

# ON SPEAKING TERMS



An unprecedented  
Human Rights Mission  
to the Soviet Union



**International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights**

Rummelhardtgasse 2/18 A-1090 Vienna Austria

**ON SPEAKING TERMS**

**An Unprecedented Human Rights Mission  
to the Soviet Union**

**(January 25 - 31, 1988)**

**International Helsinki Federation  
for Human Rights**

**A-1090 Vienna, Rummelhardtgasse 2/18**

The International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights is a non-governmental organization that seeks to promote compliance of the signatory states with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Final Act. Its Chairman is Karl Johannes von Schwarzenberg; its Executive Director is Gerald Nagler; its Assistant Director is Hester Minnema.

The IHF represents national Helsinki human rights committees in Austria (Prof. Anton Pelinka), Canada (Irwin Cotler and David Matas), Denmark (Erik Siesby), the Federal Republic of Germany (Annemarie Renger), Great Britain (Lord Avebury), Italy (Antonio Stango), the Netherlands (Max van der Stoel), Norway (Stein Ivar Aarsaether), Sweden (Lennart Groll), Switzerland (Dr. Rudolf Friedrich) and the United States (Jeri Laber), USSR (Lev Timofeyev), Yugoslavia (Drago Demsar, Tanya Petovar, Vladimir Seks).

Copies available from:

The International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights  
Rummelhardtgasse 2/18  
A-1090 Vienna

(c) 1988 by the International Helsinki  
Federation for Human Rights  
All rights reserved  
Printed in Austria

MEMBERS OF THE IHF DELEGATION TO MOSCOW

Head of delegation: Karl Johannes von Schwarzenberg, Chairman of the IHF

Austria:

Dr. Peter Jankowitsch, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Member of Parliament, member of Austrian Helsinki Committee, Chairman of Socialist International Human Rights Committee.

Dr. Theresa von Schwarzenberg, physician.

Canada:

Prof. Irwin Cotler, Professor of International Law, Chairman of the Canadian Helsinki Committee.

Denmark:

Prof. Ben Mottelson, Nobel Prize Laureate in Physics.

Prof. Erik Siesby, Professor of International Private Law, Chairman of the Danish Helsinki Committee.

Prof. Ole Espersen (until January 28): Professor of Law, Member of Parliament, former Minister of Justice, member of Danish Helsinki Committee.

Bjorn Elmquist (from January 28): Member of Parliament, Council of Europe, member of Danish Helsinki Committee.

Federal Republic of Germany:

Wolfgang Gaebler, Chief of Scientific Department of the Parliament, Board member of the West-German Helsinki Committee.

Netherlands:

Max van der Stoep, Member of the Council of State, former Minister of Foreign Affairs, Board member of the Dutch Helsinki Committee.

Norway:

Reiulf Steen, President of the Norwegian Parliament, member of the Norwegian Helsinki Committee.

Sweden:

Prof. Frantisek Janouch, Professor of Physics, member of the Swedish Helsinki Committee.

Switzerland:

Dr. Rudolf Friedrich, Former Minister of Justice, Chairman of the Swiss Helsinki Committee.

Dr. Peter Sager, Member of Parliament, Chairman of the Committee on Relation with European non-member countries of the Council of Europe.

Rev. Eugen Voss, head of the Swiss institute Faith in the Second World, expert on the Swiss CSCE delegation, board member of the Swiss Helsinki Committee.



Unites States of America:

Robert Bernstein, Chairman of US Helsinki Watch, President of Random House Publishers.

Jeri Laber, Executive Director of US Helsinki Watch.

International Helsinki Federation:

Gerald Nagler, Executive Director.

Staff:

Cathy Fitzpatrick, Research Director of US Helsinki Watch.

Björn Cato Funnemark, Secretary of Norwegian Helsinki Committee.

Sally Laird, British journalist.

Hester Minnema, Assistant Director of International Helsinki Federation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface ..... 1  
Independent Groups in Moscow ..... 5  
Human Rights Monitoring ..... 7  
New Soviet Public Human Rights Commission .....11  
Political Prisoners .....19  
Psychiatry.....25  
Legislative Changes .....29  
Perestroika and Religion.....35  
Emigration and Travel.....39  
Discussion at the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.....41  
Moscow Conference .....45  
Meeting with Press Agency Novosti.....49  
Apendices.....53

The IHF visit to Moscow and the preparation of this report were made possible thanks to the support of:

Carnegie Corporation of New York  
European Cultural Foundation  
Central and East European Publishing Project  
Commission of the European Communities  
Foreign Ministry of the Netherlands  
Mercedes Corporation  
Ploughshares Fund, New York  
The Aaron Diamond Foundation, San Francisco  
Foreign Ministry of Norway  
Norwegian Mission behind the Iron Curtain  
Norwegian Committee on Soviet Jewry  
National Helsinki Committees  
Individual participants

## PREFACE

The idea for a Moscow visit first arose in the spring of 1987. New developments in the Soviet Union seemed to have created an opportunity to improve relations between East and West, and to establish contacts between governmental and non-governmental institutions. The period of glasnost introduced by Secretary General Mikhail Gorbachev indicated a willingness within the Soviet Union to move towards a more open society where a constructive dialogue between official and non-official institutions may be possible.

Taking advantage of this new spirit, the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (IHF) thought the moment was right to establish contacts in Moscow which had previously not been possible. The trip would combine three purposes: establishing a dialogue; fact-finding; and reporting to the CSCE Conference in Vienna, the press, and our governments about the present situation in the Soviet Union.

The IHF first proposed the trip to the Soviet Ambassador to the CSCE Conference in Vienna, Mr. Yuri B. Kashlev. At the same time the IHF sent letters to various Soviet institutions with which the IHF wanted to meet in particular.

The IHF formed a high-level delegation consisting of eighteen parliamentarians, scientists, professors of law, and professional human rights activists from 10 different countries. Four staff members were added to the delegation.

After three months Soviet authorities informed the IHF it was welcome to come to Moscow. Ambassador Kashlev announced at a press conference on September 22, 1987, that in the spirit of glasnost, the IHF, an organization which had been critical of the Soviet Union, was invited to come to Moscow to discuss human rights issues. As the International Herald Tribune and other newspapers reported, the visit was to be the first of its kind.

It required another four months before the trip could finally take place. In the meantime, the IHF started corresponding with the official host of the delegation, the Soviet Commission on European Security and Cooperation (CSCE), headed by Mr. Lev Tolkunov. In its letters, the IHF clearly indicated the officials it sought to meet and expressed its firm intention to carry out a separate, unofficial program during the evenings and over the weekend.

In general, the requests of the delegation were met, and with one exception, no efforts were made to hinder contacts with independent groups and individuals.

At the official level, meetings were held with:

Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Anatoly L. Adamishin;  
First Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs Leonid G. Sizov;  
Deputy Minister of Health Oleg Shchepin;  
Minister of Justice Boris Kravtsov;  
Head of the Administration of Visas and Registration (UVIR),  
Rudolf Kuznetsov;  
Director of the Serbsky All-Union Institute, Dr. Georgy  
Morozov;  
Chairman of the USSR Council for Religious Affairs Konstantin  
Kharchev;  
Acting President of the USSR Academy of Sciences Academician  
V.A. Kotelnikov;  
Deputy Chairman of the Soviet Committee for European Security  
and Cooperation Evgeni K. Silin;  
Chairman of the Social Commission for International  
Cooperation on Humanitarian Issues and Human Rights Professor  
Fyodor M. Burlatsky;  
Director of the Institute of State and Law of the USSR  
Academy of Sciences Prof. Kudryavstev;  
Chairman of the Board of the Novosti Press Agency Valentin M.  
Falin.

Meetings had also been requested with one or more members of the Politburo, but these were not granted and no explanations for the denial were provided. The same was true of the IHF's requests to meet with the Chairman of the KGB, Marshal Viktor Chebrikov, and the Procurator General of the USSR, Aleksander Rekunkov.

One other very important request of the delegation was not fulfilled. This was the request to meet with the Helsinki monitors who are still imprisoned in Perm labor camp. The request was originally denied on the grounds that the Perm area is closed to foreigners, but when the IHF offered an alternative - transferring the prisoners temporarily to a Moscow prison in order to meet with the delegation - this was not taken very seriously.

When the IHF raised the issue again in Moscow with the Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs in charge of penitentiaries, he seemed never to have heard of our request, and by that time it was too late to arrange such a meeting within one week's time. The IHF has followed up on this request by asking the Soviet authorities to make it possible for the Soviet affiliate of the IHF, Press Club Glasnost, to visit the Helsinki monitors instead. Since the Perm area is closed only to foreigners, this should not cause any problem from a legal standpoint.

Press Club Glasnost, a member committee of the IHF since October, played a crucial role in the visit of the IHF delegation. None of their members was included in the delegation, since at the time the delegation was formed Press Club Glasnost had not yet been adopted as a member of the IHF. Nevertheless, for the IHF it was of crucial importance that the members of Press Club Glasnost be treated like any other member of the IHF and that they be given the possibility to present their cause to Mr. Burlatsky's Commission. Until then, efforts by Press Club Glasnost to establish contacts with the Soviet authorities had not been successful.

In this respect a highlight of the trip was the meeting which took place between the IHF delegation and the newly established Soviet Public Commission for International Cooperation on Humanitarian Affairs headed by Fyodor Burlatsky, commentator for Literaturnaya Gazeta, and close adviser to Mikhail Gorbachev. For the first time a public debate among Soviet representatives, Western human rights activists and Soviet human rights activists took place in the Soviet Union, in the presence of both Soviet and international press. As Mr. Burlatsky himself described the event afterwards: "I would call it historic, for the simple reason that we have made a first step from confrontation towards cooperation." (See separate chapter about this meeting.)

Now that this first step towards a constructive dialogue has been made, following up on it is essential. Therefore, the IHF intends to send smaller, specialized delegations to the Soviet Union in the future to continue the discussion begun in January. During these visits the IHF will also try to visit other regions of the Soviet Union to investigate more closely the position and rights of the various nationalities.

In addition, the IHF has invited Professor Burlatsky and his Commission to visit the IHF in Vienna or any of its national Helsinki committees.

The report which follows comprises eleven chapters written by various individual members of the delegation.

Karl Johannes von Schwarzenberg  
Gerald Nagler

## INDEPENDENT GROUPS IN MOSCOW

The IHF had specifically requested that the evenings be kept free to allow time to meet with independent human rights organizations, editors of independent publications and members of clubs. In addition to Press Club Glasnost, the IHF delegation met with members of a variety of groups and clubs including the editors of Glasnost magazine, Friendship and Dialogue, the Moscow Group to Establish Trust between East and West, Civil Dignity, the Club for Social Initiative, Memorial, Perestroika '88, Freedom of Emigration for Everyone, Democracy and Humanism, and SMOT, the free trade-union group. Delegates also met with Russian Orthodox, Pentecostal, Baptist, Catholic, Jewish refusenik groups such as The Legal Seminar and The Poor Relatives, and Hare Krishna religious activists as well as with representatives of the Crimean Tatar, Lithuanian, and Ukrainian nationalist movements. Last but not least, the IHF delegation met extensively with academician Andrei Sakharov.

Dozens of Soviet citizens who had heard about the IHF through word of mouth and foreign radio broadcasts - some of them travelling thousands of miles across the USSR to Moscow deluged the hotel where the delegation was staying with visits, phone calls, and appeals. Jewish refuseniks and Hare Krishna devotees staged demonstrations near the buildings where the IHF met with Soviet officials. At every opportunity the IHF made the point to officials that the Soviet government must listen to its own people, who were obviously clamoring for justice outside the doors of various bureaucratic agencies which are apparently indifferent or ineffective in dealing with individual or group complaints.

The enormous number of groups that have formed over the last year has put the Soviet authorities in a difficult situation. For centuries, dating from long before the Communist regime, the country has not had a legal framework through which to offer independent groups a place in society. On the other hand, the present leadership has shown a willingness to be more lenient towards activities initiated outside Party control as long as they do not challenge "the leading role of the Party", but most groups are only tolerated, without receiving any official recognition. As a result, they have no access to paper supplies, photocopy machines, or conference rooms. In some cases, their petitions to Soviet officials go unanswered, and efforts to enter into a dialogue with the authorities are rebuffed. However, according to recent reports, an unpublished draft law on the registration of independent groups is currently being unofficially circulated; it allegedly contains provisions which in effect will lead to the maintenance of control over the groups' activities.

So far, in an attempt to deal with the expansive growth of independent activity, the Soviet authorities have tried to give semi-independent, or rather semi-official, institutions a monopoly position in their particular field, such as the Public Human Rights Commission of Prof. Burlatsky which is attached to the Soviet Commission on European Security and Cooperation, which in turn is part of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (see separate chapter). These Public Commissions are often composed of individuals with independent opinions, yet their existence is dependent on approval from above. It is very interesting to see how in this way a kind of "grey area" has developed, whereby the division between loyal Party officials and dissidents is no longer as clear as it used to be.

In the meantime, Soviet citizens continue to struggle to be heard by their own authorities. Important steps are being taken to achieve this, but a key issue will remain the possibility (or presently the lack of possibilities) for groups not officially approved to register and to obtain legal recognition. At this point, registration seems to be feasible only for those groups which find an officially recognized organization to sponsor them. This, in practice, implies an influence from that sponsor on policy matters of the group. Some activists, like Glasnost publisher Sergei Grigoryants, do not care to register their groups at all.

A separate report on the activities of independent clubs in the Soviet Union is being prepared by the US Helsinki Watch. The following chapter deals with those groups which specifically monitor human rights.

Catherine A. Fitzpatrick  
Hester Minnema



## HUMAN RIGHTS MONITORING IN THE USSR

At the time of our visit to the Soviet Union, there were 13 Helsinki monitors in prison or labor camp. The International Helsinki Federation had requested, in advance of the trip, permission to visit the monitors in Perm Camp 36-1, but was informed that a visit was out of the question because Perm was off-limits to foreigners. At about that time, Perm 36-1 was reportedly closed and the monitors were moved to Perm 35.

Once in Moscow, the IHF continued its efforts to see the monitors, but Soviet officials made it clear that there would be no change in their policy. We then asked that the prisoners be temporarily transferred to a prison in the Moscow region for the express purpose of meeting with us, but this suggestion did not appear to receive any serious consideration. This aspect of the mission was severely disappointing.

On the other hand, it was most impressive to learn about the formation of many independent organizations in the USSR, at least a few of which are continuing the tradition of monitoring the human rights practices of the government. Chief among the monitoring groups are Press Club Glasnost, headed by Lev Timofeyev, and the group that publishes Glasnost magazine, headed by Sergei Grigoryants. Timofeyev's group is continuing the traditions of the Moscow Helsinki Group and sees itself as an umbrella group linking a variety of organizations concerned with monitoring human rights and the development of civil society in the USSR. Grigoryant's circle, in addition to publishing the magazine, conducts case work with individuals who now come with their complaints to the editorial office he has established outside Moscow. The work of both groups is necessary and they are very effective.

We were also distressed to witness several instances of police harassment of independent groups. The first such instance occurred during a meeting between the IHF delegation and Press Club Glasnost at Lev Timofeyev's apartment. During the course of the meeting it was made clear to the participants that the entire proceedings were being taped and could be heard from a car that was parked in front of the apartment house. As if this were not enough, the meeting was also interrupted by a telephone call from the police, who threatened Timofeyev in the presence of his guests.

Another instance of harassment occurred in the presence of two of the IHF delegation members, on their very last evening in Moscow, after the other members of the IHF group had already left for home. It is not clear whether the incident took place because of the presence of the IHF members, or whether the authorities were unaware that they were witnessing it. It occurred at a meeting sponsored by a group called Democracy and Humanism, to which a number of representatives of other groups had come in order to exchange information about their various activities. Despite the fact that the meeting was held in a private apartment, it was raided by the police, who took down information about all of the more than 50 participants. At least five were taken away to the police station, where they were briefly detained. These incidents clearly have a chilling effect on citizens who might be tempted to join some of the new groups. As long as the police behave in this fashion, freedom of association and assembly will remain severely limited in the USSR and the courage and determination of those who have formed new groups seems all the more remarkable.

One of the most important accomplishments of the IHF's week in Moscow took place during a four-and-a-half-hour seminar hosted by the Public Commission for International Cooperation on Humanitarian Affairs and Human Rights, a newly established human rights organization that has the official approval of the Soviet government. The IHF delegation, after serious deliberation, decided to bring with it to the seminar three members of Press Club Glasnost, which had become an affiliate of the IHF in October 1987. Their presence was clearly not welcomed by our Soviet hosts, who did whatever they could to keep them from addressing the meeting. They were unsuccessful in the end, and Lev Timofeyev was able to address the seminar and to present a list of political prisoners to the Public Commission's chairman, Professor Fyodor Burlatsky. The event was covered by the Soviet and Western press, and the result was to give Press Club Glasnost some of the official recognition that it has been lacking and so very much deserves. (See chapter on "New Soviet Public Human Rights Commission.")

At the same time, members of the IHF group were able to keep communications open with Professor Burlatsky. A number of the delegation members had separate meetings with him and discussed the Public Commission's plans for the future and ways in which we can keep in touch with the group and make our concerns known. At these meetings, Prof. Burlatsky was urged to make contact with Press Club Glasnost and with the many other groups that are now operating as well. It was pointed out that the Soviet Union cannot have only one human rights organization and that it was an important part of his Commission's work to provide protection and recognition to other groups in the Soviet Union, including groups that may not share his own Commission's views.

During the week in Moscow there was ample opportunity for meetings between the IHF members and members of Press Club Glasnost and of the Glasnost magazine editorial board. They were able to discuss their plans for the future and ways in which their Western friends can cooperate and assist them in their future activities. This was one of the most productive aspects of the visit.

Jeri Laber

## NEW SOVIET PUBLIC HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

In early December last year, a new officially sponsored Public Commission for International Cooperation on Humanitarian Issues and Human Rights was formed under the aegis of the Soviet Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Soviet CSCE). It is chaired by Fyodor Burlatsky, head of the Philosophy Department of the Communist Party's Central Committee Institute of Social Sciences. Prof. Burlatsky is a prominent publicist and playwright who was formerly a speech-writer for Khrushchev and is reportedly close to Gorbachev. About 35 other prominent members of the Soviet establishment have joined the Commission, including lawyer Veniamin Yakovlev, director of the All-Union Institute of Soviet Law; writers Ales Adamovich and Grigory Baklanov; Academician Boris Rauschenbach; L. Novak, head of the Central Committee of the Medical Workers' Trade Union; V. Ignatenko, editor-in-chief of Novoye Vremya, and others.

There have been contradictory statements from the Commission representatives and the Soviet press as to the extent to which the Commission will work on domestic Soviet civil and political rights problems. Prof. Burlatsky has been quoted in the Soviet media as receiving numerous letters and appeals from Soviet citizens but has said his Commission cannot deal with individual cases because it has no staff. The Commission plans to meet once a month for three hours to discuss human rights issues, in addition to holding a series of public round-table discussions and open forums. The Commission's first public event was a meeting with foreign human rights activists and religious leaders in the Netherlands in January; its second open meeting took place with the International Helsinki Federation in Moscow.

When the IHF met on January 26 with the Soviet CSCE, which sponsors the Burlatsky Commission, it asked permission to bring representatives of the IHF affiliate Press Club Glasnost to the meeting with the Commission the following day. CSCE officials responded that the meeting would be open to the public and that anyone who wanted to could sit in the audience. They said that they were not familiar with Press Club Glasnost and had to check whether it was registered with the Moscow City Council. On January 27, despite efforts by CSCE officials to prevent Press Club Glasnost members from boarding a bus with the IHF delegation and then from sitting at the meeting table, Prof. Burlatsky finally decided to allow three Press Club Glasnost representatives, Lev Timofeyev, Larissa Bogoraz, and Sergei Kovalyov, to be seated at the conference table.

Before that, as the delegation arrived at the meeting place, a demonstration by Hare Krishna devotees was taking place outside the building. Plainclothes agents tried to tear away their placards and obstruct the press from filming the demonstration. Some 15 to 20 journalists, including T.V. crews, also attended the meeting. About 50 Soviet citizens were in the audience, mainly Jewish refuseniks, Hare Krishna devotees, and members of some informal clubs. After several tense exchanges during the five-hour meeting, behind-the-scenes threats from the CSCE to cancel the rest of the IHF's program, and urgent pleas by the IHF to allow Press Club Glasnost coordinator Lev Timofeyev to have the floor, Prof. Burlatsky relented and Mr. Timofeyev was allowed to speak. He gave an eloquent speech on the importance of establishing independent public opinion in the Soviet Union and freeing the remaining political prisoners, and submitted to the Commission a list of prisoners and a 50-page document that contained a summary of the final statement generated from his group's December Human Rights Seminar.

The following is an excerpt from the meeting:

Prof. Espersen (Denmark): I feel a striking sense of glasnost in this room. We have had a period of confrontation and hope that now a period of cooperation will follow. However, behind me is sitting a 72-year-old lady who has tried for many years to join her son in Denmark. You may think that the Western press writes too much about individual cases, but I believe that human rights issues can be best illustrated by the fate of human individuals. (...) One final advice I would like to give your Commission. Make sure that you will have a staff. This is of crucial importance. Otherwise it will be very difficult to deal with all the problems you are facing.

Mr. van der Stoel (The Netherlands): Mr. Burlatsky mentioned the Washington summit. We have seen with pleasure that American inspectors are allowed to visit missile factories and vice versa. Giant steps have been made forward in arms control. But don't we lag behind in the human rights field? We have all committed ourselves in the Helsinki Final Act. But what about verification? Mr. Burlatsky mentioned himself in December that cooperation in the humanitarian field should accompany cooperation in the political and military realm. (...)

On the issue of political prisoners: According to our lists, 329 were released in 1987. Yet, 360 known prisoners are still behind bars, including 13 Helsinki monitors. Will your Commission, in the spirit of the new developments, plead for their early release?

Prof. Burlatsky (Soviet Union): At present you have the possibility of engaging in monitoring. You meet with people at a high level. We can use your advice for our organization. If we come to your country, we hope to visit your Ministers as well. We should start cooperation on the basis of mutual control. And we are ready to facilitate your work in Moscow.

(...)

Prof. Krutogolov (Soviet Union): Ten years ago we in the Soviet Union focused excessively on social and economic rights. This was exaggerated. The West focused too much on political rights. Now we are speaking the same language. If we talk about human rights we talk about all human rights, on an equal footing. If one right is being violated, all rights are. The right to emigrate, the rights of political prisoners are essential. But 99% of the population in the Soviet Union have a different concept. For them the right to emigrate or to demonstrate on Red Square is not the most essential. Essential is that the militia does not raid your home, that there are sufficient apartments, etc.

We will solve the right to emigrate, that is imperative; we will also solve the problem of political rights. But for Ivan Ivanovich living 5,000 miles from Moscow, it is essential to have his basic rights protected.

My colleague Nazarov works for the militia academy. They have established a new chair for human rights. That is the most essential: they teach human rights to the man on the spot. In many aspects our country is lagging behind in the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act. It is therefore imperative to change the law. It would, however, be naive to think that we will solve all our problems by changing the legislation. Priority should be the implementation of legislation. Institutions should be established to guarantee the absence of violations of human rights. So our attention goes therefore to human rights mechanisms in other countries, such as the Ombudsman in Scandinavian countries and the Protecteur des Citoyens in Canada. A key interest are our efforts for constitutional verification of individual rights.

Prof. Irwin Cotler (Canada): I totally agree with your remarks on implementation. You also have the task of monitoring human rights in our countries. May I give you three recommendations:

1. Work for the betterment of emigration legislation, in order to facilitate rather than impede emigration.
2. Facilitate access to decision-making bodies.

3. Involve organizations like Press Club Glasnost in your work and help them to become registered as independent organizations. The representatives of Press Club Glasnost themselves are the most appropriate to discuss these matters, and therefore I would like to give Lev Timofeyev the floor.

Prof. Burlatsky : What are we up to? What do we want? A scandal, a confrontation? A show? I did not mind the presence of all those who wanted to come. But this is an open meeting of the delegates of the Helsinki Federation and our Soviet Human Rights Commission, and not a meeting with all organizations existing in Moscow. It is our prerogative to meet with those whom we invite. This is a meeting of the Commission and allow me to kindly request that you follow our procedure.

Now about the questions put forward by Prof. Cotler. None of the members of the Commission is against reunification of families. On the contrary, we are placing these problems here for discussion. I believe that our government will manifest due attention to these issues. We support the idea of new legislation to regulate the activities of non-formal organizations.

About Press Club Glasnost: We do not know this group. We do not know their purpose, tasks, methods, or platform. We have a right to get to know such a group. I cannot pledge that we will cooperate with all groups. I will not, for instance, cooperate with Pamyat. In addition, this is not by any standards the best place to solve this problem. My Commission is not fully prepared for it.

Prof. Burlatsky gives the floor to Mr. Krylov, who diverts the discussion to activities of the Commission.

Mr. von Schwarzenberg (Austria): You asked me if I wanted to have a show, a scandal. My answer is "no". Under other circumstances I would have probably taken your remark as an insult. As a rule I am the most discreet person in the world. For our part we are glad to hear different voices: from our delegation, and from the Soviet Union here, and I would like to give anybody the opportunity to speak. Concerning Press Club Glasnost: We know the members of the Press Club. They are very knowledgeable and sincere persons, who have suffered a lot.

Prof. Burlatsky gives the floor to Mr. Nazarov (Soviet Union), at which point Ms. Jeri Laber (United States) makes a point of order.

Ms. Jeri Laber: I believe our chairman has made a request for Press Club Glasnost to make a short presentation of their activities. They are a member of our organization and they are part of us. I must say that I am surprised to hear that you do not know them. Last month they organized a seminar which was discussed in the press all over the world. But if you indeed do not know them then I believe that this is an excellent opportunity to become acquainted with them.

Prof. Burlatsky: I can honestly tell you that I do not know those people. What do they represent? If you had told me before, they could have introduced themselves and their cause. We are willing to get to know this group in a separate meeting in order to see whether there is a common basis for cooperation. You have presented us with a list of your delegation and they were not on it. It is not exactly polite to settle the matter by force.

Mr. Bernstein (United States): Press Club Glasnost was adopted into the IHF after our request to visit Moscow had been made. We are very happy that you allowed them to sit here at the table. Frankly, I am baffled. It seems to me that they are not just any group. They are a member of our organization. Why is it such a big matter, now that they already are here at the table? They will speak responsibly; I have heard them speak at other meetings and you will be proud of them. They have a very long record in human rights work and those here from our countries would like to hear what they have to say.

Prof. Burlatsky: I will give the floor to the representative of this group, Press Club Glasnost. But I tell you that this is not the appropriate moment. It is like forcing a bride on us in a marriage we do not want. It is not polite.

Prof. Yakovlev (Soviet Union): We received guests and want to hear the guests. My advice is to observe procedures of normal human relations. Let us follow previously agreed principles. The quintessence is cooperation. We should all be polite and tactful.

Mr. von Schwarzenberg: We politely ask you to give Mr. Timofeyev a chance to speak.

Prof. Burlatsky: If you don't mind I will give Timofeyev the floor. I do not think that this will be such a calamity. Since I have spent some time in China, I would like to quote Mao Zedong. The sky will remain clear, the birds will go on flying, the fish will keep swimming in the river, if Timofeyev speaks.



Mr. von Schwarzenberg: We politely ask you and we will be very grateful if you could give Mr. Timofeyev the floor.

Prof. Burlatsky: Well, let the cameras roll - everyone on Timofeyev!

Mr. Timofeyev: It was not my original intention to be the first to speak on behalf of Press Club Glasnost. I thought other members deserve more attention, as having more seniority, like Larissa Bogoraz. Mr. Burlatsky was not sure how to address me: either as "comrade" (as used here in the Soviet Union) or with the Western word "Mr...". Therefore, he addressed me only by my last name "Timofeyev." I am already used to that from my experience in labor camp.

My colleagues and I came here with friendly feelings. We want to tell you what other colleagues monitoring human rights think. These groups have been in existence ever since the Helsinki Accords were signed. Human rights monitoring is developing into a nation-wide movement. It is not my intention to go into details here, but if we see each other another time, we can talk about the people in the camps who were guilty of saying nothing more than your distinguished professors are saying here now. But the times were different then. I would like to use this opportunity to present to you a list of political prisoners, which Mr. Gorbachev also received last week when he met with the Fund for Human Survival. The list has also been published in our magazine Referendum. (...)

We experience regret over the reception we had here as Press Club Glasnost. We regret it because our task should be to recapture a common definition of words like "freedom," "rights," "love," and others expressing human values. Without a common ground, freedom and disarmament will not be possible.

Mr. Timofeyev then described the Seminar organized by Press Club Glasnost last December. He also stated that an invitation was sent to Burlatsky's Commission, but that they never received a reply.

Prof. Burlatsky: Sorry, I was not in Moscow at that time.

Mr. Timofeyev: Our Seminar was different from others because it worked on a comprehensive program. We had 11 sections. In spite of threats, 400 people participated. We adopted a resolution, which I will hand over to you, hoping that you will understand what independent activities are.

After Mr. Timofeyev's speech, the meeting continued for another hour in which opinions are exchanged on various topics. When the meeting breaks up, Hare Krishna devotees in the audience distributed home-made sweets to all present, including the Commission members and two men in the audience who were identified by some as KGB officers.

Ms. Larissa Bogoraz approached Prof. Burlatsky and offered him the cooperation of Press Club Glasnost, suggesting that her group's research and resources can be very useful for the enormous task faced by the Commission. Prof. Burlatsky and some of the Commission members accepted a 50-page report on the December seminar of Press Club Glasnost and a list of political prisoners and showed willingness to look into the cases involved.

Catherine A. Fitzpatrick  
Hester Minnema

## POLITICAL PRISONERS IN THE USSR

At the time of our trip, we had documented the early release of 329 political prisoners. Approximately 360 known political prisoners remained in prison. As of February 15, 1988, the number of reported releases rose to 335 but the number of remaining political prisoners is still estimated at 360. Some new arrests were reported, mainly of Jehovah's Witnesses who refuse to serve in the army, and some persons were mistakenly reported to have been released. We caution that these numbers reflect the known, documented cases. There may be many more cases that remain unreported. Human rights activists in Moscow have recently estimated the total number of political prisoners to be several thousand more than the known cases. During our trip we had the opportunity to check our list of persons imprisoned for political reasons in psychiatric hospitals with reliable independent human rights monitors. They added approximately 40 new cases to the list, and we are now checking these cases with Western monitoring groups to see if they can be added to our lists. (There was not enough time to obtain corrections to the entire list of political prisoners but we hope that these will be sent out separately.)

The list of prisoners prepared by Dr. Cronid Lubarsky, a well-known Soviet emigré scientist, is the most reliable in the field. His list currently has approximately 370 names; about 24 of them are not included in our lists because the individuals involved have used or advocated violence. Complete copies of Dr. Lubarsky's list in Russian or English were submitted to the following Soviet officials and human rights activists: Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs (MVD) Leonid Sizov; Minister of Justice Boris Kravtsov; Fyodor Burlatsky, Chairman of the Public Commission on Human Rights; Andrei Sakharov; Lev Timofeyev; Sergei Grigoryants; Kiril Popov.

Prior to our trip, a copy of our December 1987 political prisoners report was submitted by Jeri Laber to Fyodor Burlatsky of the Public Commission on Human Rights while he was in Washington, D.C. He promised to hand it over to Soviet government officials and said that he had done so when we met with him in Moscow. In a private conversation, he estimated that about 75 religious believers would be released (approximately half of our list).

Copies of the complete IHF January 1988 political prisoners' report and lists of prisoners (divided into categories), as well as the summarized report and responses to Soviet Procurator Rakhmanin's letter to the editor of the The New York Times concerning Perm Labor Camp no. 36-1 (\*) were submitted to the following Soviet officials: Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs Sizov; Minister of Justice Kravtsov; Deputy of Foreign Affairs Ministry (MID) Adamishin; Mr. Kudryavtsev, Director of the Institute of State and Law; Fyodor Burlatsky, Chairman of the Public Commission on Human Rights; Dr. Georgy Morozov, All-Union Institute of Psychiatry (together with a report on abuse of psychiatry); and Konstantin Kharchev, Chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs (together with a longer list of religious believers from Keston College). Copies of the summary only were given to the following: Deputy Chairman of CSCE Silin and his staff; staff members and lawyers of MVD, MID, Ministry of Justice, Institute of State and Law, Public Commission on Human Rights; Valentin Falin, Chairman of the Board of APN (Novosti); and translators. Copies of the full report and summary were also distributed widely to human rights activists including Andrei Sakharov, Lev Timofeyev, Sergei Grigoryants, and Kiril Popov.

All of the Soviet officials (with the notable exception of the those from the Ministry of Health and the Serbsky Institute) accepted the lists graciously and promised to verify them and get back to us. In each meeting and each time we actually submitted the lists, we urged Soviet officials to inform us about who remained imprisoned and who was released. We stressed that we wanted our information to be accurate since the press and our governments rely on us heavily. The IHF is now following up on the matter with some of the key individuals and asking for a response to the lists.

Political prisoners were discussed at the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Imprisoned religious believers in particular were discussed at the Council of Religious Affairs.

The response we received was the orthodox government position on political prisoners: "There are no political prisoners in the Soviet Union. We have no prisoners of conscience because we do not arrest people for what they believe, only for what they do and only for committing crimes."

(\*) This letter was the first definitive published reply by a Soviet official to Western allegations about political prisoners. It contained a number of false and misleading statements.

Authorities do acknowledge that there is a small group of people whom they call "state criminals" who are considered to have committed "especially dangerous crimes" against the government, such as treason (Art. 64) or "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" (Art. 70). When we asked if these were the people kept under strict- and special-regimen in the Mordovian and Perm labor camps, they seemed to concur. These camps are known as the "political" labor camps, as distinct from the labor camps for common criminals where political prisoners are also kept. Most of these persons are considered by us as "prisoners of conscience." Officials reported to us that there were currently 19 such cases. They explained that although General Secretary Gorbachev had said (during the summit) that there were 22 such cases, the list is growing smaller all the time. (One MVD official said: "Just yesterday someone was released and maybe tomorrow one more will be released." This statement was later corroborated by independent human rights monitors who informed us that Gurman Gogbaidze was to have been freed at the end of his term in February and Gundars Astra was released early on February 1.)

As a sign of improvement, officials announced that there was now only one camp ("colony" was the word they used) where such "state criminals" were being held because they had been transferred from Mordovian Labor Camp and Perm Labor Camp No. 36-1 to Perm 35. They described 36-1 as "closed." Their statements also indicated the category of people being counted by the government: persons sentenced under Art. 70 (and possibly Art. 64 as well) under both strict- and special-regimens in the specifically "political" labor camps of Perm and Mordovia.

Officials did not give us the January list of the 19 persons, but we can reconstruct a possible version of it using information from human rights monitors: Special Regimen in Perm Labor Camp 36-1 (transferred to 35): Gunnars Astra (released), Enn Tarto, Ivan Kandyba, Vasyl Ovsienko, Yevgeny Polishchuk, Hryhory Prikhodko (transferred into exile), Petro Ruban, Mykola Horbal, Ivan Sokulsky, Vitaly Kalynychenko, Mart Niklus; Strict-Regimen in Perm Labor Camp 35 and Mordovian Labor Camp (transferred to Perm): Hryhory Nichiporenko, Vitaly Shmelyov, Alfonsas Svarinskas, Mikhail Kukobaka, Vladimir Rusak, Gurman Gogbaidze (released?), Boris Mityashin, Sigitas Tamkevicius.

The IHF urges Soviet officials to release a list of the persons they consider state criminals so that we can understand whom they are counting.

We pointed out that the Supreme Soviet decrees and amnesty had freed more than 300 people, many charged under Arts. 190-1 and 70, and that we failed to understand why the remaining prisoners could not be freed. The amnesty included (by not specifically excluding) Arts. 227 and Art. 190-1, and that meant that dozens of remaining cases in the list could be resolved. We emphasized that since roughly half the prisoners had been released early, the job was only half done, and should be completed. We submitted our list of Art. 70 cases, which contains 61 prisoners, and asked if the government was only reporting on the Art. 70 cases in labor camp since there were also persons in exile and psychiatric hospital under Art. 70. No answer was supplied on this point.

When we asked to see trial transcripts and sentences of persons under special-regimen in Perm, we were told on one occasion that "information is not centralized" and on another that such information is not given out, "in accordance with national traditions." When we requested that the U.S. organization Physicians for Human Rights be allowed to visit Perm 35, the answer from the Ministry of Internal Affairs was that "the Ministry of Foreign Affairs handles visits from foreign groups" and that they could not decide on this. As for the IHF request to visit the Helsinki monitors in Perm, see the chapter "Human Rights Monitoring in the USSR."

We applauded the fact that, to our knowledge, no political arrests under Art. 70 or Art. 190-1 had occurred in the large cities since September 1986, and that arrests under religious Arts. 227 and 142 had decreased dramatically in the provinces. To our surprise, a Ministry of Justice official told us that during the first half of 1987 there were, in fact, two arrests under Art. 190-1 and one arrest under Art. 70. (We were aware of one Art. 70 arrest of a person who was not considered a prisoner of conscience but did not know of the Art. 190-1 cases.) We asked to receive the names of the persons arrested but the official declined to release them because, again, "information is not centralized." Human rights activists in Moscow were also surprised to hear of the two arrests.

Although much attention was given in the Western press to a Soviet announcement last November that the practice of exile was to be abolished, at the Institute of State and Law it was explained to us that this idea was a proposal for a law that had not yet been passed. Several Helsinki monitors who were first reported to have been freed from labor camp were in fact transferred into exile. Prisoners whose sentences were reduced under the amnesty did not have the exile part of their sentence removed entirely.

At the Council of Religious Affairs, Chairman Konstantin Kharchev was asked about his alleged promise that "all prisoners of conscience would be freed by November 7" (the 70th anniversary of the Revolution). He was indignant about this claim and explained that his remarks had been made in a private conversation and were afterwards misquoted in the Western press. Mr. Kharchev told us that he had referred to an amnesty for some persons whom the IHF considers prisoners of conscience (though he denied that there were any in the USSR), and that despite the press reports, these did not necessarily include religious believers. The people we believe to be in jail for their religious beliefs in fact had committed "crimes" unrelated to religious matters, he said. A professor employed as a researcher in the Council looked over our lists during the meeting and pointed out that many of the people were not even jailed under laws having to do with religious affairs (Art. 227 and Art. 142). Mr. Kharchev assured us that laws like Arts. 227 and 142 were being reviewed as part of an overall revision of the Criminal Code, but while they were on the books the authorities would go on using these articles to arrest people since "the law has to be observed."

Several times at different meetings we raised the death last December of Hare Krishna devotee Sirvas Ogadzhanyan in labor camp (see also the chapter "Perestroika and Religion"). An official document stating the cause of Mr. Ogadzhanyan's death was provided to the delegation at our request; this was the only concrete response about a specific case and the only written answer that we received concerning political prisoners or any other subject during the entire trip.

Catherine A. Fitzpatrick

## PSYCHIATRY

### Psychiatric Abuse

In the West, the political abuse of psychiatry in the Soviet Union has been known for many years. According to well-documented reports, political dissenters, members of religious groups and unofficial peace movements, even persons who have complained about illegal acts by officials, have been committed to psychiatric hospitals for unlimited periods and have been treated with painful doses of psychopharmaceuticals.

Members of the delegation, including one physician, had the opportunity to speak with numerous individual victims of psychiatric abuse. Some conclusions could be drawn from those conversations:

1. People undergo compulsory treatment without clinically well-defined diagnoses, or on the basis of odd or bizarre diagnoses. Diagnoses commonly used against political dissenters are "paranoia" and "sluggish schizophrenia," an ill-defined term that is easily misused.
2. Hospital food seems to be very unsatisfactory, which is especially serious for people confined to a vegetarian diet like the Hare Krishna devotees. Reportedly, some of them died in hospitals from malnutrition or were tortured because they refused to eat meat.
3. Most of the persons interviewed had been treated with drugs that have long been abolished in Western countries because of the risk of serious side effects, like Haloperidol (known in the West as Haldol) without accompanying anti-Parkinsonian medicine, insulin shocks in far too high a dosis, Sulfazine without corrective medicines, and Majeptil.
4. Very often, attempts to administer medication encounter great resistance from the patients. Therefore, beatings occur frequently or patients may be held down so violently that severe injuries like bone fractures are inflicted.

In 1983, the Soviet Union was forced to leave the World Psychiatric Association in the wake of strong Western criticism and condemnation. Now even Soviet mass media have criticized conditions in psychiatric hospitals and the widespread abuse of psychiatry, although it has not been said openly that this abuse has served political purposes.



The most condemnatory article appeared in Komsomolskaya Pravda on November 11, 1987. The three authors compare the situation in Soviet psychiatric hospitals with Dante's hell, citing the lack of rules of procedure for committing persons to psychiatric hospitals, and accusations that psychiatrists receive bribes, practice sadism and violence, commit thefts, and prescribe inhumane and degrading treatment. The prosecutors and the courts are said to have no influence over these conditions; the whole problem has been hidden from the public since the subject has been taboo.

#### Measures to restore confidence

On January 5, 1988, the Supreme Court enacted legislation concerning commitment to psychiatric hospitals. The statutes came into force on March 1, 1988. According to Art. 1, psychiatric treatment shall be extended in accordance with the principles of "demokratisatsiya," socialist legality, humanism, and compassion.

According to Art. 2, compulsory treatment shall be given only to persons who disturb the public order or break the rules of the socialist community, or if a person constitutes a danger to himself or others.

The instructions further stipulate that:

Persons can be committed to compulsory treatment only after a thorough examination by a chief physician or, in extreme cases, by a specialized ambulatory service.

Persons who have committed criminal acts shall be subjected to forensic psychiatric examination.

A person committed to compulsory psychiatric treatment shall be examined within 24 hours by a commission of psychiatrists. The patient's case shall be reconsidered once every month.

Provision is made in the new legislation for citizens receiving psychiatric assistance or their relatives and legal representative to protest in court against the decisions of chief psychiatrists; they are guaranteed the legal assistance of a lawyer with a view to ensuring their rights.

A proposed amendment to the Criminal Code of the RFRSR introduces a special criminal provision providing for punishment of those who commit patently sane persons to psychiatric hospitals.

Another important reform is the decision to transfer the so-called "special psychiatric hospitals" (i.e., maximum security psychiatric hospitals) from the Ministry of Internal Affairs to the Ministry of Health, as of March 1, 1988.

A number of patients who are known in the West as victims of political abuse of psychiatry have recently been discharged from psychiatric hospitals.

It may be too early to judge the situation in Soviet psychiatric hospitals. Prof. Morozov, director of the Serbsky Institute, told the IHF delegation that neither with respect to the law nor with respect to the practice in psychiatric hospitals, had crucial changes occurred (see also below).

The new regulations suffer from a certain vagueness. How they will function will depend upon the attitude of those in charge of Soviet psychiatry and therefore responsible for the administration and interpretation of the statute. So it is a matter for concern that Professor Martyan Vartanyan, who is said to have been responsible for psychiatric abuse in the past, in November 1987 succeeded the late Professor Andrej Snezhnevsky as head of the All-Union Institute of Psychiatry.

Meetings at the Serbsky Institute and the Ministry of Health

The delegation met at the Serbsky Institute with the director, Professor Georgy Morozov, and his colleagues Professors Nadzharov, Zharikov from the Kursky Clinic, and Gennady Milyukin of the Information Department of the Serbsky Institute. At the Ministry of Health, the delegation met with Deputy Minister Oleg Shchepin, Vladimir Yegorov, psychiatrist, and other officials of the Ministry.

In view of the critical articles in the Soviet press and the measures taken to restore confidence, an open discussion of the problematic situation of Soviet psychiatry might have been expected. In that respect the meetings at the Ministry of Health and the Serbsky Institute were deeply disappointing.

Asked to explain the background of the above-mentioned new legislation concerning psychiatry, Prof. Morozov declared that it contained nothing really new. It had always been a crime to commit sane persons to psychiatric hospitals. The new regulations actually only repeated the old and unpublished administrative instructions concerning commitment of persons to compulsory psychiatric treatment.

The criticism in the Soviet press of psychiatric abuse was characterized as coming from incompetent persons who had simply exploited glasnost to write sensationalist articles.

A member of the IHF delegation noted as a positive development that a large number of persons who were believed in the West to have been wrongfully committed to psychiatric hospitals had recently been discharged. He asked whether these persons would be fully rehabilitated. Prof. Morozov refused to admit that these persons had been wrongfully committed; they had really been mentally ill, but now they were cured, he said.

A member of the delegation concluded that, judging from Prof. Morozov's remarks, there had been no important changes either in the law or in psychiatric practice. In that case, how could the Soviet Union be readmitted to the World Psychiatric Association?

Prof. Morozov said that the Soviet Union had not been expelled from the WPA: they had voluntarily withdrawn "because the situation created in relation to Soviet psychiatrists was unfounded and discriminatory." He said that Soviet psychiatrists would not return unless a "more democratic" system of voting within the WPA was guaranteed. He implied that the leadership of the WPA had indicated that they would like the Soviet Union to rejoin the association, but said that he found the WPA attitude towards Soviet psychiatry to be as unsatisfactory as before.

At the meeting in the Ministry of Health the delegation met exactly the same attitude as in the Serbsky Institute. The representatives of the Ministry refused to admit any abuse of psychiatry in the past. The Soviet Union was willing to consider reentering the World Psychiatric Association only if the latter apologized for the "totally false accusations against Soviet psychiatrists."

The delegation presented to Deputy Minister Shchepin a report prepared by the US Helsinki Watch on abuse of psychiatry for political reasons in the Soviet Union, with a request for comments. At the end of the meeting, Mr. Shchepin made it clear to the delegation that he took the report as an insult to Soviet psychiatry and claimed that it contained "dirty fabrications."

Prof. Erik Siesby  
Dr. Teresa von Schwarzenberg

## LEGISLATIVE CHANGES

On many occasions the IHF delegation discussed the announced changes in legislation in the Soviet Union. From a human rights point of view, the changes in the Criminal Code and the criminal procedure were of particular interest.

The delegation spoke about these issues in general terms with the Minister of Justice, Boris Kravtsov, and with lawyers at the Institute of State and Law. At the latter institute one meeting took place in plenum, between the whole IHF delegation and around 15 representatives of the Institute, and another working session was held between small groups of lawyers on each side. More specific discussions about legislation regarding the freedom to practice religion took place with the Council for Religious Affairs, while legislation on emigration was discussed with the Ministry of Internal Affairs, including UVIR, and with the Academy of Sciences. (For those two topics, see the respective chapters.)

Generally speaking, the delegation met with an impressive amount of determination to reform existing provisions restricting the individual freedoms and rights of Soviet citizens. The institutions with which the delegation spoke showed also a great interest in cooperating with lawyers abroad and had already undertaken vast efforts to familiarize themselves with legislation existing in other countries.

Still, there is a long way to go. As in every other area examined by the delegation during its one-week visit, a wide variety of opinion was evident concerning legislative changes. It is hard to predict the outcome of the present debate.

A special Soviet commission was formed to make recommendations for changes in the Criminal Code and criminal procedure. The commission started with the preparation of a theoretical framework for the new law. This document contains a list of principles on which the commission recommends that new legislation should be based. The commission has finished its work and a draft of the text is now under consideration by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet.

Once the Presidium has reached an agreement, the draft text will be published in legal publications for discussion in wider circles. It was not possible for the delegation to obtain a copy of the draft as it stands now, but on some specific issues the delegation received oral explanations regarding the proposed changes. The fundamentals of the draft laws will reportedly be published in March.

One of the new developments, which Soviet officials cited in various meetings, is the new legislation on citizens' appeals against unlawful acts of officials. This new law is considered by many Soviet lawyers to be a milestone in the modernization of Soviet legislation. It provides citizens with the opportunity to file suit against decisions of individual civil servants, which is certainly a major step in the direction of more legal protection for citizens against the state.

The delegation did raise, however, the question of why the new legislation did not apply to collective decisions by state bodies. Only if there is one clearly identifiable officer responsible for the decision can the affected individual seek redress. This seems to be a serious limitation, since in most cases administrative decisions are not taken by one individual officer. At the Institute of Law some professors agreed that this was a limitation, yet they did not think it was likely to be changed in the foreseeable future.

The delegation also pointed out that under the legislation in question a complainant risks being prosecuted for slandering the state. Art. 10 of the law states that "any complaint filed with the court by a citizen for the purposes of slander results in liability under current legislation." Because of the vague terms of this provision a citizen with legitimate reasons to file a complaint may very well decide to play it safe and not go to court. When a member of the delegation mentioned that he himself would be very nervous about appealing in such a case, the answer was: "Well, then don't go to court."

At the Institute of State and Law as well as at the Ministry of Justice, a member of the delegation, seeking to clarify how the regulations would be used, asked whether a person who had been dismissed from his job because he had applied for an exit visa - in vain - could complain to the court and be reinstated in his job by a court decision. On both occasions the answer was that the dismissal would be illegal and that the person would get his job back. That would also have been the legal position prior to the new regulations. The delegation did not find it necessary to point out that the experiences of a great many refuseniks contradict this statement.

Articles 70 and 190-1 of the RSFSR Criminal Code were also discussed. Art. 70 states:

## Anti-Soviet Agitation and Propaganda

Agitation or propaganda carried on for the purpose of subverting or weakening the Soviet regime or of committing particular, especially dangerous crimes against the state, or the circulation for the same purpose of slanderous fabrications which defame the Soviet state and social system, or the circulation or preparation or keeping, for the same purpose, of literature of such content, shall be punished by deprivation of freedom for a term of six months to seven years, with or without additional exile for a term of two to five years, or by exile for a term of two to five years.

The same actions committed by a person previously convicted of especially dangerous crimes against the state or committed in wartime shall be punished by deprivation of freedom for a term of three to 10 years, with or without additional exile for a term of two to five years.

Article 190-1 reads as follows:

Circulation of Fabrications Known to be False Which Defame the Soviet State and Social System The systematic circulation in an oral form of fabrications known to be false which defame the Soviet state and social system and, likewise, the preparation or circulation in written, printed or any other form of works of such content shall be punished by deprivation of freedom for a term not exceeding three years, or by corrective tasks for a term not exceeding one year, or by a fine not exceeding 100 rubles.

Both Arts. 70 and 190-1 require proof that the accused prepared, distributed or stored literature in the knowledge that it contained falsehoods slandering the Soviet system. The courts have convicted people without such proof, however, and have refused to allow thorough examination in court of literature specified in the charges.

Both the Institute of State and Law and the Minister of Justice confirmed that the two articles are under review. A commission has proposed a draft text of a new Art. 70 which is now apparently under consideration by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. Although some individuals were in favor of abolishing the article altogether, this does not seem likely. The proposal as it stands now, as it was conveyed to the delegation orally, recommends making punishable under Art. 70 "propaganda for the purpose of overthrowing the state." After some questioning, "overthrowing the state" was defined as "changing the system." The use or advocacy of violence was immaterial.

The delegation expressed reservations about this proposed construction. A comparison was drawn with an analogous article in the Turkish Criminal Code. Professor Siesby, who has visited Turkey on human rights missions on several occasions pointed out to Soviet officials that such an article is still no guarantee that the mere expression of disagreement with state institutions may not be interpreted as a criminal act. He, therefore, would recommend the wording: "overthrowing by force or other in itself illegal means."

Although both the change in legislation and recent practice whereby Art. 70 has been used only in very rare cases show a clear desire to be more lenient towards political dissenters, it is unacceptable that the new article remains open to broad interpretation.

How Art. 190-1 will be changed is also uncertain. Some experts advocated its abolition, while others thought that the article should be changed in a similar fashion as Art. 70. If one looks more closely at the article, however, it is hard to understand what that would imply. The distinction between the two articles can be found in the difference between mere slandering on the one hand and efforts to subvert the Soviet state on the other. By limiting slander under Art. 190-1 to acts that are aimed at overthrowing the state, the article will become superfluous, since Art. 70 also covers slanderous statements that are aimed at subverting the Soviet state. It still remains to be seen what the new Art. 190 will include.

If one seriously wants to protect the right of citizens to criticize their government, both articles should be abolished. Nevertheless, each step towards limiting their application is a positive one.

The delegation also raised the question of Art. 188-3 on "Malicious disobedience to the legitimate demands of the administration of a corrective labor institution." This article has been used to punish prisoners for the peaceful exercise of their human rights, and to re-sentence prisoners of conscience who are reaching the end of their sentence.

At the Institute of State and Law the delegation was told that some people are in favor of abolishing this article, but that in particular labor camp authorities resisted the suggestion. There was no indication that a serious reconsideration of the extremely vague terms of the article is taking place.

The announcement last November that internal exile would be abolished as a form of punishment apparently has yet to be implemented. The delegation was told at the Institute of State and Law that a draft legislation on this topic had not yet been passed. In fact, it is known that several Helsinki monitors were transferred from labor camp into exile after the November announcement.

A broad debate appears to be taking place in the Soviet Union concerning the issue of capital punishment. The commission making recommendations for changes in the Criminal Code has advised abolishing capital punishment for economic crimes; it also proposed that persons under 18, women, and men over 60 be exempted from capital punishment. This means in practice that half of the crimes which are presently punishable by the death penalty could, following the adoption of the recommended changes, be punishable only with milder sentences. The commission has also recommended that homosexuality be decriminalized to exclude acts by consenting adults.

With respect to criminal procedures the delegation discussed access to legal defense, the independence of judges, and the working conditions of the courts in the light of the critical articles that have recently appeared in the Soviet press. A commission is currently considering access to legal defense. Some experts believe that anyone who is detained should have access to legal defense whereas others recommend that a defendant should not have access to defense lawyers until after the indictment. One lawyer was in favor of allowing access to legal defense also during police interrogation.

In order to strengthen the independence of judges, the commission proposed that they be appointed by the Presidium of the Soviets for a longer period than at present (e.g., 10 years instead of 5). Furthermore, more judges should be appointed.

Prof. Erik Siesby  
Hester Minnema





Meeting with Press Club Glasnost



Reiulf Steen, Andrei Sakharov, Frantisek Janouch



Prof. Fyodor Burlatsky and members of the Public Commission on International Cooperation on Humanitarian Issues



One of the numerous meetings with independent groups in Moscow



Meeting with USSR Minister of Justice, Boris V. Kravtsov



Hare Krishna devotees present during meeting with chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs, Mr. Konstantin M. Kharchev



Lev Timofeyev, Gerald Nagler, Karl von Schwarzenberg



Björn Elmquist and Aleksander Ogorodnikov, editor of the "Bulletin of Christian Society"

## PERESTROIKA AND RELIGION

During its official visit to Moscow the IHF delegation also raised the issue of religious freedom. The delegation heard the views of the Soviet Council for Religious Affairs, in addition to those of Soviet lawyers. Reverend Eugen Voss, head of the Swiss institute Faith in the Second World, and vice-president of the Swiss Helsinki Committee, was mainly responsible for preparing the basis for discussion.

Until the end of January 1988, Soviet reform policy did not yet include the 40 religious denominations and the some 115 million religious believers in the Soviet Union. A 60-year-old law and instructions from the time of Khrushchev regulate their relations with the authorities. That is why many observers have been long expecting a change in Soviet policy towards religious communities. This happened precisely while the IHF delegation was in Moscow. The government newspaper Izvestiya published on January 26 a fundamental article by Konstantin Kharchev. The author, head of the Council for Religious Affairs, plays a key role in the matter. His position on freedom of conscience is a possible starting point for further discussions. It is astonishing that he admits the fact that under Stalin, Khrushchev, and Brezhnev a lot of mistakes were made, e.g., the closing of thousands of churches. In describing the role of these churches he uses expressions that would have been unheard of before.

With his article, Mr. Kharchev made discussion easier. Also, before the meeting with him the delegation members had been told by authoritative lawyers that the legal status of a citizen should be independent of his life philosophy. Those are completely new statements.

Mr. Kharchev said at our meeting that the legislation on religion is presently being reformulated, but that it will take time. France needed 200 years following the revolution for this purpose. He hopes to achieve the same in the Soviet Union within 3 years. In the meantime the actual law would be applied "in a better way" (whatever this means), and compromises with the religious communities would have to be made, Mr. Kharchev said. This seems to indicate a weakening of the position of religious believers rather than an improvement.

The articles of the Criminal Code which are frequently used to suppress independent religious activities, Arts. 227 and 142, are being reviewed as part of an overall revision of the Criminal Code. However, as Mr. Kharchev stated, as long as they remained on the books, religious believers who violated them would be imprisoned.

Recognition of new communities, the use of church buildings, access to religious studies and to religious literature would be made easier, Mr. Kharchev claimed. About the last item he said, "It is known to us that there is a shortage in this field. Therefore, we permitted, besides the printing of religious literature in our own country, the import of bibles, for example, as well."

The Council for Religious Affairs showed a willingness to listen to religious believers by letting a group of 22 Hare Krishna devotees into the audience room shortly after the IHF delegation arrived. The Hare Krishna devotees had demonstrated outside the Council office, carrying banners and photographs of Hare Krishna prisoners. In particular they lamented the death of Sirvis Ogadzhanyan, a 23-year-old follower of Hare Krishna who died in labor camp in December 1987. The IHF had raised the subject of his death with Soviet officials in previous meetings and was handed a written response from the Ministry of Internal Affairs by a Council lawyer. According to the official version, Mr. Ogadzhanyan died of tuberculosis. But Hare Krishna followers claimed that in fact he had died from trying to maintain a vegetarian diet under the poor conditions of labor camp, where food is insufficient even for meat-eaters and prisoners suffer extreme cold, inadequate clothing and overwork. A month before his death, Mr. Ogadzhanyan had been seen by visitors and was not suffering from tuberculosis at that time. On the urging of the IHF delegation, Mr. Kharchev agreed to accept and review the appeals about mistreatment of Hare Krishna devotees and he discussed with them for about two hours the registration of their group in Moscow.

Reality, nevertheless, shows that these moves, notwithstanding their importance, are only small steps on a very long road. The delegation handed over to the Council a list of 240 names of people who, according to the IHF's information, are in prison for their religious beliefs. We asked to be informed about the status of their cases, and Mr. Kharchev promised to make inquiries. Special attention was requested by the delegation for the cases of a Russian Orthodox deacon, Vladimir Rusak, and of Mikhail Kukobaka, who has been in prison for 20 years. Although Mr. Kharchev promised to look into the cases, he denied that there were any prisoners of conscience in the USSR and claimed that the persons whom Westerners believed to have been jailed for religious activities had in fact committed "crimes."

In the future, religious believers may have to face most problems in the provinces. Senior officials who for years had to promote the liquidation of religion might not understand the sudden tolerance shown towards religious believers. In addition, the various religious communities in the Soviet Union play an important role in preserving national cultures, which makes the Soviet authorities particularly wary of the ideological challenge they pose. Party control has been especially severe where the issue of national minorities becomes intertwined with that of religion. One can see this in Lithuania, for example, where a large part of the population is both Catholic and intent on the preservation of national Lithuanian identity. A 67-year-old Lithuanian priest, Jonas Steponavicius, has been exiled since 1961 for refusing to accept state control of the Catholic Church.

It is also in this context probably that one should understand the reaction of Mr. Kharchev to a question raised by the delegation members about the position of the Ukrainian Uniate Church which, though forcibly united with the Orthodox Church in 1946, is still struggling for independent recognition. Whereas until then the discussion had been very open and constructive, at the moment this issue was raised, Mr. Karchev's tone changed completely and he made it clear that no change in policy towards the Ukrainian Uniate Church should be expected.

The Jewish community people has observed with great concern an increase in anti-Semitism in Soviet society. An organization called Pamyat (Memory), which openly declares its anti-Semitic attitudes, has attracted a large number of members, and organizers of Hebrew seminars still undergo frequent harassment.

In the meantime, former taboos are being broken. We heard reports that recently, in a Moscow party building where usually only events that are in strict line with Party policy are organized, a discussion took place between an atheist and an Orthodox theologian. The 400 young Communists who were invited to the event sympathized with the Christian. They asked numerous questions about God, the Bible, and Jesus.

At our meeting with Mr. Kharchev, he stated that the believing part of the population should also be happy within the socialist system. Two days after his article appeared in Izvestiya, the Party newspaper Pravda responded to it by demanding a continuing loyalty to Lenin's principles. The democratization within the Party has started. The religious believers in the Soviet Union are asking themselves now whether they will have to wait 3 or 200 years for the same rights as those of atheists.

Reverend Eugen Voss

## EMIGRATION AND TRAVEL

According to Soviet officials, in 1987 more than 26,000 Soviet citizens were issued exit visas for permanent residence abroad. They included 14,488 ethnic Germans, more than 3,000 Armenians, and 8,155 Jews. The number of Jews leaving the country is nine times the figure for 1986, but only 15% of the total at the highest point of Jewish emigration in 1979. According to Rudolf Kuznetsov, chief of UVIR, the Soviet visa office, about 80% of the Jews who emigrated last year had been refused permission to leave in the past. This means that of the Anti-Defamation League's list of 11,000 refuseniks submitted to the Soviets by US Secretary of State George Shultz at the Reykjavik summit, at least 4-5,000 documented refusenik cases remain unresolved, in addition to an undetermined number of unlisted cases (probably numbering in the tens of thousands) of Jews who have either been refused or who would like to emigrate.

According to the new Soviet regulations on emigration, which went into force in January 1987, only persons with invitations from immediate relatives (spouses, parents, and children) can apply for exit visas. This has discouraged many from applying since an estimated 90% of Jews who would like to leave do not have immediate relatives abroad. The arbitrary implementation of this provision has created a very uncertain situation for those wishing to leave the Soviet Union. In various cases, people who were formerly refused an emigration visa because of alleged access to state secrets are now, after many years, suddenly refused on completely different grounds, namely the lack of close kinship abroad. In addition, applicants must also have permission from relatives remaining behind, a further obstacle to departure for many. Soviet officials have recently promised that these restrictions will be waived, but this remains to be seen.

The IHF submitted lists of more than 100 cases of long-term Jewish refuseniks, divided spouses, and former political prisoners who sought to emigrate as well as 30 hardship cases, including persons dying of cancer and other terminal illnesses. We also submitted a list prepared by the New York-based Committee of Concerned Scientists, of approximately 800 scientists and engineers who have been refused exit visas on the grounds that they allegedly had had access to state secrets. (See the chapter "Discussion at the Academy of Sciences.")



In the past, only members of the Party-approved elite were permitted to travel abroad. But foreign travel by ordinary Soviet citizens has increased in the last few years as more than 5,700 individuals have been allowed to go abroad for private visits with their relatives. Several thousand Soviet emigrés have also been permitted to return to the USSR as tourists and on private family visits. But bureaucratic hurdles and long delays remain in processing visa applications in both directions and a substantial number of persons continue to be denied permission. With the exception of ballet star Rudolf Nureyev, persons stripped of Soviet citizenship while abroad and former political prisoners continue to be denied permission to visit their homeland. Soviet emigrés often must wait two months or longer to gain permission for family visits. Tourist applications are handled more rapidly, but travellers are then forced to pay exorbitant hotel and package tour rates in order to see their relatives.

Faced with the new restrictive emigration regulations and continued inaction by government officials who are supposed to be reviewing cases involving access to state secrets, many refuseniks in Moscow and other cities have stepped up their activism, organizing a number of new support groups and mounting a series of demonstrations, most of which have been brutally dispersed by authorities. Western camera crews have been actively discouraged by the police and the KGB from covering these demonstrations. But at a demonstration that took place during the week of the IHF visit, the more than 100 plainclothesmen who were in evidence did not break up the gathering. Refuseniks surmised that the presence of IHF delegates who were monitoring the demonstration served to restrain the authorities from behaving in their usual fashion.

Catherine A. Fitzpatrick  
Prof. Irwin Cotler

## DISCUSSION AT THE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE USSR

On the afternoon of January 29, 1988, the IHF delegation met with representatives of the Academy of Sciences led by Academician V.A. Kotelnikov. (The full list of the Soviet delegation is attached below.) We were very cordially received at the Academy and the discussion was carried out in a friendly and cooperative spirit. The focus was on three main issues:

1. Scientists who are currently prisoners of conscience.
2. The refusal of exit visas on the basis of the applicants previous contact with state secrets involving technical or scientific matters.
3. Prospects for strengthening scientific cooperation between the Soviet and Western scientific communities.

1) The delegation submitted two names: Mart Niklus, ornithologist, and Viktoras Petkus, philologist. These are scientists known to us who are currently prisoners of conscience. We emphasized the interest of the international scientific community in the fate of these two men and the hope that they be given as soon as possible the possibility of returning to their normal scientific occupations. We expressed our special interest in the case of Niklus who is a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group. Academician Kotelnikov answered that these names were not known to him but he would investigate the cases. He pointed out that the decision-making in these matters lay in the hands of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Academy has very little influence. We insisted, however, that the great prestige enjoyed by Soviet science and of the Soviet Academy of Sciences gave them a special opportunity and responsibility to help in the resolution of such cases as those of Niklus and Petkus. We received assurances that the Academy would investigate these cases and inform us of their status.

2) The delegation also delivered a list of over 800 scientists and engineers (supplied to us by the U.S. Committee of Concerned Scientists) who have been denied exit visas for a long period of time (in most cases more than 4-5 years and often even longer than 15 years). We were assured that the Academy would request information on these cases and inform us of their status.

We pointed out that there was a widespread perception that the refusal of exit permits on the basis of prior contact with state secrets often appeared to be applied with considerable arbitrariness and lack of consistency. There followed a discussion attempting to explore general principles and the realities of practice in such cases. We expressed the belief that the international scientific community would like to cooperate in working out well-defined and general principles for the resolution of such cases. As an example of possible general principles, Prof. Irwin Cotler suggested, based on his work on a definite case in Canada, the following:

1. The right to leave and return to one's own country is itself a fundamental and an essential right.
2. This right is not an absolute right, but any limitations must be interpreted restrictively and on exceptional grounds.
3. Restrictions must be applied equally and not in a discriminatory fashion.
4. The limitations must be prescribed by law, set out clearly in law and must be made known to an applicant.
5. There must be a legal procedure and remedies for appealing a refusal.
6. The limitations on the grounds of state security must be demonstrably justified in that the state must show that there is a clear and immediate danger to national security.

This attempt to raise the subject of general principles was met by a somewhat diffuse response, including the assertion that the number of cases was being constantly inflated or that an even larger number of scientists in the United States were being denied the possibility of travel because of contact with scientific secrets. Prof. Kudryavtsev pointed out that an organic part of the Helsinki Accords is respect for the laws and rules of each signatory country and that Soviet practices in the field of travel and emigration should therefore not be criticized. Although the discussion was kept on a friendly level, it was our impression that the Academy was not eager to take up the discussion of principles or to concede the responsibility of scientists to attempt to influence the formulation of such principles.

3) The discussion of this point was carried out in a smaller group comprising, on the Soviet side, V. Kotelnikov and E. Primakov, and from the IHF, Dr. Teresa Schwarzenberg, Frantisek Janouch, and Ben Mottelson. A very wide-ranging discussion followed, touching upon (a) a number of specific cases involving Soviet scientists who were unable to participate in international meetings abroad; (b) formal and financial arrangements currently obstructing exchanges and collaboration with Soviet scientists;

(c) issues involving communication and the exchange of information with Soviet scientists. These matters were discussed with much openness and constructive efforts were made to identify the origin of difficulties and consider solutions.

We felt it necessary to emphasize that the very cumbersome and bureaucratic administrative procedures employed by the Academy are in themselves a significant obstacle to real and informal scientific exchange. Such obstacles are detrimental to Soviet science itself and our criticism on this point seemed to be consonant with the thinking of the Soviet committee that is currently evaluating the work of the Academy.

The Soviet Academy of Sciences was represented in the meeting with the International Helsinki Federation by the following members:

Academician V.A. Kotelnikov, acting president;  
Academician V.N. Kudryavstev, member of the Presidium, Director of the Institute of State and Law;  
Academician E.M. Primakov, Director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations;  
Dr. S.I. Brug, Vice Director of Ethnography;  
Dr. M.N. Guboglo, Head of the Center of National Problems at the Presidium of the Academy;  
Mr. Yu.I. Kochetkov, acting head of the Division of Scientific Contacts with Capitalistic Countries and with International Organizations of the Academy;  
Mr. V.R. Kalyuzhny, Head of the Department for Reception of Foreign Scientists and of Foreign Firms of the Academy;  
Dr. N.S. Nadzharnykh, Department of literature and language of the Academy.

Prof. Ben Mottelson

## CSCE CONFERENCE IN MOSCOW ON HUMANITARIAN ISSUES

The Soviet proposal to hold a CSCE Conference on Humanitarian Issues in Moscow was in the mind of every delegation member during our Moscow visit. Since the idea was first broached by the Soviet delegation to the CSCE Conference in Vienna on November 6, 1986, it has been a topic of broad discussion. Many arguments for and against the suggested conference have been raised, and were also discussed during the IHF's stay in Moscow.

The IHF had never intended to make any recommendation concerning such a conference after visiting Moscow, as was incorrectly reported in some newspapers. We were, however, well aware of the influence which the results of the trip could have on the final decision, which must be made at the CSCE Conference in Vienna on a unanimous basis. As a non-governmental organization, the IHF considers it its task to present the facts objectively and as extensively as possible in order to enable the CSCE delegations in Vienna and others to form their own views on the question.

The conference, as proposed, will consider the following set of problems:

- Cooperation in encouraging the effective exercise of civil, political, economic, social, cultural, and other individual rights and freedoms;
- Cooperation in the sphere of information, culture and education, contacts between people, institutions, and organizations (including contacts on the basis of family ties and travel for personal and professional reasons).

So far the Western and neutral delegations have had very mixed feelings about the meeting. Most of them fear that discussion of the Moscow conference diverts attention from the issues pending in Vienna, including those involving compliance with the Helsinki Final Act.

Reacting to the proposal in a speech, the American ambassador to the Vienna Conference, Warren Zimmerman, mentioned two criteria which he said ought to be met before any country could become eligible to host a CSCE meeting. Most of these conditions have also been raised by other CSCE delegations.

The first criterion, in his opinion, is that the host country should have an exemplary record in the subject on which the meeting is to be held, and the second is that the host country should provide the same open conditions for delegates, for the press, and for non-governmental organizations that previous hosts have offered. Ambassador Zimmerman commented that the Soviet Union at that time certainly did not meet the first criterion, although he would not exclude the possibility that conditions could change at a later stage. Regarding the openness of the conference, he raised ten concrete questions which he wanted to see answered before any conclusion could be drawn about the practical consequences of the proposal.

Our main discussion partner on this subject at the official level was Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Anatoly L. Adamishin. Mr. Adamishin gave only evasive replies when questioned about the right of private organizations to hold meetings and demonstrations in Moscow if the proposed conference were held in that city. He referred to the freedom our delegation enjoyed while visiting Moscow. We saw everyone we wanted to see, and even people the authorities did not want us to see. The fact of our trip to Moscow was presented as proof that Moscow could be a venue for the conference. In addition, he cited "the practice established in the CSCE-framework" and said that the U.S. conditions for agreeing to a conference in Moscow were "humiliating." He urged the West to first accept the conference in principle, then negotiate conditions.

At the unofficial level, the delegation encountered a wide variety of opinions, ranging from radically opposed, regardless of the conditions, to almost unconditionally in favor of such a conference. Many of the Soviet independent groups showed an interest in the conference taking place, because it would give them an opportunity to raise their case with Western politicians and non-governmental groups, and help them to break out of their isolation. They did not, however, agree on how to approach the proposal, that is, whether to set conditions or not.

For the independent groups the issue of access to the conference is an important one. When Minister Adamishin refers to "the practice established in the CSCE-framework," this should, in the view of the IHF, include the possibility for non-governmental organizations and private citizens, both Soviet and foreign, to approach delegations to the conference with appeals, requests, and information. Considering the difficulties which independent groups currently encounter when they seek official recognition, as well as the numerous instances when citizens from outside Moscow have been prevented from travelling to the capital to participate in seminars, one may question how the Soviet authorities would deal with non-governmental activities during the proposed conference.

One point of view which was repeatedly expressed by members of the IHF delegation and others, people, including Academician Andrei Sakharov and representatives of Press Club Glasnost, is that it is difficult to consider holding a conference in Moscow on humanitarian questions and human rights while there are still political prisoners in the Soviet Union. The delegation did not receive any indication that this problem might disappear in the near future. When the first deputy minister of internal affairs, Mr. Leonid G. Sizov, was questioned on this subject, his reply was that all the people detained in the Soviet Union are criminals, and not political prisoners (see chapter on political prisoners). Academician Sakharov would also set two further conditions for the conference: Withdrawal of troops from Afghanistan and changes in Soviet legislation.

Other arguments raised against the conference reflected mostly a fear that the conference would serve only as a propaganda show for the Soviet authorities, as happened during the Olympic games in 1980. The discussion at such a conference would not be genuine. Therefore, according to this line of thought, it would serve no purpose and after the conference ended human rights would again be violated to the same extent as before.

Some people belonging to independent clubs, however, expressed indignation over the possibility that the West would set "ultimatums" for the conference. In their view, and also in the view of those who want a conference but only under certain conditions, a human rights conference in Moscow would be of extreme importance for the future of the Soviet Union, and would create an excellent chance for increased communication between East and West on both the official and unofficial level. It would also focus attention on the human rights situation in the Soviet Union and support efforts to democratize the country.

As to the question of the unconditional withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, Mr. Adamishin remarked that the political decision to withdraw from that country had already been taken. Mr. Gorbachev, in a declaration issued on February 8, was more specific. He announced that the USSR was willing to start withdrawing from Afghanistan by May 15, 1988, and to complete this withdrawal in ten months, provided that Afghanistan and Pakistan reached agreement in the U.N.-sponsored talks by March 15.

Whatever decision is reached on the Moscow conference proposal at the political level, it is of utmost importance to listen to and consider seriously the different voices inside the Soviet Union. By doing so, the IHF delegation has tried to contribute to a well-informed debate at the Vienna CSCE Conference.

Mr. Max van der Stoel  
Hester Minnema

Valentin Falin, director of APN, gave a short briefing about the role of the Soviet press in the period of glasnost and perestroika. He mentioned that perestroika needs for its realization the democratization of society and that democratization cannot be achieved without glasnost. Mr. Falin emphasized the great interest of the Soviet people in the Soviet mass media and the role the Soviet mass media have in promoting the process of restructuring society.

In the discussion the following issues were raised:

1. Asked about the reports of psychiatric abuse in the USSR published in the Soviet press, Mr. Falin began his answer by saying that if he told us that there were no abuses of psychiatry in the USSR, we would not believe him and he would not believe himself, either. At the same time, he added, the abuse of psychiatry was no greater in the USSR than in Western countries. He informed the IHF delegation that APN distributed a statement by the Soviet Health Minister criticizing the articles in Izvestiya and Komsomolskaya Pravda. He said that all the cases reported in those articles were checked independently by several expert commissions and that most of the criticism was found to be groundless. Articles reflecting this viewpoint will be published soon in large-circulation newspapers like Trud, Sovetskaya Rossiya, etc.

2. When asked if and when Soviet writers who have been forced to emigrate (like Solzhenitsyn, Maximov, Nekrasov, Brodsky, Voinovich, Aksyonov and others) would be published in the Soviet Union, Falin answered that this is mainly a problem of literary quality. He said that works by Brodsky and Pasternak were being published in the Soviet Union. He questioned the literary quality of Solzhenitsyn, saying that Solzhenitsyn had failed to maintain the level of his short story "Matryona's Yard" and that even a well-known West German writer (it was clear from the context that he was referring to Heinrich Böll) said to him shortly before his death that Solzhenitsyn did not exist for him any longer as a writer. Falin pointed out that writers whose literary quality is beyond doubt, like Bunin, belong to the past and are still being published. He accused the West of promoting the Russian emigré writers mainly for political reasons and not for their literary value. He stated that much more English and American literature is translated and published in the USSR than vice versa.



Mr. Falin was rather aggressive in answering some questions, accusing the Western mass media of tendentious and distorted reporting on the Soviet Union. He repeatedly stated that he was not afraid of answering any question or discussing any problem.

3. Mr. Falin told the delegation that presently there are no taboo topics or themes in the Soviet press. He mentioned the publication of health and economic statistics, drug abuse, prostitution, etc. In this way the press is giving the Soviet people a better insight into their society. In another example he mentioned articles on the executed revolutionaries like Bukharin, Kamenev, Rykov, and others, saying that Bukharin and many others will soon be rehabilitated. He cited the publication of Bukharin's speech at the Central Committee meeting in one of the next issues of the journal *Kommunist*. He stated that a very serious attempt is being made to clarify all the dark episodes of Soviet history. Historical truth and historical secrets were frequently very deeply buried and it takes time to dig them out, he said. He observed that Soviet historical secrets were not as deep as American ones - the assassinations of Lincoln and Kennedy were never properly explained, for example.

Mr. Falin said that critical articles in the Soviet media are very carefully considered and analyzed, and measures are taken and reported back to the mass media by political authorities at different levels.

4. Mr. Falin also mentioned the possibility for individual citizens to publish books and periodicals privately by financing the publication themselves or through state publishing houses or cooperatives (provided that they have spare capacity). When asked if the permission of GLAVLIT (the Soviet censor's office) was still required for such private publishing activity, he answered that GLAVLIT's role was now strictly reduced to preventing the publication of state and military secrets. From discussions with independent writers and publicists, however, the delegation got the impression that, in practice, publishing without interference from state-controlled publishing houses is still only possible in *samizdat*. The cooperative *Vest'* reportedly was established last year with the aim of starting an independent publishing house, using the new laws on private enterprise. However, they did not receive the necessary permission to do so. Instead, it has been reported that a semi-official publishing house may be opened to offer its facilities to such cooperatives as *Vest'*. Although this may seem at face value to create new possibilities for the independent press, it still means that all licensed publishing activity will be under the control of government-supported publishers or institutions.

5. To questions concerning Soviet mass media coverage of our delegation's trip, Mr. Falin responded that the arrival of the delegation had been mentioned in the Soviet press, and that more articles and interviews were published subsequently.

Prof. Frantisek Janouch

## APPENDIX I

### Press Club Glasnost Officers

The following are some informal biographical notations on the officers of Press Club Glasnost, responsible for the different sections of activities of Press Club Glasnost. Many of them represent either a former or current independent group in the USSR. Thus Press Club Glasnost is in effect a coalition of civil rights and peace activists that is dedicated to monitoring compliance with the Helsinki Accords and sees itself as a part of the non-governmental element of the Helsinki process.

1. Lev Timofeyev, economist, journalist and writer, published both in the Soviet Union and abroad. Is an ex-political prisoner who was sentenced in September 1985 under Art. 70 of the Criminal Code of the RFSFR at a closed trial to six years of strict-regimen labor camp and five years exile. After his early release he established Press Club Glasnost and became its coordinator. Chief editor of the new magazine "Referendum".

2. Larissa Bogoraz is one of the oldest veterans of the civil rights movement. She was among the seven men and women who marched out on to Red Square in 1968 to protest the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. She is the widow of Anatoly Marchenko, the political prisoner who died in Cristopol Prison on December 8, 1986, after a prolonged hunger strike in protest against terrible prison conditions and the refusal of the authorities to grant him a visit with his wife.

3. Sergei Kovalyov is a biologist and former political prisoner who is still forced to live in de facto exile in Kalinin under an unpublicized administrative ruling that bars ex-political prisoners from residing in Moscow. He occasionally travels to Moscow. He was among the founders of the first human rights groups in Moscow, the Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights, and was active in the Chronicle of Current Events, the civil rights movement's magazine. Sergei Kovalyov is the father of Ivan Kovalyov, a former political prisoner and member of the Moscow Helsinki Group who recently emigrated to the U.S. with his wife Tatyana Osipova, who was also a political prisoner and Helsinki monitor.

4. Yuri Khronopulo is a physicist who works in an institute in the Moscow suburb of Dolgoprudny. He was among the original founders in 1982 of the Moscow Group to Establish Trust Between the U.S. and the USSR, but later split off from this group with several other scientists to form a separate Peace Research Seminar. He is now active in a newly re-reformed group called Friendship and Dialogue, which has been organizing discussions on peace and human rights issues between Muscovites and foreigners. Khronopulo also has contacts with the Hare Krishna movement because his son-in-law is an imprisoned Krishna devotee.

5. Gennady Krochik is a scientist and colleague of Yury Khronopulo who also worked in Dolgoprudny and was among the original founders of the Trust Group. He is now active in Friendship and Dialogue.

6. Paruir Airikyan is an Armenian nationalist rights activist and former political prisoner. After his early release from labor camp this year, he formed a committee to defend the remaining Armenian prisoners of conscience, has done extensive lobbying on their behalf, and has been successful in gaining the release of several. He has joined forces with similar prisoners' committees in the Ukraine and Georgia.

7. Vyacheslav Chornovil is a well-known Ukrainian writer and journalist who joined the Ukrainian Helsinki Group while serving an internal exile sentence for samizdat writing. He was re-arrested, served an additional labor camp term on trumped-up charges and was finally released in 1985.

8. Fr. Gleb Yakunin is a Russian Orthodox priest and former political prisoner. He was the founder in 1976 of the Christian Committee to Defend Believers' Rights, which worked under the aegis of the Moscow Helsinki Group. He was released early from internal exile this year and was allowed to receive a parish once again, which is located outside Moscow. Church authorities have warned him of involvement in dissident activity such as Glasnost magazine.

9. Viktor Fulmakht is a long-time Jewish refusenik who has been denied exit visa on grounds of exposure to state secrets. Fulmakht is a geophysicist whose work involved monitoring data from nuclear weapons testing. After the Soviet Union declared a temporary moratorium on nuclear blasts, and then permitted a private American scientific team to start monitoring the tests, Fulmakht made the point that his alleged knowledge of "secrets", long out of date, is moot. He emigrated to Israel in early February 1988, where he represents the Press Club Glasnost abroad.

10. Aleksandr Iron is a Leningrad activist and earth scientist, who has been involved in both an official earth science club and the unofficial Leningrad Trust Group. He is currently active in various environmental societies being formed independently in Leningrad. Iron contributed a piece to issues 2 - 4 of Glasnost magazine entitled "Isn't it Time to Open the Closed Stacks?" on the closed archives of Soviet libraries to which independent scholars and the public are denied access.

11. Yuri Kiselyov is a long-time veteran of the civil rights movement in Moscow. He lost his legs in an accident in his youth. During the 1970s and 1980s, he has led the Initiative Group for the Defense of the Rights of the Disabled. Kiselyov also became a member of the Moscow Trust Group after 1982 and recently one of the members of Democracy and Humanism, a discussion group on Soviet and Western history formed by ex-political prisoners and other civil rights activists.

# Moscow go-ahead for rights group

BY JUDY DEMPSEY IN VIENNA

THE SOVIET UNION will allow one of the most prominent Western human rights groups to visit Moscow and hold talks with Soviet officials on a range of human rights issues, a senior Soviet official said yesterday.

Mr Yuri Kashlev, head of the Soviet delegation to the Conference on Security Co-operation in Europe, which resumed in Vienna yesterday, said the International Helsinki Federation of Human Rights would be able to visit Moscow. "We are expecting this delegation," he said of the group which was established in 1982 to monitor compliance of the Helsinki Final Act signed in 1975 by the 35 member states of the CSCE process.

The move is unprecedented and has surprised many diplomats in Vienna; few had been expecting such an open and

swift response by the Soviet authorities.

"The CSCE monitors compliance of the Helsinki agreements of 1975 which formalised Europe's borders and sought to ensure the protection of human rights in the Eastern bloc."

"We are engaged in a dialogue on human rights in the Soviet Union not only with those who like us but those who criticise us as well," Mr Kashlev said at yesterday's meeting, referring to the federation, which has been a persistent critic of the human rights record in the Soviet Union and in other parts of Eastern Europe.

Western delegates in Vienna reacted cautiously to the news. Mr David Mellor, Minister of State at the Foreign Office, said it was a "welcome move." But he warned the West not to "be fooled off with a little bit of move-

ments. We just can't have glasnost and perestroika on that part of the agenda which suits the Soviets."

The federation applied to visit Moscow in June. "An official described the response as a very positive step. We requested a meeting with the foreign, justice, and interior ministries as well as the visa office," he said. "As far as we know, those meetings are being arranged and we made it clear we would talk to dissidents as well."

The delegation will go to Moscow next month, though the Soviet authorities said it could travel next week if it wished. It will include Lord Avebury, chairman of the British parliamentary committee on human rights, Mr Ben Motliffsen, a Danish winner of the Nobel Prize for physics, and Mr Peter Jan-

kowski, the former Austrian Foreign Minister.

Mr Mellor said there were still many outstanding issues in the human rights field which had yet to be addressed by the Soviet Union. These included freedom to travel, the end to jamming the BBC's Polish service, unrestricted sale of Western newspapers and journals and the publication of complete economic statistics.

In spite of the optimism stimulated by the arms talks in Washington last week, Mr Mellor warned the Soviet and East European delegates that "human rights and human contacts are at the heart of the CSCE."

The West, he said, would not put pen to paper on a concluding document until a substantial agreement had been reached in this field.

## Helsinki-Föderation erörtert in Moskau Problemerkatalog

Eigenbericht der „Presse“ WIEN (kös). Eine Delegation der Menschenrechtsorganisation „Helsinki-Föderation“ ist am Sonntag zu einer einwöchigen Informationsreise nach Moskau gereist. Die 21 Parlamentarier und Wissenschaftler aus neun Ländern wollen unter Leitung des Präsidenten der Organisation, Karl Johannes Schwarzenberg, in Ministerien einen „breitgefächerten Problemerkatalog“ erörtern. Man will über Reiseerleichterungen sprechen, auf die Situation in psychiatrischen Kliniken hinweisen und die religiöse Verfolgung anmahnen.

Termine im Innen-, Außen-, Gesundheits- und Justizministerium konnten fixiert werden. Vor der Abreise war aber nicht geklärt, ob es auch zu einer Begegnung mit Marschal Wiktor Tschebrikow, dem Chef des sowjetischen Geheimdienstes KGB, und Jegor Ligatschow, der Nummer zwei im Kreml, kommen wird.

Ein Besuch in dem gefürchteten Zwangsarbeitslager „Perm 36-1“ wurde nicht genehmigt. In dem Lager sollen sich noch zwölf politische Häftlinge, darunter auch Mitglieder von sowjetischen Helsinki-Gruppen, befinden. Nach offiziellen Angaben sind in dem be-

rüchtigten „Todeslager“ in den vergangenen drei Jahren zehn Häftlinge umgekommen.

In der ganzen Sowjetunion gibt es laut der Helsinki-Föderation noch mindestens 430 Gewissensgefangene. Den größten Teil – weit mehr als die Hälfte – stellen Personen, die wegen religiöser Aktivitäten verhaftet wurden.

Die Delegation der Helsinki-Föderation wird auch mit Oppositionellen zusammenkommen. Ein Treffen mit Andrej Sacharow galt vor der Abreise als sicher. Auf dem Terminkalender steht außerdem der Pressklub „Glasnost“, der sich im Herbst des Vorjahres der Helsinki-Föderation angeschlossen hat, und ein Besuch im Moskauer Büro der „Internationalen Gesellschaft für Menschenrechte“ (IGFM). In Zusammenarbeit mit der IGFM in Wien will sich die Delegation für einige Fälle besonders verwenden. Es geht unter anderem um die Ausreisepflicht für den seit vier Jahren mit einer Dänin verheirateten Journalisten Wladimir Pimonow. Pimonows Ehefrau, Lise Pedersen, hatte die Moskauer Emigrationsbehörde zuletzt mit der Bemerkung abgewiesen, man werde den Fall „im Jahre 2002 neu überdenken“.

### Fortsetzung der KSZE-Konferenz in Wien

WIEN, 22. September (AP). In Wien ist am Dienstag das Folgetreffen der Konferenz über Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit in Europa (KSZE) nach der Sommerpause fortgesetzt worden. Der Staatsminister im Auswärtigen Amt, Schäfer, setzte sich vor dem Plenum dafür ein, daß die Konferenz bis zum Jahresende ein substantielles Schlußdokument fertigstellt. Der sowjetische Chefdelegierte Kaschlew kündigte zu Beginn der vierten Runde an, daß eine Delegation der Internationalen Helsinki-Gruppe, einer kritischen westlichen Menschenrechtsgruppe, in die Sowjetunion eingeladen wurde. Der Delegation wird auch die Bundestagsvizepräsidentin Frau Renger angehören. Schäfer hob hervor, daß von diesem Schlußdokument die Fortsetzung der Verhandlungen aller KSZE-Staaten über vertrauensbildende Maßnahmen sowie die Verhandlungen beider Bündnisse über Stabilität bei der konventionellen Rüstung vom Atlantik bis zum Ural abhängen. Er sagte, daß die Nato-Staaten dafür ein umfassendes Konzept vorgelegt hätten. Gerade die Einigung über den Abbau der Mittelstreckenwaffen mache es besonders dringlich, die konventionelle Seite der Sicherheit in Europa anzugehen. Auch der sowjetische Chefdelegierte drängte auf einen positiven Abschluß der Konferenz. Es gebe keinen Grund, sagte er, mit „den Vorbereitungen der Redaktionsphase“ fortzufahren; die Schlußarbeiten an den Dokumenten könnten vielmehr „schon morgen“ beginnen.

„Die Presse“, Jan. 26, 1988

# Die Gespräche über Menschenrechte in Moskau

## Erklärungen der Schweizer Delegierten

j. g. Moskau, 29. Januar

Mitglieder der Delegation der *Internationalen Helsinki-Föderation*, der 21 Personen aus dreizehn Ländern angehören und die am 23. Januar in Moskau eingetroffen war, um mit offiziellen Gesprächspartnern und informellen Gruppen das Thema Menschenrechte zu erörtern, haben sich am Donnerstag vor Pressevertretern über ihre Kontakte geäußert. Hintergrund der Reise war, wie vor der Presse erklärt wurde, das sowjetische Werben um Abhaltung eine *KSZE-Menschenrechtskonferenz* in Moskau. Die Mitglieder der Reisegruppe werden nach ihrer Rückkehr den Regierungen ihres Landes Bericht erstatten, wurde weiter bekanntgegeben. Von Schweizer Seite nahmen der frühere Bundesrat *Friedrich* sowie der Chef des Berner Ostinstituts, Nationalrat *Sager*, und der Leiter des Zolliker Instituts «Glaube in der zweiten Welt», Pfarrer *Voss*, an den Gesprächen in Moskau teil. In einer ersten Bilanz wertete *Friedrich* die Gespräche als aufschlussreich und interessant. «Dass solche Gespräche möglich sind», sagte er, «betrachte ich als etwas Neues und Positives.» Er stellte dabei die Tatsache in den Vordergrund, dass Bürgerrechtler des Presseklubs «Glasnost», der inzwischen auch zur Helsinki-Föderation gehört, an einer der offiziellen Gesprächsrunden teilnehmen konnten.

### Unterschiede im Entgegenkommen

Der frühere Bundesrat fuhr fort, bei Begegnungen im Justizministerium sei das Bemühen um eine breit angelegte Justizreform deutlich geworden, die in Richtung einer *Liberalisierung* und einer stärkeren Berücksichtigung des Individuums weise. Dies entspreche in den Grundüberlegungen auch westlichem Denken. Bei dieser Gelegenheit habe man im Justizministerium Listen von *Gewissensgefangenen* und von unter besonders harten Haftbedingungen leidenden Personen übergeben, deren Freilassung gefordert werde. Im Justizministerium wie auch im Aussenministerium ist nach übereinstimmender Meinung von Mitgliedern der Reisegruppe am offensten diskutiert worden.

Vertreter des Innen- und des *Gesundheitsministeriums* hätten weniger Flexibilität gezeigt. So sei bei Begegnungen in diesen Ministerien der *Missbrauch der Psychiatrie* – obwohl in der sowjetischen Presse kritisch behandelt – ebenso in Abrede gestellt worden wie die Tatsache der Existenz politischer Gefangener. Der Wunsch nach einem Besuch in einem *Straflager* in Perm wurde, so war weiter zu erfahren, von sowjetischer Seite mit dem Hinweis abgelehnt, das Lager liege in einem Sperrgebiet für Ausländer. Auch das ersatzweise geäußerte Begehren, ob man Gefangene zu einem Gespräch mit den Vertretern der Helsinki-Föderation nach Mos-

kau bringen könne, wurde als «unüblich» abgelehnt.

Trotz eingeschränkter Kontaktmöglichkeiten könne man, so ergänzte Nationalrat *Sager*, in der sowjetischen Gesprächsbereitschaft ein ganz beträchtliches Novum erblicken. Die angestrebte Justizreform stimme ihn sehr hoffnungsvoll, auch wenn sie erst langfristige Ergebnisse zeitigen könne. Dies gelte es besonders vor dem Hintergrund der *historischen Entwicklung* Russlands zu berücksichtigen, da Reformen in diesem Land in der Regel von oben verordnet und nicht von unten eingefordert worden seien. Anzeichen für neue Entwicklungen wurden nach Angaben von Pfarrer *Voss* auch im Bereich *religiöser Aktivitäten* festgestellt. *Voss* wies auf eine erweiterte Diskussionsbereitschaft hin. So fänden in Häusern des staatlichen *Jugendverbandes* Begegnungen mit Priestern und Diakonen statt, die zu religiösen Themen in Streitgesprächen Rede und Antwort stehen und dabei nicht selten unter den Jugendlichen auf erhebliche Resonanz stossen. Andererseits wusste Pfarrer *Voss* von jüngsten Vorfällen zu berichten, wonach beispielsweise das Wohnhaus von Pfingstchristen, die sich dort regelmässig zum Gebet versammelten, durch *Buldozer mutwillig zerstört* wurde. Die betroffene elfköpfige Familie hofft nun, wie *Voss* weiter erklärte, auf ihre *Ausreiselaubnis*. Gleichzeitig gebe es aber auch Übergriffe auf Kommunisten, die sich im Sinne der *Perestroika* gegen Korruption und Vetternwirtschaft engagieren und deswegen von sogenannten konservativen Kräften verfolgt würden.

### «Die alten Schwarzweissklischees»

Ein Treffen mit *Andrei Sacharow* hat, wie an der Pressekonferenz weiter erklärt wurde, den Vertretern der Helsinki-Föderation gezeigt, in welcher komplizierte Lage Bürgerrechtler in der Sowjetunion inzwischen geraten sind. *Sacharow* selbst sowie die zahlreichen neuen Menschenrechtsgruppen in Moskau seien mit einer Situation staatlicher Gesprächsbereitschaft konfrontiert, in der «die alten Schwarzweissklischees» nicht mehr zum Vokabular gehörten. Dies gelte freilich für beide Seiten.

### Ein Bericht im Regierungsorgan

In der sowjetischen Regierungszeitung *«Iswestija»* ist der Besuch der Helsinki-Föderation mit einem einspaltigen Artikel gewürdigt worden. Darin wird der Vorsitzende des Komitees für Sicherheit und Zusammenarbeit in Europa, Professor *Burlatzki*, der als Gastgeber fungierte, mit der Aussage zitiert: «Die westlichen Länder haben uns beschuldigt, Persönlichkeitsrechte zu verletzen, und wir haben sie auf Verstöße gegen soziale, wirtschaftliche und nationale Rechte hingewiesen; dabei haben wir verschiedene Sprachen gesprochen, heute ist klar: keiner konnte davon einen Nutzen haben.»

## Soviet Invites Western Rights Group

VIENNA (AP) — A Western group highly critical of Kremlin human rights policies has been invited to visit the Soviet Union and discuss its concerns with leading officials, the Soviet ambassador to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe said Tuesday.

Moscow apparently approved the visit to coincide with Tuesday's resumption of the 35-nation conference, known as the Helsinki conference. Participants were hoping that it would be the final round in resolving conflicts on human rights and the disarming of conventional arsenals. The U.S.-Soviet agreement in principle on a treaty eliminating intermediate-range nuclear weapons is expected to improve the chances of an accord.

The visit to the Soviet Union by members of the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights would be the first of its kind by a private Western group. Gerard Nagler, senior representative of the federation, said a 12-member delegation from various West European countries would go to Moscow in November for five days.

4 Le Monde ● Jeudi 24 septembre 1987 ●●●

# Diplo

A Vienne

## La conférence sur la sécurité et la coopération en Europe a repris ses travaux dans un climat optimiste

VIENNE  
de notre correspondante

La troisième conférence-bilan sur la sécurité et la coopération en Europe (CSCE) a repris mardi 22 septembre ses travaux à Vienne après une pause d'été de sept semaines. Les délégations des trente-cinq pays membres (toute l'Europe sans l'Albanie, plus les Etats-Unis et le Canada), qui n'ont pas réussi à terminer leurs travaux comme prévu le 31 juillet dernier, doivent, en principe, d'ici à la fin de l'année, rédiger un document final sur la base de quelque cent cinquante propositions soumises à la conférence au sujet des trois « corbeilles » de la CSCE (sécurité militaire, coopération économique, droits de l'homme).

La majorité des délégués qui sont intervenus dans la première réunion plénière de mardi — ouverte au public selon le nouveau règlement de la CSCE — se sont montrés optimistes et on estime, comme l'avait dit le chef de la délégation sovié-

que, M. Iouri Kachlev, que « toutes les conditions nécessaires sont réunies pour terminer la conférence de Vienne sur un résultat satisfaisant d'ici à la fin de l'année ».

La volonté politique pour y parvenir ne semble pas faire défaut, dans le climat favorable créé par l'accord de principe américano-soviétique sur l'élimination des missiles intermédiaires.

### Le domaine des droits de l'homme

Les principales difficultés se situent dans le domaine des droits de l'homme. Selon les vœux de l'Occident, le document final doit avoir à ce sujet un « contenu substantiel ». Les pays occidentaux souhaitent en effet « institutionnaliser » sous une forme ou sous une autre le contrôle du respect des engagements pris par les pays membres de la CSCE. En signe de bonne volonté, M. Kachlev a annoncé que les autorités soviétiques avaient répondu favorablement à une demande d'une délégation de

la Fédération internationale pour les droits de l'homme à Helsinki de visiter l'URSS.

Sur le plan de la sécurité militaire, les positions de l'Ouest et de l'Est ne semblent pas inconciliables. L'Est souhaite poursuivre la conférence de désarmement de Stockholm par une « phase deux » avec la participation des trente-cinq pays de la CSCE. L'Ouest a accepté le principe de la négociation à trente-cinq sur les mesures de confiance, mais insiste pour limiter les négociations sur la « stabilité conventionnelle de l'Atlantique à l'Oural » aux vingt-trois membres de l'OTAN et du pacte de Varsovie. Les deux négociations doivent cependant se tenir au même endroit et à la même date.

Pour ce qui est de la coopération économique, la protection de l'environnement est un des sujets principaux des propositions, qui portent également sur le renforcement de la coopération scientifique et technologique et la relance du commerce Est-Ouest.

WALTRAUD BARYLI.



# BEHIND THE 'IMAGE OF THE ENEMY'

East meets West on human rights

We have long known about the existence of the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (IHF), but preferred to ignore it, seeing the IHF's attention to the human rights situation in socialist countries as biased and aggressive. The Federation's acts seemed to contradict the spirit of the Helsinki process: they seemed bent on discrediting the socialist system in Europe and fanning East-West cooperation. But the time calls for new approaches to the realities. One of the latest results of the efficiency of the new thinking was a visit to Moscow by an IHF delegation at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. The meeting marked an important attempt to move from mutual mistrust to constructive dialogue and from confrontation to cooperation. Was the experiment a success? Our correspondent asked IHF delegation member Reulf STEEN, former Chairman of the Norwegian Labour Party and now Vice-President of the Storting (Parliament) of Norway, and Fyodor BURLATSKY, Chairman of the Soviet Public Commission for Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights.



Fyodor Burlatsky (left) and Reulf Steen.

Photo by Andrei KNYAZEV

**MM:** Mr. Steen, to begin with — a few words about your Federation, its objectives and interests...

**Reulf Steen:** The Federation was set up shortly after the Helsinki conference and includes the national committees for human rights established in all West European countries, the USA and Canada. In touch with the Federation is a broad circle of the Helsinki process. Its geographic sphere of interest is limited to countries which are signatories to the Final Act. We are mainly interested in the human rights situation in East European countries and in the USSR, since we attach greatest importance to human rights, while paying less attention to social and economic rights.

**Fyodor Burlatsky:** The East and West engage in constant polemics: what constitutes human rights? Until recently, we emphasized the need to ensure social and economic rights, while the West insisted on the priority of civil and political rights. Now it looks the situation is changing. In the Soviet Union, greater attention is being focused on democratization, that is, on the expansion of civil and political rights and liberties and on their guarantees. It would be good if the West, too, revised its traditional approach to human rights and paid more attention to socio-economic rights.

**MM:** Mr. Steen, what is your opinion?

**R.S.:** Focusing our attention on the situation with personal rights in the East European countries and in the Soviet Union, we proceed from the assumption that the situation with this group of rights in Western Europe is satisfactory. But these personal rights have not been balanced with social and economic rights. And therefore, I think, the actions of human rights activists should be to a larger extent

concentrated on socio-economic rights in Western Europe and North America insofar as this is a problem of paramount importance. This must be most categorically that our actions in the sphere of socio-economic rights, as part and parcel of human rights, are far from effective.

**MM:** A significant confession. How typical is your opinion in the West if it shared by many people?

**R.S.:** It looks like changes in this direction are in the offing. At any rate, at an international meeting in early January in the Netherlands, the representatives of 13 countries of Eastern and Western Europe and the USA issued a joint communique to the effect that human rights should include both political, civil and socio-economic rights.

**MM:** What do you think is the reason for these changes?

**R.S.:** I think that the key reason is humankind's reaching a crucial stage signified by the recent signing in Washington of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles. If such a major step is possible in such a delicate sphere as armaments, where so much mistrust, fear and mutual apprehension have built up, why shouldn't the same be possible in the sphere of human rights?

**R.S.:** Our delegation's visit to the Soviet Union may have produced the impression that the human rights problem in the USSR is the most important for us. But it is not at all a delusion to think so. I am convinced that of overriding importance for humankind are the problems of war and peace. To achieve a successful solution to them, there is a need for mutual confidence and the way to this lies through the solution of the human rights problem. And it is not at all

difficult to solve it, I believe, if one were to speak about the Soviet Union.

**MM:** For one, knew, even before the meeting, and received confirmation of this during a talk with Andrei Sakharov, that the number of the so-called prisoners of conscience is very small in the Soviet Union. For your country this is an insignificant problem, which practically does not exist as a major problem. But this is a big problem for East-West relations. When not to solve this major problem by eliminating a problem which is so insignificant for your country? Such a step would be instrumental in further consolidating the climate of trust between East and West, created by the signing of the INF Treaty.

**MM:** Are you saying that the INF Treaty might be instrumental in facilitating progress in the sphere of human rights in the context of East-West relationships?

**R.S.:** Quite correct. I am sure that to a very considerable extent the problem of human rights is linked to the feeling of security. The higher the tension, the more suspicious we are towards each other and the less safe we feel. As individuals, as groups and as states. Hence the mutual suspicions. Also hence the growth of suspiciousness with particular states: people begin to look for spies, for saboteurs everywhere. This leads to an infringement of personal liberties and rights. The INF Treaty has improved the atmosphere of co-existence between states in the East and West; it has lowered the tensions and consolidated trust. I think that our delegation's visit to the USSR would not have been possible without the Treaty.

**F. B.:** The organizations operating in the sphere of human rights can and must contribute to improving the climate of trust between states. I believe, it is to build mutual confidence. We may later be disappointed, but it is still better to place trust in each other from the beginning: only with this approach can we begin in earnest the difficult transition from confrontation to cooperation.

We must be prepared to listen to constructive criticism. Many in your country cannot get used to criticism coming from abroad. I see this as the sign of an inferiority complex. It must be overcome. We are strong enough

to listen to an honest voice telling us about our shortcomings. Of course, if the criticism is unconstructive, we shall be able to give a worthy reply. We have gained a wealth of experience in how to meet our rebuts. But the main thing, I believe, is to rid all parties of the notion that any "other side" is necessarily an enemy, an adversary who wants to hurt or harm you.

**R. S.:** I find this very important. Let me add: no matter what attitude political circles in the West may take towards the USSR, the overwhelming majority of people in our countries wish the Soviet people well. Especially, in the attainment of the objectives facing perestroika and glasnost. As I see it, a successful conclusion to these processes would become a major event of world history until the end of the century. The consequences of perestroika and glasnost will have the most serious effects for world politics as well, and hence — for the day-to-day life of people all around the world. Just imagine what humankind will be able to achieve if we are able to leave the rhetoric behind and move on to solving the pressing problems confronting us. And the possibilities of such a transition depend on what course perestroika and glasnost will take in the USSR.

**MM:** Understand me correctly: I would like to remind you of the great responsibility devolving on all of you for the destinies of perestroika. Responsibility for supporting those who are in the CPSU which back up the ideas so closely associated with Mikhail Gorbachev's course. It would be unnatural if no struggle were going on around the policy of perestroika in the Soviet Union. I would only wish everyone taking part in this struggle that in so doing they should be guided by the interests of advancing perestroika and glasnost.

**MM:** You will probably find this call odd. But, leaving the Soviet Union, I would not like you to have an impression that we in the West use all our thoughts and all our resources exclusively for dealing with the question of human rights in the USSR. If you take me personally, at least 90 percent of my resources — intellectual and material — can actually be used for human rights in other regions of the globe. Many other

members of Helsinki commissions do the same: they take part not only in the work of the IHF, but also in commissions fighting against apartheid and for human rights in Chile and Guatemala. We have or take the International Institute of Human Rights, which is a much larger and more influential organization than the IHF; the question of human rights in the USSR and East European countries does not belong to its range of interests, it deals with human rights problems in other regions of the world that require close attention.

From personal experience I know how greatly the situation with human rights has deteriorated in the past few decades in Latin America, South Africa and the Middle East. The situation there is truly dramatic. Along these lines as well there is plenty of room for cooperation between you and us.

**MM:** To what extent is the Soviet side prepared to cooperate with the IHF?

**F. B.:** Over a long period our partners have stored up information on the situation about human rights in different countries of the West, Latin America, etc., and most zealously — about the USSR and other socialist countries. We cannot yet boast of having such files, nor do we have experience in work outside the USSR. If I were to go now to Norway, for example, I would have to find out what to say about the human rights situation in that country.

**R. S.:** Well, I shall provide the necessary materials. And rather critical at that...

**MM:** Judging by our discussion, the basis for mutual understanding seems fairly strong. How would you generally assess the IHF delegation's visit to the Soviet Union?

**F. B.:** I would call it historic. For the simple reason that we have made a first step from confrontation towards cooperation. In some respects it was not easy to make the step — there is nothing more difficult than breaking habits, especially bad ones. But the step has been made, and it must be followed by others.

**R. S.:** I also consider the IHF delegation's visit to the USSR a historic event. It has been a step, but will not be a one-time event, but become the starting point for a new process. Until now our Federation and the Soviet side have been in a state of confrontation, and a very rude one at that. This happened, I believe, due to the lack of experience in getting in touch with and insufficient understanding of each other. The meetings in Moscow have enriched us with experience, and experience in the Soviet side always has been. If it is not always present, it is possible that those who happened to meet in Moscow would have found us too critically minded towards them. But this impression could take shape merely because at the given moment we were precisely in the Soviet Union. It can start up again at all those instances when we visit other countries we are no less (and in many cases much more) critical. Be it one way or another, but we have reached an understanding on cooperation, and this is the most important thing.

INFORMATION

## THE PROBLEM OF VISAS

Deputy Chairman of the Novosti Press Agency Board Karen Khachaturov was unable to join a group of Soviet officials invited to the USA by the Center for Soviet-American Dialogue: the US Embassy denied him a visa.

This is not the first time a member of the Novosti staff has been denied a US visa.

# A Breath of Helsinki Air

## Moscow's new climate

The standoff took place in subzero Russian weather. As a delegation of human-rights advocates from the West bundled into a bus outside Moscow's Hotel Belgrade last week, three Soviet dissidents tried to join them. Officials barred the door, then reluctantly allowed them aboard. The bus took the visitors—members of the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights—to a meeting with the recently formed Soviet Commission on Human Rights. Soviet officials reluctantly let the three dissidents sit at the same table with the Westerners but didn't want them to participate in the discussions. "Do we want a scandal, or cooperation?" asked Fyodor Burlatsky, the commission chairman. The Western delegates insisted, however, and finally Burlatsky permitted one of the dissidents, Lev Timofeyev, to have his say. "I will give him the floor," Burlatsky conceded. "But," he complained, "you have taken the worst path toward *glasnost* and cooperation with our group."

The incident illustrates both how far the Soviet Union has traveled under Mikhail Gorbachev and how far it still has to go. On the credit side, the Soviet leader has ordered the release of prominent dissidents, increased the pace of Jewish emigration, permitted greater freedom of expression and set political, legal and religious reforms in motion. The creation of Burlatsky's commission is in itself a tacit admission by the Kremlin of its own human-rights shortcomings. But as Lev Timofeyev and his fellow dissidents discovered when they sought to take part in last week's Helsinki-watch session, Soviet citizens still do not have the guaranteed right to stand up and speak at a public gathering—unless Western dignitaries happen to be on hand to intercede on their behalf.

**'Fate of our friends':** When he did take the floor, Timofeyev proved an apt spokesman for human rights. He once served two years in Soviet prison camps because of his dissident activities; now he heads Press-Club Glasnost, an independent human-rights organization that serves as the Helsinki watch in Moscow. Timofeyev praised Gorbachev for adopting "reasonable policies." But he expressed lingering misgivings: "We are always concerned for the fate of our friends who remain in the camps," he said, noting that some dissidents still remain imprisoned for human-rights activities in the pre-*glasnost* era.



A standoff over human rights: Timofeyev (center) seated among delegates from the West

To hear them talk, the meeting's Soviet hosts have converted to Western-style liberalism. Burlatsky, a columnist at the newspaper *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, announced that his commission would soon hold televised hearings on human rights in the Soviet Union. He also called for an international dialogue on the subject. "For many years this problem was used as the pretext for confrontation between Eastern and Western countries," he said. "The West accused us of violating political rights. We accused the West of violating civil rights, economic rights and others. Nobody was the winner in that confrontation. Everybody lost. Now the moment has come to turn that page in our history." Another commission member, attorney Mikhail Krutogolov, went so far as to concede that his country "is lagging behind in implementation of the Helsinki Final Act"—a criticism the West has aimed at the Soviet Union for years.

Whatever the case, the Helsinki group's visit to Moscow—its first ever—was a remarkable event. In the pre-Gorbachev era, the Kremlin relentlessly harassed the Soviet Union's own Helsinki-watch leaders, imprisoning them and even sending them into foreign exile. Yet last week Soviet authorities extended a VIP welcome to the International Helsinki Federation delegates, who represented 13 countries and included West European parliamentarians and a Nobel Prize-winning physicist. The visitors not only met with Burlatsky's human-rights commission but also held talks with officials in the Supreme Soviet, the Justice Ministry, the Interior Ministry (which supervises police and prisons) and even the Serbsky Institute—the psychiatric hospital that has been used as a reposit-

tory for many political prisoners. They also met with several unofficial political groups—including one called "Victims of Stalin"—now tolerated in the age of *glasnost*. The meeting with Burlatsky's commission provided a revealing look at the new Soviet style. About 60 Hare Krishnas, Jewish refuseniks, divided spouses and other dissidents were in the audience. They applauded the Helsinki Federation members openly, while a KGB agent with a video camera unobtrusively recorded their presence on tape.

**'Asking for time':** Some of the visitors, including Robert Bernstein, head of Random House publishing company and chairman of the American Helsinki Watch, felt guardedly optimistic about Gorbachev's reforms. "There's no doubt that at the upper levels they are doing a lot of self-examining," said Bernstein. "In effect, they're asking for time. They're saying they can't do everything in one minute." Bernstein, long an outspoken critic of Soviet human-rights behavior, has had his troubles with the Kremlin. Soviet authorities regularly denied him visas until 1987, when they finally permitted him to attend the Moscow book fair. Last week, however, Bernstein shared a lavish dinner in a Moscow restaurant with Andrei Sakharov, the patron saint of Soviet dissidents. Also present was Naum Meiman, 76, an original Helsinki-watch member who was recently granted permission to emigrate to Israel—13 years after applying. The mere fact that three such activists could sit down freely together in a Moscow restaurant suggested that some things, at least, have changed for the better under Mikhail Gorbachev.

ANGUS DEMING WITH STEVEN STRASSER IN MOSCOW

~~HELSINKI GROUPS--BRIEFING.~~

/28/1 TASS 109

MOSCOW JANUARY 28 TASS - +A DELEGATION FROM THE INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF HELSINKI HUMAN RIGHTS GROUPS, INVITED BY THE SOVIET COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN SECURITY AND COOPERATION, HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO CONDUCT DISCUSSIONS WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SOVIET PUBLIC AND OFFICIALS ON ISSUES OF INTEREST TO THE DELEGATION.+ A SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTRY SPOKESMAN TOLD A BRIEFING HERE TODAY.

GENNADY GERASIMOV, HEAD OF THE FOREIGN MINISTRY'S INFORMATION DIRECTORATE, SAID THAT DELEGATION MEMBERS HAD MEETINGS WITH LEV TOLKUNOV, CHAIRMAN OF THE SOVIET COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN SECURITY AND COOPERATION AND CHAIRMAN OF THE SOVIET OF THE UNION OF THE USSR SUPREME SOVIET, BORIS KRAVETS, MINISTER OF JUSTICE OF THE SOVIET UNION, LEONID SIZOV, FIRST DEPUTY MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR OF THE USSR, AND OLEG SACHEPIN, FIRST DEPUTY HEALTH MINISTER OF THE USSR.

THE DELEGATION WILL BE RECEIVED TODAY BY SOVIET DEPUTY FOREIGN MINISTER ANATOLY ADAMISHIN. MEETINGS HAVE BEEN PLANNED WITH KONSTANTIN KHARCHEV, CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL FOR RELIGIOUS AFFAIRS AT THE USSR COUNCIL OF MINISTERS, AND VALENTIN FALIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY.

+THE DISCUSSIONS IN MOSCOW SHOW THE POSSIBILITY OF TRANSITION FROM CONFRONTATION TO COOPERATION IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS,+ GERASIMOV SAID.

+AND THIS IS DESPITE THE FACT THAT THE DISCUSSIONS ALSO REVEALED A DIFFERENCE IN THE ASSESSMENT OF INDIVIDUAL FACTS AND PHENOMENA.

OUR PARTNERS EXPRESSED THE DESIRE TO RECEIVE A CORRESPONDING SOVIET DELEGATION IN VIENNA AND OTHER CAPITALS.+  
ITEM ENDS +++

# Dinner With Andrei: New Day for Sakharov and Dissidents

By Gary Lee

Washington Post Service

MOSCOW — Andrei D. Sakharov is not given to formalities, but this night was different. He was sporting a pin-striped suit and a new tie, and as the evening wore on, he stood to speak, bringing silence across the dinner table.

As snow fell and a cold wind blew outside, Mr. Sakharov exuded a rare warmth, laughing at the odd Art Buchwald joke, bolstered by the feast of suckling pig and Georgian wine.

Surrounding him were two dozen of the world's leading human rights campaigners. Some had flown in from as far away as New York, surprised to receive visas. Others, including a handful released last year from Soviet prisons, had come by bus from across Moscow.

If the mood, fare and company were rare, so were the guest of honor and his feat. Devoted to scientific research, committed to human rights activism, Mr. Sakharov stayed the course of both, forging an independence unparalleled in a country firmly ruled by a hard-knuckled Communist Party.

Two decades ago, at age 46, Mr. Sakharov abruptly broke ranks with his career as a high-ranking physicist in the Soviet Academy of Sciences, choosing instead to protest the treatment of the nation's downtrodden, particularly those falsely accused and wrongly imprisoned. Eventually, he took a stance against such official Kremlin acts as the 1979 invasion of Afghanistan.

Harassed by the KGB, jeered by his peers in Soviet officialdom, he was banished for seven years to the Gorky, a city off-limits to Westerners, where he was out of the reach of Western journalists and diplomats in Moscow.

Many surrounding Mr. Sakharov on this night had suffered in his grief and their own.

Naum Meiman, at 76 the oldest human rights campaigner in Moscow, had fought bitterly for his wife to receive cancer treatment in the West, only to have her die a year ago, days after reaching the United States.

Larisa Bogoraz received a visit from KGB agents in November 1986, forcing her to sign emigration papers

for herself and her husband, Anatoli T. Marchenko. Days later, she learned that he had already died in prison of unknown causes.

For Mr. Sakharov, the years of exile were brutal. When he returned to Moscow, old friends found him changed utterly. Ill and shaken, he declared his intention to return to a career in science.

After retreating to near-seclusion in his central Moscow apartment with his wife, Yelena G. Bonner, Mr. Sakharov, 66, faced criticism for withdrawing from the everyday struggle against Soviet rights abuses.

Since returning, he has adopted a moderate political stance and clung to his independence, sometimes supporting Western positions, sometimes criticizing them.

More important, Mr. Sakharov has adopted two causes as his own: an end to Soviet involvement in Afghanistan, and an end to Soviet involvement in the imprisonment of other political officials, Mr. Sakharov said. He has also supported a quiet campaign for the release of other political prisoners.

Twice he got imprisoned for his own part in the Soviet Union's "prisoners of conscience" campaign.

Since Mr. Sakharov's return to the Soviet Union in December 1986, he has been imprisoned several times for his human rights activism, including his role in the 1987 Grgoryants, Boston, Massachusetts, case.

As Mr. Sakharov said, he offered his own interpretation of the Helsinki Declaration on Human Rights, a Vienna-based group, and the Soviet Human Rights Commission, the activist,

Lev Timofeyev, was allowed to address the gathering.

## Dissident Causes Dispute at Soviet Rights Forum

By Gary Lee

Washington Post Service

MOSCOW — An unprecedented meeting between official Soviet and Western human rights monitoring groups nearly broke down Wednesday when a former Soviet political prisoner, now a human rights activist, attempted to speak as a member of the Western delegation.

After a 30-minute dispute between members of the visiting International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, a Vienna-based group, and the Soviet Human Rights Commission, the activist,

Lev Timofeyev, was allowed to address the gathering.



Lev Timofeyev, was allowed to address the gathering.

Mr. Timofeyev, pardoned after serving two years in detention, called for the release of 200 political prisoners in the Soviet Union. An economist, Mr. Timofeyev was jailed in 1985 for anti-Soviet acts after he published articles abroad critical of the Soviet economy.

"We feel that priority should be given to gaining a common concept of certain well-known words — such as freedom, rights and love — which at present have widely differing interpretations," Mr. Timofeyev said.

Mr. Timofeyev is head of Press Club Glasnost, an unofficial human rights advocacy group composed of Soviet citizens.

The organization, founded several months ago as part of a Soviet human rights thaw, became part of the Helsinki federation this week.

Fyodor Burlatsky, who heads the official Soviet commission and was chairman of the session Wednesday, objected at first to Mr. Timofeyev's appearance, saying that the official Soviet delegates were not familiar with him or his organization.

"We do not consider this the appropriate time or place to get acquainted with Press Club Glasnost," he said.

The meeting illustrated how even in times of *glasnost*, or openness, sparks fly whenever Soviet officials face off against their Western counterparts on the issue of human rights.

In this case, the difference was over whether Soviet officials such as the members of the human rights commission recognized nonofficial Soviet human rights activists and their positions.

"Int.Herald Tribune", Jan.28th 1988

# Police stand by as Jews protest

The Times, January 29, 1988

From Christopher Walker, Moscow

One of the largest demonstrations by Jewish refuseniks ever seen in Moscow took place yesterday on the steps of the Lenin Library. More than 100 chanting Soviet Jews, carrying placards demanding their right to emigrate, stood in sub-zero temperatures for nearly an hour.

Participants were surprised when plainclothes KGB officers and uniformed militiamen made no attempt to pursue their normal practice and break up the protest.

The protesters claimed that the reason for the change of heart was the presence at the demonstration of international human rights monitors, who are visiting Moscow for the first time this week as part of a Soviet attempt to improve the country's human rights image.

"The real test is not what happens while our group is here, but whether when we are gone the Soviet Union will live up to its obligations," said Professor Erwin Cotler, a Canadian member of the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights.

Soviet office workers and shoppers appeared bemused by the demonstration, which took on a festive atmosphere, with the Jews chanting "Let my people go", "Give us our visas" and "Let us go to

Israel", while the KGB men, some with still and video cameras, looked on.

"This is the first time so many of us have managed to demonstrate and the first time we have been able to do it without being beaten, arrested and told that Hitler should have finished his work," Mrs Judith Lurie said. She has been waiting for eight years to join her mother in Israel.

Professor Cotler, who has held talks with a number of senior Kremlin officials as well as dozens of dissidents, said: "The right to emigrate is a crucial part of the Helsinki Final Act. Had it not been included, the Canadian Government for one would have refused to sign it."

The professor said the delegation would not consider sanctioning Moscow's call for an international human rights conference here until it was certain that human rights were being respected even when outside monitors were not present.

● **14-year wait:** Professor Nakhim Snelvich (Naum) Meiman, aged 80 and a leading Jewish refusenik, has been granted permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union after attempting for 14 years to leave. He recently learnt he had leukaemia.



Die drei Schweizer Mitglieder der Delegation vor ihrem Abflug nach Moskau. Von links: Rudolf Friedrich, Peter Sager und Eugen Voss. (Bild key)

## Westliche Menschenrechtsdelegation in Moskau

Zürich, 23. Jan. (spk) Zur Untersuchung der aktuellen Menschenrechtssituation in der Sowjetunion ist am Samstag eine internationale Delegation von Menschenrechtsexperten nach Moskau gereist. Die Schweiz ist durch alt Bundesrat Rudolf Friedrich sowie Nationalrat Peter Sager und Pfarrer Eugen Voss vertreten, wie die Schweizerische Helsinki-Vereinigung (SHV) am Sonntag mitteilte. Die Menschenrechtsexperten

folgen einer Einladung von Lew Tolknow, dem Vorsitzenden des sowjetischen Komitees für Freiheit und Zusammenarbeit in Europa. Die Delegation wird mit ihren Gesprächspartnern unter anderem im Aussen-, Innen-, Justiz- und Gesundheitsministerium sowie in der Akademie der Wissenschaften und im Amt für religiöse Angelegenheiten den Stand bei der Verwirklichung der Menschenrechte diskutieren.

"Neue Zürcher Zeitung, 26. Jän. 1988

Neue Zürcher Zeitung

Passport Control

THE INDEPENDENT - Feb. 2, 1988

# Soviet 'informal' groups warned not to go too far

DAILY TELEGRAPH, January 28, 88  
**Human-rights row and 'monster' jibe fuel glasnost debate**

"Politiken" 24. Jan. 1988

**Menneskeret**  
Delegation på vej til Moskva

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR  
**INTERNATIONAL**

FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 1988

19/1/88

## Sparks fly at Moscow rights meeting

Official and unofficial Soviet representatives agree to disagree

Nr. 5 / 1. Februar 1988

profil

### „Wer ist dieser Herr?“

Schwieriger Dialog der Internationalen Helsinki-Föderation in Moskau.

The Washington Post

January 30, 1988

# Visiting Rights Monitors Call for More Soviet Progress

NCR Handelsblad 1. Feb. 1988

# Politie in Moskou treedt op tegen Helsinki-discussie

THE TIMES MONDAY JANUARY 25 1988

Russia's doors opened for human rights critics

# Helsinki team will meet dissidents

New York Times, Jan 28, 1988

Rights Monitors at a Protest  
By Group of Jews in Moscow

# Til Moskva for a tjekke Glasnost

Fire danskere deltager i turen "Politiken" 24. Jan. 1988

Buenos Aires, martes 2 de febrero de 1988

# DERECHOS HUMANOS EN D Incidente en Moscú con el grupo de Helsinki

BUITENLAND

# 'WILLEN WIJ EEN SHOW, EEN SCHANDAAL?'

Westerlingen en Russen spreken in Moskou over mensenrechten

INTERNATIONAL  
  
FEDERATION FOR  
HUMAN RIGHTS

IHF-PUBLICATIONS

Rummelhardtgasse 2/10  
A-1090 Vienna  
Tel. 222/42.73.87

Bank account: Creditanstalt  
Bankverein 0221-00283/00

BOARD

Franz Johannes von Schwarzenberg  
Chairman  
Aase Lionaes  
Deputy Chairman  
Hilze Wittgenstein  
Deputy Chairman

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Gerald Nagler

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEES

Lord Eric Avebury  
Helsinki Subcommittee of the  
Parliamentary Human Rights Group  
(United Kingdom)

Stein Iver Aarseth  
Norwegian Helsinki Committee

Pieter van Dijk  
Helsinki Committee of the  
Netherlands

Rudolf Friedrich  
Swiss Helsinki Committee

Lennart Groll  
Swedish Helsinki Committee

Jeri Leber  
US Helsinki Watch

David Metas  
Canadian Helsinki Committee

Anton Pelinka  
Austrian Helsinki Committee

Annemarie Renger  
Helsinki Committee of the  
Federal Republic of Germany

Erik Siesby  
Danish Helsinki Committee

- 1) International Citizens Helsinki Watch  
Conference, October 1982  
Price: AS 70,-- 122 pages
- 2) Violations of the Helsinki Accords:  
Report from Hungary, May 1983  
Price: AS 70,-- 36 Pages
- 3) Second International Conference of  
the International Helsinki Federation  
for Human Rights, April 1984  
Price: AS 110,-- 60 pages
- 4) Violations of the Helsinki Accords,  
August 1983 - September 1984, October  
1984  
Price: AS 110,-- 195 pages
- 5) Violations of the Helsinki Accords  
since Madrid, 1985  
Vol. I : Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia,  
East Germany, Hungary, Poland,  
Romania, Turkey;  
Vol. II: USSR, Yugoslavia;  
Price: AS 170,-- 283 pages
- 6) Human Rights in the United States:  
A Status Report, May 1985  
Price: AS 70,-- 43 pages
- 7) Human Rights in Canada: A Status  
Report, May 1985  
Price: AS 70,-- 33 pages
- 8) Human Rights in Malta, May 1985  
Price: AS 140,-- 67 pages
- 9) Ten Years after Helsinki: Where are  
they now? Helsinki Monitors in the  
Soviet Union, August 1985  
Free of charge
- 10) A Soviet Jew: The Berenshtein Case,  
A Documentation, June 1985  
Price: AS 70,-- 55 pages



- 11) Asylum and Family Reunification Policy in Ten European Countries, June 1985  
Price: AS 170,--            388 pages
- 12) Censored and Alternative Modes of Cultural Expression in Hungary, October 1985  
Price: AS 70,--            56 pages
- 13) Censorship, Ethnic Discrimination and the Culture of the Hungarians in Romania, October 1985  
Price: AS 70,--            23 pages
- 14) Culture in Poland, October 1985  
Price: AS 70,--            38 pages
- 15) "The Unofficial Writers Symposium Budapest 1985" (edited by Index on Censorship)  
free of charge            32 pages
- 16) Violations of Human Rights in the German Democratic Republic, April 1986  
Price: AS 70,--            40 pages
- 17) The Moscow Helsinki Group, Ten Years May 1986  
Price: AS 85,--            54 pages
- 18) Freedom and Fear - Human Rights in Turkey  
A Helsinki Watch Report, March 1986  
Price: AS 130,--            122 pages
- 19) Violations of the Helsinki Accords in Bulgaria, November 1986  
Price: AS 60,--            40 pages
- 20) Violations of the Helsinki Accords in Czechoslovakia, November 1986  
Price: AS 60,--            48 pages
- 21) Violations of the Helsinki Accords in the German Democratic Republic, November 1986  
Price: AS 60,--            48 pages

- 22) Violations of the Helsinki Accords in Hungary, November 1986  
Price: AS 60,-- 48 pages
- 23) Violations of the Helsinki Accords in Poland, November 1986  
Price: AS 60,-- 60 pages
- 24) Violations of the Helsinki Accords in Romania, November 1986  
Price: AS 60,-- 52 pages
- 25) Violations of the Helsinki Accords in the Soviet Union, November 1986  
Price: AS 180,-- 364 pages
- 26) Violations of the Helsinki Accords in Turkey, November 1986  
Price: AS 60,-- 60 pages
- 27) Violations of the Helsinki Accords in Yugoslavia, November 1986  
Price: AS 60,-- 52 pages
- 28) Human Contacts, visits and reunification of Families between Eastern and Western countries, November 1986  
Price: AS 90,-- 53 pages
- 29) What's up in Poland, Autumn 1986  
Price AS 70,-- 40 pages
- 30) Turkey: Torture and Political prisoners, March 1987  
Price AS 70,-- 45 pages
- 31) Assignment: Eastern Europe. Working conditions of foreign journalists in Bulgaria, CSSR, Poland and Romania  
Price AS 70,-- 50 pages
- Also available:
- 32) From Below: Independent Peace and Environmental Movements in Eastern Europe & the USSR, Helsinki Watch  
Price: AS 180,-- 265 pages

