



# NEWS from U.S. Senator Bob Dole

(R.-Kans.)

New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510 (202) 224-6521

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
TUESDAY, JULY 11, 1978

CONTACT: BILL KATS  
202-224-8947

## SOVIET HELSINKI VIOLATIONS HINT AT LIKELY SALT ACTIONS, DOLE SAYS

WASHINGTON -- Sen. Bob Dole (R-Kan.) today warned the Carter Administration that the Soviet Union's refusal to abide by the Helsinki Agreement is an indication that the Soviets may also take a SALT pact lightly.

Speaking before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (the Helsinki Commission), Dole again called for suspension of SALT negotiations "until the Soviet government indicates it can keep its word."

Dole, one of the Helsinki commissioners, said, "Surely it must have occurred to Secretary Vance that if the Soviet Union can violate the Helsinki Agreement so openly, and shamelessly place on trial people of such high character as the Helsinki monitors, it can violate any other agreement it enters into just as shamelessly, if not as openly. Were this to happen after we sign a SALT agreement, the result for our country would be catastrophic. For if the Soviet Union can be cruel enough to attack people for daring to insist on compliance with its government's agreements, it can just as easily attack the United States if we foolishly enter agreements without adequately insuring their adherence."

Dole made five major recommendations to the commission:

1. Indefinitely postpone SALT negotiations pending Soviet Helsinki compliance.
2. Demand release of 12 Soviet Helsinki monitors who were sentenced; acquittal of Shcharansky, Ginzburg and Viktoras Petkus.
3. Suspend scientific exchanges pending Helsinki compliance.
4. Make sure minority republics such as Georgia, Lithuania and Ukraine, are invited to the 1980 Madrid follow-up.
5. Explore possibility of rejecting the Helsinki Agreement as a failed document that was not pursued by the Soviets with good-faith implementation efforts.

Following is the text of Dole's remarks:

## SENATOR BOB DOLE'S STATEMENT AT THE CSCE

JULY 11, 1978

### INITIAL OPPOSITION TO HELSINKI

American acceptance of the Helsinki Agreement in 1975 was condemned by many groups and individuals in our country as an unnecessary and unwarranted concession to the Soviet Union. It could not be denied that the Soviet Union was in de facto control of territories it had liberated from the Nazis during World War II and has since refused to relinquish. These territories include previously sovereign states such as the three Baltic Republics as well as Poland and others whose freedom the Allies were fighting to guarantee. By signing the Helsinki agreement, however, with its sections guaranteeing the territorial and political integrity of the signatory states, that is, accepting the status quo in Europe, the United States and our allies would be in the position of legitimizing the post-World War II conquests of the Soviet Union. Many Americans were understandably opposed to an agreement that would signal American acceptance of Soviet post-War imperialism.

### HUMAN RIGHTS

The United States was able to gain acceptance of the agreement among our citizens by insisting on and securing the inclusion of clauses guaranteeing human rights and self-determination of peoples. These are principles we have always followed and defended and their inclusion in the Helsinki agreement is only natural. Anything less would have been unacceptable.

### BOTH SIDES COMPROMISED

Thus the Helsinki Agreement was one where both the East and West gained something, but also compromised on certain points to secure its acceptance. The West accepted the present reality in the world, distasteful as it was, and recognized Soviet post-War conquests. In return, we received a pledge from the Soviet Union to humanize its dangerously oppressive system by implementing human rights principles and to work for the decentralization of its massive power by permitting national self-determination for its satellites and member republics.

### GOOD WILL NECESSARY

As conceived, the Helsinki Agreement is a good one that accepts international realities, yet takes concrete steps to insure continued peace and harmony in the world by granting citizens basic rights and by working for more communication among nations. One element in the entire formula is crucial, however, and that is the good will and integrity of those leaders who are now committed to the implementation of the agreement.

### CITIZEN ACTION TO INSURE COMPLIANCE

Initially, it was very encouraging to note both sides of the agreement taking steps to insure its proper implementation. The United States changed its tone and stance with respect to Eastern Europe, accepting the current regimes in power. The United States even went to the length of preparing a consulate in Kiev, Ukraine; returned the Crown of St. Stephens to Budapest; downplayed the captive nations issue, and conducted state visits to several Eastern European capitals. The Soviet Union informed the West of troop maneuvers and accepted several cultural exchanges. Most encouraging of all was the acceptance of the Helsinki Agreement among the citizens of the various signatory countries. In the United States, various ethnic groups changed their emphasis from opposition to communism, which the Helsinki Agreement does not condemn, to support of human rights, which, of course, the final act guarantees. In the Soviet Union, seven citizen groups, responding to the initiative taken by Mr. Brezhnev and his government, formed monitoring committees to help in the implementation of the Helsinki Agreement. These groups in Moscow, in Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia and Armenia focused attention on those areas of human and national rights that needed to be improved within the Soviet Union generally and the various member republics in particular. In Czechoslovakia, the Charter 77 group and in Poland, the Union for Polish Workers' defense, used the Helsinki Agreement as a guideline for their activities. In Yugoslavia and Rumania, individuals like Mihajlo Mihajlov and Jul Goma worked to implement the human rights provisions in their respective countries.

### SOVIET HARRASSMENT OF CITIZEN GROUPS

Unfortunately, the Eastern bloc nations rejected the efforts of their citizens to make the Helsinki Agreement a meaningful document. The memoranda of the various Helsinki groups, which included useful suggestions for improving the human rights situation in their respective countries, began to include accounts of harassment and repression directed against the group members themselves. Soon arrests were ordered. Finally, in June 1977, the world was treated to the disgraceful spectacle of the trials of two Ukrainian Helsinki watchers, Mykola Rudenko and Oleksa Tykhiy. In an incredibly cynical gesture, Soviet authorities conducted the trials at the same time that representatives of the Helsinki signatory nations were meeting in Belgrade to prepare for the follow-up conference that was to review each country's compliance with the Helsinki Agreement. Rudenko and Tykhiy (who received 12 and 15 years respectively,) were only the first of the Helsinki watchers to be convicted. Other trials followed -- in Armenia, Lithuania, Georgia, Ukraine and most recently in Moscow where world-renowned physicist, Yuri Orlov was sentenced to 12 years and Jewish refusenik Vladimir Slepak was sentenced to 5 years.

### STARTLING JUXTAPOSITION OF 3 EVENTS

This history of harassment, which can only be described as cruel, continues at this very moment. On the same day that we are meeting in Washington to discuss Soviet human rights violations, Secretary of State Vance is meeting Foreign Minister Gromyko in Geneva to discuss the SALT agreement while Soviet Helsinki monitoring group members Alexander Ginzburg and Anatoly Shcharansky are meeting a Soviet court in Moscow and Viktoras Petkus is meeting a court in Vilnius, to discuss their role in working to implement the Helsinki Agreement. The juxtaposition of these three events is startling and it raises profound questions about the future of our relations with the Soviet Union.

### SOVIET ACTION REJECTS AGREEMENT

The United States entered the Helsinki negotiations in good faith and signed the final act in the belief that it is a good agreement and that it would be adhered to. We have made every effort to comply with the provisions of the Helsinki Agreement. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, has made every effort to frustrate it. The trials of Ginzburg, Shcharansky and Petkus are eloquent proof of that.

### SHCHARANSKY AND GINZBURG AND PETKUS

All three men are people of great integrity and courage. They are dedicated to non-violent, humanist principles. The careers of all three men bear witness to that. Alexander Ginzburg is an author and poet who has already been punished with prison sentences for his dedication to truth and self-expression. After release from prison, Ginzburg was active for three years helping people in need, administering the Russian public fund for the aid of the families of political prisoners. Anatoly Shcharansky has been just as active, helping Jewish families secure their rights to emigrate and keeping Western newsmen informed of the activities of human rights activists in the USSR. Viktoras Petkus is a Lithuanian patriot who defended the national rights of his people. In 1976, all three men took their government at its word and joined the Helsinki monitoring group, working to actualize the final act. They will receive their reward for their humanitarian activities this week when they stand for sentencing before a Soviet judge. Simple human decency should move us to speak out in their defense.

### PRESIDENT'S INTEGRITY QUESTIONED

There are even more serious aspects to these cases to consider, however. Anatoly Shcharansky is accused of working for the CIA and is on trial for treason. The evidence of his alleged treason is giving a Western newsman reports on para-psychology. For this Anatoly Shcharansky faces death. In an unprecedented move, the President of the United States publicly assured the Soviet Union and the world that Mr. Shcharansky is not an agent of the CIA. Putting this man on trial after such assurances is a deliberate insult to the integrity of the President and of our nation.

### SOVIET VIOLATIONS SET DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

Further, the trial of any Helsinki monitor, whether in Moscow or Kiev or Vilnius is a deliberate and brazen violation of the Helsinki Agreement. Surely it must have occurred to Secretary Vance that if the Soviet Union can violate the Helsinki Agreement so openly, and shamelessly place on trial people of such high character as the Helsinki monitors, it can violate any other agreement it enters into just as shamelessly, if not as openly. Were this to happen after we sign a SALT agreement, the result for our country would be catastrophic. For if the Soviet Union can be cruel enough to attack people for daring to insist on compliance with its government's agreements, it can just as easily attack the United States if we foolishly enter agreements without adequately insuring their adherence. We must insist on Soviet compliance with any and all agreements it enters into with us, not simply because that is the honorable and just course of action, but because it is the only safe course of action.

### NO SOVIET INTENTION TO COMPLY

Today's trials and the whole history of Soviet harrassment, arrest and convictions of other Helsinki monitoring group members, indicate a total lack of intention on the part of the Soviet Union to implement the Agreement they introduced and signed with so much acclaim. Harsh actions directed against the Charter 77 Group in Czechoslovakia and the workers group in Poland indicate that the territories occupied by the Soviets after World War II are still repressed as before.

### OTHER PROVISIONS VIOLATED

Other provisions of the Helsinki Agreement besides the human rights sections are violated just as flagrantly. American and Western publications are not readily available in Eastern Europe as agreed. Western tourists are still subjected to rigorous, at times humiliating, searches by Soviet authorities. Family reunification remains an unrealized phrase in most of the countries of Eastern Europe. Recently, Soviet military authorities conducted maneuvers in Ukraine without permitting Western observers, as provided by the Helsinki Agreement.

### VARIOUS EFFORTS TO ENCOURAGE COMPLIANCE

In the last year and a half as a member of the Helsinki Commission, I have attended numerous meetings and met with various individuals, and each time, I have heard similar accounts of Soviet efforts designed to frustrate the implementation of the provisions of the Helsinki Agreement. I have introduced several Congressional resolutions and amendments intended to encourage Soviet compliance with the final act. I even went to Belgrade to convey personally to the Soviet Ambassador the high hopes Americans have for the realization of the ideals spelled out in the Agreement. At each point, I was forced to express the dismay and disappointment of Americans at the lack of progress or even signs of good will on the part of the Soviets with respect to the Helsinki Agreement. As recently as yesterday I introduced a resolution to encourage Soviet compliance.

### GOOD FAITH GESTURES NEEDED

With more trials of Helsinki monitors now in progress or in readiness, the United States should begin to seriously question whether we can tolerate continued violations of the final act without demanding some genuine compliance or taking some concrete actions of our own. I suggest that the first act of good faith on the part of the Soviet Union be the release of those twelve Helsinki monitors sentenced for their offers to aid the Soviet government in its compliance with the Agreement. Actions against the five monitoring members now in custody and awaiting trial should be dropped. Those on trial today, of course, must be acquitted, the harrassment and punishment of individuals who volunteered to help the Soviet Union meet its international obligations is an affront to us and an insult to the whole Helsinki process. Similar good faith efforts to meet Helsinki Agreement obligations must be initiated in other Eastern European countries, as well.

### RESPONSE TO SOVIET VIOLATIONS

Failure to meet obligations should be answered by a refusal on our part to aid the Soviet Union in those areas of its economy, such as advanced technology, where it is obviously inferior to our own. Continued harrassment of scientists should be answered by our refusal to subsidize scientific exchange that is likely to benefit the Soviet Union. Minority republics, such as Georgia, Lithuania, and Ukraine, should be invited to participate in the Madrid follow-up conference to discuss directly the repressions against their citizens. Negotiations such as SALT which directly involve the security of our country should be postponed until the Soviet Governemnt indicates it can keep its word. In short, we must take some action to make the final act more than an impressive, but meaningless piece of paper.

### REEVALUATE HELSINKI

Finally, should there be no positive responses to our calls for Soviet compliance with the Helsinki Agreement, we should explore the possibility of reluctantly rejecting the Helsinki Agreement as a failed document that was not pursued by the Soviet Union with good faith implementation efforts. Since we have not seen any steps taken on the part of the Soviet Union to either humanize or decentralize their system, we should no longer be obligated by it. We should be prepared to withdraw our recognition of the post-World War II boundaries and political systems gained through forceful means until such time as the Soviet Union stops frustrating the efforts of its citizens to implement the Agreement.

### GENUINE COMPLIANCE ESSENTIAL

The Helsinki Agreement has been beneficial in providing the framework for a workable world, given today's geopolitical realities. It must be greeted by all sides with a spirit of good will. If it was worth signing, it is worth adhering to. To insure genuine meaning for the document, however, we must insist on genuine compliance. Any other course would be dishonest, immoral and, in the long run, dangerous.