yourselves are created, by suppressing his will and intellect with neuroleptic drugs? Or are you, forgetting the duty and honour of the medical profession, simply obeying orders from above? In this connection I would like to remind you of the results of the Nuremberg trials, when those punished included not only the organizers of crime but also those who carried out the criminal orders of the Nazis. I will not even mention the Hippocratic oath, which you violated on the day when you accepted a perfectly sane man—Yury Sergeyeovich Belov—into your hospital.

I demand that you stop the persecution and humiliation of Yu. S. Belov. Stop giving him triftazin. Stop the murderous "treatment" with haloperidol and modandepo. After forcible treatment with these preparations, Belov has been subject to pains in the heart. Recommend his release, as you were intending to do before my visit.

I must emphasize this: my visit to Belov was of an entirely personal nature. He is my friend. There was nothing criminal among the things which I gave him.

You have decided to give this matter a political nature. You have taken the first step along the path to the physical annihilation of Yury Sergeyeovich Belov. You know that he will not survive a new course of "treatment" with neuroleptic drugs.

I am calling on public opinion in our country and abroad to come to the defence of Yu. S. Belov.

I am calling on all people of good will to try to obtain Belov's release to save him from destruction in your psychiatric hospital.

ALEKSANDR PODRABINEK.

The Public Group to Promote the Observance of the Helsinki Agreements in the U.S.S.R.

DOCUMENT NO. 2

Information on the Interruption of Human Contact in the Sphere of International Postal and Telephone Communications

I. In accordance with the Final Act of the European Conference on Security and Cooperation (paragraph "Human Contact") :

It is the aim of the participating states . . . to facilitate freer movement and contacts among persons . . . and to contribute to the solution of humanitarian problems that arise in that connection.

Under conditions prevailing in the U.S.S.R., the "free movement" of Soviet citizens to travel to other countries of the world and to return (to the U.S.S.R.) is impossible, if one has in mind anything resembling free movement.

Therefore, postal and telephone communications play an exceptionally important part in establishing more direct contacts between people and in the exchange

of humanitarian information. However, even this contact is also made extremely difficult, if certain official organs do not approve the nature of the information exchanged.

II. On August 31, 1972, the Soviet Council of Ministers adopted a special resolution on an addendum to article 74 of the Soviet statute on communications, which states the following: "The use of telephone communication (inter-urban, urban, rural) for purposes contrary to state interests and the social order is forbidden." In actual practice, this addendum is used to disconnect telephones even without any warning, after several telephone conversations with foreigners in which any information which does not meet with official approval is communicated (e.g. information on prisoners of conscience, persecution of dissidents, texts of statements in defense of those persecuted, information from abroad on the reaction of Western public opinion to certain events in the Soviet Union.)

The telephone is usually disconnected with a warning that it not be used in the future for conversations with persons abroad; but not infrequently, telephones are disconnected permanently and their numbers are assigned to other subscribers.

Following is a list of telephones known to us to have been disconnected (the list does not include telephones which eventually have been reconnected by the authorities.)

A. Persons whose telephones were disconnected *after* the Final Act of the European Conference had been signed:

1. Valentin Turchin, telephone 129-25-30, Moscow, December 1975. Dr. Turchin is the Chairman of the Soviet Group of the Amnesty International.

2. Yuri Orlov, telephone 129-51-60, Moscow, November 1975. Professor Orlov is a member of Amnesty International.

3. Vadim Borisov, telephone 452-85-00, Moscow, August 1975. Borisov is the author of a well-known article in the collection entitled, "Iz pod glyb" ("From under the Rubble), frowned upon the authorities.

4. Abram Yutis, telephone 3-70-74, Odessa, August 1975.

5. Vladimir Rayz, telephone 75-90-21, Vilnius, February 1976.

6. Tatyana Khodorovich, telephone 280-91-02, Moscow. Tatyana Khodorovich is a well-known civic leader. After her telephone was reconnected, (for a short time) it was again disconnected when Leonid Plyushch was preparing to leave the U.S.S.R. During that time, Tatyana Plyushch-Zhitnikova's telephone was also disconnected.

7. Boris Fridman, telephone 37-39-58, Minsk.

8. Lev Ovsishcher, telephone 22-81-63, Minsk.

9. Vladimir Kislik, telephone 56-55-56, Kiev.

10. Mark Nashpits, 1-62, Tupik, Chitinskaya oblast.

11. Vladimir Voinovich, writer, telephone 151-28-53.

B. Persons whose telephones were disconnected before the signing of the Final Act, were not reconnected after the signing and still remain disconnected:

1. Nina Ivanovna Bukovskaya, 463-12-59, Moscow. Telephone disconnected on July 30, 1975. Mother of the well-known prisoner of conscience, Vladimir Bukovsky.

2. Vladimir Slepak, 229-57-82, Moscow.

3. Vladimir Prestin, 162-79-22.

4. Pavel Abramovich, 461-89-38.

5. Yuli Komarovsky, 264-93-75.

6. Ida Nudel, 172-48-64.

7. Aleksandr Lerner, 137-53-96.

8. Izabella Novikova, 301-11-39.

9. Iosif Beylin, 161-19-83.

10. Mark Novikov, 164-19-83.

11. Vitaly Rubin, 223-54-72, 294-97-59.

12. Viktor Brailovsky, 433-92-28.

13. Viktor Elistratov, 162-39-00.

14. Vladimir Shakhnovsky, 482-92-32.

15. Yevgeny Baras, 241-46-02.

16. Feliks Kandel, 151-96-85.

17. Evgeny Yakir, 129-26-30.

18. Grigory Rozenshteyn, 129-12-73.

19. Nikolay Shepelev, 461-88-76.

20. Arkady Polishchuk, 287-47-11.

21. Lidia Voronina, 295-57-77.

22. Ilya Essas, 187-85-57.
23. Naum Kogan, 479-80-62.
24. Iosif Blikh, 10-98-98, Leningrad.
25. Grigory Roman, 14-73-66, Leningrad.
26. Grigory Ioffes, 19-52-21, Leningrad.
27. Ekaterina Davidovich, 32-71-14, Minsk.
28. Grigory Khess, 24-27-40, Minsk.
29. Anna Ioffe, 22-14-29, Minsk.
30. — Kushner, 37-18-73.
31. Isay Goldshteyn, 22-71-19, Tbilisi.
32. Ida Shtern, 28=813, Vinnitsa.

Both lists are incomplete. In those rare cases when the authorities for certain reasons do not want to disconnect a telephone (e.g. Academician Sakharov's telephone) or when a subscriber uses telephones in government telephone stations, conversations not approved by the authorities are either jammed or interrupted. We have established numerous cases when both parties expecting to talk with one another, are told that "the conversation could not take place because one party has not shown up," or "no one answers the telephone."

III. Postal communication with foreign countries is no less subject to control than telephone communication. It is true that in this case it is much more difficult to prove intentional interruption of contact, since the local postal authorities always say that it is not their fault that letters have not been delivered. The experience of those who tried to obtain compensation through court action for the numerous letters which they have not gotten or which were not delivered, (e.g. Isay and Grigory Goldshteyn in Tbilisi, Mark Abramovich in Kishinev, Ida Nudel in Moscow) shows that every time the investigation drags on for years and produces no results. Nevertheless, in a number of cases the interruption in postal delivery is quite evident. For example, in April 1975 (before the Final Act had been signed) according to American Jewish organizations, about 4,000 telegrams were sent to Vladimir Slepak during his 22 day hunger strike in Moscow. Nevertheless, not a single one reached him. Ida Nudel did not receive a single one of the numerous telegrams sent to her from abroad on her birthday, April 27, 1976, which was already after the Final Act had been signed.

Dr. Valentin Turchin, Chairman of the (Soviet) Group of Amnesty International states:

Early in 1975, a few months after the Group was admitted to Amnesty International, printed matter and letters sent from London stopped coming through altogether. Until the end of 1975, I maintained contact with London by telephone. On December 11, my telephone was disconnected. At first I was told that it was for six months. If Orlov's case is to be taken as an example, then probably my telephone will not be connected even after 6 months. Thus, contact with London will be totally halted. It is even impossible to say how much material has been sent from London during this time and detained by the authorities. It is quite possible that the General Secretary of M.A. (A.I.—translator's note) seeing that the material sent out does not reach its destination, has stopped sending it.

Letters we sent abroad in defense of prisoners of conscience in foreign countries also apparently do not reach their destination, as they are intercepted on the way. Of the several dozen letters sent abroad by members of the group, a considerable number (about half) was sent return receipt requested.

Only once did we receive confirmation that the letter was received: this was Viktor Sokolov's letter to the Minister of Internal Affairs of Spain, Peralta.

But in addition to Amnesty (International), personal letters are also frequently detained by the authorities. Postcards go through more frequently. Only scientific journals arrive regularly. As a rule, other journals and books get lost. In November 1975, Jeremy Stone, Director of the American Federation of Scientists, sent me his book on the problem of disarmament. The book never arrived. I was assured by the local post office that it had never arrived there. On the other hand, a dictionary sent by the same Dr. Stone was safely delivered to my apartment. Hence, the authorities make their selection according to very evident principles. But books and journals which are in great demand here, also frequently never arrive. Our American friends sent my son a subscription to *The National Geographic* for 1975. In all this time, only one issue arrived. The magazine apparently charmed the censors

with its wonderful photographs. In the summer of 1975, the Swedish mathematician, Lars Elden, sent me an historical novel about the Swedish Vikings in Russia. The book never arrived.

IV. All the facts of which we are informed speak of the continuing violations of the humanitarian articles of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, both under the paragraph "Human Contacts" and, basically, under the paragraph "Information".

Members of the Group.

Yuri Orlov.
Vitaly Rubin.
Anatoly Shcharansky.
Lyudmila Alekseeva.

Submission for the record by Dr. Andrew M. Sessler, Director, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory: a statement on the arrest and detention of Professor Yuri Orlov, a telegram to the USSR Academy of Science signed by 225 scientists, and a biography of Professor Yuri Fyodorovich Orlov.

THE ARREST OF YURI ORLOV

The arrest of Yuri Orlov, by the Soviet Government on February 10, 1977 is, I allege, a violation of the Helsinki Accord, Basket I, Article VII.

This arrest has greatly disturbed many—and, in particular, his fellow high energy physicists. Three of us, Dr. Andrew M. Sessler, Director, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory; Dr. Karl Strauch, Professor of Physics at Harvard University; and Dr. Gustav-Adolf Voss, a member of the directorate of the DESY high energy research facility in Hamburg, West Germany, contacted, over a two-day period, a number of high energy physicists here and in Europe to join in a telegram which was sent on February 18, 1977 to Professor A. A. Logunov Vice President of the Soviet Academy of Sciences. We contacted a representative sample of high energy physicists, totaling 225 scientists. Of these, only five requested that their names not appear on the telegram. The reason: they felt they could more effectively work for Orlov's release through their contacts inside the Soviet Union.

We feel that the contents of this telegram and the list of very distinguished signers (including six Nobel Prize winners) should be brought up at Belgrade as an expression of deep concern for Dr. Orlov's fate by his fellow scientists around the world. High energy physicists have for many years pioneered in collaborations between Soviet and European and Soviet and American scientific groups. These collaborations have resulted in significant contributions to knowledge.

These many international contacts have resulted in Orlov being personally known to many western physicists, and consequently his fellow high energy physicists are deeply disturbed by his arrest. (See Attachment A for the telegram and list of signers.)

We would emphasize that we sent this telegram as private citizens and concerned scientists, and not as representatives of the various institutions with which we are affiliated.

Orlov is a distinguished Soviet high energy physicist and a corresponding member of the Armenian Academy of Sciences. He has recently formed, and heads, an unofficial committee which monitors Soviet compliance with the human rights provisions of the 1975 Helsinki Agreement. (See Attachment B for Orlov's biography and a list of his publications.)

Orlov's case has attracted the attention of many, including Senator Hayakawa (see Attachment C), and Mr. Hodding Carter III of the Department of State. (See Attachment D.)

Orlov's confinement follows the recent arrest or imprisonment of other Soviet dissidents including Mykola Rudenko, Sergei Kovalev, Aleksandr Ginzburg and others. News stories giving the details—to the extent that we know them—of Orlov's arrest and associated background information are appended. (See Attachments E, F, G, H.)

In my opinion this is a flagrant case of violation of the Helsinki Accord which besides being extremely serious for Yuri Orlov will have, as the Soviet authorities make their charges against Orlov public, an increasingly chilling effect on Soviet-USA scientific relations.

Sincerely,

ANDREW M. SESSLER.

The scientists' telegram was sent on Feb. 18, 1977 and reads: "Professor A. A. Logunov, Vice President, U.S.S.R. Academy of Science, Leninsky PR. 14, Moscow A-83.

Dear Professor Logunov: We, the undersigned, have noted the recent arrest of Dr. Yuri Orlov. He is known to all of us as a distinguished scientist and a respected member of the international community of high energy physicists.

We want you to know of our great concern for Dr. Orlov and hope that the matter of his arrest can be favorably resolved in short order.

The scientists who signed the telegram are listed below:

Bonn, W. Germany:

K. Dietz.
G. V. Gehlen.
Husmann.
G. Knoop.
W. Paul.
V. Rittenberg.
H. Rollnick.

Daresbury, England:

A. Ashmore.
Bailey.
T. J. Duke.
R. Marshall.
J. C. Thompson.

Darmstadt, W. Germany:

C. Schmelzer

Frascati, Italy:

B. Allen.
M. Bassetti.
G. Belletini.
G. Capitani.
V. Chimenti.
R. A. Del Fabro.
E. De Sanctis.
E. Fiorintino.
A. Gattono.
E. Jarocci.
C. Mencuccini.
G. Murtas.
C. Pellegrini.
P. Picchi.
A. Reale.
C. Sanelli.
M. Serio.
S. Tazzari.
F. Tazzioli.
A. Treger.

Geneva, Switzerland:

U. Amaldi.
D. Amati.
F. Bonaudi.
P. Darriulat.
T. Ericson.
P. Falk-Vairant.
S. Fubini.
V. Glaser.
J. D. Jackson.
M. Jacob.
K. Johnsen.
E. Keil.
R. Levy-Mandel.
E. Lohrmann.
I. Mannelli.
A. Martin.

M. Morpurgo.
G. Petrucci.
E. Picasso.
J. Prentki.
L. Radicati.
L. Resegotti.
W. Schnell.
J. Steinberger.
H. O. Wuester.
B. Zumino.

Hamburg, W. Germany:

J. Bienlein.
W. Jentschke.
W. Koch.
H. Schopper.
P. Soeding.
M. Teucher.
G. A. Voss.
G. Weber.
G. Wolf.

Heidelberg, W. Germany:

Heinze.
Soergel.

Karlsruhe, W. Germany:

Citron.
Heinz.
Schatz.

Muenchen, W. Germany:

H. P. Duerr.
Buschhorn.
N. Schmitz.
W. Zimmerman.

Orsay, France:

Augustin.
Beck.
Belbeoch.
Bergher.
Bieth.
Bizot.
Brunet.
Buon.
Chabert.
Cordier.
Cosme.
Couran.
Davier.
Delcourt.
Dudelzark.
Eschtruth.
Ferme.
Fulda.
Gendreau.

Orsau, France—Continued

Greland.
 Haissinski.
 Harar.
 Jullian.
 Laclare.
 Lalanne.
 LeLeux.
 LaPlanche.
 Le Duff.
 Lefort.
 Le Francois.
 Level.
 Marin.
 Morellet.
 Paulot.
 Perez-y-Jorba.
 Potaux.
 Ramband.
 Ropert.
 Rumpf.
 Sommer.
 Szklarz.
 Tkatchenko.
 Zyngier.

Rome, Italy:

Eduardo Amaldi.
 C. Bassani.
 G. Chiarotti.
 G. Salvini.
 C. Schaerf.

Ann Arbor, Mich.: Kent M. Terwilliger.*Batavia, Ill.:*

Frank T. Cole.
 Edwin L. Goldwasser.
 Fred Mills.
 Leo Teng.
 Robert R. Wilson.

Berkeley, Calif.:

Robert Birge.
 Owen Chamberlain.
 Geoffrey Chew.
 William Chinowsky.
 Tom Elioff.
 Gerson Goldhaber.
 Hermann A. Grunder.
 Walter D. Hartsough.
 David L. Judd.
 Denis Keefe.
 Glen R. Lambertson.
 L. Jackson Laslett.
 Edward J. Lofgren.
 Edwin M. McMillan.
 Piermaria Oddone.
 Jack M. Peterson.
 Art Rosenfeld.
 Andrew M. Sessler.
 Lloyd Smith.

George Trilling.
 William A. Wenzel.

Brookhaven, N.Y.:

Mark Q. Barton.
 John P. Blewett.
 Renata W. Chasman.
 Ernest D. Courant.
 Maurice Goldhaber.
 G. Kenneth Green.
 Alfred W. Maschke.
 Melvin Month.
 David Rahm.
 R. Ronald Rau.
 Lyle W. Smith.
 George H. Vineyard.

Cambridge, Mass.:

Martin Deutsch.
 Herman Feshbach.
 Francis E. Low.
 Francis M. Pipkin.
 Norman F. Ramsey.
 Karl Strauch.
 Richard Wilson.

Chicago, Ill.:

Herbert Anderson.
 James W. Cronin.
 Malcolm Derrick.
 Tom Fields.
 Ron Martin.
 Robert Sachs.

College Park, Md.:

Robert Gluckstein.
 George A. Snow.
 Kurt Gottfried.
 T. Kinoshita.
 Boyce McDaniel.
 Edward E. Salpeter.
 Kenneth Wilson.
 Donald R. Yennie.

Los Alamos, N. Mex.:

Edward Knapp.
 Darragh Nagle.
 Donald Swenson.

Los Angeles, Calif.: Harold Ticho.*New Haven, Conn.:* Robert K. Adair.*New York, N.Y.:*

Charles Baltay.
 Rodney L. Cool.
 Leon M. Lederman.
 Won Yon Lee.
 Abraham Pais.

Pasadena, Calif.: Murray Gell-Mann.*Princeton, N.J.:*

Val Fitch.
 Marvin L. Goldberger.
 Sam B. Treiman.

Santa Barbara, Calif.: Jose Fulco.*Santa Cruz, Calif.:* Matt Sands.

Stanford Calif.:

Joseph Ballam.
 James D. Bjorken.
 Richard Blankenbecler.
 Stanley Brodsky.
 Sidney Drell.
 Richard Helm.
 William Herrmannsfeldt.
 Robert Hofstadter.
 David Leith.

Terry Martin.
 Philip Morton.
 Wolfgang Panofsky.
 Martin Perl.
 John Rees.
 Burton Richter.
 Richard Taylor.
 Perry B. Wilson.
 Herman Winick.

Stony Brook, N.Y.: Chen-Ning Yang.
Urbana, Ill.: Albert Wattenberg.

BIOGRAPHY OF YURI FYODOROVICH ORLOV

Born in 1924. His childhood was spent in the village (between Moscow and Sueslensk) in the forests, in his father's native land. He lived with his grandmother who would earn a living by doing midwifing and herbal cures, sewing and knitting. There was also a small garden plot. And nothing else in the household.

The father worked in Moscow as a teamster. Once when an urchin threw himself headlong (or fell accidentally) down under his wheels, he quit to become a worker and in a while, a student "rabfac" (a department for the worker's education in a university). He died in 1933 of tuberculosis, not yet having graduated but working already as an engineer.

Yuri's mother was raised in a family of a ship mechanic on the Kama River, and the whole family died of (typhus) during the Civil War. Then, when she met Yuri's father in Moscow, he was taken with her beauty and bravery.

Yuri went to school in Moscow and lived with his mother and stepfather. The stepfather was a worker in an archives, and was a very kind, albeit unlucky artist. He was drafted in the first year of World War II and died in battle near Kharkov in 1942.

At the beginning of the War, Yuri worked as a turned at a plant. While working there with the friend of an uncle, Yuri was told by this friend: "Hope that the alliance in this War with democratic countries will lead to democratization of ours after the War." Yuri wondered how he could say that, since all of the newspapers, books and teachers had told him that the Soviet Union was the most democratic country in the world, and that only this democracy was authentic. Yuri wondered why this man was not afraid of being reported by an informer.

In 1944, Yuri was drafted into the army and was sent to a military college; then, 1 month before the war ended, he was sent to the Ukrainian front. In military college, he had become a candidate-member of the Communist Party.

After the War, some officers appeared to have a very critical attitude toward the Soviet regime. Yuri took part in discussions, in small closed groups of 3 or 4 men, which centered around protest of the "dictatorship of the bureaucracy" and desire to "return to the original Marxist ideas," but did not fully understand all of these things. Yuri, while serving in the army after the war in the North Caucasus, had diligently studied the works of "classic Marxism and of Hegel, trying to find the "true ideology."

He had compiled two thick notebooks, containing among other things, many disloyal excerpts from Engles. Once when he was summoned to the Special Department (a representative of the KGB in almost any Soviet organization) Yuri burned them. However, the summons proved to be just an offer to become a secret agent. It took a while for him to understand the real reason for their having called him, and once he did understand, he categorically refused. The persuading lasted 2 days. At the end, he was taken over to a high official who asked Yuri, "why do you think that with us it is like in the Gestapo?" For the second time, Yuri was overwhelmed. Strange as it was, according to Yuri, he did not know, it did not occur to him and nobody told him what the real dimensions of repression in the Soviet Union were and what the nature of it was. Yuri had not come to be curious about it, perhaps due to fear, as it was perilous even to ask. In his "ring" (discussion group) this topic was not touched.

During the demobilization at the end of 1946, Yuri went back to school, prepared for entrance exams to Moscow University, and simultaneously held a job

as a stove stoker at a Moscow factory. This job gave him plenty of time to prepare and assured him of bread ration-cards.

This work at the University, in physics (technical) and then in the physics department, was finished in 1952. In 1948, he was obliged to transfer to a membership in the Party from the candidate status. During his study, all political doubts had been totally put aside.

It is interesting that out of a group of seven students living in the same flat, at the same scientific institute where the practical classes were held, three happened to be secret agents. Incidentally, the physico-technical department was reformed into the institute in 1951 with all the Jewish students being transferred to Ryazan and Kazan, and all Russian students to Moscow University and Moscow Institute of Physics/Engineering. As a result of this, one very talented student (Eskin) committed suicide by throwing himself out of a seventh floor window.

In 1953, Yuri began his work at the Institute of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, which was headed by the academician A. I. Alichanyan. By the beginning of 1956, his thesis was completed and his first article was published in "Nuovo Cimento." This was generally the very beginning of somewhat freer publications on topics which had been considered prior to that as "closed" or "secret", but which were not really secret at all. Yuri collaborated in five reports at the 1956 Geneva Conference.

In April 1956, Yuri spoke out at a Party meeting in the Institute against Party policy before the 20th Congress. The meeting was devoted to discussions of materials concerning the 20th Congress. Yuri spoke about the general loss of honesty and morality, and about the need for democratic reforms. The meeting seemingly upheld his view and other speeches in the same spirit.

A few days later, a huge and slanderous column emerged in "Pravda", detailing a secret letter from the Central Committee to party members, in which the party's evaluation of those speeches was given. Yuri was immediately fired by order "from the very top," expelled from the party and his name was erased from scientific reports on the grounds that his "name is shameful for the Soviet science," as he was notified officially. His dissertation was banned.

For 6 months, Yuri was unemployed. However, in many of the physics institutes, people donated money to help those who had been fired, so that this period was not a very great ordeal.

In Moscow, nobody would give him a scientific teaching job. One personnel officer impudently told him to go to a plant where he could be "reforged." Soon the law about "parasites" was issued. Therefore, Yuri took an offer of A. E. Alichanyan (the brother of A. I. Alichanyan) and moved to Armenia to work on the project and an electron ring accelerator.

Things went successfully there for Yuri, and at the end of 1958, he even managed (with some pressure) to have his dissertation admitted to a defence. In 1963, he defended his doctoral dissertation. (Doctor is the second scholarly degree in the U.S.S.R., the first degree being that of "Candidate", which is roughly equivalent to the Ph.D. in the United States.)

On the 40th anniversary of Soviet Armenia, Khrushchev, travelling in Armenia, ordered the people "to forget the past" and Yuri was retrieved and given again his "secret" classification status. Without this status, he could not read some of his own classified works, could not enter many of the buildings in Moscow's institutes for use of the libraries, as well as many other, pretty ridiculous restraints.

The order "to forget" was honestly fulfilled. In 1968, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Armenia even approved leaving Yuri's name on the slate of nominees for election to the Armenian Academy of Science, and Yuri was elected a corresponding member of the Academy. In general, the attitude of people in Armenia towards him was always singularly good. The election results, however, proved to be quite unexpected in Moscow. Pressure on Yuri increased; there were restrictions in business, travelling and other repercussions. Yuri was never allowed to go abroad.

In 1972, Yuri was forced to leave Armenia for Moscow, where after a half year of severe hardships, he was shovled by L. A. Artzimovitz into an institute under his supervision. On September 16, 1973, Yuri wrote a letter to Brezhnev regarding the campaign against Sakharov. In October of that year, he became involved with an initiative group of "Amnesty International", and was promptly fired from his job. Amsartsumyan (the president of the Academy of Science of Armenia), in spite of his promise, could not hire him even in Armenia. In February of 1974,

Yuri Orlov signed an appeal devoted to the eviction of Solzhenitsyn. In May of 1976, he headed a committee called the "Group to Assist Fulfillment of the Helsinki Accords in the U.S.S.R." which would inform the heads of all signatory states of any Soviet violations of the Helsinki Agreement. Soviet authorities, in May of 1976, searched his flat and claimed to find evidence which "proved" that his activities were directed from abroad.

In early 1977, Orlov was arrested along with Alek Ginzberg on charges of anti-Soviet activities.

NOTES. The information contained in the body of this biographical summary was provided by Khronika Press in New York, with details about Orlov's 1976-77 activities provided by the Bay Area Council on Soviet Jewry in San Francisco, Calif.

The use of parentheses in the body of this work indicates that there is some uncertainty about the precision of translation from the Russian.

The following documents were translated by the Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee, Washington, D.C., and submitted to the Commission.

UKRAINIAN PUBLIC GROUP TO PROMOTE THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

MEMORANDUM NO. 4

On New Repressions in Ukraine Against Members of the Helsinki Group

On February 5, 1977, the organs of the KGB and the procuracies of Kiev, Donetsk, and Moscow regions again conducted searches in the apartments of the members of the Ukrainian Public Group. In the apartment of the leader of the Group Mykola Rudenko, his literary archives, 90 percent of which had been purloined during the previous search, this time were stolen in their entirety. In addition, Rudenko's wife Rayisa, his son Yuri, and a member of the Group, the writer O. /Oles/ Berdnyk, were subjected to personal searches (without the presentation of a warrant). Those performing the search conducted themselves roughly; obviously, they were employees of the organs /of the KGB/. After the search the leader of this "action," the deputy procurator of Donetsk Region, Noskov, took Rudenko away without answering his wife's questions as to the grounds on which he was being held. For 3 days the Kiev procuracy did not answer Rayisa Rudenko's questions about the fate of her husband; finally, on the fourth day she was informed that he was in investigation solitary confinement cell No. 1 in Donetsk Region.

Not a search, but a real pogrom was conducted in the apartment of O. Meshko, a member of the Group. Investigating officer Pankov of the Kiev procuracy, the warrant issued at the request of the Moscow procuracy, broke a window like a bandit and climbed into the apartment. He took everything that was either hand-written or typed (as he put it, "all the trash").

After Oksana Meshko refused to submit to a personal search, demanding a warrant for that, the investigating officer twisted her arm and, with the help of two women, searched her roughly.

Searches were also conducted in the apartments of M. /Myroslav/ Marynovych and M. /Mykola/ Matusevych, both members of the Public Group, as well as in the apartments of their parents and relatives in Kiev, Vasytko, and Drohobych. Those performing the searches conducted themselves roughly, not even granting the essentials to small children—a walk, rest, food.

All these searches and the violence were conducted supposedly in connection with the "case of O. /Oleksiy/ Tykhy," a member of the Public Group living in the Donbas. The essence of the "case" on the basis of which O. Tykhy was arrested has not been disclosed.

One thing is clear: the arrest of the leader of the Group, M. Rudenko, and a member, O. Tykhy, as well as the searches in the apartments of the other members, are but the beginning of a whirlwind of repression, which the KGB is preparing to direct against the Public Groups in the U.S.S.R.

(Note: On February 8, of this year, the physician M. Kovtynenko, who had refused to act as the KGB's informer on M. Rudenko, was sentenced to one and a half year's imprisonment. The regional court punished him for /taking/ "bribes"—three and a half rubles, a can of coffee, etc. It is obvious that this case had been fabricated.)

A lot depends on world public opinion: will this ominous wave subside, will the repressive organs return those arrested back to their homes, will they allow

the legal monitoring of the implementation of the Helsinki Accords?! Or will the spirit of Helsinki—the Spirit of Cooperation and Friendship, of Trust among people—be laid to rest beneath the crags of ruthless despotism and lawlessness?!

Members of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords:

L. LUKYANENKO.
O. BERDNYK.
P. HRYHORENKO.
O. MESHKO.
M. MARYNOVYCH.
M. MATUSEVYCH.
N. STROKATA.
I. KANDYBA.

February 9, 1977.

The signed copy is kept in the Group's archives.

(S) O. BERDNYK.

To the Countries Participating in the Belgrade Conference in the Summer of 1977:

MEMORANDUM NO. 5

UKRAINE OF THE SUMMER OF 1977

INTRODUCTION

The historic will of a people inevitably manifests itself in one or another form, revelation or action. As a mountain stream searches out crevices in order to carve out a channel for itself, so does the dynamic essence of a people find spokesmen for itself—spokesmen who are sons of its spirit—in order to give to other fraternal peoples a sign of its will.

The Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords is one such sign.

The bureaucratic structure of the Soviet Union reacted to the appearance of the Group to Promote with great pain and hostility. During the three months it has been in existence the security organs [KGB] conducted several brutal, harsh and savage searches in each of its members' apartments, confiscating almost all of the Group's literary, epistolary and philosophical archives, its documents, a number of books which had no relationship to the case, etc. Finally, on February 5, 1977, the head of the Group, the poet Mykola Rudenko, and a Group member, teacher Oleksiy Tykhy, were arrested, with no charges whatsoever being filed against them.

What is it that the initiators of the above-mentioned lawlessness and arbitrariness are so terrified of? What terrifying things do they see in people who openly state their convictions, while inviting the ruling circles of their own country and other states to a creative, evolutionary dialogue?

The courage and openness with which the Group has come forward prove that its members are not enemies of the Soviets [Councils], nor to the revolutionary ideals of a New World, nor to the humane ideals of Socialism and Communism.

What need was there for the searches and arrests, when all of the Group's documents were released to the world for the purpose of making them public?

We are not building an underground—this proves that we do not intend to overthrow the Soviet system.

We are not afraid of discussion—this proves that we are sure of our convictions.

We are ready to have our ideas either approved or rejected in an all-national referendum—and this proves that we would joyfully accept the will of the nation.

Is the bureaucratic structure—which has at its disposal an apparatus of repression, censorship, obedient servants and the fear sown in the Stalin era and undispelled to this day—ready for these things?

We are few, but we contend that with us is the will of Evolution. That is why again and again, patiently, in friendship and with hope, we appeal to the ruling circles of the land: Cease the repressions against honest people who think differently than do dogmatists and the orthodox! Such people are the hope of the future! Such people can be counted on in threatening times; they will not betray. Why should they be feared, those who speak the truth while risking their

lives, health and personal happiness? On the contrary, they should be invited to take part in constructive discussions and action.

A normal governmental structure should be interested in our opposition, for forces that criticize are a sign and certification of the existence of shortcomings and, therefore, of the opportunity to better the situation.

On the other hand, "universal approbation" at "elections," conventions, and meetings is not joy, but misfortune and a terrifying sign, for it all attests that the spirit of the people is dying.

A nation's monolithic quality is manifested not through bureaucratic resolutions and approbations, but through the freedom and unfettered nature of the spiritual and intellectual life of the people.

Such freedom should be aspired to rather than have its coming obstructed with arrests and repressions.

We declare, sincerely and courageously, that we have no fear of a new wave of persecution, for Truth is on our side.

All people die, but some die as nobodies, cowards and traitors, and some as true sons of their Mother, their Nation. We prefer to die the way the glorious knights of the Zaporozhian Sich died, the way Taras (Shevchenko), Lesya (Ukrayinka) and the Stonecutter (Ivan Franko) died, having carried out Ukraine's will, as it had made itself known within their hearts.

And now the voice of Mother Ukraine thunders in our hearts. In doing her bidding we offer to (other) Fraternal Peoples our credo, our hopes, our confidence that Light will conquer Darkness, that the era of enmity, fragmentation, and hostility will come to an end and the Sun of Freedom will rise over the Earth.

Listen to the Word of Ukraine of the year 1977

1. STATEHOOD

All of the historical cataclysms that the Ukrainian people lived through during the past few centuries were born of the idea of Statehood. The Will of a Nation aspires to nonsubordination, to sovereignty, to the building of its own independent life; at the same time, neighboring imperialistic predators do everything in their power not to allow such sovereignty, but to preserve the Nation Chosen as Victim in the form of a raw material—as a source of food, of spiritual force, of energy, of everything else.

This is what happened to Ukraine. Though possessed of an enormous reservoir of love of freedom, wisdom, creativity, of rare riches of the earth and the spirit, in a critical moment she was unable to hold on to her Statehood and became a colony of a cruel, merciless empire, whose will was diametrically opposed to the will of Ukraine.

Russia violated all the fraternal treaties and trampled underfoot the Word spoken at [the Treaty of] Pereyaslav. A people whose love of freedom Europe had enthused over became serfs, slaves, bondservants to alien ravagers. Hryhoriy Petrovsky, speaking in the Duma, provided an excellent characterization of autocracy's criminal activity in Ukraine—degradation of cultural and spiritual life, merciless exploitation of natural resources, unceasing genocide.

This is why the Ukrainian people so joyously supported the Revolution and the proclamation of the Ukrainian Republic.

The more outstanding ideas of the Ukrainian revolutionaries, as well as Lenin's ideas on the nationality question, however, were never put into practice. In the following years the chauvinistic spirit of autocracy could not be defeated and "the spirit of Catherine and Peter" found its still more terrible embodiment in Stalin's malignant activity.

Millions hounded and tortured to death, millions dead of starvation—all of this has been known to everyone for a long time. Sometimes it even seems strange why Ukraine still exists on geographical maps, why a Ukrainian word can still be heard now and then. And the strangest of all is that Ukraine is a member of the United Nations and therefore is considered a Sovereign State.

We will not be playing blindman's buff: this statehood of ours is nothing but a paper mirage. And the time has come to dot all the "i's", to end the incessant and insidious game with our sovereignty, as well as with the sovereignty of all the other Union republics.

The will of history is such that every nation (even the smallest) stepped onto the field of history as the one-for-all-time Son of His Mother within the One Brotherhood of Mankind.

We deeply respect the culture, the spirituality, the ideals of the Russian people. But why should Moscow be making the decisions for us at international forums, (for example, the Helsinki or Belgrade forums) as to these or other problems, obligations, etc.? Why should Ukraine's cultural, creative, scientific, agricultural, and international problems be defined and planned in the capital of the neighboring (even if allied) state?

We are not naive simpletons. We understand that at work here is that very same spirit of imperialism and chauvinism, about which our Bard [Taras Shevchenko] wrote with such clarity and anger:

It was he, [Peter] the First, who crucified
Our Ukraine,
And [Catherine] the Second finished off
The widow-orphan . . .
Executioners, executioners and cannibals . . .

You can't say it better than that! And present-day revolutionaries, communists, romantics and builders of the New World of Love and Brotherhood should carefully read through the manuscripts of the past, so as not to wander among the abstractions of excogitated schemes but instead to gird themselves in the impregnable armor of the testaments of the Spirit of the People.

We are not ones to be caught in a netting of criminal fabrications, unless the satraps of the bureaucratic citadel simply crush us without resorting to any kind of "legality."

Simply, sincerely and with conviction we announce several thoroughly thought-out positions on the subject of Statehood (that of neighboring peoples as well as of our own):

—Not the Individual for the State, but the State for the Individual. That is why any and all social transformations should receive the Nation's approbation through a popular referendum. All those "voices of the people" that have been organized in the press will be discarded onto the trash heap of history.

—We are not raising the issue of Ukraine's "separation." We don't have anyone to separate from. The planet is one. Mankind is one. Fraternal peoples are our neighbors. From whom should be separate? On the contrary, we raise the issue of Annexation, the Annexation of Ukraine, Russia, Georgia, Latvia and other fraternal nations to the One Spirit of Mankind.

We are for an Association whose name is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which will in time be transformed into a Brotherhood of Free Peoples of the Earth. But EVERY NATION should be a FREE AGENT within this association and independent in its creative spirit. Only under this condition will vanish those deformations that distort relations among peoples and sow discord and suspicion. In short, a people should be masters of their land, their tradition, their creative inheritance, their futurological aspirations, their will to build a better life for all, for everyone.

Therefore, the most radical demand of the spirit of the Ukrainian Nation, for itself and for fraternal peoples, is full sovereignty of creative manifestation in all areas of spiritual and economic life. Nothing on earth can prevent the embodiment of the idea into visible forms of historical reality, for this is the will of evolution.

Exactly how the social transformations, the strengthening of the sovereignty of this nation or another will be manifested is difficult to foresee and it should not be planned. A nation—a sleeping giant—has in its heart many surprises for its enemies and skeptics.

But one thing is clear: no great action of historical importance will ever be realized without a free, thinking and fearless individual. That is why special attention is due the Individual, his spirit and his rights.

2. MAN, HIS RIGHTS

A chimeric situation: we have a Constitution that is not altogether bad, our country signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Accords, and in all these documents are endless repetitions about Human Rights, about all that Man can do and has a right to and this and that, etc. But when it comes to reality, then all of these rights and opportunities turn not only into mirages but into cruel blows. By demanding that which is declared in official documents, a human being dooms himself to endless tortures. Himself and his closest . . .

A terrifying paradox, one which needs to be explained.

Without a doubt, the gist of the matter is that RIGHTS are declared by the bureaucratic structure, in a manner of speaking, they are posted on a wall, rather than Flow Out of Man's Sense of Legality Itself.

We shall cite a very simple example.

Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Expression, Freedom of Emigration and Immigration, and so on . . .

In declaring these rights, the government structure didn't tell Man anything new, but blasphemously only interprets for him that which belonged to every thinking being down through the centuries, and not only to Man, but to every living thing. And whereas early man asked only himself, the "God within him," whether to act one way or another, now he must ask for PERMISSION FOR FREEDOM OF SPEECH OR ACTION from some bookworm, from some bureaucratic soul. And bureaucrats, it's clear, will always find a plethora of paragraphs and pseudolegal loopholes in order to forbid Man to realize his will.

Our example—the present situation.

If you wish to leave, you're an enemy of the State. But the state is formed by my voluntary agreement with others; it follows, then, that I can create a state and also dissolve it. And if others wish to retain it, this does not give them the right to keep me a prisoner of their will, for they themselves turn into jailers and slaves.

If you think differently, you're an enemy of the State.

Does the State have some obligatory thought, which should guide all thinking?

An idea is lightning! How can it be brought into line with a law? Whoever says that he thinks AS THE STATE DEMANDS, does not think at all, for to repeat blindly someone else's thoughts—even though they be brilliant—is to become a parrot, a phonograph record.

The essence of all these ideas is that we must, without fail, return man to his status as the WARD OF LAW, which is attested to in Article 6 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and act according to the will of the Ward, and not according to a paragraph of a statute created to obscure the RIGHTS, rather than to fulfill them.

Therefore, all declarations in constitutions, international legal documents, and the like, concerning Human Rights, should not be viewed as the right of a bureaucrat to allow me this or that, but as the Right of Man to turn the sword of Laws on the bureaucrats when one or another of them does not allow the legal assertion of the will of the ward. (We, of course, are not speaking here of those impingements by the ward upon others, upon their Rights, that are clearly criminal.)

Concretely, we demand:

Freedom to leave one's homeland and to return,

Freedom to disseminate one's ideas and to get acquainted with the ideas of others,

Freedom to form creative, artistic, philosophical and scientific associations and to dissolve them,

Freedom to take part in the formulation of the consciousness of the people and in the affairs of state,

Freedom to work toward the unification of the Spirit of Man, based on Brotherhood, Love and Reason.

Man is a wondrous Flower of Evolution. His mission—to unite a world fragmented since creation into a Magic Wreath of Beauty and Harmony. The realization of this idea stands in the way of the spirit of militarism, of present-day imperialism of chauvinism. In these menacing times, when the ecological, demographic, energetic and economic balance of the Planet has been catastrophically disturbed, we cannot do without the amicable, selfless, sincere actions of all peoples and individuals.

Governmental structures which do not understand or which do not want to understand the horror of the situation, or which, though understanding, criminally ignore it—such structures are enemies of Evolution, and, as such, of all of Mankind.

Therefore, the violation of the right of nations to self-determination, to a sovereign spiritual life, as well as the violations of the Human Right to sovereign self-expression, are violations of cosmic law. A governmental structure, which is guilty of such violations is an enemy of all of Mankind and falls under the merciless verdict of history—to be erased from the Stone Tablets of the Future and covered with/eternal shame and damnation.

We are puzzled by the calm and indifference with which government leaders of certain countries react to repressions in countries which signed the Helsinki Accords. It is clear that mockery of Human Rights is something not out of the ordinary for all states, but such indifference should not have a place in the 20th century, for we are on the threshold of the Cosmic Birth. Even one cruel, vandalic act against any single Individual could be decisive on God's Cosmic Judgment Day!

Can it be that anyone would find it pleasant to become renowned as a present-day inquisitor and tyrant? Would it not be more pleasant and more humane to open the prison doors, eliminate censorship, disperse the informers and provocateurs, dispel the fear that has enveloped the soul of the people and prevents them from spreading their shoulders to full width and rushing forward toward evolutionary renewal?!

Ukraine of the year 1977 proposes:

That all borders of the country be opened to allow people to leave and criminal codes of the Soviet Union and the Republics eliminated.

That all borders of the country be opened to allow people to leave and to enter.

That channels be opened for the free flow of information—scientific, artistic, literary, personal and any other kind that does not infringe upon Human Rights.

That censorship, as an institution that is a relic of feudalism, be eliminated for all time, with the right to withhold all military and pornographic publications from book and other markets transferred to publishers.

That capital punishment be eliminated, as a manifestation of the criminality of governmental structures. **THE STATE CAN NOT GIVE BIRTH TO LIFE, IT DOES NOT HAVE THE RIGHT TO TAKE IT AWAY.**

That the very idea of killing be condemned at the level of the United Nations, thus branding all states and persons that desire to further their designs through killing (wars), as enemies of Mankind who have no right to enter into a Common Future.

That all armies (except internal peace forces) be eliminated within the next few years and an All-Planetary Brotherhood of Peoples be created, based on the United Nations.

That economic, ecological, demographic and cosmological problems be resolved through common effort.

It is time to awaken from the bureaucratic somnolence to, realize that the problems of one human being are the problems of all of Mankind, and in all our actions to start from the **BASE, COMMON TO ALL.**

UKRAINE OF THE YEAR 1977 is filled with the most sincere aspirations, desires and wishes and sends to the brotherly peoples at the Belgrade Forum its Greeting and Love!

Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords

OLES BERDNYK.
 PETRO HRYHORENKO.
 OKSANA MESHKO.
 LEVKO LUKYANENKO.
 IVAN KANDYBA.
 NINA STROKATA.
 MYKOLA MATUSEVYCH.
 MYROSLAV MARYNOVYCH.

February 15, 1977.

MEMORANDUM NO. 6

Concerning the So-Called "Internal Affairs" of a State

In response to the arrests of the leaders and members of the Ukrainian and Moscow Public Groups, the sea of World Conscience stirred. Today it is no longer possible to oppress with impunity the champions of Law in any country, for on the horizon of History Nuremberg looms to this day, menacingly warning all tyrants.

Having usurped the constitutional prerogatives, the bureaucratic structure of the U.S.S.R. attempts to save its unlawful privileged position by labelling all international protests against arbitrariness as "interference into the internal affairs" of the Soviet state.

If one were to accept this juridical thesis as the basis for international activity, then this would grant present-day tyrants of the East and West the right to suppress with no hindrance freedom of thought and action, thus bringing to a stop Mankind's progression toward a World of Justice.

The lawful entity (ward of Law) in the internal life of a state is Man. The lawful entity (ward of Law) in international relations is the State. This is well known. But if a State, in its internal life, tramples on the interests and rights of its citizens, such a country, in terms of legality, is bankrupt, and cannot be trusted in the least, for in its laws it declares one thing, but in practice does something totally different.

Masquerading behind the fiction of "internal affairs of the state," the repressive organs of our country imprison creative and thinking individuals, fighters for Law and independently minded cultural activists, plunder literary and scientific archives, destroy the works of writers who are not to their liking, completely control correspondence, deprive "disobedient" individuals of their jobs, install electronic surveillance devices in apartments and offices, persecute these and other people with the help of provocateurs, agents and informers, fabricate "criminal cases" against freethinkers, do not give the persecuted an opportunity to emigrate to another country, etc. This entire bouquet of lawlessness, this total disregard for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki accords, is hidden behind the formula of non-interference into "internal affairs" . . .

Of course, for the old Stalinists, who (because the task of censuring the personality cult was not brought to conclusion) still abound in the judicial-investigative organs and in the KGB and who are accustomed to working in the dark of night and in total secrecy from the Soviet and world public, aspirations to act in the spirit of the Helsinki Accords and to make public facts about violations of Human Rights constitute interference into their internal affairs. However, pre-trial investigation, solitary confinement cells, prisons, concentration camps—these are not the internal affair of the KGB or the MVD, they are the affair of all Soviet peoples, the affair of all of Mankind. If the Soviet peoples are not indifferent to the fate of Chilean patriots and if mass rallies of workers in the U.S.S.R. in their support are not interference into the internal affairs of Chile, then, by the same token, mass rallies of citizens of Western countries in support of Soviet and, particularly, Ukrainian fighters for the realization of the Helsinki agreements do not constitute interference into the internal affairs of the U.S.S.R.

Indeed, international solidarity in defense of Justice is the most beautiful symbol of our era! It is the harbinger of a New World of Love and of a Single Spirit of Mankind, which is being born in the social upheavals of the 20th century!

Nations of the World, nations of the Belgrade Forum! We appeal to you—demand an answer from the usurpers of the Law, wherever they may appear! Arbitrariness and lawlessness cannot be permitted to rage on Earth just before the dawning of a World of Unity! The struggle for Human Rights is not the internal affair of this or that state, it is the internal affair of a united mankind!

Freedom to the courageous Fighters for Law!

Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, February 21, 1977, Kiev, Ukraine.

OLES BERDNYK.
 PETRO HRYHORENKO.
 OKSANA MESHKO.
 MYKOLA MATUSEVYCH.
 MYROSLAV MARYNOVYCH.
 IVAN KANDYBA.
 LEVKO LUKYANENKO.
 NINA STROKATA.

The signed original is in the Archives of the Group.

MEMORANDUM NO. 7

The Ukrainian Group To Promote: The First Four Months

On March 9, 1977, the Ukrainian Group to Promote marked the first four months of its existence. In our Declaration and Memorandum No. 1 we announced the basic principles of our activity and defined our mission as a MOVEMENT IN DEFENSE OF LAW, directed at correcting bureaucratic and other distortions and abuses, which are unavoidable in a society with an immature democracy or a dictatorship.

Human Rights encompasses the widest spectrum of thought, feelings and actions. Therefore, we indicated that in giving priority to the humanitarian aspects of the Helsinki Accords, the Group would also note violations of rights in the social, economic and national spheres of the life of the Ukrainian people.

In our Declaration we stated that it is an absolute necessity that Ukraine participate in all conferences of European countries as a sovereign nation, a member of the United Nations. There can be no reasonable alternative to this. (Incidentally, it must be noted that other European Republics of the U.S.S.R. find themselves in a similar position: Byelorussia, Moldavia, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and, most of all, the largest of the Republics, the Russian Federation. They too have never been represented at European conferences by separate delegations. In addition to this, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Moldavia and Russia, as well as the Asian Republics of the Union—Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaidzhan, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Kirghizia and Tadzhikistan—are not even members of the UN. Actually, it is a startling fact that one of the largest nations in the world, the Russian nation, is not a member of the UN, along with the other above-mentioned nations. Although we point this out only in passing, it is a bitter fact, which supports the conclusion that the problem of Rights and Mutual Relations of the Republics of the U.S.S.R. is totally unresolved.)

We also declared it our aim to struggle to increase consciousness of law among broad masses of the Ukrainian people, in the hope that by the joint efforts of fighters for Law and world opinion we would succeed in overcoming the opposition of the bureaucratic structure and the various repressive organs in the area of violations of the law.

In Memorandum No. 1 we outlined the wide-scale violations of law in our Republic, which have continued to the present day despite the exposure of the crimes of the Stalin and Beria "eras." We tried to bring to the attention of the world community the fact that the sharpest edge of the repressions and terror that the punitive organs can bring to bear has been turned against the people who defend spiritual sovereignty in the various spheres of national and creative life. This constitutes a scandalous violation of the Constitutions of the U.S.S.R. and the Ukr.S.S.R., the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Accords and other international pacts ratified by the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.

We presented a list of several score prisoners of conscience (in actuality there are thousands of them!)—honest, selfless courageous workers in the fields of culture, science, religion, who languish in prisons and [labor] camps on the territory of neighboring Republics, something unheard of in the practice of international law.

But before we could publish our documents, the procuracy of the city of Moscow, in cooperation with the Ukrainian KGB, pounced on us: during the night of December 23-24, 1976, they conducted searches in the apartments of Group members M. Rudenko (Kiev), O. Berdnyk (Kiev), L. Lukyanenko (Chernihiv), O. Tykhy (Donbas) and I. Kandyba (Lviv). During these searches all of the Group's documents were confiscated, as were literary archives and correspondence. At the same time, pornographic material and weapons were planted in the apartments, which compelled us to predict in a written protest to the Procurator of the U.S.S.R. that some kind of provocation was being planned against the members of the Group; this became substantiated later.

In our letter, addressed to the world community—to PEN International, to Western communist parties, etc.—we voiced our concern that the fierce attack on the Ukrainian Group to Promote—dead-of-night searches, threats, surveillance—even when taken separately from other facts, is proof of the complete disregard by the bureaucratic structure of the U.S.S.R. of those commitments which our country accepted in signing the Helsinki Accords. This indisputable fact strengthened our resolve to continue our activity.

In Memorandum No. 2 we again pointed out the necessity of Ukraine's participation in the Belgrade Conference in 1977 as a sovereign European state.

In Memorandum No. 3 we illustrated the violations of the freedom of conscience in our Republic, using as an example the tragic fate of the Christian and Catholic, Y. Terelya, who has spent half his life in [labor] camps and psychiatric hospitals, and now wanders from place to place in search of somewhere to stay and a job, always under the never-sleeping eye of the KGB.

Hundreds of letters and complaints from all corners of Ukraine began to pour in to the members of the Group as soon as people heard about its formation. This fact in itself is evidence of how widespread the violations of the law are in Ukraine. We are preparing a detailed report on this, to be sent to the Government

of the Ukr.S.S.R. and to the signatories of the Helsinki Accords. But the KGB again decided on a sudden attack: on February 5, 1977, the head of the Group, Mykola Rudenko, was arrested, as was Group member Oleksiy Tykhy, in whose "case" the search warrants were issued. In this instance of the organs of the KGB and the procuracy of Donetsk Region (the search warrant was signed by the procurator of Donetsk Region, Noskov, and approved by the Deputy Procurator of the Republic, Samayev) confiscated M. Rudenko's entire literary archives, taking away even his scientific works on economy and cosmogony.

On that same day searches were conducted at the apartments of Group members Oksana Meshko and Nina Strokata, as well as of M. Marynovych, M. Matushevych, and the homes of their parents and relatives. (See attached supplement.)

For three weeks the KGB did not allow M. Rudenko's wife to bring him indispensable articles or any food to solitary confinement interrogation cell No. 1 in Donetsk. (In addition, for the first four days she was told absolutely nothing about her husband's fate.)

Neither the wives nor the friends have yet been informed of the actual charges brought against M. Rudenko and O. Tykhy, despite the fact that all members of the Group and dozens of their friends have been called for questioning to the Donetsk Administration of the KGB and by the Ukrainian KGB in Kiev.

Through all these interrogations there runs the implication that the arrested men have been called to account not for the creation of the Group to Promote, but for something secret, mysterious, something the others know nothing about.

We categorically state that the interrogating organs do not have and cannot possibly have any materials that discredit those arrested, aside from the Group's documents, which are totally legal and which have been submitted for publication. Furthermore, we call the attention of the Procurator of the Ukr.S.S.R. and of lawyers of all countries to the gross violations of procedural Law in the prosecution of this "case" (specifically, Article 116 of the Code of Criminal Procedures of the Ukr.S.S.R.), which requires that the investigation be conducted in the place where the accused and the majority of the witnesses live. Conducting the investigation in Donetsk is a legal absurdity and an act of investigative cowardice, an attempt to remove from the capital of the Republic to outlying districts the juridical reprisal against a poet and thinker.

In recent days a new wave of repressions has rolled over Ukraine. In Odessa art critic V. Barladyanu has been arrested, and searches have been conducted in the apartments of his wife, of the Siry family and two other families that several times appealed to the Group to Promote with complaints about flagrant violations of the law with respect to them. Thus, not only the activity of the Group, but even contact with it is considered a crime!

In a lightning blow, the wife of political prisoner V. Lisovy, Vira, and Nadia Svitlychna were fired from their jobs, and thus deprived of all means of subsistence, merely for their acquaintance with members of the Group. N Svitlychna has also been threatened with arrest because she has not yet registered at a place of residence after being released from a /labor/ camp (this, although she has been repeatedly denied her legal right to do so).

In its Memorandums Nos. 4, 5 and 6, in letters to the countries that will participate in the Belgrade Forum-77, to PEN International, to the leadership of the U.S.S.R., etc., the Group to Promote has called the attention of the world community to the complete lack of any guarantees in defense of Law in Ukraine, which proves that the bureaucratic structure of the U.S.S.R. and the organs of internal security have usurped the constitutional prerogatives of the Soviet of Deputies of Workers, and because of this, the Fundamental Law of the State /the Constitution/, and all the more so the international agreements on Human Rights are not being implemented.

What will happen now? Will the movement in defense of Law be destroyed with the tacit approval of the signatories of the Helsinki Accords, accompanied only by the sorrowful shaking of heads? Or will the Belgrade Conference-77 call on those that violate laws and rights to answer?

We do not consider that world public opinion should painfully react to EACH violation of rights in our country—every nation has its own troubles, similar to ours. Such a reaction would be senseless and even dangerous to the movement in defense of Law, for it would make this movement dependent on unknown forces and influences, and would tear it from its own roots, from the evolutionary development of the consciousness of Law in one's nation. Guarantees of the Law must be established HERE, by demanding the unswerving implementation of the laws of the Ukr.S.S.R. and the U.S.S.R.

This is why we are firmly committed to the continuation of our uneven struggle to the end, in the sincere belief that the national will, sooner or later, will confirm the Rule of Law in all spheres of thought, creative pursuit and action.

Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords March 15, 1977.

OLEK BERDNYK.
 PETRO HRYHORENKO.
 OKSANA MESHKO.
 LEVKO LUKYANENKO.
 MYROSLAV MARYNOVYCH.
 MYKOLA MATUSEVYCH.
 NINA STROKATA.

SUPPLEMENT TO MEMORANDUM NO. 7

As we have already reported, on February 5, 1977, organs of the KGB, in addition to arresting M. Rudenko and O. Tykhy, conducted searches in the homes of many members of the Group to Promote and their relatives.

In the apartment of M. Rudenko (Kiev) the literary and scientific archives were completely devastated. The KGB confiscated a volume of poetry, consisting of some 50,000 verses, the manuscripts of a science fiction novel, philosophical works on economy, cosmogony, etc. M. Rudenko's wife, son Yuri, and writer O. Berdnyk, a member of the Group, were subjected to personal searches. O. Berdnyk's literary archives were also almost completely confiscated.

In the apartment of Group member O. Meshko the KGB conducted not so much a search as a rout. Investigator Pankov (of the Kiev procuracy) entered the premises like a true bandit—he broke in through a window. All books and things were turned upside down, letters and manuscripts were confiscated wholesale with no regard for their contents. "All the trash," as Pankov expressed himself. A personal search of O. Meshko was conducted forcibly: the investigator held her arms fast while two women searched her.

A search was conducted at the apartment of Group member Nina Strokata, who lives in exile in Tarusa (the R.S.F.S.R.)

In Drohobych, a search was conducted in the apartment of M. Marynovych's mother, L. I. Marynovych. The warrant was issued separately in the names of Marynovych and Matusevych, who lives elsewhere and was only visiting. The action was conducted during the night. When Matusevych and Marynovych protested against a personal search, they were taken to the headquarters of the militia, where the search was made. A record of the proceedings, however, was denied them. Of course, agents of the organs were there.

A search was conducted in the apartment of Matusevych's sister Tamila (Kiev), who had been arrested in Vasylkiv and brought to Kiev. Letters, documents, the book *The Sword of Arey*, a camera and a photo-enlarger were confiscated. The home of Matusevych's mother, Anastasiya Fedorivna (in Vasylkiv), was searched. She was arrested at the school where she teaches. At the time of the search her 8-year-old grandson was not allowed to go for a walk. On that same day a search was conducted at the home of Marynovych's wife Raylsa Serhiyivna Serhiychuk (village of Kalynivka, Vasylkiv district). During the search she was not allowed to feed her 9-year-old daughter, and the daughter was not allowed to go for a walk.

A search was conducted at the apartment of Matusevych's wife, Olha Dmytrivna, in "connection with the case of O. Tykhy." She and a guest, Y. Badzyo, were personally searched.

The dacha of the Matusevych family was searched (village of Shevchenko, Vasylkiv district) in the presence of Matusevych's father, Ivan Petrovych, who had been brought there from his apartment in Vasylkiv.

A search was conducted in the home of Matusevych's wife's parents, Heyko and Sushan (Kiev). The mother, Anna Ivanivna Sushan, fainted, and as a result, the search was conducted without the presentation of a warrant and without a record of the proceedings.

During the searches, hundreds of objects were confiscated—books, manuscripts, notebooks, letters, etc. In all cases there were flagrant violations of procedural law.

Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, March 10, 1977.

On the Persecution of V. Lisova, Wife of a Political Prisoner.

The name of V. /Vasyl/ Lisovy—philosopher, courageous champion of Law—is known to the world public. He is suffering in the /labor/ camps of Perm Region for having selflessly defended his countrymen sentenced for their beliefs.

Here we would like to draw the attention of the Washington-based Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee and the participating countries of the Helsinki Conference to the miserable and helpless situation of the wife of this political prisoner, Vira Lisova, and her two children. For many years she was unemployed and led a beggar's existence. Finally, she received temporary work. But still she had no peace: collaborators of the KGB regularly broke into her apartment, terrorizing her psychologically, threatening and frightening her children.

After her letters to the French Communist Party and other organizations in defense of her husband, the organs of the KGB became rabid. On March 4 of this year she was ordered by phone to come to the Ukrainian KGB in Kiev for a conversation. She refused. That same day a messenger brought to her a summoning her to appear on March 5 as a witness, not, however, before an examining magistrate, but directly to the Ukrainian KGB. She refused, in view of the fact that the summons, from a legal standpoint, was groundless.

On March 9, while she was at work, a plenipotentiary of the Ukrainian KGB, who refused to give his name, called her into the office of the deputy director of the Institute for the Organization of Labor and Modernization of Industry. He ordered the administration officials to leave and proceeded with a psychological beating.

Here are some gems of his verbal eruption: "You are a dishonorable woman! You take part in national activities, just like your husband! You pass abroad information." (This was a reference to a letter to G. Marché.) "You were at the sendoff of Amalrik. You kept contact with Rudenko. You reproduced copies of your husband's 'Open Letter.' You receive packages and help from nationalist sources. If you have the conscience of a Soviet person, give them up!"

V. Lisova answered that if the packages were from hostile sources, the KGB could prohibit their delivery. The collaborator of the Ukrainian KGB replied that they have no such power, but that she herself was obliged to do so.

"You bitterly hate the KGB and the Soviet government. You live in a hostile environment. We fight for you. We will be reporting to the procurator. We can imprison you, but we feel sorry for you."

V. Lisova walked out of the office in a terrible state. After taking medication, she visited the procurator of the Republic who oversees the KGB, where she wrote a statement about all this. The procurator promised to pass on her statement to the KGB for "review." At home V. Lisova fell seriously ill. Emergency and personnel diagnosed a pre-heart failure state. Rest and treatment were prescribed.

The following day—more calls from the KGB and promises to continue the "conversation" after her recovery. The personnel office of the Institute informed her that she was fired and that same day brought to her home her job registration book.

Thus, V. Lisova—mother of two children, a sick and unprotected woman—finds herself without work, without any means of subsistence, and under the Damoclean sword of the KGB. The tyrannical power-mad top dog and complete lawlessness exult triumphant. When V. Lisova promised to put in a complaint with V. Fedorchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian KGB, she received the cynical reply: "Be sure to write also to Andropov!"

We will stop right here! These facts are sufficient to illustrate the revelry of lawlessness in Ukraine.

Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords, March 1, 1977.

O. BERDNYK.
O. MESHKO.
L. LUKYANENKO.
I. KANDYBA.
N. STOKATA.
P. HRYHORENKO.

MEMORANDUM NO. 9

To the Procurator of Ukraine: On the Gross Violations of Law in the Investigative "Case" of M. Rudenko

The Procuracy of Ukraine sanctioned the arrest of the poet M. Rudenko, the leader of the Group of Promote (Helsinki) in Ukraine. According to Article 116 of the UPK /Code of Criminal Procedures/ of the Ukr.S.S.R., an investigation must be conducted where the suspect or the majority of the witness reside, or where the crime took place. Taking into account all the points specified in the UPK, the investigation should be conducted in Kiev.

Why has procedural Law been violated? Of what concern is the formation of the Ukrainian Public Group to Promote the Implementation of the Helsinki Accords to the Donetsk KGB Administration and to its senior investigator, Nahovitsyn, who is in charge of the investigation and who summons scores of people to Donetsk from Kiev, Chernihiv, Lviv and so on?

It seems that we see here juridical abuse on the part of the organs of repression, which are preparing a reprisal against the poet in secrecy from the public of Ukraine. Inasmuch as the subject of discussion is the movement in defense of the law in the Republic, our Group demands adherence to all procedural norms and an open trial. We feel that the Ukrainian KGB in Donetsk HAS NO RIGHT to summon witnesses in a case involving the Group, since the nucleus of the Group is in Kiev. We ask you to point out this gross violation of the law to the security organs.

March 18, 1977.

OLES BERDNYK,
*Member of the Ukrainian Public Group
 To Promote the Implementation
 of the Helsinki Accords.*
 (S) OLES BERDNYK.

To: The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., Moscow.
 The Congress of the United States of America, Washington.

Copy: The Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee in Washington,
 Dr. A. Zwarun

AN OPEN LETTER

Honored Legislators of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. In signing the Helsinki Accords, the two most powerful countries on Earth gave their Solemn Word that they would cooperate in the cause of safeguarding peace, security and Human Rights. People with an honed sense of legality in different parts of the world received the Accords as a kindred cause and began to form groups to promote the implementation of these agreements. Such a group appeared also in Ukraine, a group which in its declaration pointed to instances of violations of the Law of our Republic. But even before the declaration had a chance to be heard in the world, blows rained upon the Group—numerous searches, persecution, threats, and, on February 5, 1977, the arrests of the head of the Group, the poet Mykola Rudenko, and a Group member, teacher Oleksiy Tykhy.

They were arrested with no warrant being issued, with no indication of the substance of the crime. For weeks now they have held Mykola Rudenko in a Donetsk dungeon, without informing his family and friends about the reasons for his arrest and forbidding his wife to send him even the most indispensable things.

An ominous precedent! All the standards of Law violated completely! The organs of repression have returned to the practices of Beria's time, the practices that were damned by the people. What Helsinki Accords is it possible to speak of when a prominent poet and thinker and the author of the Economic Monologues, in which he reveals for mankind a new understanding of the interdependence of Man and the Cosmos, when such a selfless human being has been brutally tossed into a dungeon, as in the darkest periods of the Inquisition?!

In this can be clearly traced the purposeful actions of the antievolutionary forces, which strive to destroy the efforts of the governments of the U.S.S.R., and the U.S. and the other signatories of the Helsinki Accords, aimed at safeguarding peace and securing Human Rights. It is imperative that the criminal acts of persecution against fighters for Law be resolutely investigated.

Putting forth my demand for such an investigation, in accordance with the laws of friendship and brotherhood that have been practiced in Ukraine since ancient times, I declare a hunger strike as a sign of protest against the arrest of Mykola Rudenko and other fighters for Law.

The hunger strike will last until either Mykola Rudenko is released, or competent organs announce in the press what he was arrested for and what they plan to do with him.

I will begin the hunger strike in March 1977. I ask the Helsinki Guarantees Committee in Washington to support me. I ask other fighters for Law and all honest people in the World to join with me at least symbolically by demanding the release of Mykola Rudenko and other fighters for Law.

March 7, 1977, Kiev.

Writer OLES BERDNYK,
Member, Ukrainian Public Group
To Promote the Implementation
of the Helsinki Accords.

To the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine, V. V. Shcherbytsky.

Copy: The Congress of the United States

Copy: The Helsinki Guarantees for Ukraine Committee in Washington,
Dr. A. Zwarun

AN OPEN LETTER

Volodymyr Vasylyovych! For a few years now you have been informed about the situation I have found myself in since being expelled from the Writers' Union: a beggar's existence, a total ban on the publication of my works, constant persecution by the security organs, searches, electronic surveillance, provocations, confiscation of my literary archives, the impossibility of creative self-expression. And finally, in line with Order No. 31, dated August 13, 1976, and issued by the Main Administration for the Safeguarding of State Secrets in Print (of the Council of Ministers), all my books (even for children) were destroyed, removed from libraries and taken off the book market.

In its most recent search, in December 1976, the KGB confiscated almost all of my literary archives—unfinished short stories, philosophical works a writer's diary, etc.

Does world public opinion need more evidence that to the bureaucratic system of our country the Helsinki Accords are empty words?! When a fiction writer, a dreamer, a futurologist, an author of several dozen books about the future, about a New World of Love and Unity, is crushed and debased before the public?!

In spite of my numerous personal appeals to you for help in unraveling my life's knot, I have received neither help nor a reply! There is no hope for renewing my creative work as a writer, and without this I cannot contemplate further living! I have but one solution—to emigrate with my family to the U.S.A. or Canada, from where I have received invitations. There I could continue my work in the field of futurology.

The alternative to emigration: Death, I cannot breath in this atmosphere of lawlessness and vicious persecution. In all sincerity, I would rather not live in a foreign land, but to "patriotically" await arrest or other forms of repression, while living in poverty with a small child at the homes of others, under the unflinching eye of the KGB—this my soul does not accept!

This drives me to a radical step: on March 21, 1977, I will begin a hunger strike until DEATH, unless I receive your radical reply. This is not a threat, Volodymyr Vasylyovych! It is simply an escape from the labyrinth of lawlessness into which I was thrust by the apologists of arbitrariness.

I hold you personally responsible for whether or not I shall receive an answer this time. Do not heed the bureaucratic whisperings, that I am blackmailing the Central Committee. I have forty days, as do you, after which every day may bring THAT GUEST who passes no one by. In my situation I greet him, for DEATH at this time is more merciful than men!

May fate keep you from the straits on which I and my colleagues in misfortune have befallen.

Sincerely,

OLEK BERDNYK,
Member, Ukrainian Public Group
To Promote the Implementation
of the Helsinki Accords.

March 18, 1977.

The following document, Letter No. Two, was submitted to the Commission for the record by the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners, P.O. Box 142, Cooper Station, New York, New York, 10003.

THE UKRAINIAN GROUP TO PROMOTE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

LETTER NUMBER TWO

To: The Governments of the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR. The Governments of the Participating States of the Helsinki Agreement.

The matter of preserving peace is not a matter solely for governmental leaders—it concerns all people. Therefore, it should be dealt with not only on governmental levels with the help of arms limitation agreements; mistrust among peoples of different nations should be eliminated with the help of as many contacts as possible among citizens of different countries on an individual basis.

Our strength is in the progressiveness of our cause and the legality of our conduct. Nevertheless, we understand our weakness and the strength of the organized bureaucracy. It makes use of a huge apparatus of repression against any opposition: arrests, prisons, camps, persecution after release from confinement. Above all, there is the problem of obtaining residence permits in order to live where one wishes. Wives and husbands, are often unable to register in a given city and therefore are unable to live together. Some individuals suffer for years before they are reunited with their families. This was the case with Bohdan Khrystynych, Ivan Kypysh, Mykhaylo Horyn and many other Ukrainian dissenters.

Another means of repression is work. In the absence of individual or private ownership, the only way to earn a living is to be employed by the only employer—the state. The KGB uses this to force people of intellectual professions to work as coal stokers, machinists, electricians and so forth. This is an effective means to deprive dissenters of an intellectual milieu where there could be response to their ideas and maintenance of the intellectual level of the dissenters themselves. In addition this type of work provides only meager compensation and forces people to spend their free time devising ways to earn extra money. Consequently, this means that very little time can be devoted to civic activity.

Administrative surveillance, censorship of mail, house searches, expulsion from work, pressure on families and intimidation—these are all serious matters. Due to these tactics, the Group was unable to collect more written facts. Yet a number of letters and appeals did manage to reach us, and we are attaching extracts from them on which we support our conclusions. This information also requires us to do the following:

Inform the signatories of the Helsinki Accords and public opinion of gross violations of the Final Act;

Appeal to the governments of the Ukrainian SSR and the U.S.S.R. to curb their bureaucrat-violators of human rights in the Ukrainian SSR!

Documentation of human rights violations compiled from letters and appeals which reached the Group from Ukrainians living in the Ukrainian SSR and in other Soviet republics:

I. Political prisoners:

1. On April 14, 1977, the wife of Yevhen Sverstyuk, Lilya, arrived for a personal visit with her husband. She had come from Kiev, a distance of 3,000 kilometers. The visit, however, was not permitted, supposedly on the grounds that her hus-

band had had his visiting rights revoked. Later, she was granted permission to see him, but only in the presence of a guard and only providing that they speak in Russian. She agreed to meet under these conditions but the labor camp administrators subsequently informed her that her husband had refused to a visit under these conditions. Lilya left; her husband declared a hunger strike to protest the illegal denial of his right to a personal visit. Up to 20 individuals supported him in this. On April 30, the head of the labor camp administration, Polyakov, sent Lilya Sverstyuk a telegram stating: "A visit will be permitted at the end of May-June." It required a form of extreme protest—a hunger strike by 20 people—to reverse the illegal decision of the camp administration.

2. On May 15, 1977, Valetyn Moroz declared a hunger strike protesting the denial of permission for a personal visit with his wife.

3. Ivan Hel declared a hunger strike demanding better living conditions for his wife and daughter. They live in an old and dark basement-like apartment and are being denied better quarters because Ivan Hel is a dissident.

II. Psychiatric hospitals:

The Berehiv regional court decided to once again confine Yosyp Terelya in psychiatric hospital for forced "treatment." (Y. Terelya had previously been imprisoned for 9 years during which time he was also forced to undergo "treatment" in psychiatric hospitals; in 1976 he was released as a perfectly normal and healthy person.)

III. Exile:

Exile is a new form of imprisonment which is not necessarily less severe than standard imprisonment. Exiles are doomed to a pitiful existence. They are deprived of the most basic living quarters and of work. An exile is essentially a prisoner without a camp.

1. Volodymyr Vasylyak had previously served a 5-year term in camps; in 1975, he was exiled to Tomsk oblast for three years. After visiting a church in Ivano-Frankivsk, new charges were brought against him.

2. Mykola Kots (age 45, higher education) works at odd jobs under very difficult climactic and material conditions. Provocations are constantly being organized against him.

3. Vasyl Stus (writer and critic) has been in exile in Magadan oblast since January, 1977; he is forced to work under ground in a mine. In one of his letters he writes, "I long for the camp." He is very ill.

4. Bohdan Chuyko (Tomsk oblast) has been in exile since the end of 1976 after having previously spent 15 years in prisons. He has no living quarters or money for food. A "Group No. 2" invalid, he has no toes on either foot. He cannot provide himself with basic necessities since he is totally incapable of working.

The administration is deaf to the requests of exiles. It often tries to spiritually break them. For an exile to obtain permission to visit the Ukraine during vacation is a fantastic accomplishment, and the administration does everything possible to block such visits.

IV. Permission to register and live in a city and securing employment:

1. Oleksander Nazarenko (incomplete higher education) was imprisoned from 1968-1973 for his activities in defense of human rights and the rights of Ukrainians. For a long period of time after his release he was not permitted to register and live in Kiev. He then moved to Skadovsk where he married and only then was allowed to register. He is employed as a watchman in a water works station. He is being subjected to constant moral degradation. His wife, Lidia Huk (a medical doctor) was sentenced to 1½ years of imprisonment under Article 187.1 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR. She is subjected to persecutions (false accusations, threats with loss of job).

2. Nadiya Svitlychna was released in 1976 after having served a 4-year sentence. Since that time she has not been allowed to officially register in any city. Her seven-year old son whose residence permit was illegally revoked is also deprived of the right to live in Kiev and therefore, cannot avail himself of medical treatment and services. Svitlychna, who has a higher education, works as a yard keeper.

3. Lev Lukyanenko (a member of the Group to Promote) has been under administrative surveillance for over a year! Although a lawyer, he is forced to work as an electrician.

4. Ivan Dykiy and his wife were sentenced to 5 and 4 years in prison respectively, and 5 years in exile. For a long period of time Dykiy was not allowed to register for a residence permit and therefore could not live with his wife. Later they were registered and allowed to live in Drohobych temporarily (6 months), after which they were allowed to live in Stebnych, 8 kilometers away.

5. Mykola Berelavsky lives under horrible conditions—7 people in a room of 18 square meters—and his material situation is very difficult.

6. Stepan Kuroshlyak, who had served a 5-year sentence in prison camps, is subjected to continuous persecution. Following a provocation, he was fired from his job at the Rubkovsky LMZ and has been unable to secure employment since the end of 1976.

7. Kuzma Matviuk (engineer) is not allowed to hold the kind of job for which he is qualified by specialization and educational background. He is under surveillance.

8. Fyodor Klimenko is employed as a metal worker. An attempt has been made on his life, and he is under surveillance.

V. As a result of his appeal for assistance to the Group, Vasyl Barladian (b. 1943 in Moldavia, art critic) was penalized for his convictions: he has been expelled from the Party, not allowed to defend his dissertation, and, on March 12, 1977, arrested by order of the Procurator's office. In connection with his arrest, the following Odessa residents had their apartments searched:

E.S. Danelian, A.V. Golumbivkaya, G. V. Mikhailenko, A.V. Barladian and Serykh (the latter without a warrant from the Procurator).

Vitaly Kalinichenko (Dnepropetrovsk region) was summoned to the regional Procurator's office on March 5, 1977, where he was warned that he could be held responsible for the dissemination of Moscow and Ukrainian Group to Promote declarations. (In 1976, he was released after having served a sentence under Article 62.1 of the Criminal Code of the Ukrainian SSR).

On April 23, 1977, searches were conducted at the apartments of the following individuals in connection with the arrests of Group members M. Marynovych and M. Matusevych:

Raisa Sergiychuk, Anastasia Matusevych, Lyubov Marynovych, Nadezhda Marynovych, Temila Matusevych, Oleg Lapin, Lyubov Kheine, Hanna Kovalenko, Evhen Obertas, Mikhaillina Kotsyubinskaya and Boris Antonenko-Davidovich.

On April 29, in the newspaper Literaturna Ukraina, a slanderous, mud-slinging article directed at M. Kotsyubinskaya and B. Antonenko-Davidovich was published. The article written by Gornocaya entitled, "You Don't Get Money for Nothing," appeared five days after the searches at the apartments of M. Kotsyubinskaya and B. Antonenko-Davidovich.

VI. The violation of the right of an attorney to defend and a client to defend himself:

The attorney Sergei Martysh (of the Dernitskaya legal consultation office in Kiev) officially accepted the task of preparing an appeal in the case of Aleksandr Sergienko; but the lawyer was not permitted to familiarize himself with trial materials in KGB archives. He was denied access with the words: "It's not authorized, because it's not authorized."

All the same, the attorney wrote the appeal on the basis of old notes and according to memory (he had defended A. Sergienko in the regional court), but he was forbidden to go to Vladimir Prison to consult on the appeal with his client. A board of attorneys sent the appeal via special channels but it "got lost." Later, it turned out that the appeal had been handed over to the client in camp, but taken away forcibly soon afterward along with attached handwritten notes.

All other papers pertaining to the case were also taken away from A. Sergienko in order to deny him the possibility of appealing for review of his case in the future.

OLEK BERDNYK.
NINA STROKATA.
OKSANA MESHKO.
IVAN KANDYBA.
LEVKO LUKYANENKO.
PYOTR GRIGORENK.
PYOTR VINS.
OLGA GEIKO (MATUSEVYCH).

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS: U.S. POLICY AND THE BELGRADE CONFERENCE

MONDAY, JUNE 6, 1977

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE,
Washington, D.C.

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 2 p.m.; in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dante Fascell, chairman, presiding.

In attendance: Commissioners Fascell, Pell, Fenwick, Simon, Buchanan, Leahy, Bingham, Case, and Dole.

Also present: R. Spencer Oliver, counsel and staff director; Alfred Friendly, Jr., deputy director.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN FASCELL

Mr. FASCELL. The Commission will come to order. Today's hearing closes the first round of the Commission's public review of implementation of the 1975 Helsinki accords. So far this year, the Commission has heard 55 witnesses in 13 open hearings, received hundreds of pages of written submissions for its record, surveyed the experience and opinions of recent emigres from the Soviet Union, of U.S. businessmen conducting trade with the East and of Western journalists working there. Next month, the Commission will begin to issue its analysis of the record it has compiled. Our goal will be to describe the impact the accords have had on patterns of conduct in the areas where the 35 signatory states accepted common standards of behavior.

Judging by the testimony accumulated so far, it is clear that the spirit of Helsinki has been proclaimed much more often than it has been honored. But I guess that is not unusual. East and West, the image of implementation has taken precedence over the reality of compliance—especially in the fields of policy and practice which require positive, unilateral action by governments.

But if the record is—by and large—a disappointing one, the process which was set in motion at Helsinki is certainly healthy.

We are able now to discuss with each other candidly, if sometimes pointedly, and constructively issues about which diplomats before could only whisper.

That, I would submit, is progress. And that, I would submit, is change. And I would also add that I think it is healthy change.

The process and progress, of course, is not complete, but it certainly seems important to preserve it and to strengthen it.

We look forward, then, today to the testimony of the Secretary of State to define where we have been and where we are going. We are

very pleased to have this opportunity to discuss with him the possibilities we have open to us to reinforce the Helsinki process and to augment its results.

So, Mr. Secretary, and Ambassador Sherer and Mr. Nimetz, we are very happy to welcome you here to this Commission meeting to enter into this discussion with us to complete our record in this first round of Commission activity.

Mr. Secretary, the floor is yours and we will be delighted to hear from you.

**STATEMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE, HON. CYRUS R. VANCE,
ACCOMPANIED BY MATTHEW NIMETZ, COUNSELOR, AND AMBASSADOR ALBERT SHERER, JR.**

Mr. VANCE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.

You have all received the administration's report on the implementation of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference.

Today I want to underline, as did the report, the continuing importance of the effort which began at Helsinki.

You are fully aware of this administration's interest in promoting more stable and mutually beneficial relations between the peoples of the East and West. The Helsinki Final Act provides one framework for such cooperation.

You are also aware of our commitment to honor and promote the rights of individuals, the human rights of all peoples, no matter what their political or social origins and affiliations. The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has provided a multilateral mechanism to pursue these aims.

Before discussing our plans for the forthcoming meeting in Belgrade, I want to convey my thanks for the close working collaboration achieved between the executive and legislative branches of our Government on the many political, economic, and humanitarian issues involved in the Helsinki accords.

I wrote you 3 months ago, Mr. Chairman, to say that "I am most anxious to bring about a relationship of full cooperation between the State Department and the Commission." I think that this relationship has been achieved. You and your colleagues in the Congress have played a very helpful and constructive role. We are looking forward to your personal contribution in the work of the Belgrade review conference.

The spirit of collaboration has also marked our relations with our allies, at the Geneva and Helsinki phases of CSCE, as well as in our preparatory work for the forthcoming review process.

Let me now state very briefly the objectives which we seek at our Belgrade meeting:

We seek full implementation of all the commitments contained in the Helsinki Final Act. None can be called more binding, more vital, than the others. All three of the so-called baskets are important.

We seek incremental improvements in relations between East and West on all the fronts surveyed at Helsinki: political, economic, scientific, cultural, security and humanitarian.

We seek to move forward on all these fronts simultaneously; the freer flow of people and ideas is as important to long-term security and cooperation as, for example, advance notice of major military maneuvers; the humanitarian pledges at Helsinki are as important as, say, the promises of greater commercial cooperation.

There will be consideration of new proposals. But we must not be diverted from assessment of how fully the specific undertakings of Helsinki have been carried out by all the signatories.

This is an ambitious agenda. There may well be differences in understanding and priority; these can be discussed in good faith, in hopes of narrowing such differences.

But such discussions cannot serve as a diversion or a cloak for inaction. The CSCE Final Act was approved by 35 heads of state and government after 3 years of intense negotiations. Undertakings of such gravity cannot subsequently be relaxed or overlooked.

At Belgrade, we will assess on the spot how best to be effective and persuasive in pursuing our objectives. Between public diplomacy and quiet diplomacy, we will strive for maximum practical impact:

We will avoid grandiose new proposals that have little chance of being acceptable. Propaganda ploys, debating points have no place in our strategy.

We will state our goals and our assessments clearly, without polemics.

It would serve no one's interests if such serious and far-reaching questions were dealt with in anything other than a serious and straightforward manner.

The report I have transmitted to the Commission on behalf of the President gives you a detailed assessment of what has been done and what has not been done.

Let me say from the start that no nation's record is perfect, and we will accept constructive criticism of our own record, just as we ask others to do.

When I outlined the administration's human rights policy at the University of Georgia in April, I said that "a decision whether and how to act in the cause of human rights is a matter for informed and careful judgment. No mechanistic formula produces an automatic answer."

So it will be in our decisions about working for implementation of the commitments contained in the Helsinki Final Act, those dealing with our political, economic and military relations, as well as those affecting human rights.

Respect for the undertakings solemnly accepted at CSCE is an effort to which our Government is firmly committed, in the full knowledge that the pursuit of security and cooperation in Europe poses a test of our perseverance as much as of our ideals. I am confident that we will, together, persevere.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am prepared to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. We appreciate that statement of broad policy within which the United States will be guided.

I want to take the opportunity while you are here to express the appreciation of the Commission for the splendid cooperation that we

have received from you personally and others in your Department not only in carrying on the work of the Commission, but also in carrying on the work with respect to preparation for Belgrade. There has been a really fine working relationship and we are delighted to have been a part of it.

I cannot pass up this opportunity to say, however, that I hope that whatever the processes are, to get the executive commissioners named. They will be completed soon. I gather the matter is held up in the other body for some reason and I do not know what it is.

Mr. VANCE. We are prepared to move very promptly on that.

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Let me ask you how you view the role of the Commission as far as the Belgrade Conference is concerned.

Mr. VANCE. We would welcome participation of the members of the Commission in the Belgrade Conference.

Mr. FASCELL. Do you mean as delegates of the United States?

Mr. VANCE. Yes; as delegates of the United States and as members of the U.S. delegation.

Mr. FASCELL. We certainly appreciate that and we welcome the opportunity to participate in that fashion as we are able. All of us have great interest in this.

Mr. VANCE. Might I add also, Mr. Chairman, that we also look forward to the participation of the staff of the Commission—not only in the final meeting which will be held next fall, but very actively in the preliminary meeting which will be starting on June 15.

Mr. FASCELL. Of course, we are prepared to cooperate in that fashion, Mr. Secretary, and the members of our staff will be part of that working delegation. The names of our staff who will be a part of that working delegation will be submitted very quickly.

Mr. Secretary, the report that was transmitted is certainly a straightforward report. It seems to me that it calls the shots pretty straight. I do not think I misread that report in terms of the violations as the United States saw them or the areas that needed improvement or even some of the accomplishments.

There were fairly well detailed specifics in the report.

So I want to compliment you and whomever prepared it on behalf of the President. In submitting that report to the Commission and to the public, you performed an extremely useful function.

But it leads to this question. There has been some discussion and some fear among some persons that the United States would, in some way, back down on Basket Three because of the sensitivity that is involved not only with respect to specific cases, but also because it seems to have evoked a great deal of repression in the Soviet Union and other Eastern bloc countries.

What does the Secretary of State say about that kind of allegation?

Mr. VANCE. Let me say that the United States will not back down on its position with respect to the question of human rights and the items in Basket Three. We believe strongly that the questions of human rights are appropriate and proper subjects to be discussed between states. We believe that the Final Act itself makes this very clear, and we intend, at the Belgrade meeting, to review the implementation in Basket Three in detail and with the same care and seriousness that we will the items in the other two Baskets.

Let me say again, however, that we will do this without polemics, but in a proper, straightforward and serious way.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Secretary, personally, I am happy to hear that assessment, the statement and the reassurance. I think all of the Commission is. I also agree with your policy with regard to polemics. I see absolutely no useful purpose in a debate filled with acrimony and recrimination. This is a serious matter and at a meeting of sovereign governments where everything must be done absolutely by consensus, so that any one government has a veto automatically—I think that is the only sensible way to approach it.

I also must say that I personally agree with your policy guideline about a two-track approach on this very important problem—whether it happens to be Basket Three or any other baskets. That is, we must be able to deal effectively on a so-called quiet diplomatic level, but we must never discount public diplomacy as being an effective part of the implementation that private diplomacy can bring about.

I gather that is exactly the way you feel about it.

Mr. VANCE. That is exactly the way we feel about it.

Mr. FASCELL. All right. Congressman Buchanan.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, I would like to join the chairman in commending the approach reflected in your statement. It seems to me that while there will be, whatever approach we take, continuing charges of interference in internal affairs, I assume you would concur that the signatories to the Helsinki accords made it the business of the other signatories to inquire into performance in the areas of agreement including Basket Three.

Mr. VANCE. I do, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think your approach should be as winning a one as may be possible and I commend you for it.

Mr. FASCELL. Congressman Simon.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, Mr. Secretary, I would like to commend your basic attitude. Propaganda ploys and debating points have no place in our strategy. No nation's record is perfect, and we accept constructive criticism of our own record. I think your fundamental approach is sound.

I also like your desire to move forward. Do we have any indication from the Warsaw Pact countries that they share this concept of moving ahead in Belgrade?

Mr. VANCE. Let me respond briefly, if I may, and then I might ask Ambassador Sherer to comment.

I have discussed the Belgrade Conference with a number of participants who will be active there and have told them the general nature of our approach; namely, that we intend to put our emphasis on a complete review of the implementation of the Helsinki accords and that we intend to do it without polemics and that we would hope and expect that they would act in a similar fashion. The ones that I have talked to have indicated to me that that is their intention. I hope that is the case.

Bud.

Mr. FASCELL. Ambassador Sherer.

Mr. SHERER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I might just add that if there is any difference in approach between the East and the West

that we have detected so far, it is that perhaps the Eastern side is more interested in looking forward rather than looking backward at implementation, whereas we believe in the words of the Final Act in which a thorough review of implementation is called for.

Mr. SIMON. If I may follow through on one further question here. There are those who say that our statements on human rights—your statement at the University of Georgia, for example—our emphasis on Basket Three, in fact, has been counterproductive within the Soviet Union. The case of Mr. Shcharansky is given as the most recent example.

How would you respond to that charge?

Mr. VANCE. I would respond by saying that one cannot judge the ultimate effect of our statement with respect to human rights and the actions which we take with respect to human rights, including quiet diplomacy, in the short run.

One has to judge this over a period of time. And I want to emphasize that in measuring the achievements of the Helsinki accords, one has to look at it in the same way. I do not think that one can take a look at it in this moment alone and say it has either been a success or a failure. I think what you have now is a mixture of things. We have some slight movement forward in certain areas; we have no movement in others; and we have regression in others.

But I think that a process has been started, as the chairman indicated, and that we must stay with that process and continue to press what we believe to be correct. One of the ways of doing this is through the review process which we will be engaged in at the Belgrade Conference.

So my short answer to your question is I think it is too early to draw any conclusions and I believe in the long run that this is the course—the one we are following, which we must follow, both because it is morally right and because I think in the long run, it will achieve proper international objectives.

Mr. SIMON. I might just say that I concur in that judgment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mrs. Fenwick?

Mrs. FENWICK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, your Georgia speech was an encouragement and a wonderful thing for all of us.

Mr. VANCE. Thank you.

Mrs. FENWICK. And I particularly treasure two words that you have used twice now—once written and once spoken, “serious and straightforward.” Serious, implying the responsibilities that we carry and the need for the proper application of our principles to each specific case as it turns out. But straightforward—in that we will not yield. Mr. Secretary. Because, after all, Mr. Brezhnev’s speech of March 13 clearly showed that he still clings to the ideological struggle, to his right to intervene with armed force wherever he thinks it will not be resisted too stiffly. Surely that gives us equal right, with equal calm and confidence and determination to assert our unswerving devotion to human rights, in the same spirit. It can be done with equal calm and confidence, more than that, we never signed a document recognizing their right to an ideological struggle, or their right

to march into other peoples' countries. They did sign the accord that gave us the right to be concerned about human rights.

Mr. Secretary, what do we say to some of these cases—the case of a professor in the University of Virginia, married with full accord of the Soviet Union authorities in 1974. His wife cannot get out. Reunification of families—what does it mean? What relationship is closer than husband and wife? How do we improve matters a little bit for these not so spectacular human beings—not great ballerinas or physicists? How do we—for Mr. Shcharansky, too?

Mr. VANCE. I think we must just continue to persevere in our discussions with the countries directly involved in particular kinds of cases. Sometimes we will do this by public statement; sometimes by quiet conversations; and I think one will see, if one does, that there will be some successes.

I will just take the case of—what may seem in a way a small case—the 12-children in Czechoslovakia.

Mrs. FENWICK. Yes.

Mr. VANCE. It may seem small because it is only 12 people—

Mrs. FENWICK. No, it is not small.

Mr. VANCE. It is not small.

Mrs. FENWICK. No.

Mr. VANCE. And I think that the individual cases must be kept after, and if we do, then maybe there is a chance of affecting what happens.

Mrs. FENWICK. It seems to me that détente can be conducted with the one hand, and our basic concern for human rights with the other hand, just as they expect to be able to do. We, too, ought to be able to expect it.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. VANCE. Thank you.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Bingham.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to welcome you, Mr. Secretary, and Ambassador Sherer, as well as Mr. Nimetz who has previously appeared before us.

There is just one matter in your statement that I wanted to ask about because I read it with a little surprise and that is, that among the objectives that you indicate you will seek at the Belgrade meeting will be consideration of new proposals.

Mr. VANCE. Yes, sir:

Mr. BINGHAM. My recollection was that the Helsinki accords themselves did not contemplate consideration of new proposals at a follow-up conference and I think previously and in our discussions, we had sort of assumed that this would get us away from the strict pursuit of the follow-up conference as foreshadowed in the original accord, which would put us in a strong position to insist on implementation of the original accord.

Mr. VANCE. My recollection is that it does provide not only for review of implementation, but also provides secondarily, for the consideration of new proposals, particularly built upon the question of implementation.

Thirdly, the topic on the agenda would be the question of what follows on after Belgrade.

I think that it is appropriate to take a limited number of new initiatives, if you want to call them that, but I do not think that we can let ourselves be thrown off the track by getting so involved with new initiatives that we do not stick to the main purpose which is the question of a review of implementation.

We have ourselves, at this point, along with our colleagues in the West, under consideration some 40 proposals—new proposals. We will undoubtedly want to take a few of those proposals we think would be wise and constructive and put them on the table there. I am sure that there will be some put on the table by our Eastern colleagues. I think it would be a mistake to exclude—

Mr. BINGHAM. You do anticipate that?

Mr. VANCE. Yes, and also by neutral countries as well.

Mr. BINGHAM. I see.

Mr. VANCE. We have been in contact, as you know, with the neutral countries as well as with the Soviet Union and some of the other Warsaw Pact countries and we have been in consultation with quite a few of our colleagues who will be there from the nonaligned states. So I do expect some new proposals. But what I say is that we should not let ourselves get involved in grandiose new proposals which will take us down a fruitless track, but try to concentrate on those which really do make sense and which will, in the spirit of the basic accords, continue to move us forward.

Mr. BINGHAM. Ambassador Sherer has said that the East European countries, if I understood you correctly, Ambassador Sherer, would be tending to focus more on the future than on the past. Did you have in mind consideration of new proposals in that regard?

Mr. SHERER. No, Mr. Congressman. What I had in mind is something that we have heard third-hand from Soviet authorities and that is that they have in mind some sort of a political concept that they would like to introduce even at this preparatory meeting, which is supposed to be dealing with four very specific subjects.

We have heard that they intend to introduce a political concept which will mean let us not look backwards—let us only look forward. I think we want to stick to the language of the Final Act and talk about the things the Final Act says that we should talk about.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Secretary, as you know, there has been some concern expressed here on the Hill and elsewhere that we should try to see that our own record with regard to Helsinki is as good as possible. The McCarran-Walter Act has frequently been mentioned in this regard as a part of our laws that seems to be in conflict with Basket Three. Do you have any comment for us on that, either in terms of the current policy being followed by the Department in the administration of that act or in terms of possible revision of the act?

Mr. VANCE. Yes; I do. First, let me say that the CSCE proposals or provisions on travel and contacts among individuals and organizations are some of the clear provisions that exist in that document. We believe that our performance in this area compares favorably with other countries. However, we are currently reviewing our visa practices, as I think you all know.

With respect to visa provisions for Communist Party members they are, as you point out, governed by the Immigration and Nationality

Act. There is a provision, however, that waivers can be made by the Secretary of State.

In implementing the waiver proposals, we have been guided by the long-standing policy, which was made clear at the Helsinki Conference, on the granting of visas in the labor area. As you know, this was specifically stated and made, I think, very, very clear at the Helsinki Conference.

As a result of that, we have been following that procedure with respect to visa waivers in the time since this administration has been in office. However, the whole visa question is, as I said, under consideration in the executive branch right now.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FASCELL. Senator Dole.

Mr. DOLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, I appreciate very much your statement which I have read and I think my other colleagues on the Senate side may be involved in a rollcall that will probably delay their attendance.

In a general way, beyond assuring a full and frank discussion of what has happened since the signing of the accords, do we have any additional high priority objectives to achieve in Belgrade—in addition to a full and frank discussion of the 2-year history?

Mr. VANCE. Well, our basic objective is to forward two fundamental principles: one is improving the relationship between states and the other is improving the lot of the individual citizen in each of these countries. So all of our work is directed toward achieving those basic purposes.

The question then arises of how do you best do that. We think that you best do it by concentrating, as we believe is intended by the document itself, on the review of implementation. We think it is also possible, however, to discuss some new proposals in connection with that review if they be of a limited number and if they really do build upon the structure of the Helsinki accords.

We also think it is important, however, to sketch out what the post-Belgrade regime will be. I think if one looks and sees what is happening now as we approach Belgrade, one can begin to see bits and pieces of increased progress just from the mere fact that the Belgrade Conference is coming. Therefore, I think we would welcome at the Belgrade Conference not only the continuation thereafter of bilateral relationships seeking further implementation, but the setting of a date for a similar Belgrade-type conference in the future so as to keep that kind of prod upon all of us to make sure we go forward.

Mr. DOLE. In line with your statement about progress being made. Given the vocal activism on the part of some dissidents and the repression of these activities, is it possible to draw a balance sheet? Do you think the Helsinki accords have promoted or harmed the rights of those who have had their human rights imperiled?

Mr. VANCE. As I indicated earlier, Senator, I think that one must judge this in the long run and over a period of years. I think that if we go country by country and case by case, the answer will be, in some cases, yes and in other cases no. I think it is too short a period of time to draw a specific balance sheet and it would be perhaps misleading to do so.

But I come back and emphasize the fact that I have no doubt in my own mind that across-the-board, the fact that we have the Helsinki accords has been a positive fact and has improved the lot of individuals by and large across the spectrum.

Although, I must concede in certain areas, in certain countries, you will find that there are retrogressions and not even a holding of the position that was obtained before.

But on balance, I would say clearly that the Helsinki accords have been a positive factor.

Mr. DOLE. Just in one specific area—that of Shcharansky—we hear that he is being charged with treason and linked to the CIA and, of course, the State Department has already expressed its concern. Do you believe it serves any useful purpose or is it necessary for American officials to speak out further on his case before any formal charges are actually made?

Mr. VANCE. That is a difficult question to answer. We have made very clear—very forcibly, our views with respect to this matter. It is, as I understand it, now in the hands of the court there. I think it really has to be an individual decision on the part of each individual as to what he or she thinks under those circumstances is best.

Mr. DOLE. But you do not plan any statements or any further—

Mr. VANCE. Not at this time.

Mr. DOLE. I am wondering if there is any guidance for the rest of us. Can we be helpful with public statements or is that a judgment you say we must make?

Mr. VANCE. I think you really must at this point. We are going to continue to observe for the moment and see what happens, but again, I think this is really a question of individual judgment.

Mr. DOLE. And finally—this may have been touched on and I do not want to have the wrong impression. Has there been any change in the attitude of this administration? Has it been toned down any with reference to human rights, or does the President feel just as strongly, or has it become more selective?

Mr. VANCE. There should be no question about that. The President feels just as strongly and he feels very, very deeply as do all of us, that this is a fundamental question which I have said many times is part of the framework of our Constitution and a strand in the fabric of our society which is of great importance. And that we will continue to—

Mr. DOLE. So that same standard would apply to a country like Cuba where there may be political prisoners and perhaps some ignoring of human rights before we get into any “normalization” of relations with a country like Cuba or Vietnam or any other Communist country.

Mr. VANCE. The principles of human rights, it seems to me, are international. Anybody who is a member of the United Nations clearly is undertaking the responsibility to act in this area. I think this is a fundamental issue to be discussed among states and there is no reason we should step away from that at all.

Mr. DOLE. Particularly in reference to Cuba where we seem to be extending a hand of friendship, would it be fair to say that a precondition of any further “normalization” would be some demonstration—

positive demonstration by the Castro government concerning political prisoners—human rights?

Mr. VANCE. Let me say with respect to Cuba that we have taken a couple of steps which I think were constructive steps. One is the signing of the Fishing Treaty and the second is agreement with respect to interest sections in embassies in each of the capitals. Again, I think this is a positive step.

There are a number of questions which remain between us and one of those is the human rights question. They all must be discussed as we move in a measured way in our discussions with Cuba.

Mr. DOLE. And finally, would it be fair to assume then that we are not going to plunge into anything without their intervention in Africa and human rights questions being resolved?

Mr. VANCE. That is another item to be discussed between us. As I said, we plan to move in a measured way and there are a number of items which we will be discussing with them.

Mr. FASCELL. Senator Case.

Mr. CASE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Secretary and your associates, my apologies for being in and out. We had a vote since you started and there may be another. It must be very frustrating for you to give up your precious time for what may appear to be dilatory attendance by the members of the Commission. It is caused by matters beyond our control.

Mr. VANCE. I understand.

Mr. FASCELL. Will you yield at that point?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. All of those lights mean that the House Members are going to have to go. We have a series of rollcalls on, I do not know how many bills. We will leave the Secretary to the tender mercies of the other body with Cochairman Pell in charge and we will go to the rollcall and come back as quickly as possible.

Mr. VANCE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASE. Is there a 10-minute rule, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PELL. No. I think not unless we find we need one.

Mr. CASE. In that case, will you inform us when we have used that time?

Mr. PELL. Yes.

Mr. CASE. There is only one thing, Mr. Secretary, that really concerns us related to our discussions with the executive branch at this time. It has been touched upon by my colleagues on the Commission and most recently by Senator Dole. That is whether this is going to be an exercise in who can be the nicest to the other side and how we can show that all the world is one—or will it be a real airing of the situation, particularly in respect to Basket Three?

I think I speak for most members of the Commission, as well as members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate generally, when I say I hope that it will be a real effort to demonstrate that we mean what we say about human rights and the specifics of the Helsinki accords in that area.

I do not see how we can do this without talking about specific cases and I do not see how we can talk about specific cases without raising

the hackles of the people involved on the other side. I expect that they would talk about or attempt to talk about our failures in this area. I think this will be a very wholesome thing because it will show, among other things, I think, what the difference is between what we mean by human rights and what they mean by human rights. It may illustrate to a useful degree the difference between the East and the West in these matters.

I said this morning to your associate that you probably were not the right people to handle these negotiations because your job is to get along with the other side and to accomplish things not by indirection, but in spite of themselves. I am not sure that it can take into its jurisdiction the matter of what are really, in the very, very highest sense of the word, confrontations.

There is confrontation here. The ultimate confrontation is between the system of the East and the system of the West. Unless we, I think, really treat this as involving that, I do not think we are doing what at least I believe the Congress considers ought to be done.

Maybe in the eyes of the world and maybe in the eyes of God, it is just as bad for a man to go hungry, for instance, or not have a job as it is for a government to put people in the insane asylum in order to keep them out of their way or to torture them or not to allow them the kind of due process that we regard as true or to maintain a society in which people are afraid—deeply afraid.

Maybe those things in the cosmic sense are equivalents, but I suggest that they are not equivalents. I do not mean that we are in favor of starving people. We are not, as you know. But we do not equate the holding of a job as the same as the rights of a human being to be free from being whipped or tortured or driven insane or having his sanity put into great danger.

To have this brought out in Belgrade would make the accords worthwhile. And I think not to do it would be to just go through an exercise and waste an awful lot of good people's time.

I have not talked in a precise way. I have said some things loosely, but I have stated my concern at having this thing run by a bunch of professional diplomats which is what you fellows are supposed to be. Some of you are only part time. [Laughter.]

And I like both kinds and we need both kinds, but you are still in that spot and I do not know whether you can break free from it. Frankly I have not seen yet the kind of spirit to have the knock-down, drag-out, real confrontation that I think is called for at this stage.

We have a deep disagreement about this. I think, and maybe that is the reason the Commission does exist and is going to be represented in Belgrade. It is not a matter of anything personal at all. It is just a matter of recognizing that there is a difference between the kind of a job that you have to do and that we have to do.

Mr. VANCE. Perhaps I might respond to that, if I could.

Mr. CASE. He would have responded sooner if I had not kept on talking. [Laughter.]

Mr. VANCE. Let me assure you that we will make a real effort to carry forward on what we and you have said about our obligations in this conference. Our commitment to human rights and to reviewing the implementation of the Helsinki Accords on human rights is deep

and abiding and I think it is just as deep and abiding as that of the Congress.

Mr. CASE. I will not interrupt you again, but I never question that—it is a question of what we are supposed to do at this conference.

Mr. VANCE. And I can assure you that we will be covering specific cases, as well as generalities, in the discussions. We have said, and I repeated here again today and will repeat it again and again, that we believe that a full and frank review of the implementation in all of the areas, including the human rights area, is our task and it is necessary and right that we should do so.

Now I do, however, repeat again the caution that I do not think it ought to be done in a polemical fashion and if by “knock-down, drag-out,” you mean it is going to be polemical, then we do have a disagreement.

I do not think that is what you mean, but if it is—

Mr. CASE. I do not mean we should wave brickbats or whatever they are—I have heard of them for a long time and I never was quite sure what they were—maybe an Irishman can tell me.

Mr. LEAHY. I will fill you in later on.

Mr. CASE. Or get into physical combat about this thing at this stage, but I do mean that we may have to use sharp words and indicate disagreement—and not only that, but make it clear that we are in disagreement and not attempt by using the same word for different meanings, to paper over what I think is a very deep difference that exists.

Mr. VANCE. The words which I would use would be frank and straightforward.

Mr. CASE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PELL. Senator Leahy.

Mr. LEAHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, I also want to apologize for stepping out at one point. With all of our efforts here, in both the House and the Senate, to set an orderly pace for the Government, the country, and the rest of the world, we have somehow overlooked the fact that it would really help things a lot if we could do the same for ourselves and I suspect sometime within the next century or so we just might do that.

I think that there may have already been a question asked of you on this. I heard Senator Dole asking one as I came in and I was delighted with your response that the President will not ease up on his statements on human rights. I suspect that we are going to be faced, both in individual cases and in other ways, with pressure for the administration of the U.S. Government to ease off on our position on human rights. I hope that we will not and I have the utmost faith, both in you, sir, and in the President that we will not.

I am very concerned about the arrest of Mr. Shcharansky in the Soviet Union. I understand our Government has made assurances that he is not in any way involved with the Government of the United States or with anybody in the Intelligence Agency. Is that correct?

Mr. VANCE. We have said that there was no truth to the allegations that he was involved with the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. LEAHY. That is my understanding. I met Mr. Shcharansky in Moscow a couple of years ago and brought him letters from his wife.

This is a case that concerns me very much because I suspect that probably because of the attention given to him, he is in the situation where he is now. I also hope that we do not give in to pressure on individual areas because of that and I suspect that Mr. Shcharansky would be one of the first to encourage that.

Mr. Secretary, I realize it is impossible to decide at this point—if you even know at this point—just what will happen in Belgrade. Are you hopeful for a realistic meeting or are you concerned that maybe it will just breakdown to polemics and accusations on both sides with very little coming out of it? I realize this is a very broad question, but what are the indications that you are getting now, this close to the time we begin the meeting?

Mr. VANCE. On the basis of the discussions that we have been able to have, both with the Eastern Bloc countries and with the nonaligned countries at this point, people are saying that they want a serious discussion which will accomplish real objectives and for the moment, I think one must take that at face value. Whether when one gets into the actual debate, this will break down, of course, I could not predict at this point. It is always a possibility. I hope it will not break down because I think that would not be in the interests of any of the parties to the conference nor ultimately in the interests of the real hoped-for beneficiaries; namely, the people of these countries.

Mr. LEAHY. In that regard, have we been making concentrated efforts in our own country to review our own accord with the Helsinki Agreement—are we looking at the McCarran-Walter Act, for example, and the funding of expanded cultural, educational and scientific exchanges. Are there not some areas where we could say that we may not have done all we could have done?

Mr. VANCE. Yes, we are very much involved in taking a look at this. As you know, we have already taken steps to lift travel restrictions because we felt that this was a necessary and desirable step that we must take. We are currently reviewing the visa restrictions problem and we are going to take a look across-the-board at our performance. As I indicated in my statement, none of us is perfect.

Mr. LEAHY. I understand. What would you feel, following a conference like this—and I realize that we do not want to limit all discussion to Basket Three by any means—but Mr. Secretary, when a conference is over, what would be the kind of thing that you could look at to say that we have been successful. And I suppose you might almost put that in a reverse: what type of things would make the United States question whether we should really continue the effort or whether we may have an agreement that is worth more in the value of the paper than in what is going to come out of it.

Mr. VANCE. Let me say two things in answer to that. I would look first to see whether or not there had been a realistic and frank review of implementation where the facts had been laid out on the table on both sides and had been debated in a realistic way. If that is done, I think it will highlight the deficiencies and that would be a very positive factor.

Second, I feel that we should set up as a result of the Belgrade Conference in the fall, some sort of follow-on mechanism which again

puts a signpost before us in the road, so that everybody knows that they are going to be coming to another point where they are going to have to stand up and be counted as to whether or not they have or have not made progress in these various areas.

Those are two specific items. A third area would be that if we had a few new proposals that were, indeed, constructive, I think that would be another fact to be measured against the yardstick. But again, I would caution that we not get lost in considering new proposals and neglect the real purpose which is review of implementation.

Mr. LEAHY. And that means each Basket, One, Two and Three.

Mr. VANCE. Yes, I think we must go and review each Basket.

Mr. LEAHY. I think that is extremely important because without in any way backing out from the accordance of Basket Three, I think we all realize that we must review each Basket. Unfortunately, the press attention and our own attention sometimes seems to put an undue emphasis on Basket Three. I do not think there is any way you can look at the other two without realizing that the implementation of those will have to affect favorably the implementation of Basket Three.

Mr. VANCE. Yes, I think you make a very important point and I think if we look at the implementation to date, we find that the implementation on Basket One is reasonably good, but there are a number of other ideas that I think are quite good that we could propose to increase the confidence-building measures, for example.

Second, I think that the implementation in Basket Two has not, in many regards, been satisfactory and I think it is very important to make sure that we do start to make progress in Basket Two because all of this spills together and works together to build the kind of framework in which you can improve the relationships between nations. So I do not think we ought to neglect any of those. They are an integrated whole in a sense.

Mr. LEAHY. I am glad to hear your point on Basket Two because that sort of agrees with my own thinking. You have looked at it in far greater detail than I have, Mr. Secretary, and I agree with you on that conclusion. I do know that you will continue to look at all of those, but I just cannot help but feel that full implementation of the first two have got to help us very much in the last one.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Secretary, I, too, join the chorus of apologies. I not only missed the start of your statement, but I missed the vote as well because I was coming in from out of town.

I congratulate you on your statement when you said all three of the so-called Baskets are important and also your view that Belgrade should not be an arena for polemics, but, as you suggested, some frank and straightforward conversation, but not one of sheer confrontation. I know my own view, developed from the conversations with various European leaders with whom I met, was that what we have done here is achieve a sort of norm of behavior that we expect of people and while we recognize the Soviets have not met that norm, we want to keep this norm in front of them and mention as well some of the good things—some of the slight improvements that have been made, like the distribution of missals in the former Baltic Republic—one or two

little things of that sort, as well as all the heinous things that they have done.

In that regard, in connection with the Shcharansky trial, I was wondering if you saw that as a precursor to a series of showcase trials somewhat like we had in Czechoslovakia in the early fifties or in Russia under Stalin or if you saw this as being somewhat individual and separate.

Mr. VANCE. I honestly do not know. We will just have to wait and see.

Mr. PELL. I helped draft and initiated the letter about Shcharansky that was signed by about 30 of my colleagues and sent to General Secretary Brezhnev. Do you feel that letters like that are a help, a hindrance, or have no effect?

Mr. VANCE. I think that letter was a help. Senator Dole asked me a similar question as to what one should do at this point and I answered by saying that insofar as the Department is concerned, that we have made our views known very clearly and strongly and for the moment we are going to watch and see what happens.

Mr. PELL. I think that course is probably correct. I think we are more expendable, as politicians in the public arena—whereas your ammunition can perhaps be better expended sometimes privately.

In connection with the arguments that are going to be used there at Belgrade, one of them will be the Soviet argument that we have not been very good about issuing visas to trade unionists—Mr. Meany does not like them—and also the question about the publication of the full text of the Agreement. But we cannot tell The New York Times to publish the full text; nor do we want to use the taxpayers money to pay for a full page of advertisement. How do we handle these arguments?

Mr. VANCE. With respect to the question of visas, and in particular with respect to visas as they relate to labor leaders, I commented earlier to Congressman Bingham on this. I indicated that our position is very clearly known with respect to the visa situation as it relates to labor leaders, and there was no misunderstanding that it was not included under the Helsinki accords. That is very clear. I do not think there can be any question on that.

I did say, however, that our whole visa policy is under review in the executive branch at this time.

Mr. PELL. On the question of publication of the agreement, which is a technical point, but it has done immense good behind the curtain where the Soviet and the Communist presses of the Eastern European countries have published the full text. Many of my old friends—when I used to live there—have tried to stay in touch and they have used this text as a reason why they would try to get a passport to go to the West—as a reason why they should have some liberalization. Ambassador Shierer, I am sure has seen that effect when he was in Czechoslovakia.

I am wondering if we will make any efforts to fully publish the text of the Agreement.

Mr. VANCE. My recollection is—I have got a note here in front of me—the Department of State Press Release with the full text was

issued in August of 1975, and the full text was also carried in the State Department's Bulletin which was printed by the Government Printing Office.

Mr. PELL. That is absolutely correct, but the free press did not carry it in our newspapers. That is the point of argument that they toss back at us, which we should be prepared for.

Mr. VANCE. I believe that summaries and excerpts were—

Mr. PELL. That is correct, but the full text was not published, and on the other hand, in the Communist press, the full text was.

Mr. VANCE. I do not want to interfere with the press.

Mr. PELL. I agree with you, but it is an important point that will come up.

Another question here that concerns me is how you felt we would handle at Belgrade the Communist argument that principle VI on intervention in internal affairs, restricts our rights to raise questions about the implementation of principle VII on human rights.

Mr. VANCE. I think the answer to that is really very clear. Principle VII says that this is a principle which is guiding to all the participants to the Helsinki Conference and signatories to the Helsinki accords. I think having said that, it makes it clear that it is legitimate for one participant to raise with another participant the fact that that country does not believe that the other country is, in fact, abiding by the principles which we have all solemnly signed.

Mr. PELL. I think this will be probably one of the areas where Ambassador Sherer will be spending a good deal of his time.

Mr. VANCE. I think so, too. Bud, go ahead.

Mr. SHERER. Well, I agree.

Mr. PELL. Another Soviet argument will be that the West attaches exclusive priority to human rights, that we do not give the same attention to the rights of employment or social rights, medical care and that argumentation. How do we intend to handle that one?

Mr. VANCE. Let me speak to that. I tried to make clearer the Government's policy with respect to human rights in a speech which I gave 1 month ago. And I indicated that among the rights which were included under the definition of human rights were economic and social rights as well. So certainly, we believe within the Government that they are included. The political rights are but one element and other rights are included as well.

Mr. PELL. Although if we hold to that firmly, we have certain lacking here. My own State with 8 percent unemployment—we obviously would fall down in that regard.

Mr. VANCE. That is why I think all of us must recognize that we are not immune from criticism and it is to be expected that where we may be deficient, we will be criticized.

Mr. PELL. I agree with you. Now, on the general question of the emphasis on human rights, do you feel that this is having an adverse effect on our fundamental relations with the Soviet Union in détente? My own view is that it is not, but there are two tracks here, and one is human rights and the other is the fundamental question of arms control and basic relations between the nations.

Mr. VANCE. I share your views, Senator Pell. I think that there are two tracks on this and I think that the basic interest which the Soviet

Union has in the problem of arms control, particularly in the strategic area, stands on its own two feet. And that, therefore, there is not the linkage that has sometimes been suggested.

Mr. PELL. Along that same line, are you concerned that our emphasis on human rights is going to cause any split with our Western allies? I did notice that while they all would come up to you in private and say fine, they did not want to particularly identify themselves as vigorously as ourselves publicly.

Mr. VANCE. I think we are going to find different public responses by different countries. I think you are quite right that all of them do say in private conversations that they are very much with us on this—some of them say that for special reasons they do not feel at this point that they can be quite as outspoken as they would like to be under the circumstances. Let me say that in our preparation for Belgrade, we have coordinated very closely with our allies and will continue to do so as we move toward the fall when the substantive discussions will get underway.

Mr. PELL. Do you think that if we raise the question of the Jackson-Vanik amendment—if that comes up again—will that have an adverse effect?

Mr. VANCE. I think we have first got to sort out among ourselves what our position is going to be with respect to Jackson-Vanik. The executive branch has not reached its conclusions on this and as it considers it, of course, it will want to work very closely with Congress in discussion of the Congress's views on this matter.

Mr. PELL. In doing that, we should bear in mind that it was almost 70 years ago that we tied in the maltreatment of Jews in Russia with the withholding of trade privileges to them. That is a fact that is not generally brought out—it did not just originate with Jackson-Vanik.

I saw in the press that the head of our delegation will be Under Secretary Christopher. Would you be at liberty to say who else will be in the delegation? I think earlier you responded that members of the Commission would be welcome there as delegates.

Mr. VANCE. Indeed, I did say that and all members of the Commission are welcome there.

Mr. PELL. Will there be any outside delegates brought in along the lines of Senator Case's suggestion?

Mr. VANCE. There will be nine State Department people on the delegation. I think I should leave it to the President to indicate who the individuals are when he considers it to be the appropriate time.

Mr. PELL. Thank you very much.

Do any of my colleagues have any more questions?

Senator Dole, Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. To the question of members of the Commission—will the members of the Commission be members of the delegation or are we just welcome there?

Mr. VANCE. No; you will be members of the delegation.

Mr. DOLE. That will be in the meeting in October, right?

Mr. VANCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOLE. Now, what about—

Mr. CASE. Excuse me. That has a certain connotation of discipline.

Mr. VANCE. Of discipline?

Mr. CASE. Of discipline in coordination of policy and what not that perhaps we ought to clarify before we get there.

Mr. VANCE. This is a subject which we have been discussing with your chairman at some length. It is our strong view that our delegation would be strengthened by the participation of the members of this Commission and we hope that you will see fit to do so.

Mr. PELL. My own view would be that we should adhere to whatever is the chairman of the delegation's position at the time, but if we disagree, we can disagree in another arena, but not at Belgrade.

Mr. CASE. The chairman of the Commission or the chairman of the delegation?

Mr. PELL. Chairman of the delegation, Secretary Christopher.

Mr. CASE. You mean, in other words, the administration's position should be the main one?

Mr. PELL. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I am not arguing with you about that because the question arises at the U.N. and at other groups and so on.

Mr. VANCE. Yes; it does.

Mr. CASE. I am not saying now whether it will be one way or the other, but we ought to know now where we stand.

Mr. VANCE. Yes.

Mr. PELL. Senator Dole.

Mr. DOLE. Just to pursue the same—now, the Ambassador will be going over when—Friday?

Mr. SHERER. Saturday, sir.

Mr. DOLE. Saturday, and then you will be working on the agenda for about how long?

Mr. SHERER. The preparatory meeting is strictly technical in nature, Senator, and we think we can finish that work in 6 weeks.

Mr. DOLE. And that will sort of lay the foundation and the groundwork for what happens in October?

Mr. SHERER. Yes, sir. We have four tasks—one is to establish the date of the main meeting; second is to establish the duration of the main meeting; the third is to discuss the agenda of the main meeting; and fourth is to discuss the modalities of the main meeting.

Mr. PELL. What does "the modalities" mean?

Mr. CASE. That was the word I meant to ask you about this morning.

Mr. SHERER. I had to look it up and I believe it means procedures.

Mr. CASE. You are the one that used it. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOLE. Then I assume that in this preparatory meeting, there will be a determination made about what will be discussed at the main meeting and it is your—as I understand it, the administration's—point of view that every thing should be discussed and laid on the table—all three Baskets, in other words, not just Basket III.

Mr. VANCE. All three Baskets should be there and perhaps there might be even a fourth one to deal with the Mediterranean situation which is part of the accord. I think this is to be worked out by Ambassador Sherer and his colleagues there, but it will certainly include all three Baskets. Whether it includes a fourth or a fifth Basket, I think is still up for discussion.

Mr. DOLE. Will there be a determination made at the first meeting whether or not we will be—I should not say permitted, but whether it

would be wise to go into individual cases—will that be a determination made by each member of the delegation at the main meeting?

Mr. VANCE. Go ahead, Bud.

Mr. SHERER. Senator, I think that the procedures that will be adopted for the main meeting will be similar to the procedures that were in effect at the second stage in Geneva of the Helsinki meetings. And that is that we breakdown into committees and we do go into individual cases and we do use strong language in these committees—straightforward talk that Senator Case had asked about earlier.

Mr. DOLE. You had a pretty good laundry list of the things they will be saying about us so we will be prepared?

Mr. SHERER. Yes, sir, we do have a fairly complete list, I think.

Mr. DOLE. Theirs is longer than ours?

Mr. SHERER. I do not believe so, sir.

Mr. DOLE. Certainly we have a longer list than they have?

Mr. SHERER. Yes; that is right.

Mr. DOLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PELL. Yes.

Mr. DOLE. We had one session privately with the members of this Commission and it was brought out that sometimes Members of Congress become "loose cannons." They may be turned loose on the horizon, but of course, we do not want to embarrass the administration, so I suppose there will be a lot of close contact with Members.

Mr. VANCE. Yes, there certainly will be and we have to work out the procedures and work them out in detail so that everybody knows and understands what the procedures are. We have got time to do that and we have started the discussions with the chairman already. I really believe that this can be worked out satisfactorily with everybody.

Mr. PELL. I do agree with the importance of some discipline.

I thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. I would also add that since you have answered the questions so fully and frankly, there is no need for an executive session immediately following this. The House Members are still—my fellow Commissioners are still on the floor voting and I do not think my other colleagues have any further questions.

Mr. CASE. I would just like to ask, Mr. Chairman, that we be permitted to submit questions to the Secretary because, among other things, the President's Report just got to us this morning. We have not had a chance to read it carefully and we would like to do that.

Mr. VANCE. Surely.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the Secretary's willingness to answer these questions.

Mr. PELL. I think that is a very good idea, but I was hoping you might limit it to 5 days or a week.

Mr. CASE. I should think a week would be a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. VANCE. Good. Thank you very much.

Mr. PELL. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary, and gentlemen. We now stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:20 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]