

Trading Off on Human Rights

The U.S. Should Lead an Economic Boycott of the Soviet Union

BY HENRY A. WAXMAN

Last week's trials of Anatoly Shcharansky and Alexander Ginzburg bring to an end the Soviet campaign to erase all visible traces of the movement among Soviet citizens to monitor their government's compliance with the Helsinki accords. Shcharansky and Ginzburg will now join the 19 of their colleagues already jailed or exiled who formed the Helsinki monitoring group.

These two trials, coming in the wake of the trials of Orlov, Slepak, Nudel and others, have precipitated a crisis in U.S.-Soviet relations. The decision to prosecute such courageous and outstanding men reflects a hardening of Soviet attitudes, both domestic and foreign, which threatens the security of the West.

It is time we met this challenge. In my view, the United States should forthwith place an economic embargo on all trade with the Soviet Union. That is, President Carter should suspend export licenses for grain, heavy machinery, computers and all other American goods we now export there. Furthermore, we should encourage other nations to impose an economic boycott against the Soviets.

Consistent with this, all official U.S. agencies and private groups should suspend contact with their Soviet counterparts pending an easing of Soviet human-rights policies.

An economic shock of this magnitude would force the Soviet Union to appreciate the consequences of its actions, obliging its leaders to choose between cooperation and confrontation.

It is my hope that, after a termination of trade has made the Soviets realize what is at stake, they would seek to work with us to reestablish good relations based on mutual respect for human rights.

I was part of a congressional delegation that visited the Soviet Union this March. In Moscow, Kiev and Leningrad, we sought out and met Soviet refusedniks and dissidents. We spoke with Shcharansky's mother, Ida Milgrom, as well as with Mariya and Vladimir Slepak (he was sentenced to five years' internal exile less than a month ago), Ida Nudel, Viniamin Levich and many others. Each spoke

Rep. Henry A. Waxman (D-Los Angeles) is a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This article is based on testimony he delivered last week before the congressional Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

of the nightmare of repression which was engulfing them all—a nightmare they knew would climax in the Shcharansky trial.

A sense of unbelievable frustration and pessimism pervades the refusednik community. The only hopes they attach to the Helsinki accords—which were the very basis and justification for their movement—are the continuing attention and outspokenness of the other signatories to the agreement.

We cannot and must not be silent. The Soviet Union must be made aware that it cannot act with impunity against the legitimate expressions of basic human rights.

A year ago our congressional agency monitoring compliance with Helsinki reviewed these issues and found that there was widespread hope generated within the Soviet Union as a consequence of its signing the Final Act. But, as the Commission on Security and Cooperation also noted, "Initiatives in support of Final Act compliance have been answered by acts of official repression, systematically so in the Soviet Union."

At that time the commission further warned: "Acts of intolerance are jeopardizing progress toward the overall goals of the Final Act: improved international security and

cooperation." This conclusion implicitly rejected the notion that Soviet repression is merely an "internal affair."

Like it or not, human rights for the Soviet people are closely linked to the prospects for detente and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the West—especially after the Soviet Union solemnly pledged to protect and enhance those rights. Clearly, injustices perpetrated inside the Soviet Union carry grave implications for the security of those outside its borders.

As Secretary of State Cyrus Vance stated so eloquently last week, Soviet activities have eroded and undermined the West's trust and confidence. Words and representations however, no matter how forcefully stated, will most likely prove insufficient to obtain an easing of Soviet policy. Thus we should be prepared to back our commitment to human rights with appropriate economic sanctions. Precedent for this kind of approach was firmly established in the 1974 Trade Act, which linked the extension of most-favored nation status with a liberal emigration policy.

On July 5, Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin urged greater trade between our countries. His proposal should be rejected—unless and until the Soviets ease their human-rights policies.

In 1977, total trade between our countries was nearly \$1.9 billion, with our exports accounting for 80% of this volume—or \$1.6 billion. The Soviet Union is heavily dependent on American grain and desperately wants access to hard technology in computers, as well as equipment for developing its vast petroleum resources in Siberia.

Although we fully respect cultural and political differences, Soviet conduct in the area of human rights violates the minimum standards agreed upon at Helsinki. The Soviet present posture is incompatible with a growing economic relationship between our two countries and in my judgment not only warrants but also requires that the United States revoke all economic ties. That is the best way I know to deter the Soviet government from the cruel course it has set.

Bless You, Andrew Young

BY MARY McGRORY

WASHINGTON—Our ambassador to the United Nations, Andrew Young, has once again proved himself the most valuable member of the Carter team.

Young has no doubts about his role. He is the point man of the Administration. What is a point man for, except to deflect fire from the commander? He has done for Jimmy Carter

cause the Soviets are disgusting to their dissidents.

Young may have been reacting to the high hypocrisy and opportunistic content of the statements issuing from Capitol Hill, where one senator presented himself as a profile of courage for having "agonized" over a demagogic blast at the Russian bureaucracy, con-

Better in Oregon

ed district, he says, will represent a kind of home rule that can zero in on what citizens of the area—not the "feds"—want in terms of the environment, shelter, income and other pressing issues.

Portland metro-government boosters played smart politics to make their gains, working incrementally and winning strong state legislative support. A legislature-authorized study commission in the 1960s reviewed the morass of special service districts in the Portland area and successfully backed creation of the regional government association, the local council of governments and, in 1970, the metropolitan district for direct delivery of some services.

But the district accrued power only over a zoo and solid-waste planning. So a more recent study commission drew up the proposal for merging the regional association, including its broad powers over land-use planning, into the metropolitan district. With strong citizen and business backing, the commission persuaded the legislature to accept the plan and it went on the ballot this spring. Unlike a similar

at ap-
ments
ess of
bore
re the
lover
which
unno-
table
r ads
nts of
pub-

urban
ower,
elec-
tricity
all of
unila-
onal.
dow
can
ap-
par-