

The Belgrade CSCE Meeting
Review of Implementation and
Consideration of New Proposals
Preliminary Report

U.S. Delegation Statements
Oct. 6 to Dec. 22, 1977

The Belgrade CSCE Meeting

Review of Implementation and Consideration of New Proposals Preliminary Report

**U.S. Delegation Statements
Oct. 6 to Dec. 22, 1977**

N O T E

The statements included here are representative of many others, both formal and informal, made by American Delegates to the Belgrade CSCE Meeting during the review of implementation phase. The selection is intended to reflect the activities and efforts of the U.S. Delegation during the review of implementation and consideration of new proposals.

C O N T E N T S

Excerpts from Introduction to the Third Semi-Annual Report
by President Carter to Committee on Security and Cooperation in Europe

Statement by Secretary of State Vance

Excerpts of Remarks by Congressman Dante Fascell, Chairman of CSCE
Commission, at Commission Hearings in Early 1977

Plenary Statements

Opening Statement by Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, Chairman of the Delegation of the United States of America, October 6, 1977	... 1
Statement on Final Act Principles by Prof. Joyce Hughes, Public Member, October 11, 1977	... 9
Statement on Basket III Human Contacts Provisions by Ambassador Goldberg, October 13, 1977	... 12
Statement on Confidence Building Measures (CBMs) by Ambassador Goldberg, November 2, 1977	... 15
Statement on Detente by Ambassador Goldberg, November 4, 1977	... 17
Statement on Basket III by Ambassador Goldberg, November 9, 1977	... 18
Right of Reply Statement on Human and Economic Rights by Ambassador Goldberg, November 11, 1977	... 22
Statement to the Press Authorized by Ambassador Goldberg, October 26, 1977	... 25
Statement regarding Principle Seven by Senator Claiborne Pell, November 23, 1977	... 26
Statement regarding Human Rights by Senator Robert Dole, November 25, 1977	... 28
Statement introducing U.S. Human Rights Proposal by Ambassador Goldberg, December 2, 1977	... 31
Statement regarding Security Matters by Ambassador Goldberg, December 7, 1977	... 33
Statement by Ambassador Goldberg marking Human Rights Day December 9, 1977	... 36

Basket I

Statement regarding Principles by Ambassador Albert W. Sherer, October 19, 1977	... 41
Statement regarding Principle VI by Ambassador Goldberg, October 20, 1977	... 44
Statement regarding Confidence Building Measures by Robert Strand, October 24, 1977	... 47
Text of Invitations to Soviet Maneuver "Carpathians" and FRG Maneuver "Standhafte Chatten", minus Complimentary Opening	... 52
Statement by Ambassador Goldberg November 1, 1977	... 54
Addendum to Basket I Statement by Ambassador Goldberg, November 1, 1977	... 59
Statement in Support of Proposal on Role of Institutions, Organizations and Persons by John Borbridge, Public Member November 4, 1977	... 60
Statement regarding Self-Determination by Robert Frowick, November 14, 1977	... 61
Statement on Questions Relating to Disarmament by Robert Strand, November 15, 1977	... 64
Principles 9 and 10 by Sol Chaikin, Public Member November 15, 1977	... 67
Right of Reply By Mr. Chaikin, November 15, 1977	... 70
Statement regarding Principle X by Representative Buchanan, November 16, 1977	... 71
Speech regarding Principle VII: The "Intervention" Objection and the "National Laws and Regulations" Defense by Ambassador Goldberg, November 17, 1977	... 74

Statement on New Human Rights and other
Proposals in Subsidiary Working Body S
(Principles) by U.S. Rep. Greenwald
December 2, 1977 ... 81

Statement regarding Human Rights Proposals
by R. Spencer Oliver, December 12, 1977 ... 84

Basket II

Statement regarding Commercial and Scientific
Exchanges by Ambassador Sherer, October 12, 1977 ... 90

Statement regarding General Provisions
by Alton Jenkins, October 18, 1977 ... 92

Presentation on Business Contacts and
Facilities by Alton Jenkins, October 21, 1977 ... 94

Statement regarding Exchange of Economic and
Commercial Information by Alton Jenkins
October 26, 1977 ... 98

Statement regarding Industrial Cooperation
by Karen Taylor, October 28, 1977 ... 103

Statement regarding Cooperation on Science
and Technology, by Michael T. Dixon, November 2, 1977 ... 106

Statement regarding Environmental Protection
by John Borbridge, November 7, 1977 ... 109

Basket III

Summary of Statement Human Contacts
by Guy Coriden, October 17, 1977 ... 112

Statement by Ambassador Goldberg
October 18, 1977 ... 113

Statement regarding Visa Policies by Guy Coriden, October 19, 1977	... 114
Summary of Statement on Human Contacts, by Guy Coriden, October 10, 1977	... 116
Summary of Statement on Information by Guy Coriden, October 24 and 26, 1977	... 117
Right of Reply Regarding RFE/RL, by Guy Coriden, October 28, 1977	... 119
Statement regarding Freedom of Information by Guy Coriden, October 28, 1977	... 120
Summary regarding Cultural Exchange by Guy Coriden, November 2, 1977	... 122
Summary of Cultural Exchange by Guy Coriden, November 4, 1977	... 124
Statement regarding Educational Exchanges by Prof. Andrzej Korbonski, November 7, 1977	... 125
Summary of Statement on Educational Exchange by Congressman Paul Simon November 8, 1977	... 128
Summary of Statement by Guy Coriden, November 10, 1977	... 129
Statement regarding Proposal CSCE/BM/49 by Representative Millicent Fenwick, November 23, 1977	... 130
Statement on Educational Exchanges by Ester Kurz	... 132
<u>Press Relations</u>	... 133
Statement to the Press made by Myron Hoffmann October 25, 1977	... 134
Press Briefing by Myron Hoffmann, November 7, 1977	... 135
Press Briefing by Myron Hoffmann, November 15, 1977	... 136

Excerpt from the Introduction to the
Third Semiannual Report by President Carter
to the Committee on Security and Cooperation in Europe

During this reporting period, the most significant development affecting implementation of commitments undertaken at the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) was the beginning on October 4 in Belgrade of the first CSCE follow-up meeting.

President Carter's appointment of the distinguished American jurist and diplomat, Arthur J. Goldberg, as Chairman of the US delegation and Ambassador-at-large for CSCE demonstrates the importance which the President attaches to the CSCE process and to the Belgrade meeting in particular. This meeting provides the first opportunity to conduct a full review of the understandings contained in the CSCE Final Act, signed by 35 heads of state at Helsinki in August 1975. It also offers a forum to set forth clearly the President's personal commitment to a dialogue on humanitarian matters as one of the fundamental aspects of detente.

Ambassador Goldberg leads a delegation which includes all of the Congressional members of the CSCE Commission as well as members of the Commission staff, a number of distinguished public members from business, academia, the labor movement and other walks of life, plus representatives of several government departments and agencies. In preparing for the Belgrade conference, the United States delegation called upon the resources of other government departments and, with the assistance of the CSCE Commission, heard the views of numerous private organizations whose interests are affected by provisions of the Final Act.

As a result, Ambassador Goldberg entered the Belgrade meeting with the broad support of the American people for his important task. On instructions approved personally by the President, all delegation members are working to assure that the Belgrade discussions result in an honest and candid review of areas where progress has been made and of areas where greater efforts are needed, especially in the vital field of human rights.

The Administration shares the view expressed in the report issued by the CSCE Commission on the second anniversary of the Helsinki Summit that the Final Act offers significant potential for improvement of relations between East and West. We also agree that much of that potential is yet to be realized. The Belgrade meeting has offered a unique opportunity to give new impetus to the long-term process initiated with signature of the Final Act and to ensure that the great potential represented by this process is not left to dissipate.

The Belgrade meeting is a new venture in the history of East-West relations. It is not a negotiation as such, and it does not look toward a new agreement or to changes in the Helsinki Final Act. Its task is to conduct an exchange of views on experience gained during the past two years and to examine means of deepening cooperation in the future. The experience gained in the course of this exchange will be one of the most important results of the meeting. Based on this experience, the participants should be better able to pursue implementation both in their own countries and in their mutual relations in years to come.

Statement by Secretary of State Vance

In a statement to the U.S. Congressional Commission on Security and Cooperation, before the beginning of the Belgrade meeting, Secretary of State Vance set forth the goals of the United States:

-- We seek full implementation of all the commitments contained in the Helsinki Final Act. None can be called more binding, more vital, than others. All three of the so-called Baskets are important.

-- We seek incremental improvements in relations between East and West on all the fronts surveyed at Helsinki: political, economic, scientific, cultural, security, and humanitarian.

-- We seek to move forward on all these fronts simultaneously; the freer flow of people and ideas is as important to long-term security and cooperation as, for example, advance notice of major military maneuvers; the humanitarian pledges at Helsinki are as important, as say, the promises of greater commercial cooperation.

-- There will be consideration of new proposals. But we must not be diverted from assessment of how fully the specific undertakings of Helsinki have been carried out by all the signatories.

This is an ambitious agenda, there may well be differences in understanding and priority; these can be discussed in good faith, in hopes of narrowing such differences.

But such discussions cannot serve as a diversion or a cloak for inaction. The CSCE Final Act was approved by 35 heads of state and government after three years of intense negotiations. Undertakings of such gravity cannot subsequently be relaxed or overlooked.

At Belgrade we will assess on the spot how best to be effective and persuasive in pursuing our objectives. Between public diplomacy and quiet diplomacy, we will strive for maximum practical impact.

We will avoid grandiose new proposals that have little chance of being acceptable. Propaganda ploys, debating points have no place in our strategy. We will state our goals and our assessments clearly, without polemics. It would serve no one's interests if such serious and far-reaching questions were dealt with in anything other than a serious and straightforward manner.

Let me say from the start that no nation's record is perfect, and we will accept constructive criticism of our own record, just as we ask others to do.

Respect for the undertakings solemnly accepted at CSCE is an effort to which our government is firmly committed, in the full knowledge that the pursuit of security and cooperation in Europe poses a test of our perseverance as much as of our ideals. I am confident that we will, together, persevere.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN DANTE FASCELL, CHAIRMAN
OF THE CSCE COMMISSION, AT COMMISSION HEARINGS IN EARLY 1977

Since (Helsinki), news reports from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union--stories of ordinary citizens as well as educated political activists citing the Helsinki agreement in campaigns for redress of grievances--have...confirmed that the accords are eliciting an unexpected response inside those countries.

That response has made Helsinki a catchword for concepts of civil liberty, religious freedom and human rights in general. The response has been met by repression--arrests of the most vocal advocates of the Helsinki spirit in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, policy harassment in East Germany and Rumania.

And that repression has itself been met by public and governmental protest in the West. In the process an old debate has been reborn: an argument over the results to be expected from East-West dialogue and the means best suited to obtain those results.

The Soviet Union, in particular, has warned Americans that our expressed concern for fair play for dissent inside the U.S.S.R. endangers the course of bilateral relations and the chances of achieving a new strategic arms limitation agreement this year.

That is linkage with a reverse twist. But it is being echoed by Western commentators who fear that the United States is committing itself to a lost cause: the protection of dissenters who protect the denial of human rights in their own countries and who seek there the recognition of the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

As I understand--and applaud--the statements of our Government, however, I do not share the concern that America is acting either futilely or foolishly. America has always stood for the ideals of civil liberty. We stand for them now. Neither the White House, the State Department nor this Commission--by our actions--seeks to interfere in Soviet affairs nor to change any nation's internal system.

On the contrary, we seek only to further a process of understanding between two very different and long-opposed systems. That understanding cannot be advanced on false premises. It requires full exchanges of views and objective examination of facts and circumstances.

That understanding can be promoted within the framework of the Helsinki accords. Those provide protection against armed intervention in internal affairs or the threat of such intervention. They offer respect for national sovereignty side by side with respect for individual rights.

They require a commitment to gradual and orderly implementation--by all parties--of all aspects of the undertakings, whether they concern an improved flow of economic data or an easier flow of people. They may require more and more difficult accommodations from the Eastern signatories, but they impose burdens on the West as well.

OPENING PLENARY STATEMENT
BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG
CHAIRMAN OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Belgrade, October 6, 1977

Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates,

On behalf of the American delegation, permit me to express our sincere thanks to our hosts, the Government of Yugoslavia. We are more than grateful for the facilities and support they have so generously provided for the conduct of our work. It is particularly symbolic that this Conference is held in a nation which has done so much for so long to promote security and cooperation in Europe.

Two years and two months ago the leaders of our 35 nations assembled in Helsinki to conclude -- with their solemn approval -- the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

This week we are beginning in Belgrade a new phase of the process they initiated. We are embarking on a mutual examination of our experiences in implementing the Final Act. We are also seeking together new means of solidifying and building from the foundations laid in Helsinki.

Our task is part of a great and ancient enterprise: the search for security, the advancement of cooperation in Europe. This Conference is one more step toward that high goal, one part of the broader process of reducing risks of confrontation in Europe and of replacing them with opportunities for cooperation.

This meeting is both an expression and a result of considerable improvements in East-West relations. In turn, what we accomplish here in the coming months can have a direct impact on the further development of detente.

I have been designated by President Carter to speak here as the representative of the United States Secretary of State. I carry with me the President's deep, personal commitment to advance the goals of the Final Act and the work of which it is such an important element. He is dedicated to working constructively with all nations represented here, to help fulfill the Final Act's commitment to improved European security and cooperation.

Two corollary principles make the Helsinki approach unique. One is our rule of consensus, the recognition that every nation should take part on an equal footing in decisions which affect the future of Europe. The second is also crucial: the tie, formalized by the Final Act, between the freedom and welfare of each of our nations, and the freedom and welfare of each of our individual citizens. Let me reaffirm in the most positive terms the wholehearted commitment of the United States government to the pursuit of detente. Let me also restate our view that a deepening of

detente, a healing of the divisions in Europe, cannot be divorced from progress in humanitarian matters and human rights. The pursuit of human rights does not put detente in jeopardy. Rather, it can strengthen detente, and provide a firmer basis for both security and cooperation.

The United States wants to build upon and enlarge the scope of East-West understanding. For my Government is convinced that this Conference in Belgrade must not be the end of the CSCE process. Rather, it must be an occasion to inject fresh momentum into that process. The true test of the work we do together lies not only in the conclusions we reach. It lies also in the higher goals we set and in the energy with which we set about meeting them.

My Government will do its best to provide new impetus to the CSCE process, both here in Belgrade and in our over-all policies towards Europe and the world.

-- We will conduct the review of implementation on the basis of the unity of all sections of the Final Act and the equal value of all the principles.

-- We will make clear our intention to honor the political commitments in this document and to utilize fully the practical opportunities which it opens.

-- We will discuss concrete problems, of both past and future implementation.

-- And we will conduct our policies in Europe fully aware of the fact that CSCE can only bear part of the burden for guarding the peace. There must also be progress in other efforts at detente, and the benefits of our efforts must be applied throughout Europe. Berlin, for example, remains a basic testing place of detente. This divided city must continue to receive the benefits of the Final Act. Berlin must prosper under the Quadripartite Agreement, free from crisis, if detente and CSCE are to succeed.

Just as the United States goal for Europe is one of peace, so at this Conference we seek no confrontation. We have no desire to trade debating points. Instead, we want to exchange ideas on how better to implement the Final Act. We seek a thorough, non-polemical, straightforward, and detailed review of implementation. And through that review, we seek to help formulate new measures which can give added concrete expression and momentum to the basic commitments of the Final Act.

General Assessment

The first obligation we all share is to conduct a candid review of the promises each of us has made, the promises we have kept, and the promises we have yet to fulfill.

The assessment my country has made of the over-all record of participating states over the last 26 months shows encouraging evidence of progress. But the progress displayed is not progress enough. It still falls short of the goals of the Final Act and, just as important, of the high expectations the Final Act aroused. Those expectations remain valid, and we must all be frank in judging that many of them remain unmet.

Let me comment first on what my own country has done to implement the Final Act. In general, the Act codified standards which reflect American policy in dealing with other nations and with our own citizens. Nevertheless, in response to the Final Act we have looked closely at our own behavior and -- where we have found the need and the means -- have acted to improve our conduct. In particular, we took two steps regarding the Final Act pledge to "facilitate freer movement and contacts." First, President Carter this year removed all restrictions on travel abroad by American citizens. Second, with President Carter's support, Congress recently relaxed our visa requirements, so that people wishing to visit the United States will not be excluded because of political affiliation or belief, except in the rarest instances.

Moreover, in the field of human rights, President Carter yesterday redeemed a pledge he gave last spring by signing the International Covenants on Human Rights at the United Nations. American adherence to those pacts has been a matter of personal concern to me and to many others for a decade.

The President is pledged to pursue ratification of the Covenants. Meanwhile, his action yesterday is an earnest of our good faith and a proof of the positive impact the Final Act is having in the United States.

In the spheres of commercial, cultural, educational and scientific exchanges, we have done much and have much yet to do. For example, the United States Government has made a special effort to inform our businessmen about provisions of the Final Act affecting their opportunities to enter and work in markets with which they have not always been sufficiently familiar. This year, we signed our first cultural, educational, and scientific cooperation agreements with Hungary and Bulgaria; and we concluded negotiations on a similar agreement with Czechoslovakia. With the Soviet Union, we renewed several scientific cooperation arrangements.

Meanwhile, in some other signatory nations, we have seen a well-intentioned and productive effort to implement the principles and provisions of the Final Act. In some nations in the East, advances have been only modest, and are still far below the Final Act's standards. And there are individual cases under the Final Act where forward motion has been stalled or even reversed.

Under the stimulus of the Final Act, some progress has been made in bettering relations among the participating states. The exchange of goods, knowledge, people, and ideas has expanded in some measure. Substantial obstacles do remain to travel and the flow of information between one part of Europe and another, but these have already diminished

somewhat. This improvement can be seen simply in the numbers of people who have been able to leave old homes for new ones in Europe, America, and Israel. These results mean real individual happiness, and we here must reaffirm our resolve to speed that development.

Likewise, in translating our shared political undertakings to the area of military security, the Final Act has brought another kind of exchange, promising but incomplete. Confidence-building measures, involving advance notification of maneuvers and exchange of observers, have made openness a virtue in a field where secrecy was once instinctive. We have laid a foundation on which this meeting can productively build.

Thus we can see some progress.

We can see it in terms of individuals and families reunited after being separated by war, accident, and history. But we must recall the many who remain apart.

We can see progress in business contacts that become business contracts. But we cannot overlook the still inadequate supply of relevant economic data on which the growth of business confidence depends.

We can see progress in books translated, performers applauded, students instructed, and scientific theories tested. But here, too, the openness and ease of contact promised at Helsinki has been only partly realized.

Thus, we cannot be satisfied with the record of implementation. The standard we have set together should be even higher, if the goals of the Final Act are to be realized.

Let me illustrate some areas in which we in the United States feel old practices have not been changed sufficiently to meet the new imperatives of the Helsinki spirit.

In educational exchange programs, it is not enough to increase the number of scholars involved; rather, a prerequisite for such an increase is improved freedom for scholars and their research. What value is there, for example, in financing a student's work abroad, when for months he is denied admission to an essential archive, and when, having finally been admitted one day, he is not permitted back the next -- even to collect his notes?

Also, in seeking "to facilitate the freer and wider dissemination of information of all kinds," we cannot point convincingly to progress while international broadcasts are subjected to continuing interference.

Similarly, while steps have been taken to ease travel and working conditions for journalists, those advances are jeopardized when visas are made conditional on a correspondent's agreeing not to contact certain sources of information and opinion.

Finally, while real progress has been made in reuniting divided families and concluding binational marriages, satisfaction with those developments must be balanced by regret that many long-standing cases remain unresolved, that the resolution of routine cases is too often arbitrary and capricious, and that new bureaucratic obstacles are imposed on people seeking to join relatives abroad. This runs counter to the Helsinki promise "gradually to simplify" exit procedures. It is also hard to see the workings of the "positive and humanitarian spirit" when an ill and aged husband is denied, after long years of separation, the company of his nearly blind wife and their daughter.

Equally difficult to understand are broader restrictions on the right of individuals to travel or emigrate. That right is established in Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country." All of us have pledged in the Final Act to "act in conformity" with that Universal Declaration, and we have given specific emphasis to that promise in the Final Act's provisions on family reunification.

Human Rights and Detente

The two years since the Helsinki summit are particularly short when we set them against the historic divisions we are trying, through the Final Act, to bridge. Some of the deepest differences among the participating states lie in views on the status of the individual in relation to the state. The issue of human rights represents the widest gap between the ideals and practices of East and West. It is a sensitive subject on the international agenda, but one which can be dealt with in an understanding manner, and which must be discussed in order to facilitate further progress under the Final Act.

Precisely because the distance between our views on human rights is so great, we must all work to narrow the divide. This is not a simple process. In my own country, a mere 15 years ago many Americans were denied the right to vote. But through commitment to an ideal, and constant efforts to reach that ideal, this blemish on the American record was removed. Other serious blemishes remain, and our efforts to remove them also remain constant. The process is inevitably a gradual one, but efforts like ours are what make progress in human rights possible under the Final Act.

In the United States, we also realize that human rights encompass economic and social rights as well as political and civil liberties. It is our view that one set of values cannot be stressed at the expense of the other. Rather, it is the combination of these rights and the respect in which governments hold them all which offer the best promise that all can be attained.

Concern for these rights is not new either to Americans or to the other states taking part in this Conference. It is enshrined in Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations. It is enshrined in the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And the Final Act, in Principle VII, binds all the participating states to "recognize the universal significance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, respect for which is an essential factor for the peace, justice and well-being necessary to ensure the development of friendly relations and cooperation among themselves as among all states."

American policy -- evolving from a history of political development with deep roots here in Europe, and nurtured by the efforts of other nations -- has long pursued that vision. It is explicit in our Bill of Rights. It animated the Four Freedoms proclaimed by President Franklin Roosevelt -- freedom from want and fear, freedom of speech and religion -- for which Americans last fought on this continent in the war against fascism. It was also part of the heritage of President Kennedy when, 14 years ago, he launched a fresh initiative for world peace. He asked: "Is not peace in the last analysis a matter of human rights?" And he proposed an "agreement on a freer flow of information and people from East to West and West to East."

When such an agreement was concluded in Helsinki as part of the Final Act, President Ford echoed his predecessors' words. He said: The founders of my country did not merely say that all Americans should have these rights, but all men everywhere should have these rights."

On many occasions this year, President Carter has set forth his own commitment to the continuity of American policy in the area of human rights -- whether political, economic, social, or cultural. At the United Nations last March, he stressed that the "search for peace also means the search for justice ... (and) the search for peace and justice means also respect for human dignity ... I know perhaps as well as anyone that our ideals in the area of human rights have not always been attained in the United States, but the American people have an abiding commitment to the full realization of those ideals. We are determined therefore to deal with our deficiencies quickly and openly."

It is in that same spirit that the United States delegation will speak about human rights and basic freedoms here in Belgrade. We have much to learn from that exchange of views.

Let me illustrate some of our concerns. The Principle VII guarantee of religion and belief means to us that expression of faith must not be penalized by loss or reduction of educational or career opportunities. People should be free to worship without fear or state interference in their choice of ministers, literature, and houses of prayer.

Similarly, the "freedom of thought and conscience" we have all pledged to respect must have breathing space in which to flourish. Its expression should not be censored. Its exponents should not be imprisoned or exiled for making their thoughts known.

Moreover, the "legitimate interests" of "national minorities" in our 35 states require respect for unique cultural and linguistic heritages, and active policies to preserve these traditions and achievements for future generations.

Our governments have assumed the responsibility to "promote and encourage the effective exercise" of these rights. And in Principle VII we subscribed to "the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties" in the field of human rights. The response of citizens to that challenge, alone and in either private or public groupings in many signatory states, has been heartening evidence of the Final Act's healthy impact on all of us. In my own country, we have benefited by the dedication, candor, and commitment of our Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Its valuable work will be reflected in what we do here in Belgrade; and we are honored by having its members as part of our delegation.

All the more, then, we are also obliged to register vigorous disapproval of repressive measures taken in any country against individuals and private groups whose activities relate solely to promoting the Final Act's goals and promises.

Any such repression is contrary to the spirit and the letter of our common pledge. Rather, at this meeting, we should all reaffirm the valuable role to be played by individuals and organizations, in their own countries and in international associations, to help make that pledge a reality.

Conclusion

In the coming weeks, the United States delegation will focus its efforts in a constructive manner on improving relations among the participating states. We are here to help strengthen prospects for cooperation, and to help move closer towards what should be the noblest common goal of this Conference: to give the process of detente a human measure and a humanitarian face.

In that spirit, the United States delegation will consider and, as appropriate, support new measures to improve implementation of the Final Act. We see opportunities for improvement in the following areas:

- promotion of human rights;
- execution of confidence-building measures;
- qualitative expansion of scientific, economic and commercial data exchanges;
- easing of travel for journalists and businessmen;

- freer access to printed and broadcast information from other countries; and
- fuller opportunities for scholars and scholarship.

This list by no means exhausts our agenda or the specific ideas the United States, with other interested states, will pursue in the coming months. There are also opportunities to promote the exchange of literature, television programs, and culture of all kinds. There are possibilities for exploring, in such appropriate agencies as the UN Economic Commission for Europe, the coordination of approaches to such pervasive problems as environmental pollution. And, there is great potential for expanding trade and for sharing the benefits of technology.

However, our success will be measured not solely by words on paper, but rather by what we all do both here and at home after this meeting ends. Together we must give the process of implementation direction, higher goals, and fresh momentum, to ensure that -- when we next meet in a similar assembly -- we can record even greater progress.

In our work we will need patience, perseverance and perspective. This Conference in Belgrade is one stage of a dynamic process and a continuing dialogue. And that Helsinki process is part of an even larger effort to build more secure and more humane relations among our nations and peoples.

We are nearer the beginning than the end. The Conference must give the people of the signatory countries and people throughout the world a first report of first progress. It must demonstrate to them our shared commitment to go further. We owe them our best efforts and results better than those so far achieved.

PLENARY STATEMENT
BY PROF. JOYCE HUGHES
Belgrade, October 11, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

In presenting the views of the United States, I speak as an accredited permanent member of the delegation. However, it should be noted that I am a private citizen, and not a professional diplomat. Thus, I also represent the broad spectrum of American public opinion on the important questions that will be discussed in this meeting. The people of the United States desire progress under the provisions of the Final Act relating to security in Europe, but we are also keenly interested in implementation of all 10 principles enunciated in the initial section, especially in the area of human rights. It is clear, of course, that the principles represent solemn moral and political undertakings drawn from the body of established international law.

The United States delegation is also clear on its purpose in both these plenary sessions and the organized, sequential and structural talks in the subsidiary working groups. Simply stated, that purpose is to further the goals set forth in the Preamble to the Final Act. Those are "to make detente a continuing . . . increasingly viable and comprehensive process"; to contribute "to the strengthening of world peace and security"; and to promote fundamental human rights.

While these high goals and the solemn promises we have all made affect the relations among participating states, they also affect relations between citizens and states and exchanges between individual citizens. If the basic human rights of every citizen of every nation are not observed, there can be no lasting peace; there can be no permanent security; there can be no real cooperation among nations.

While the United States emphasizes the area of human rights, we view the principles, and the Final Act, as an integral whole. The Preamble states that all of the Principles are of "primary significance" and that each is to be "respected and put into practice." This delegation will discuss each Principle in great detail in the working bodies. In order to respect our pledge to observe a time limitation, in this statement we must be brief and paint with broad strokes.

We view detente as an important goal, but believe that progress in that area is intertwined with our concern for human rights. We believe that a human face should be placed on the body of detente. As Ambassador Goldberg emphasized in his opening address, "a deepening of detente, a healing of the divisions in Europe, cannot be divorced from progress in humanitarian matters and human rights. The pursuit of human rights does not put detente in jeopardy. Rather, it can strengthen detente, and provide a firmer basis for both security and cooperation".

The Final Act shows that our concept of security is an evolving one. In the confidence-building measures, the Act has provided us with imaginative and practical steps toward a reduction in the tensions caused by military maneuvers. Our talks in Belgrade can contribute to the evolution of the process.

It is a dynamic process, evidenced by the interaction among separate CSCE pledges. The undertakings to respect sovereign equality, the territorial integrity of states and the inviolability of frontiers do not stand alone. They are intimately linked to the equally significant obligation not to accept border changes except those agreed to under international law and those to promote the self-determination of people, and settle disputes peacefully.

The question of peace through disarmament is an important topic, but it is not an appropriate subject for this meeting. We hope that discussions in other forums such as the MBFR talks in Vienna can begin to show real progress after long delays. The President of the United States, in his address to the United Nations last week, declared our willingness to go further than ever before to eliminate the dangers of nuclear testing. In addition, President Carter is pursuing bilateral and multilateral talks to reduce the growth of nuclear armaments.

Our talks in this forum can contribute to peace, security and cooperation if we continue to be candid. Since the Helsinki summit we have seen this new candor in the animated international discussion of the application of Principle 7 to the conduct of many participating states. Through it our nations are proceeding not only to better understanding of one another, but also to better performance in the protection of the fundamental freedoms of all our citizens.

In the United States we are accustomed to open, friendly debate between individuals with conflicting views and from diverse origins, as well as frank exchanges between the public and the government. We welcome a similar exchange of constructive comment among nations.

In that context, however, the United States delegation is concerned about repressive measures contrary to Principle 7, which have been taken in certain signatory nations. Such actions are not conducive to the good atmosphere which has evolved during the plenary session of this Conference. However, we shall have more to say on these matters as our discussions continue.

In the American view, the discussion here and elsewhere is essential to the healthy advancement of the CSCE process. An international agreement such as the Final Act can only live and grow as its signatories question one another, freely commenting on matters of interpretation and practice which are related to the implementation of our undertakings. Such comment and inquiry in no way breaches the promise we also gave -- and firmly uphold -- not to intervene in matters "falling within the domestic jurisdiction" of other states.

The issue of human rights is a matter of principle in the Final Act, Governed now by our international agreement -- and others which preceded it -- human rights are, by definition, not a matter of domestic jurisdiction alone. And, as all of the participating states have declared in the Final Act, we are determined to respect and put into practice all of the 10 principles "irrespective of our political, economic or social systems".

In Principle 10, we have agreed that all participating states "will fulfill in good faith their obligations under international law". That commitment is closely bound to the preceding Principle on cooperation among states. The rules we live by at home and abroad -- codes of conduct we have voluntarily accepted -- order our daily existence and secure our prospects of improving it.

In one area the United States sees with deep regret a continuing pattern of disrespect for the pledges we have all made. Let me be specific. In some signatory states, ordinary and registered mail is improperly handled.

When letters do not pass freely between members of the same family -- some living in one country and some in another -- the process of family reunification is obstructed, not facilitated. When a publisher in New York cannot correspond directly with a literary adviser or author in Moscow, "contacts and cooperation among persons active in the field of culture" are frustrated, not increased. And, when an American friend is unable to obtain delivery of a subscription to the National Geographic Magazine for a Soviet schoolboy or a copy of the World Almanac for a teacher in Czechoslovakia, the flow of information is choked, not widened. These are not hypothetical incidents. These are actual cases. These are facts and we intend to address them forthrightly and with candor because we believe that a thorough review demands such candor and straight talk.

The conduct just described runs contrary to Principle 9 and also to the "Freedom of Transit" guaranteed in the Universal Postal Convention. Such actions conflict with the broad pledge of Principle 10 to fulfill obligations under international covenants, as well as provisions elsewhere in the Final Act.

The United States recognizes, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, that the Final Act as a unity, all of whose provisions and principles relate to one another. It is also a document of intent, a guide to a gradual process of development and implementation; an evolutionary proceeding.

The United States looks forward with sincere, but realistic hope, to the continued international application of the principles contained in the Final Act, and to a more humane, more secure, more confident global society that process promises for us all.

PLENARY STATEMENT
BY AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG
Belgrade, October 13, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

During the open plenary session, one distinguished delegate from the East criticized the West's visa practices which, he stated, compared unfavorably to his own country's practices. As I reported in my opening statement, America's visa policies have been liberalized. They compare favorably with other countries, although not perfect. I welcome a discussion on this subject and all others on our agenda in the working groups, where we will be eager to discuss any problems, but I do not regard the distinguished delegate's criticism as an affront or as a signal of confrontation. This type of dialogue should be welcomed by all delegates at this Conference if we are to make progress. I trust that my remarks will be understood in a constructive spirit, so that we can move away from platitudes and proceed to specifics.

The United States recognizes that all three Baskets are of great importance. The United States considers Basket III as a keystone of the Final Act. Both President Carter, in whose name I speak, and the American public, place high value on the human rights provisions of the Final Act.

The human contacts provisions of Basket III --- family reunification, family visits, and marriages between nationals of different states -- are in our view especially significant. They lend great political force to the most human of impulses -- the desire to be with and rejoin spouses, relatives and friends. Where a person is powerless to fulfill that personal dream, our collective commitment gives strength and hope, provided we do our task and implement the specific provisions of the Final Act.

The United States is encouraged by the increase since 1975 in the numbers of people permitted to leave their countries for the purpose of rejoining -- or just visiting -- relatives in the West, in Israel and in other countries. But has movement truly been facilitated when thousands of members of ethnic groups have been refused permission to rejoin families elsewhere and there is evidence that thousands of others have been discouraged from applying?

The United States recognizes the favorable resolution of some family reunification and marriage cases by several of the signatory states. But, by way of example, Mr. Chairman, are governments promoting the Act in its full spirit and the further development of contacts when over 2,700 individuals in one signatory country and close to 2,000 in another cannot cross their borders to live with relatives in my own country?

The American delegation would further like to commend efforts that have been made to ease the procedural obstacles confronting those who wish to leave. But is it in the Final Act's "positive and humanitarian spirit"

in some signatory states to continue to subject exit visa applicants to long and uncertain delays, to arbitrary and unjustified decisions, and to punitive and discriminatory measures?

I simply cannot understand why a wife and husband should be separated because of capricious government policies, or why applicants in a signatory country are being refused the right to apply. Similarly I also cannot understand why so many are kept in the dark about application procedures? Why, for example, is one man refused the right to leave a country on the grounds of possessing state secrets when someone who had worked with him at the same job possessing the same information is allowed to leave? Further, why should some applicants still be thrown into an impossible Catch-22 situation where they lose their jobs upon applying for exit visas and are then arrested for not working. Is this sensible? Is it consistent with what we decided at Helsinki? I think not. And is it humane that a man, a woman, or their family should be repeatedly arrested and harassed because they have asked to leave? And is it consistent with the humanitarian provisions of the Final Act to harass or imprison people for peaceful, non-violent political dissent or religious beliefs?

These are the types of problems that continue to concern the government and people of the United States. And these are the types of problems we intend to pursue in specific detail in the working bodies because we consider this is what the Final Act requires us to do. These practices evidence that basic attitudes opposed to the two-way flow of people have in some signatory states not been modified and that state-imposed barriers to greater human contacts have not been removed. People are still prevented from being with people. People ultimately is what the Final Act is all about.

It is each nation's obligation to such individuals to reexamine their situations and remedy them in the "positive and humanitarian spirit" which the Final Act sets as a standard. It is our obligation at this Conference, moreover, to agree on new measures to liberalize travel, marriage, and family reunification practices. The rules and decisions must, if Helsinki is afforded its proper weight, be fair; the financial and social costs minimal.

I regret that there is resistance, on the part of certain signatories, to ensure a free, untrammelled flow of ideas and information guaranteed by the Final Act. It has been said by way of illustration that hard currency shortages in other states inhibit the purchase of information products from my own country. I recognize the problem these shortages impose, but surely they cannot be an insuperable obstacle to fulfilling the solemn undertakings of what we all have agreed upon.

It is hardly a lack of dollars that motivates the jamming of Western radio broadcasts. Nor can we believe that the same financial problems which are asserted to limit purchases of Western publications also demand storage of them in library stacks closed to all but a privileged few.

In my own country we impose no artificial obstacles to access to information of all kinds, and certainly the Final Act contemplates that journalists should not be impeded from performing their duties to the public.

We are pledged in the Final Act to facilitate -- not control -- cultural and educational exchanges. Yet, practices contrary to both the spirit and letter of the Final Act still persist. We took a survey of Americans participating in one of our exchanges. We found it disturbing to note that less than 20 percent are satisfied with their experience in gaining access to archival material of a scholarly character. Formally accepted to conduct research, and granted official entry, many scholars continue to be sharply restricted in their ability to conduct what is recognized by all standards as solely academic pursuits.

We cannot undertake all measures of implementation at once. It is a step-by-step process. But we must take some concrete measures. We hope other delegations will join us in proceeding in a detailed discussion of mutual accomplishments and shortcomings so that the "thorough review" of implementation will take place in the subsidiary working bodies next week.

We cannot afford to give way to frustration. People all over the world are listening to what we say and do. Nor can we be content with the stale repetition of the conventional wisdom of our respective societies. If ever there was an opportunity to break free of ideological cliches, it lies in the Final Act and the framework of interaction it provides us and our peoples.

Our review of implementation should reveal the situations which cry out for attention wherever they may be, including my own country and agree on ways to improve them. Where we go in the future depends on our willingness to react to constructive criticism. The action we take in response to the dialogue in working groups will be the measure of our sincerity.

The people of Europe, America, and throughout the world, expect much from us. I hope that we earn the trust they repose in us by the progress we make here.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

PLENARY STATEMENT
BY AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG
Belgrade, November 2, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

I wish to express my government's support for the proposal on confidence-building measures sponsored by the Delegations of Norway, Canada, Great Britain, and the Netherlands.

This proposal is a welcome contribution to our consideration of how to build confidence through greater openness about military activities. It is consistent with the recognition in the Document on Confidence Building Measures and Certain Aspects of Security and Disarmament that experience gained by the implementation of CBMs, together with further efforts, could lead to developing and enlarging measures aimed at strengthening confidence. My delegation also welcomes, as did the distinguished delegate of Norway, the constructive proposal of the neutral and non-aligned countries.

A detailed review of our experience with implementation began last week in the appropriate forum, the subsidiary working body on security. This review will continue next week.

Already, there has been general acknowledgement of the positive contribution of CBMs but recognition also of the wide variation in the degree to which states have implemented those elements of CBMs which are discretionary. The proposal presented today would assure fuller and more consistent implementation of these measures in a number of ways. Let me point briefly to a few of them:

-- Some states have availed themselves of the option to notify their smaller-scale maneuvers, others have not. This proposal would give the concept of smaller-scale maneuvers specific definition and would strengthen the obligation to notify such maneuvers.

-- Examination of the texts of notifications given to date has shown that the extent to which these have included more than the bare required minimum of data and given a truly informative picture of the maneuver being notified has varied considerably. This proposal would assure more consistently informative notifications.

-- An opportunity to observe maneuvers in a meaningful way has not always been provided. This proposal would establish minimum standards of access for all observers.

-- The Final Act commends the question of notification of major military movements to our further attention. This proposal would establish a clearly defined requirement for the prior notification of such movements, consistent with the language and spirit of the Final Act and without in any sense amending the Act.

I believe this proposal will merit the careful attention of the security working body once it begins to consider measures to develop and enlarge confidence-building measures.

I repeat: We endorse and fully support the proposal on CBM measures sponsored by the Delegations of Norway, Canada, Great Britain and The Netherlands.

PLENARY STATEMENT
BY AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG
Belgrade, November 4, 1977

I have listened with close attention, as I always do, to the statement of the Distinguished Representatives of the Soviet Union and Poland on the necessity of furthering detente. I agree with this goal. I am sure all here would agree detente encompasses many areas -- the SALT negotiations, reciprocal reduction of conventional forces and armaments, mutual reduction of forces in Europe, trade, scientific, cultural and educational exchanges, reunification of husbands and wives and reunion of families, free flow of information, access by journalists, economic cooperation, and military confidence-building measures. Some we will deal with here and some in other forums. Detente, in the view of many delegations, and others, must have a human face.

I am not aware that any delegation has not been serious or has sought to engage in a propaganda exercise.

I agree with the representative of Norway about our agenda. We must be faithful to the Final Act and the decisions taken at the preparatory meeting and then we would be willing and anxious to take up the new proposals.

I remind you again of what President Kennedy once said: "Is not peace in the last analysis a matter of human rights?"

PLENARY STATEMENT
BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG
Belgrade, November 9, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

At the outset of my remarks I would like to express my delegation's full support for the nine new proposals sponsored by Belgium and others to strengthen several of the Final Act's Basket III provisions. We will also study with great interest the proposals made by the Polish and Italian delegations.

As we have seen in more than six weeks of work in the Plenary and the subsidiary working bodies, while steps have been taken to realize several of the Final Act's provisions, a great deal more needs to be done. The new proposals sponsored by Belgium and others essentially aim at clarifying and enriching several different Basket III provisions, and seek to clarify the Final Act. I wish to emphasize that, as we understand the proposals, the sponsors do not intend to change the Final Act in any way. Each of the proposals deals with an important area which would benefit -- based on the past two years' experience -- from a more precise definition, as the Final Act contemplates.

I would particularly like to draw attention to the three proposals we are co-sponsoring, together with several other countries, concerning visa application procedures and access to archival material. These two problems, as we have mentioned several times in plenary and in the working bodies, are of particular concern to our government and people.

As the Conference concludes its discussion of the first part of the agenda, Mr. President, the United States delegation wishes to make some general observations about the status of our work.

It is the conception of my delegation that, in conformity with the Final Act, this meeting of the participating states has two central objectives. The first is to join as sovereign nations in a thorough examination of the provisions of the Final Act and of the matter and degree to which they have been implemented unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally. The second concern is to draw from that mutual inquiry appropriate conclusions about the future conduct of our nations -- acting alone and acting together -- to realize the broad goals of the Final Act.

The phase of the Conference's work known as the review of implementation is now approximately six weeks old. The discussions in this initial period, in our view, have been forthcoming in some respects and lacking in specifics in others. It is a fact that in a few of the subsidiary working bodies the debate has approached a dialogue. Delegations have been able in limited areas to describe the actions of their

countries in pursuit of Final Act goals, voice their concerns about actions -- or lack of action -- by other states and hear explanations of conduct which required both questioning and justification. I refer to the Basket II discussions and that phase of Basket III dealing with cultural and some educational exchanges.

In these rather limited areas, then, the Conference has shown itself capable of making a joint accounting of progress within the framework of the Final Act. That is no mean feat. In light of the undertakings given at Helsinki, our delegations have been able on these subjects to examine not just themselves, but each other -- not just the smooth and narrow path of traditional cooperation, but also the varied and difficult issues of innovation.

In the field of economics, we have been able to probe the very dissimilar, even dissonant priorities of market and non-market systems. In the area of human contacts, we have been able to explore the continuation of restrictive visa practices that do not accord with the spirit of the Final Act or the exigencies of a shrinking planet, but often without receiving adequate explanations. In matters of information, we have not found a common understanding of the value of sharing news and ideas, and I am impelled to add we have found substantial inadequacies.

It is a matter of great concern to my country that Murray Seeger of the Los Angeles Times, a very prestigious newspaper, has been repeatedly refused a visa to work in Czechoslovakia, and Eric Bourne of the Christian Science Monitor, also a highly respected newspaper, has been offered conditions limiting the scope of his proposed work in Czechoslovakia which in all good conscience he could not accept. And I must also mention that it is a matter of concern to my country that Paul Hofmann of the New York Times, which is world renowned, and Leslie Collitt of NBC have been expelled from Czechoslovakia during working visits there. I hope we will get an explanation of why this is so as all of these reporters are distinguished, respected and responsible and hope to discuss it in the next phase of our work.

My delegation supports the standard for dialogue the then Prime Minister of Sweden proposed in his address to the Helsinki Summit. "Respect for one another's social systems and the principle of non-intervention," Premier Palme said, "should not be given to mean that this exchange shall be restricted to assent and joint declarations. Frank criticism must also be allowed in the face of phenomena such as the oppression of dissidents, torture and racial discrimination."

It is in this spirit that we raise the cases of Orlov, Shcharansky, and Ginsberg in the Soviet Union, and we raise them by way of illustration because they have been seeking to monitor the implementation of the

PLENARY STATEMENT
BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG
Belgrade, November 9, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

At the outset of my remarks I would like to express my delegation's full support for the nine new proposals sponsored by Belgium and others to strengthen several of the Final Act's Basket III provisions. We will also study with great interest the proposals made by the Polish and Italian delegations.

As we have seen in more than six weeks of work in the Plenary and the subsidiary working bodies, while steps have been taken to realize several of the Final Act's provisions, a great deal more needs to be done. The new proposals sponsored by Belgium and others essentially aim at clarifying and enriching several different Basket III provisions, and seek to clarify the Final Act. I wish to emphasize that, as we understand the proposals, the sponsors do not intend to change the Final Act in any way. Each of the proposals deals with an important area which would benefit -- based on the past two years' experience -- from a more precise definition, as the Final Act contemplates.

I would particularly like to draw attention to the three proposals we are co-sponsoring, together with several other countries, concerning visa application procedures and access to archival material. These two problems, as we have mentioned several times in plenary and in the working bodies, are of particular concern to our government and people.

As the Conference concludes its discussion of the first part of the agenda, Mr. President, the United States delegation wishes to make some general observations about the status of our work.

It is the conception of my delegation that, in conformity with the Final Act, this meeting of the participating states has two central objectives. The first is to join as sovereign nations in a thorough examination of the provisions of the Final Act and of the matter and degree to which they have been implemented unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally. The second concern is to draw from that mutual inquiry appropriate conclusions about the future conduct of our nations -- acting alone and acting together -- to realize the broad goals of the Final Act.

The phase of the Conference's work known as the review of implementation is now approximately six weeks old. The discussions in this initial period, in our view, have been forthcoming in some respects and lacking in specifics in others. It is a fact that in a few of the subsidiary working bodies the debate has approached a dialogue. Delegations have been able in limited areas to describe the actions of their

countries in pursuit of Final Act goals, voice their concerns about actions -- or lack of action -- by other states and hear explanations of conduct which required both questioning and justification. I refer to the Basket II discussions and that phase of Basket III dealing with cultural and some educational exchanges.

In these rather limited areas, then, the Conference has shown itself capable of making a joint accounting of progress within the framework of the Final Act. That is no mean feat. In light of the undertakings given at Helsinki, our delegations have been able on these subjects to examine not just themselves, but each other -- not just the smooth and narrow path of traditional cooperation, but also the varied and difficult issues of innovation.

In the field of economics, we have been able to probe the very dissimilar, even dissonant priorities of market and non-market systems. In the area of human contacts, we have been able to explore the continuation of restrictive visa practices that do not accord with the spirit of the Final Act or the exigencies of a shrinking planet, but often without receiving adequate explanations. In matters of information, we have not found a common understanding of the value of sharing news and ideas, and I am impelled to add we have found substantial inadequacies.

It is a matter of great concern to my country that Murray Seeger of the Los Angeles Times, a very prestigious newspaper, has been repeatedly refused a visa to work in Czechoslovakia, and Eric Bourne of the Christian Science Monitor, also a highly respected newspaper, has been offered conditions limiting the scope of his proposed work in Czechoslovakia which in all good conscience he could not accept. And I must also mention that it is a matter of concern to my country that Paul Hofmann of the New York Times, which is world renowned, and Leslie Collitt of NBC have been expelled from Czechoslovakia during working visits there. I hope we will get an explanation of why this is so as all of these reporters are distinguished, respected and responsible and hope to discuss it in the next phase of our work.

My delegation supports the standard for dialogue the then Prime Minister of Sweden proposed in his address to the Helsinki Summit. "Respect for one another's social systems and the principle of non-intervention," Premier Palme said, "should not be given to mean that this exchange shall be restricted to assent and joint declarations. Frank criticism must also be allowed in the face of phenomena such as the oppression of dissidents, torture and racial discrimination."

It is in this spirit that we raise the cases of Orlov, Shcharansky, and Ginsberg in the Soviet Union, and we raise them by way of illustration because they have been seeking to monitor the implementation of the

PLENARY STATEMENT
BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG
Belgrade, November 9, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

At the outset of my remarks I would like to express my delegation's full support for the nine new proposals sponsored by Belgium and others to strengthen several of the Final Act's Basket III provisions. We will also study with great interest the proposals made by the Polish and Italian delegations.

As we have seen in more than six weeks of work in the Plenary and the subsidiary working bodies, while steps have been taken to realize several of the Final Act's provisions, a great deal more needs to be done. The new proposals sponsored by Belgium and others essentially aim at clarifying and enriching several different Basket III provisions, and seek to clarify the Final Act. I wish to emphasize that, as we understand the proposals, the sponsors do not intend to change the Final Act in any way. Each of the proposals deals with an important area which would benefit -- based on the past two years' experience -- from a more precise definition, as the Final Act contemplates.

I would particularly like to draw attention to the three proposals we are co-sponsoring, together with several other countries, concerning visa application procedures and access to archival material. These two problems, as we have mentioned several times in plenary and in the working bodies, are of particular concern to our government and people.

As the Conference concludes its discussion of the first part of the agenda, Mr. President, the United States delegation wishes to make some general observations about the status of our work.

It is the conception of my delegation that, in conformity with the Final Act, this meeting of the participating states has two central objectives. The first is to join as sovereign nations in a thorough examination of the provisions of the Final Act and of the matter and degree to which they have been implemented unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally. The second concern is to draw from that mutual inquiry appropriate conclusions about the future conduct of our nations -- acting alone and acting together -- to realize the broad goals of the Final Act.

The phase of the Conference's work known as the review of implementation is now approximately six weeks old. The discussions in this initial period, in our view, have been forthcoming in some respects and lacking in specifics in others. It is a fact that in a few of the subsidiary working bodies the debate has approached a dialogue. Delegations have been able in limited areas to describe the actions of their

countries in pursuit of Final Act goals; voice their concerns about actions -- or lack of action -- by other states and hear explanations of conduct which required both questioning and justification. I refer to the Basket II discussions and that phase of Basket III dealing with cultural and some educational exchanges.

In these rather limited areas, then, the Conference has shown itself capable of making a joint accounting of progress within the framework of the Final Act. That is no mean feat. In light of the undertakings given at Helsinki, our delegations have been able on these subjects to examine not just themselves, but each other -- not just the smooth and narrow path of traditional cooperation, but also the varied and difficult issues of innovation.

In the field of economics, we have been able to probe the very dissimilar, even dissonant priorities of market and non-market systems. In the area of human contacts, we have been able to explore the continuation of restrictive visa practices that do not accord with the spirit of the Final Act or the exigencies of a shrinking planet, but often without receiving adequate explanations. In matters of information, we have not found a common understanding of the value of sharing news and ideas, and I am impelled to add we have found substantial inadequacies.

It is a matter of great concern to my country that Murray Seeger of the Los Angeles Times, a very prestigious newspaper, has been repeatedly refused a visa to work in Czechoslovakia, and Eric Bourne of the Christian Science Monitor, also a highly respected newspaper, has been offered conditions limiting the scope of his proposed work in Czechoslovakia which in all good conscience he could not accept. And I must also mention that it is a matter of concern to my country that Paul Hofmann of the New York Times, which is world renowned, and Leslie Collitt of NBC have been expelled from Czechoslovakia during working visits there. I hope we will get an explanation of why this is so as all of these reporters are distinguished, respected and responsible and hope to discuss it in the next phase of our work.

My delegation supports the standard for dialogue the then Prime Minister of Sweden proposed in his address to the Helsinki Summit. "Respect for one another's social systems and the principle of non-intervention," Premier Palme said, "should not be given to mean that this exchange shall be restricted to assent and joint declarations. Frank criticism must also be allowed in the face of phenomena such as the oppression of dissidents, torture and racial discrimination."

It is in this spirit that we raise the cases of Orlov, Shcharansky, and Ginsberg in the Soviet Union, and we raise them by way of illustration because they have been seeking to monitor the implementation of the

Final Act in the Soviet Union. It is clear that the Final Act endorses such peaceful activities, and persons engaged in them should be free from harassment, arrest and imprisonment.

Some here say it is better not to mention such cases specifically, as I have done, in either the plenary or working groups of this Conference, but rather to raise these questions bilaterally. The United States has raised these cases and others bilaterally at the highest level without substantial success and, therefore, we raise them here, as illustrative examples of many others, because we consider it the joint business of our Conference, and we hope that by doing so progress can be made.

Now I can understand that there may be interventions objecting to this approach. I don't like my country to be criticized, but I have said and now repeat that, if the criticism is unjustified, I shall reply, and if justified promise remedial action. It is not a pleasant task to criticize other countries and I take no relish in it. I have been charged by my President to represent my country here -- and I will do it to the best of my ability. In the spirit of dialogue, however, I simply don't understand why it is said that it is not appropriate to raise such matters here. A full, specific and candid review of the human rights and other provisions of the Final Act is the business of this Conference. I continue in the hope that such a dialogue will take place.

Further, it is inevitable in light of new proposals bearing on these subjects that if progress is to be made, the new proposals will have to be discussed factually and not in platitudinous terms.

It is in our common interest to conduct our discussions with civility and tact, but we must be candid enough to cover all aspects and seek to arrive at a consensus on them. I repeat that I do not regard my own country to be immune from criticism during these discussions since we do not claim to be perfect.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my delegation has sought to make two basic points on human rights. First, the record, despite limited progress, has on the whole been disappointing. Secondly, we need to discuss this record frankly and to seek improvements if we are to convince our people that detente means practical benefits in their daily lives and that they should, therefore, give it their support. I am pleased that many other delegations have been making the same point.

What we seek to discuss cannot be regarded as improper intrusion into the internal affairs of any country. Human rights is a matter of the Final Act and of international law as set forth in the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international documents and agreements.

The distinguished representative of the Soviet Union has voiced his concern that an examination of details of implementation of human rights could somehow undermine the bridges of understanding so laboriously built over the last decade between the participating states. My belief, on the contrary, is that those bridges are only as strong as their foundations. It is the primary role of this Conference to strengthen the foundations so that detente can have a strong, enduring and noble edifice.

It is, therefore, in all our interests and in the interest of the CSCE process to strengthen the foundations of the Final Act. The dialogue we are seeking to conduct is designed precisely to explore the understandings we have reached, our progress and shortcomings, and to insure that there are no misconceptions about their meaning. Only if that examination proceeds candidly and studiously, can we be certain, as we move to the next phase of our work, the detente we all seek will be solid and contribute to security and cooperation in Europe.

RIGHT OF REPLY STATEMENT
BY AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG
Belgrade, November 11, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

I would like in a preliminary remark to set the record straight because I want to protect the reputations of a member of our foreign service and of the president of one of our largest unions. In the distinguished Soviet Delegate's remarks he described the head of our Government workers union as George Vest. This might have been a problem of translation but George Vest is Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs and the head of our Government workers union is Jerry Wurth. Each is rightly proud of his office and they jointly would not want confusion as to their respective roles.

I have listened with close attention to the remarks made by the delegates of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. It seems that every time I or a member of my delegation speaks it is described to be a lecture. Every time they speak, although sometimes they are far more discursive than I am, their speeches are not so characterized. So perhaps I'll call their remarks something else - a discursive dissertation.

I would like to call attention to the fact that I do not think that our dialogue is furthered by the use of pejorative adjectives. It is not conducive to international diplomacy. Just to give a few examples employed at repetitive length by the Soviet Ambassador: political hypocrisy, propagandistic approach, crude, provocative, pseudo-juridical. These characterizations are red herrings designed to escape the truth of our statements.

We regard the statement by the representative of the Soviet Union as a diversionary response to our statement made on Wednesday. This is evident from the pejoratives used throughout, which are designed to avoid, rather than to render a genuine reply to our specific illustrations.

My remarks Wednesday were directed to the idea that the Final Act mandates frank discussion of human rights progress and shortcomings, and that it is not interference in the internal affairs of any signatory country.

We express great disappointment that the Soviet and Czechoslovak delegates did not respond to the violations of human rights which we specifically mentioned.

I have said repeatedly in various interventions that my country's record on human and economic rights isn't perfect. But our country's record of achievement in both areas is far better than the records of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. I do not propose to deliver an elementary economic, sociological or legal analysis of our respective systems. It is well known throughout the world what our working conditions are, what our standards of living are, what our trade union rights

are. They are among the highest, and of this we are justly proud. Of particular importance is that our trade unions are free and are not subject to government controls. Can the same be said of theirs? The ironic reference by the Soviet Delegate to George Meany's criticisms of some of our shortcomings demonstrates that, We have repeatedly said we are not perfect. But the perfect is no enemy of the good.

Adlai Stevenson once said to a political opponent, "If you will stop telling lies about me, I'll stop telling the truth about you." I direct his relevant comment to the Soviet and Czechoslovak delegates.

It is interesting to note that the distinguished representatives of the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia quoted American sources, our press, congressional reports, comments by labor leaders and others, in what they regarded to be criticisms of our policy. This illustrates a crucial point -- that everyone in our country is free to criticize our deficiencies without being subject to harassment, arrest, and imprisonment for doing so. We are very proud of our free press, though public officials sometimes resent their criticism. A great American, Benjamin Franklin, summed up our continuing policy in this regard: "We ought to prevent abuses of the press, but to whom do we entrust the power to do do?"

In my country the right of association is fully protected. Thus everyone in the United States is free to join groups to monitor compliance with the Final Act, without governmental interference or for that matter to express his or her individual opinion. There are over 100 groups in my country freely exercising their monitoring rights. I have met with them before and will meet with them next week in Washington. Some may praise -- some may criticize -- but it is basic to our constitutional conception that all public officials are servants of the people and not their masters. We are still awaiting acknowledgment from the Soviet and Czechoslovak press or the representatives of their governments that their countries are not perfect -- that they are not the ultimate utopia. It would be refreshing to hear such an obvious truth. Just yesterday President Carter frankly stated that our system is not perfect, but that we are doing all within our power to correct it.

The Final Act calls for the free flow of information. That is a great characteristic of our imperfect society -- the freedom to associate and criticize as the individual sees fit. It would be a giant step toward the realization of the goals of the Final Act if similar criticisms appeared in the Soviet and Czechoslovak press and if monitoring groups could also freely criticize their country.

I want to assure the distinguished representative of Czechoslovakia, who has made reference to my past activities on behalf of human rights that I shall continue both privately and officially to raise my voice against violations of human and economic rights. It is both a personal moral obligation and an obligation called for in the Final Act. Reference has been made to our failure to ratify several ILO conventions. I personally favor their ratification but everyone knows they have long been a matter of reality in the United States.

I would like to state very directly that it does not add to the level of this Conference to use words like "warning" as the distinguished Ambassador of the Soviet Union has done on several occasions in seeking to dissuade my delegation and others from speaking about the human rights provisions of the Final Act. To what end is such an inflammatory word employed? Rhetoric like this does not help our striving to promote good neighborly relations.

And, finally, references were made to the fact that the United States is not sponsoring any resolutions. I am at a complete loss to understand these statements. We are cosponsoring a whole series of resolutions leading to the promotion of detente and to increased security and cooperation in Europe. This remains our objective and we shall continue at this conference to strive toward this goal.

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS
AUTHORIZED BY AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG
Belgrade, October 26, 1977

I wish to reaffirm that there is no difference on tactics or strategy between the fifteen NATO signatory countries. As we said before, now that we have reached the stage of the subsidiary working bodies we are bound by the language of the Final Act to become more specific and name countries, categories, and when appropriate, cases, where the Final Act has not been fully implemented. There is no disagreement on this score among the NATO groups and, indeed, among many neutral and non-aligned countries.

On strategy we also agree that our aim is to obtain a final document which reviews implementation and contains some constructive proposals. These proposals hopefully will constitute an improvement of the implementation of the Final Act.

As far as the problem of dialogue is concerned we fully share the wish of many Western, neutral and non-aligned signatory states to promote discussion with the East. Up to a certain point such a dialogue has already developed in the two first Baskets. I regret very much that in the third Basket up to now there has been no meaningful dialogue. The Eastern countries have been stating their position and not responding to questions posed not only by NATO countries but from neutral and non-aligned countries as well. We think it is important for all countries -- East and West alike -- to raise questions relating to the implementation of the Final Act and for appropriate responses to be made. In no other way can a useful dialogue be carried on in furthering detente with a human face.

It remains my conviction, shared by our allies and other countries, that this approach is non-confrontational. It is, of course, obvious that there are differences in this area between West and East. But a candid, frank, and specific dialogue scarcely reaches the dimensions of what in ordinary diplomatic usage and practice is deemed confrontational or inappropriate.

I express the hope that in all subsidiary working groups including Basket III there can be a dialogue in this spirit -- this indeed is the real spirit of Helsinki.

PLENARY STATEMENT REGARDING PRINCIPLE SEVEN
BY SENATOR CLAIBORNE PELL
Belgrade, November 23, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

As a member of our own Congress for nearly two decades and someone who has spent a good part of his lifetime in Europe, and as the son of a father who was a diplomat, I take particular pleasure in speaking here today as an individual; but I am also speaking as a member of the U.S. delegation.

The delegation of the United States is impressed by the large number of proposals which have already been put forward here, and we fully appreciate the desire on the part of all delegations to give each proposal their full and careful attention as we continue our considerations of new measures. These proposals certainly cover the full spectrum of our mandate here and include many very positive and useful elements, bearing witness to the seriousness of intent of all the delegations here.

My delegation is firmly convinced that the CSCE process is part of the warp and woof of the entire process which we label "detente" and as such it must endure. But detente refers to far more than just the development of relations between states. In the final analysis, the true measure, the real measure of detente will be the degree to which it redounds to the benefit of the individual citizen. We must not lose sight of the individual as we consider the many proposals before us. If the individual does not benefit from our endeavors, by what yardstick will he measure our work here?

As we conducted our review of implementation of the Final Act, it must have become apparent to everyone here that all of us still have a long way to go before all the signatory states reach full compliance with the Final Act in the field of human rights. It was also clear that this was an area of great sensitivity. My delegation, for its part, did all it could to begin a serious discussion on what we all must acknowledge to be a genuine problem and a legitimate matter for our concern. However, the best efforts of my delegation, and of others, to discuss what we consider to be infringements of individual human rights, were repeatedly turned aside with the argument that to raise these matters here was "interference in the internal affairs of another signatory country".

Mr. Chairman, I realize that time is short, and so I do not propose to review the arguments raised here regarding this point. Suffice it to say that my delegation totally rejects, as without foundation, the argument that raising these matters is interference

in any country's internal affairs." Thirty-five nations subscribed to the objectives of principle VII and the humanitarian provisions of Basket III, and they are as much a subject for discussion and proposals as any other aspect of the Helsinki Final Act. The fact that some Eastern delegations chose to respond to the points raised by several Western delegations, including my own, on the subject of human rights, by attacking the human rights record of the United States was a true indication that human rights is also in their view a proper subject for discussion in this forum. Although we would have preferred a more positive reaction to the specific points raised, my delegation is nevertheless pleased that it is not only the Western delegations that are concerned with human rights.

It is my delegation's view that it is appropriate and necessary that the review that has been conducted at this conference should result in proposals for further concrete and specific action in the field of human rights. The distinguished representative of Belgium, speaking for the Nine, has already made a constructive proposal to this end, one which deserves wide support. In my delegation's view, further proposals are called for so that it will be clear to the world that the discussion of and concern for human rights will not end when this conference ends.

Continuing the discussion of human rights, fundamental freedoms, and economic and social justice here and in other bilateral and multilateral fora, is a logical step in the process begun more than two years ago in Helsinki. Our concern and desire, that the discussion continue, mirrors the commitment of my country to the struggle for human rights around the world.

In closing, I recall a line penned by the English poet John Donne, which goes as follows, and which I believe is particularly appropriate for our discussion here today and tomorrow, and as the weeks go on.

"No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manner of they friends or of thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee."

PLENARY STATEMENT REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS
BY SENATOR ROBERT DOLE
Belgrade, November 25, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

I wish to extend my gratitude to the Government of Yugoslavia for the excellent job they have done in hosting this historic meeting. Although my duties in the Senate of the United States have prevented me from spending as much time here in Belgrade as I would have liked, I, along with my colleagues in the Congress, have followed these proceedings very closely and with great interest. The Chairman of my delegation, Ambassador Goldberg, has articulated the views of our government and our people on many occasions during this meeting in a frank and forthright manner. He has expressed the particular concerns of our country that the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Final Act be implemented and observed. In doing so, he speaks for all Americans.

My delegation, however, is not only concerned with the human rights provisions of the Final Act. We are dedicated to the fulfillment of all its provisions. Quite frankly, great doubts were expressed by many Americans about the Final Act at the time it was signed in August of 1975. It was not all some Americans wanted and more than others cared for. President Ford was criticized for his participation at Helsinki and the Final Act was a matter of some contention in last year's Presidential election.

To his credit, President Carter not only continued, but personally strengthened America's commitment to implement the Final Act. Just last week, Vice President Mondale reaffirmed this resolve. American commitment to the implementation of the Final Act is across the board, it is strong, it is bipartisan.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that whatever is accomplished here will be the result of compromise and cooperation. It is significant, however, to note that whatever the end results, there has been a review of the Final Act and there is a consensus for additional meetings. This, in itself, is progress -- painfully slow as it may be.

Without a doubt, it is fashionable, politically speaking, to pursue the quest for human rights. In most cases, it is also highly appropriate. Some, of course, would have you believe they discovered the dignity of man, while others are quick to condemn but slow to self-examine.

Ambassador Goldberg and other United States delegates have been specific and to the point. They have properly stated our case. Therefore, it is not my purpose to confront, or posture, or pound anyone over the head. Specific "human rights" cases which have been called to my attention have been passed on to appropriate officials. I shall hope for expeditious handling and favorable disposition. My delegation does not seek to confront but to cooperate and we do not seek to confuse but to clarify and not to weaken but to strengthen.

We are a nation of immigrants, people who have come from all over the world to participate in the promise of America. Most of our population come from European backgrounds. They have cultural and ethnic identity with most of the participating states in this meeting. They actively maintain their interest in their heritage and in their former homelands.

They express their interest through associations and organizations throughout America. For example, I have met with representatives of organizations such as the National Confederation of American Ethnic Groups, the Czechoslovak National Council of America, the Congress of Russian Americans, the Polish American Congress, the Hungarian Organization in North America, the Ukrainian National Association and the Joint Baltic American National Committee -- and many others. They have expressed their concern not only about the human rights provisions of Basket III and Principle VII, but also about the right of self-determination of all peoples.

It is a fact that the United States has never recognized the Soviet incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and U.S. official policy of nonrecognition was not affected by the results of the European Security Conference. This long-standing principle is the policy of the United States and is supported by the Congress of the United States.

I cite these groups and their concerns not to be provocative or confrontational. I merely wish to clarify and explain the reasons for the strong concerns of my delegation and my government in the field of human rights. There is -- in my opinion -- a direct connection between the public perceptions of the integrity of the Helsinki process and the ability of governments in the West to carry on the process of detente. Public trials of political dissidents, for example, could have a profound impact on pending or subsequent bilateral and multilateral agreements. Most members of the Congress of the United States believe, in my opinion, that human rights cannot be subordinated to development, cooperation and security.

Our basic goal is to promote genuine understanding and relaxation of tensions between the participating states, greater respect for human rights, freedom of religion and self-determination of all peoples. We view CSCE as an important step toward achieving these objectives. We also understand that ours is not a perfect system -- that we too have our own problems and failings -- but we are making efforts to do better, and we will continue our work toward full implementation of all the provisions of the Final Act in our own country.

Finally, it is in this spirit that the American Delegation, with the support of other delegations, will put forward a proposal which will, among other things, recognize the importance of the CSCE process and its continuation. The proposal will resolve to implement unilaterally the relevant provisions of the Final Act relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms and to ensure their implementation bilaterally and within the context of the CSCE and other multilateral fora.

December 10 is Human Rights Day, anniversary of the U.N. General Assembly's adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. May it serve to remind all nations of how far we have come and the distance yet to travel as we strive for future cooperation and security in Europe.

PLENARY STATEMENT INTRODUCING U.S. HUMAN RIGHTS PROPOSAL
BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG
Belgrade, December 2, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

On behalf of its sponsors, I would like to introduce a proposal dealing with respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief. I would also like to give a short explanation of this proposal, and should mention that a more detailed explanation will be given in the appropriate working group on principles.

The essence of our proposal, based on Principle 7, is the recognition that human rights refer to the personal rights of the individual, to economic and social rights, and to civil, political and religious rights.

It is clear that everyone has agreed the Final Act is an historic document of momentous significance which should and must not be changed. We respect that view. Our proposal clearly follows and is faithful to the commitments our governments agreed to at Helsinki at the highest levels.

The purpose of the sponsors in introducing this proposal is in no way propagandistic, nor do we conceive that the proposal that is so clearly based on the Final Act should be considered controversial.

Specifically this proposal reaffirms the undertakings made by States in the Final Act to individuals in the human rights area, and seeks to ensure that these undertakings are truly respected and reflected in the concluding document of this meeting.

It is reasonable to offer such a proposal because the review of implementation has demonstrated its necessity.

The language of the proposal, I wish to emphasize, recognizes that all of the principles of the Final Act are of primary significance. This is our shared mandate and our common agreement.

As I stated earlier this week, my delegation is concerned with all provisions of the Act, all of its principles, and is participating actively in the discussion of all such matters in both plenary and in the appropriate working bodies. We do this in the effort to reach a constructive concluding document that will reflect a common consensus.

The proposal makes clear that human rights encompass economic and social rights as well as political and civil liberties. This

is made explicit in the Final Act, the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the International Covenants on Human Rights which are incorporated by specific reference in the Final Act. It is our view that one set of values cannot be stressed at the expense of the others. Rather, it is the combination of these rights and the respect in which these governments hold them all, which offer the best promise that all can be attained and that a genuine detente can be achieved.

Mr. Chairman, in reviewing the many new proposals already tabled it appeared evident, in the view of the sponsors that a proposal following the guidelines of Principle 7 should be proposed.

This proposal in no way lessens our commitment that all proposals on every part of the Final Act -- humanitarian, economic, environmental, cultural, education, scientific, ensuring the free flow of information, and the proposals relating to military security -- be honestly discussed and negotiated on their merits by the signatory states. Nor does it lessen our strong support -- and I speak for our delegation and I'm sure for the sponsors -- our strong support for the constructive specific proposals in the human rights or humanitarian area which have already been tabled, as well as the proposal we table today. We trust that there will be an honest exchange of views -- a phrase which I borrow from the distinguished delegate of the German Democratic Republic -- on this proposal, and that constructive consideration will be given to the proposal which I offer. The people we all represent, West and East, expect no less.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PLENARY STATEMENT REGARDING SECURITY MATTERS
BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG
Belgrade, December 7, 1977

Mr President,

I would now address myself to the subject raised by our distinguished colleague and friend from Poland. It is not his fault by any means that he addressed himself to a question which we were talking about the other day. He realized that the hour was late and reserved the time to talk about it today. I found myself in a very similar situation because I, too, recognized that the hour was late and answered briefly the presentation of the distinguished Soviet delegate, which I listened to with great interest. I am afraid that the brevity of my remarks did not allow me to do justice to his presentation.

Mr. Chairman, my country yields to no other country in its desire to limit the arms race and curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The treaty, which came about in large part through constructive negotiations by the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., was signed by many nations, and many countries played important parts and made contributions which were appreciated by my country and by my President. And the objective was -- and remains for all of us here, as reflected in the Charter of the U.N. -- to "save mankind from the scourge of war". Today the need is even more pressing than when the U.N. Charter was signed, because the threat of war is now magnified by nuclear weapons while consideration at the time of the signing was based mainly on conventional weapons.

I mentioned the other day that various efforts were presently being made, including the conference between the Soviet Union and the U.S. in Washington about the sale of arms. Our President has frankly said that our country is the biggest arms salesman. The Soviet Union is the next biggest arms salesman. It is natural that we talk to each other. I hope that these talks will expand to include other countries.

Very interesting talks are also now taking place in Washington between the Soviet Union and the U.S. with the aim of dealing realistically with the problems of arms and disarmament in the Indian Ocean, and finding a sensible solution.

In the interest of time the other day, I didn't review completely all the various negotiations going on relating to arms and disarmament. I would like to recall some negotiations in which we are all a part. The U.N. Disarmament Committee will meet soon to discuss problems of great importance, and I have mentioned Geneva, Vienna, and of course, many bilateral discussions.

I would not like anybody to believe that my country does not recognize the great importance of disarmament, and the necessity to limit arms to ensure security in Europe. It is an objective fact that the security of Europe extends beyond Europe to the security of the world. I take no exception, Mr. President, to the concept that no man is an island; even Europe is not an island. European security, as the Final Act recognizes, is closely related to security throughout the world. So I would like to be very precise on this subject. Of course my delegation recognizes that the Final Act encompasses this element of security and does so very importantly. It also encompasses recognition that security is based on other things which the Final Act acknowledges to be of equal importance. I will not go through the text, in the interest of time, but I will cite some of these considerations:

"Sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty; refraining from the threat or use of force; inviolability of frontiers; territorial integrity of states; peaceful settlement of disputes; non-intervention in internal affairs; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief; equal rights and self-determination of peoples; cooperation among states; fulfillment in good faith of obligations under international law."

As the distinguished delegate from Hungary has appropriately stated, security also depends on economic matters, as well as on CBMs, and certain aspects of disarmament, such as prior notification of major military maneuvers; also tourism, human contacts, culture, and the like.

So what I was trying to say is that security relates to all of these aspects, and to point out that my delegation is trying to be faithful to the Final Act in recognizing this and discussing it. You have known me for a long time, I am very blunt, perhaps too blunt. We cannot pick and choose, none of us can pick and choose. I was trying to gently suggest to others that they cannot pick and choose and one cannot disregard human rights and other humanitarian aspects of the Act. My distinguished friend from Poland quoted me correctly as saying that I would have welcomed all delegations joining in the statement we made on human rights. He said he did not have the opportunity. Perhaps that is a failure of all of us. I, too, recall that I was not given the opportunity to join in his proposal, and indeed that has been true of many other proposals that have been offered. Perhaps we are not going about our jobs correctly, all of us. Perhaps it would be better if we forget that we are from the East or West. We are all countries of Europe, or deeply concerned with European affairs. Perhaps we should discuss,

even in an early stage, proposals that are going to be made. I won't propose this now, since 84 proposals, perhaps 85, have already been made. Perhaps we can learn from our experience and do this next time. And I now make this a proposal for my successor to offer at the next conference of this type.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say a final word on the question of follow-up. I have listened to the various proposals and there is a dichotomy between trying to solve all of the disarmament problems in the world and at the same time trying, as we Americans say, to conclude our work here with all reasonable speed.

This conception is based on our experience in dealing with arms matters. However, we are obligated to discuss disarmament as well as all other aspects of security, and do what we can to contribute to other fora where discussions are going on, and where experts have been going about this job. I subscribe to this concept, as stated in the Final Act, in full measure, and here reaffirm our commitment to all aspects of the Final Act.

Since we operate under consensus, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that in whatever time you have left during your chairmanship you get a group together and try to arrive at a consensus as regards the modalities of our further work. I do not see such great difference in principle in many of the suggestions that have been made, but it seems to me that we need the expertise of the subsidiary working bodies to go about our work in the most expeditious manner. Our working groups must be allowed to finish their work. The plenary can, of course, suggest that they get on with it, but we cannot change the venue and lose the benefit of the enormous amount of time and expertise all baskets have put into their work thus far. The baskets must be included in the drafting and we need their contributions to that process.

PLENARY STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG
MARKING HUMAN RIGHTS DAY DECEMBER 9, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

It is altogether fitting that this Belgrade meeting, as you have done, Mr. Chairman, take proper recognition that tomorrow is Human Rights Day. My government and most other members of the United Nations, as well as many groups and individuals, will be observing the 29th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which as I noted in a prior intervention, is incorporated by reference in the Final Act. Today I would like to suggest that the participating states of the Helsinki Accord have a special opportunity to do more than "observe" this event of transcendent importance. Separately and together, we can, if we have the political will, translate the rhetoric of celebration into the Concluding Document and into actions that will benefit our citizens as individuals and our nations as members of a stable worldwide community.

At the heart of the Universal Declaration is its recognition that "the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of members of the human family" lie at "the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world." That same concept animates the Final Act. It is paraphrased in the Preamble, detailed in Principle 7 and specified in the Act's Humanitarian provisions.

As a concept, the link between the dignity of the individual and the just ordering of the society in which he lives is an old precept for many of our societies. As a foundation of international order, it is a relatively innovative idea, a vision born of two world wars and the determination to promote justice, liberty, and economic security. The Universal Declaration speaks of "barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind" and ties their prevention to the promotion of "friendly relations between nations."

Our Conference in Belgrade has been exploring ways in which to deepen those relations, not least through the promotion of the human rights the Universal Declaration proclaimed.

We are approaching the time for action--the drafting of our Final Document based on this review of our shortcomings as well as the advances we have made and the proposals tabled. It is appropriate to summarize the possibilities and challenges before us.

The United States Delegation has consistently adhered to the view that this meeting has been, and is, required frankly and honestly to review the record of the implementation by all of the signatory states, as well as to consider new proposals to further implementation. We also are of the view that we are obligated individually and collectively to reaffirm our determination to fulfill our solemn undertakings in the Final Act. Further, we firmly believe that we must give adequate consideration to the Final Act's innovative commitment on respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief and we must comply with these provisions. To this end my delegation, joined by others, has sponsored Proposal BM/60 reaffirming Principle 7 and seven other resolutions emphasizing and endorsing other specific humanitarian measures of the Final Act.

We should, in the opinion of my delegation, and in fidelity to the Final Act, also give special and collective acknowledgement to the valuable and privileged, and what should be the protected, role of individuals and organizations in furthering the process of implementation through their public scrutiny of developments and practices in their own and in other signatory countries. This too is the subject of a proposal which we and others have tabled.

And we should also jointly pledge our energetic efforts both to protect the rights of religious believers among our citizens and to facilitate international contact among them, as the Final Act stipulates.

Our giving of such commitments will be understood around the world as a fresh contribution to the process begun in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Final Act. We all recognize that much of the Final Act depends for its realization on the unilateral actions of each of our states. In the area of human rights and fundamental freedoms, the initiative, and responsibility for action lies very much at home, subject, however, to the type of international accounting we have been seeking in the important review we are conducting at this meeting.

In the United States, the agenda of unfinished human rights business is not fully realized, although we are proud of our over-all record. It includes action on ratification of certain international agreements in the field of human rights which President Carter recently signed at the United Nations. It includes programs--none of them yet perfected, but all of them already solid governmental policy commitments--to advance the equal rights of minorities and the economic security of all citizens. And, finally, it includes the search for better ways to implement the policy, enshrined in such legislation as our Foreign Assistance Act, of promoting "the increase observance of internationally recognized human rights.

The effort the United States is making is a sincere one. We would hope that other nations would, in the same spirit, examine their conduct to see, by way of illustration, whether the right to religious education is truly fostered, whether believers can freely profess and practice their faith, whether opportunities for free association of believers to worship and celebrate their religion are honored in fact as well as words. It is a fact of life that in some nations of Eastern Europe those conditions do not obtain. This is a matter of grave concern to the United States. One hundred and forty million Americans are identified with Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Moslem, Budhist and other religious groups of their own choosing. This is safeguarded by the First Amendment to our Constitution which guarantees the free exercise of religion. Our people share the belief of the poet Tennyson, who once wrote that, "More things are wrought by prayer than man can dream of." We regret the fact that grave violations of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief exist in some of the countries of the East.

Fundamental to the pursuit of human rights is the unfettered expression of divergent and peaceful views. Tomorrow, observing an anniversary of great importance to the promotion of human rights, let us not forget those who have been unjustly punished simply for expressing what is characterized as dissent. A number of the signatories of this meeting have such prisoners of conscience.

Tomorrow's anniversary is an important occasion to recommit our Conference to advance toward the human rights goals of the Final Act. As the Secretary General of the United Nations said in his statement on the occasion of Human Rights Day "The protection and promotion of human rights is now among our most urgent priorities. Much has been accomplished over the year, but regrettably much still remains to be done. Disturbing violations in various parts of the world contradict the goals and ideals we have proclaimed not only in the Declaration, but in the Charter of the United Nations, and they stand as serious barriers in the way of international peace and security."

We have cited specific cases, categories and countries during the review of implementation at this meeting dealing with significant and regrettable aspects of human rights violations, and President Carter on December 3 in reporting to our CSCE Commission has cited in great detail both the progress and as the Secretary General of the United Nations has pointed out, the "disturbing violations of human rights which occurred and are still all too prevalent in" various parts of the world.

My delegation will make President Carter's report, citing chapter and verse, available to all delegations.

It would be fitting--in the spirit of the day, and of the obligation the Final Act puts on each participant--for appropriate authorities to examine again their compliance in light of the Universal Declaration and the Final Act and to take appropriate remedial action. And we have a special obligation in this connection in light of the specific human rights and humanitarian provisions of the Final Act.

We should respond to Secretary General Waldheim's call for "All governments, non-governmental organizations and peoples in every nation to commemorate the historic occasion we mark today by re-dedicating themselves to securing the fundamental freedoms set forth in the Declaration." The Final Act mandates us to do so.

I have suggested some actions our states can take here in Belgrade and elsewhere to give fitting tribute to tomorrow's anniversary. I can only add that lip service is not real

observance of human rights. Actions and practices are the true test of a society's commitment to its ideals. As His Excellency, the Honorable Lazar Mojsov, President of the Thirty-Second session of the General Assembly, said in his remarks commemorating this occasion: "The oppression of man and non-respect for human rights have always been negative omens of social unrest and even international conflict. In the interest of peaceful and progressive advancement to a better, more secure and more just world, the human community as a whole must, once and for all, do away with such manifestations which jeopardize fundamental human rights.

In light of the comments made by delegates representing some of the countries of the East questioning the relationship between human rights and security, the comments by the President of the Assembly and the Secretary General of the UN provide a definitive answer.

As the remarks by Secretary General Waldheim and General Assembly President Mojsov so eloquently point out peace, security, and human rights are indeed indivisible, and all those who seek detente must recognize that the detente we seek must have a human face if it is to be effective and enduring.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BASKET ONE - STATEMENT REGARDING
PRINCIPLES

BY AMB. ALBERT W. SHERER
Belgrade, October 19, 1977

Mr. Chairman:

In the first two weeks of our meeting, we have had useful and encouraging plenary debates on broad themes. This debate demonstrated again the commitment of all 35 participating states to the success of the CSCE process and of this meeting. We all share the conviction that we are in the midst of a process that will take many more years to bring the pledges of the Final Act fully to life. Some progress has been made; much more remains to be done. The time for rhetoric at this meeting is passed. We have begun the heart of our work. We need over the next few months in this working body and in the others that began their work this week to conduct a careful, candid, thorough, constructive examination of the details of implementation of the Final Act. We shall do this in order to make more precise our common judgement of the present balance sheet and to agree on how we can make more progress in the future.

My delegation will describe briefly its overall approach to the Declaration of Principles. We will also speak to several individual principles. We shall wish to deal in more detail about those parts of the Declaration which have produced the most controversy in the two years since Helsinki and about which the views of the participating states diverge most widely.

Implementation of the various principles has not been uniform. Some have been implemented virtually automatically in the normal course of bilateral and multilateral relations between participating states. Implementation of other principles, since they require affirmative action, has gone more slowly. Regrettably lack of progress in implementation of at least one principle in certain signatory states has raised grave concern in my country about the practical effect of the Final Act. The United States Delegation, of course, shares fully the essential point expressed in the Final Act that "All the principles... are of primary significance and, accordingly, they will be equally and unreservedly applied, each of them being interpreted taking into account the others." Like every delegation, however, we will give particular weight in our interventions to those subjects that are of most immediate interest to us. We shall do this because in our judgment the present state of implementation reveals that they require the most attention.

We regard the Declaration of Principles as our common charter of political behavior. Taken together, these principles represent a codification of inter-state relations and commitments that is grounded in long-established principles of international law and in such basic documents as the United Nations Charter. It would be naive to claim that

each state represented here understands each principle or the principles in their totality exactly alike. There remain real political and ideological differences between us. Nevertheless, we are bound by our common commitment at Helsinki to endeavor, in the words of the Final Act, "to make detente both a continuing and an increasingly viable and comprehensive process, universal in scope."

How can the Declaration of Principles help us in this endeavor? How successful have we been in the two brief years since Helsinki?

The United States Delegation calls attention to the following statement in the final clauses of the Declaration: "The participating States express their determination fully to respect and apply these principles, as set forth in the present Declaration, in all aspects, to their mutual relations and cooperation in order to ensure to each participating State the benefits resulting from the respect and application of these principles by all."

In other words, these are not the principles of coexistence for application between East and West between states with differing political, economic or social systems. The Declaration of Principles itself mandates that these principles are to be applied by each state in its relations to each other state, regardless of political or military alliance. The United States Delegation considers that all the governments represented here recognize that too often this bloc-free aspect of the Declaration of Principles has been ignored. The Europe envisaged by the Declaration of Principles is one in which each state feels secure in its basic interests without the need to assert special hegemonic rights or intra-Alliance reservations. We have not yet reached that day. We must continue to work toward it.

Much that I have said applies directly to the first Principle, that of "Sovereign equality, respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty," as well as to the eighth principle, "Equal rights and self-determination of peoples." I would like now to address a few words to the complex of Principles Two through Five. Their linkage is immediately apparent from their titles: "Refraining from the threat or use of force"; "Inviolability of frontiers"; "Territorial integrity of States"; and "Peaceful settlement of disputes". Much has been said in the plenary about the need to complement political detente with military detente. Of course, the United States Delegation agrees with this ideal. The major forums in which this can be done, however, are at places other than Belgrade. I would commend to all delegations President Carter's address to the United Nations General Assembly on October 4, the day this Belgrade meeting convened. It is a comprehensive, detailed statement of the United States' determination to work for a world free from the threat of military, particularly nuclear, conflict.

In the CSCE the participating states have reconfirmed the political principles that must guide any effort to make ours a more secure world. In particular, they have subscribed again in the second principle and in elaboration of that principle proposed originally in Geneva by the Romanian Delegation, to the fundamental rule of the United Nations Charter, that they will "refrain in their mutual relations, as well as in their international relations in general, from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations and with the present Declaration." This is a basic point of our political relations. As the Final Act says, we must not assault each other's frontiers; we must respect each other's territorial integrity and in particular "refrain from any action inconsistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations against the territorial integrity, political independence or the unity of any participating State, and in particular from any such action constituting a threat or use of force;" we must settle disputes among us and resolve any open questions, including questions that might relate to European frontiers in accordance with international law, peacefully, and by agreement.

I recite these long passages from the Declaration of Principles in detail to show that we have already committed ourselves to the words. We should not be tempted by the possibility of adding more words to the solemn ones we have already signed or by the call for empty, destabilizing agreements that would be inconsistent with the right of individual or joint self-defense recognized in the Charter of the United Nations. Once again, I would refer you to President Carter's UN address for a thorough exposition of my government's position, and I would commend to you in particular the following two passages that relate directly to the principles now under consideration:

First, and I quote: "The United States is willing to go as far as possible, consistent with our security interests, in limiting and reducing our nuclear weapons. On a reciprocal basis we are willing now to reduce them by 10 percent, by 20 percent, even by 50 percent. Then we will work for further reductions to a world truly free of nuclear weapons."

Second, and I quote again: "To reduce the reliance of nations on nuclear weaponry I hereby solemnly declare on behalf of the United States that we will not use nuclear weapons except in self-defense; that is, in circumstances of an actual nuclear or conventional attack on the United States, our territories or armed forces or such an attack on our Allies."

BASKET I STATEMENT REGARDING PRINCIPLE VI
BY AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG
Belgrade, October 20, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

Today I propose, in accordance with our agenda, to devote my time to a discussion of the Sixth Principle. Before doing so however, I think it only appropriate, particularly Mr. Chairman since you are in the chair, to comment concerning the constructive proposal submitted in Geneva by your delegation with regard to the "Draft Convention on a European System for the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes." This is a subject that is of great interest to me and my government. We look forward to working closely with your delegation, Mr. Chairman, and others, with regard to the forthcoming meeting of experts, and promise full cooperation to ensure a successful outcome.

We have heard in recent days and also today, from the distinguished representatives of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, and Bulgaria that when my delegation and others express concern about repressive measures relating to the Final Act and lack of implementation, we are, in their view, trespassing over forbidden territories and we are, in fact, violating the Sixth of our Principles. My delegation disagrees and we shall state our reasons.

The distinguished representatives of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, the GDR and Bulgaria have resorted to a completely unwarranted interpretation of Principle VI in this attempt to avoid discussion of certain matters unpalatable to them. They have asserted that violations of Principle VII guaranteed human rights and fundamental freedoms and the humanitarian aspects of Basket III, are beyond the competence of this meeting and should not be the subject of dialogue with other participating states, including my own. This argument is without foundation, and represents a complete distortion of the letter and spirit of the Final Act.

The Final Act contains a solemn commitment by participating states to "refrain from any intervention, direct or indirect, individual or collective, in the internal or external affairs falling within the domestic jurisdiction of another participating state, regardless of their mutual relations."

It is clear from the negotiating history of Principle VI, its text, and established principles of international law, that the provisions of the Sixth Principle apply to, and I quote:

"armed intervention or threat of such intervention
against another participating state;

"acts of military, political, economic, or other
coercion;

"direct or indirect assistance to terrorist activities
or to subversive activities directed toward the violent
overthrow of the regime of another participating state."

Now this is what Article VI is all about and this is not simply a legalistic interpretation. The language of Principle VI is explicit, and the reasons underlying it are abundantly clear. Principle VI embodies a commitment by all participating states to abjure from military action, use of force, and coercion in order that peace, security and cooperation in Europe may be assured. As is well-known, Europe has been subjected on a number of occasions since the end of the Second World War, and even within less than half a decade of the convening of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in 1972, to armed intervention across international borders. The Final Act has language designed to forestall such actions in the future so that we shall never again see a large country impose its will by force upon a small country. When the United States Delegation and other delegations raise questions about the performance of other states, with reference to all sections of the Final Act, as they did yesterday in referring to the Prague Trial and repression of individuals in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia seeking in a peaceful way to monitor their countries' implementation, they are doing so in full conformity with the Act, and are in no way violating Principle VI or any other principle. On the contrary, they are fulfilling their obligations under the Follow Up provisions of the Final Act and in all fidelity to the correct interpretation of Principle VI.

In our debate earlier this week, the signatory states I have mentioned have gone so far as to claim that they should be the sole judge of how well they are fulfilling their Final Act commitments and that therefore they may refuse to engage in a substantive dialogue in response to expressions by delegations of concern and criticism. The adoption of such an attitude would completely frustrate the constructive work of this conference, and reduce it to a meeting in which we are engaged in mere platitudes. If progress is to be made, this attitude, this approach, cannot be accepted by this conference.

Moreover, no state, party to the Helsinki Accord, can choose a sentence out of context to distort the meaning of Principle VI or of any part of the Final Act. No state can quote a word or two from the Preamble and ignore the rest of the Preamble which, among other things, is designed to "promote fundamental rights, economic and social progress, and well-being for all peoples". No state can, in fidelity to the Final Act, abjure its commitment to observe and honor the human rights provisions of the Act.

All states here are raising their voices at the United Nations against the application of infamous apartheid laws in South Africa, by means of arrest, official harassment and trials. I heartily approve of these protests at the U.N., based upon the U.N. Charter and I am confident that all delegates join with me in what I have just said. This example vividly illustrates that domestic laws must, under given circumstances and established principles of international law, give appropriate recognition to solemn international commitments.

The distinguished delegates of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and other East European countries have argued that persons monitoring the Final Act in their countries have violated national laws by promoting the free flow of information, a right guaranteed by the Final Act. However, the Final Act itself endorses the free flow of information and therefore such activities are a legitimate subject of international concern, and a matter for dialogue here. And arrests, harassment, trials and imprisonment for such activities are matters of our legitimate concern.

Furthermore, the Final Act states explicitly that participating states will act in conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, which in its Preamble "reaffirms faith in fundamental human rights and in the dignity and worth of the human person." Additionally, Article 55 of the Charter embodies "universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." I need scarcely remind you that the United Nations Charter is a document to which all of us have subscribed. And the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is an integral and important part of recognized principles of international law.

Mr. Chairman, we must keep in mind that the Final Act is a balanced, indivisible whole. No state can legitimately use Principle VI to negate any of the other important provisions of the Final Act. This would be an outright repudiation of the solemn undertakings we all made at Helsinki. We must not allow this to happen.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we believe that the Sixth Principle cannot and must not be used to avoid a dialogue about matters that are of the deepest concern to all of us and that go to the very heart of our ability to keep the CSCE process alive and moving toward the ultimate implementation of all of the provisions of the Final Act.

The Final Act refers to people and the rights of people. This is one of the great features of the Final Act. If a fellow delegate expresses concern and criticism of the performance of my country under the terms of the Final Act, when I think that this criticism is unjustified I shall say so. When I think the matters are justified, I shall say so, and do all in my power to commit my country under our constitutional processes, to do better. I hope that this spirit will be generally shared so that we can conduct our deliberations with candor and frankness, and in the interests of dialogue.

To make general speeches about human rights and to avoid specific reference to the Prague trial would make our own deliberations here dealing with the human rights provisions of the Final Act a mockery.

We have entrusted to our care the question of discussing, debating and reviewing implementation of the Final Act and to consider new proposals to further the provisions of the Act. We must do this with candor and good will, and move forward to improving the prospects of peace, cooperation and security in Europe.

BASKET ONE - STATEMENT REGARDING
CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES
BY ROBERT STRAND
Belgrade, October 24, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

The document on confidence-building measures and certain aspects of security and disarmament contains specific undertakings designed to bring increased openness in the conduct of certain military activities. The goal is to build confidence and ease tensions among states. These measures complement in the security area the measures to build detente in the political, economic and humanitarian spheres which are found in other parts of the Final Act.

Openness about military activities, achieved through implementation of the confidence-building measures in the Final Act, may promote confidence and stability in a number of ways.

It may reassure other states about the benign nature of particular routine military activities which might otherwise appear threatening.

It may also give reassurance in a more general way by demonstrating the willingness of States to provide information about their own military activities. This willingness is demonstrated best when States go beyond strict compliance with those confidence-building measures which they have agreed they "will" take, to liberal implementation of those which are discretionary.

Finally, the practice of openness, by helping to dispel some of the air of fear and distrust among States which has been one factor impelling them to arm against each other, can help improve the climate for conduct of the various negotiations underway in other forums to limit and reduce arms.

In our detailed review of the implementation of confidence-building measures, we shall want to look carefully at what states have done and then consider how implementation may be improved. In looking for ways to improve, we must consider both how the discretionary elements among the confidence-building measures may be more liberally implemented and how we may act upon the statement at the end of Section (Roman numeral) I of the document on confidence-building measures that, "experience gained by the implementation of the provisions set forth above, together with further efforts, could lead to developing and enlarging measures aimed at strengthening confidence." I join my British colleague in welcoming the interest in improving implementation of CBMs indicated by a participating state in Plenary this morning.

Today, I would like first to review briefly in general terms how confidence-building measures have been implemented since the signature of the Final Act. I will then look in greater detail at the implementation of the provision for prior notification of major military maneuvers.

What is the overall picture?

-- To date, there is no indication that any participating state has failed to live up to the obligation to notify its major military maneuvers. All major maneuvers have been notified within the period prescribed; in some cases longer notice has been given.

-- The NATO countries and the neutral and nonaligned states have notified many smaller-scale maneuvers. The United States, for its part, has notified one smaller-scale national maneuver, and notification has been given of seven smaller-scale multinational maneuvers, sponsored by other countries, in which American troops have participated.

-- The Warsaw Pact states, in contrast, have yet to exercise meaningfully their option to give prior notification of maneuvers involving fewer than 25,000 troops.

-- Of the maneuvers notified within the context of the Final Act, observers have been invited to more than half. A number of observer invitations have been extended by members of both military alliances as well as by the neutral and nonaligned states. Practice has varied, however, with respect to the choice of states invited, the opportunity observers have been given to follow and understand the development of the maneuver, and acceptance of invitations received.

- Invitations issued by NATO, neutral and nonaligned countries have generally been issued to a large and geographically dispersed group of states. Until recently, invitations by Warsaw Pact countries have been limited to a smaller group of nearby states.

- Observers at maneuvers held in NATO and in neutral and nonaligned countries have been given a satisfactory opportunity to understand the scenario and follow its development. The United States has yet to be invited to a maneuver held by a Warsaw Pact state and must leave it to others to record their experiences. We welcome the recent departure from this practice.

- NATO countries, acting in the prescribed spirit of reciprocity, have accepted observer invitations from all quarters. Until very recently, no Warsaw Pact state had accepted an invitation from a NATO state.

- Although some states, including the United States, have reported troop movements connected with maneuvers when notifying those maneuvers, no state has exercised its option under the Final Act to notify its major military movements per se. The United States is prepared to give further consideration to this question, as called for in the Final Act.

-- Finally, since the signature of the Final Act, there has been a wide and encouraging participation in military exchanges between participating states.

It is evident from this overview that much has been done to give life to confidence-building measures and that there has been no breach of the obligations agreed to.

• It is equally evident that there is ample room for states, by their voluntary implementation of the discretionary elements of the confidence-building measures in the Final Act, to contribute further to openness about their military activities and hence to confidence among them.

I would like now to look more closely at how states have implemented the first of the confidence-building measures, the requirement to give prior notification of major military maneuvers.

As already noted, there is no evidence that any state has failed to notify a major military maneuver. There have been some fourteen such notifications given. All have been given within the prescribed time and some longer in advance. This record represents a significant contribution to openness, and in some cases a welcome departure from past more secretive practices.

All notifications of major maneuvers have also contained at least the bare minimum of information required. However, the degree to which notification texts have incorporated more than the bare minimum and given an informative picture of the maneuver being notified has varied widely.

The Final Act has the following to say about what information shall be contained in the text of notifications:

"Notifications will contain information of the designation, if any, the general purpose of and the States involved in the maneuver, the type or types and numerical strength of forces engaged, the area and estimated time-frame of its conduct. The participating States will also, if possible, provide additional relevant information, particularly that related to the components of the forces engaged and the period of involvement of these forces."

This paragraph contains two sentences, one setting out what must be included in notifications, the other what is discretionary. The latter sentence, however, does not say that states "may also, if they wish" include additional information but rather that they "will also, if possible" do so. This language creates a strong presumption that additional relevant information will be provided.

Nevertheless, much is left to discretion. Even in the sentence laying out what must be included in notifications it is left to States to determine in what detail to describe the "general purpose" of a maneuver, how far to break down the "type or types...of the forces engaged", and how precisely to identify the area in which the maneuver is to be held.

To illustrate the range of implementation of what is prescribed in the paragraph on content of notifications, I would like to read and briefly analyze the texts of two major maneuver notifications my government has received in recent months, one from the Soviet Union, the other from the Federal Republic of Germany.

The first is the notification of the Soviet maneuver, "Carpathians".

[Comparison of text of "Carpathians" and FRG maneuver "Standhafte Chatten"]

The differences between these two notifications are not trivial or inconsequential. Both texts satisfy the minimum requirements of the Final Act. However, that provided by the Federal Republic shows clearly how liberal implementation, going beyond what is strictly required, may contribute to confidence among states.

By giving a fuller and more detailed picture of the maneuver being notified, the German text provides greater reassurance about the nature of the activity being conducted. In a more general, and perhaps an even more important way, it strengthens confidence by demonstrating concretely the willingness of the Government of the Federal Republic voluntarily to provide additional information about its own military activities.

It is toward the promotion of such openness that we shall look in considering further how CBMs have been implemented and how implementation may be improved.

Text of Invitations to Soviet Maneuver
"Carpathians" and FRG Maneuver "Standhafte
Chatten", minus complimentary opening

Carpathians

"On July 11-16, 1977 maneuvers code-named "Carpathians" will be held in the area of Lutsk, L'vov, Rovno by the troops of the Carpathian military region. The task is to improve cooperation of different branches of armed forces. Ground troops together with the air force units will participate. The expected number of troops is about 27,000."

Comments

-- The notification text complies with the minimum terms of the Final Act. At the same time:

-- The purpose is stated in the most general terms, in terms so general indeed that it is difficult to form any impression of the nature of the maneuver.

-- No breakdown of type or types of troops is provided beyond a statement of the services involved.

-- And no information is provided about the components of the forces engaged or the period of their involvement.

Standhafte Chatten

"... The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has the honor to notify the maneuver "Standhafte Chatten". This maneuver, in which armed forces of the United States will take part in addition to units of the Bundeswehr, will take place in the Federal Republic of Germany from 12th to 15th September 1977. The maneuver will take place in the framework of the "autumn forge" exercise series -- a coordinated series of regular national/multinational field training and command post exercises being conducted by certain members of NATO.

"Name of the Maneuver: "Standhafte Chatten"

"General Description: Field maneuver of the land forces, comprising two parties with air support;

"Purpose of the maneuver: Operations at divisional level; command and control of major units and interaction of combined arms in rapidly changing situations;

"Time of the maneuver: 12th to 15th September 1977;

"Maneuver area: Brilon - Kassel - Bad Hersfeld - Siegen - Plettenberg;

"Command level: 111 German corps;

"Units participating: 2nd Light Infantry Division, 5th armored division, parts of No. 26 Airborne Brigade, parts of the corps support and supply units, one US brigade; air forces in the framework of the multinational maneuver "cold fire 77", which will take place simultaneously; "Total number of military personnel involved: 38,000, including command personnel and umpire services;

"Absence from garrisons: the ground force units will leave their garrisons between 5th and 12th September; the bulk of them will return by 18th September."

Comments:

-- The notification complies with the requirements of the Final Act. Beyond this;

-- The purpose of the maneuver is described in some detail.

-- In describing the "types" and "components" of forces engaged, specific units are identified.

-- The relationship of the maneuver to other maneuver activities is provided.

-- Not only are specific participating units identified, but the period of their absence from garrisons is also stated.

BASKET I STATEMENT
BY AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG
Belgrade, November 1, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

Almost 25 years ago, what we now call the CSCE process began as an idea. This concept was put forward by the Soviet Government and the head of its State, His Excellency President Brezhnev. In the negotiations that followed -- at Helsinki, Geneva, Helsinki and Belgrade -- the non-aligned, neutral countries and countries of both West and East Europe made significant contributions. The Final Act is the culmination of a common effort and its implementation is a shared responsibility. The peoples of Europe, the United States and Canada -- indeed the peoples of the entire world -- expect us to fulfill this responsibility. There can be no escape from this responsibility and -- at times in light of controversial issues which inevitably arise from our differing ideologies -- this most onerous task.

Our solemn commitment to each other is to continue this process. In the months since the Final Act was signed at Helsinki, few of its provisions have been as widely discussed as Principle VII. This Principle has come to be recognized as the joint undertaking of all 35 participating states to respect human rights and fundamental freedoms.

My country claims neither a monopoly of wisdom on the meaning of the commitments undertaken by Governments in Principle VII, nor a perfect record of implementation. The American standard of respect for human rights has been reached, despite our constitutional commitments, only as a result of a complex and difficult evolution, after painful and sometimes incomplete corrections of abuses, and as a consequence of seeking a progressive enlargement of individual freedoms.

In the 1950's -- in my own country -- an American Senator named Margaret Chase Smith reminded her colleagues in the U.S. Senate -- in what has been called a declaration of conscience -- of some fundamental American ideals. She defined them as "the right to criticize; the right to hold unpopular beliefs; the right to protest; the right of independent thought. The exercise of these rights, she added, "should not cost one single American citizen his reputation or his right to a livelihood."

Her statement still stands as a concise representation of many important goals Americans believe Principle VII exists to foster. In its reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights, Principle VII also binds the participating states to respect many other specific commitments; respect for the rights "to life, liberty and the security of person,"

for equality before the law and due process in the workings of the law, for the advancement of economic and social rights, and for "freedom of movement" and "freedom of association." Reinforcing those rights are the protections against "torture or ... cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment" as well as against "arbitrary arrest, detention or exile." But central to the confirmation of those rights, which CSCE governments are obliged to respect, is the link Principle VII recognizes between the "inherent dignity of the human person" and "the effective exercise" of fundamental freedoms.

Principle VII likewise established an interrelationship between the "universal significance of human rights" and the prospects for international "peace, justice and well-being." Principle VII thus mirrors the view which we support that government respect for human rights is an "essential factor" of detente. Having made the question of a government's treatment of its own citizens a matter of international concern in the Final Act, the participating states in particular agreed to the proposition that government action to assure individual freedoms is not exclusively an internal matter for each state to consider by itself.

From our own experience of gradual progress toward higher human rights standards we understand that such actions can be difficult to set in motion quickly or to be attained. Still, if we are to meet the expectations aroused in our respective peoples, there must be discernible progress to correct systematic abuses of human rights if the Final Act is to have credibility.

The United States Government has from time to time fallen short of the human rights targets we have set for ourselves and our people. We do not object to an examination of our record, and find it difficult to understand why other governments take exception when we examine theirs.

President Carter, the other day at the White House, said explicitly that we have to do better at home. In spite of blemishes on our record, however, the point to be made is that the governmental institutions of the United States are working to eliminate injustices rather than to deny them.

There are positive attitudes and developments to be noted in many CSCE states. The United States delegation accepts as an indication of progress, for instance, the action to which the representative of Poland referred in his address to the opening plenary, the amnesty of July 22 for imprisoned members of the Workers Defense Committee. My delegation also welcomes similar measures by other governments, proclaiming amnesty for non-violent political prisoners, and securing the freedom of individuals who have petitioned this Conference for redress of abuses of the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief. Similar gestures in other signatory states -- exonerating those imprisoned for their beliefs,

for acts of conscience such as religiously motivated refusal to serve in the military or civil protest against arbitrary government behavior -- would be welcome indications of growing adherence to Principle VII.

We understand the Final Act to mean that any delegation is free and indeed obligated to discuss shortcomings of any signatory in any area covered by the Final Act and to call attention of this Conference to action taken against individuals who dedicate themselves to a peaceful struggle for human rights. In the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, for example, authorities this year have brought criminal charges against men and women whose principal offense, in the view of the United States, has been their public effort to promote the aims of the Final Act. I assure these delegations that it is not in a confrontational spirit but in the spirit of full review, from which my country is not exempt, that we allude to these facts.

Such actions against public groups to promote observance of the Helsinki Agreement are not consistent with "the effective exercise of civil, political ... and other rights," to cite the language of Principle VII. The activities of these people and their groups are taken as evidence of the involvement of citizens in the realization of Final Act goals. We have discussed these specific cases in the appropriate working body and they are the subject of vigorous discussion which is the meaningful way this Conference, in our view, should be conducted.

If we refer as we have done to the motivation behind Charter '77, it is because as we read this document it manifests a desire to initiate a "constructive dialogue" on human rights matters. This appears to us to be particularly the sort of citizen endeavor to exercise civil and political liberties within the legal framework of a participating state which Principle VII envisions and endorses. We believe, therefore, that international obligations are not honored when criminal charges are brought against men and women who seek to clarify the application of the Final Act and such other international documents as the UN covenants. It is particularly difficult to agree that there is justification for the arrests and conviction of peaceful advocates whose trials appear related in large part to the question of how the Final Act is being implemented. Equally disturbing is the harassment of others who subscribe to the Final Act by governments putting people under house arrest, expelling one from his apartment, depriving others of drivers' licenses or jobs. Denial of job opportunities is particularly striking in countries that place great emphasis on the "right to work." These actions do not fit with the promise conveyed by Principle VII that participating states would respect freedom of thought and conscience.

In the field of religious faith, Principle VII expresses the promise of each state "to recognize and respect the freedom of the individual to profess and practice, alone or in community with others, religion or belief acting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience." Such actions

should not be punished either by fines, job dismissals, threats against parents seeking to assure their children a religious education or by prison terms for the open, active profession of religious faith. Rather, the United States Delegation believes that Principle VII calls for governments, at a minimum, to facilitate the access of believers to religious teaching, literature and materials. There have been some welcome steps made in this direction in the Soviet Union and other participating states. As the representative of the Holy See pointed out, it is not enough. Implementation of Principle VII mandates the expansion of such practices.

The broad Principle VII commitment to "promote universal and effective respect" for human rights as well as the very specific renunciation in Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of "Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment" strongly suggests that psychiatric treatment of individuals confined for political views should be of specific concern to us.

I do not mention specific categories or countries to score debating points. A debator does not point out, as I have done, shortcomings on the part of his own side -- in my own case my own country. Let me repeat that we do not raise these matters lightly or for propaganda purposes. We raise them because they are directly related to the health of the CSCE process and of detente in general. We recognize our own difficulties, and we are working openly to correct them. We call upon other governments likewise to take the first step to real cooperation in this sensitive area by recognizing that they, too, are not without blemish, and that these blemishes are legitimate subjects for consideration between us. I repeat today my earlier pledge: We are ready also to discuss calmly and rationally the flaws which others may perceive in American implementation and, where we believe criticism is justified, to recommend remedial action to our authorities.

It is in this spirit that our comments on implementation -- both our own and others -- are offered, and we urge that they be so accepted. I know that some have suggested -- most recently the Distinguished Representative of Poland in his learned exposition yesterday -- that the exchange of criticism among ourselves on the basis of Principle VII in fact contravenes the Principles themselves: specifically, the protection of each state's "right freely to choose and develop its political, social, economic and cultural systems" without intervention in that process by another state.

May I say, with respect, that this seems to me a fundamental misconstruction of the relations among these principles. These protections of sovereignty enjoyed by a state in no sense limit its obligations with respect to human rights, even as he has defined them, or the right of other states to speak up on the basis of them. Quite the contrary: We are dealing here with complementary, interlocking parts of great agreements of the post-War era, reflected in the UN Charter, the Helsinki Final Act, and a large and growing number of other international instruments.

Sovereignty and non-intervention proscribe any effort by one state to coerce another into changing its system or -- equally important -- refraining from doing so, as it may wish. And none of us here has any proper business trying to change anyone else's system. Diversity reigns. But the other side of the coin is that, in exercising our right to choose and develop our own systems, each of us can be held accountable by other members of the international community for conforming that development to certain minimum international standards of individual justice in the field of human rights as well as social and economic problems. To that extent, the treatment of individual people by any of us is the concern of all of us.

I hope we will strive toward common goals that go beyond the minimum, and that is the strong thrust of the Final Act. But these minimum standards are our common point of agreement in the Final Act.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, after our debate is completed, we will face the question of what conclusions we should draw from it. Certainly we shall continue to deal with sensitive matters in our continuing bilateral contacts after Belgrade. The Belgrade meeting, however, it seems to us, would make a major contribution to understanding and further cooperation if it were to include language in its concluding document reflecting not only our debate but also a specific recommendation by the 35 participating states on how to improve implementation of all aspects of the Final Act, including the human rights ideals incorporated in it. We, and others, will offer a proposal to that end. This recommitment should, in the view of the United States Delegation, focus directly on the positive role that can be played by individuals and non-governmental groups in the process of securing implementation of the provisions of the Final Act. It should reconfirm that such individuals and non-governmental groups are to be given the protection of their government when they seek to assist in the implementation process, even when, as must inevitably happen from time to time, they point out instances of non-implementation by their own government.

Mr. Chairman: My delegation will work for such a recommitment at Belgrade. We think that this is a realistic, even mandatory task because it goes to the fundamental question of the practicality of the Final Act. The manner in which our conference deals with this task will, I assure you, have a major effect upon the judgment that the American people and the people of the world are forming on the CSCE process. We must, therefore, find here together a way to combat cynicism and to encourage optimism about the Final Act. We believe that this is an objective shared by all the participating states. The United States Delegation considers that, with goodwill, we can make good progress toward achieving it in this body.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ADDENDUM
BASKET I STATEMENT
BY AMBASSADOR GOLDBERG
Belgrade, November 1, 1977

During his discussion of the US effort to guarantee human rights at home, Ambassador Goldberg quoted extensively from the Constitution, in particular the First Amendment and other relevant portions of the Bill of Rights. He also cited the slavery crisis which led to the Civil War and the ultimate adoption of the 13-15th Amendments. The Ambassador provided substantial statistical material to illustrate the manner in which economic and social rights are safeguarded in the United States, including information on unemployment compensation, social security, the minimum wage, welfare payments, and medical care. The following material was included:

1. Average US weekly unemployment compensation is \$75 and in many cases supplemented under collective bargaining agreements total 95% of the weekly wage.
2. Under our Social Security Act a worker in a basic industry such as steel receives a pension of about \$325-350 a month, with survivorship benefits for his widow, supplemented by industrial pensions of substantial amounts now exceeding \$300 a month.
3. Our national minimum wage is presently \$2.65 an hour, and under pending legislation will be increased initially to \$2.85 an hour, and ultimately \$3.30 an hour.
4. Welfare payments in our major industrial states average \$250 per month from Federal Government contributions plus whatever the individual states contribute over and above the Federal sum, and these contributions often exceed the Federal contribution.
5. Our senior citizens are covered by comprehensive medical care. The same is true of welfare recipients. Ninety-five percent of other workers are covered by health insurance programs provided, in the case of Government workers by Government, and in the case of industrial workers by collective bargaining agreements. Further, at the next session of Congress, it would appear clear that an even more comprehensive health program will be enacted. But worldwide medical associations and public health authorities have acclaimed US health care as the most outstanding.
6. Unemployment compensation, together with collectively bargained supplements in our major industries, provide for payments approximating 80 to 95% of weekly wages for as long as two years.

BASKET I STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSAL
ON ROLE OF INSTITUTIONS, ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS
BY JOHN BORBRIDGE
Belgrade, November 4, 1977

Mr. President,

One of the more remarkable features of the Helsinki Final Act is the fact that, as a document embodying a set of basic political accords among states, negotiated by their sovereign representatives, much of its content deals directly with people, and with their non-governmental organizations and institutions. The great bulk of Basket III, much of Basket II, whole sections of the Declaration of Principles are concerned essentially with private persons or groups -- their individual and collective rights, and their activities in virtually every field of human endeavor, without in any way denigrating the language of the Final Act and the decisions taken at the preparatory Belgrade meeting that only signatory states and non-participating states in the Mediterranean invited by consensus can participate in this Conference.

If involvement of people is not a novel insight, Mr. President, it is an important one. This is one of the principal features of our Final Act that marks it as designed for the last quarter of the 20th Century, rather than the first. For it exhibits a full-blown awareness that, if they are to be durable, great commitments on future security and cooperation among nations are no longer matters lying within the exclusive province of governments. They must be concerned with the people themselves as well, and the people will be importantly involved in their implementation.

It is this last point -- that individual people, their organizations and their institutions, must be an integral part of putting the Final Act into practical effect -- that is the subject of the proposal introduced this morning by the distinguished representative of Belgium of the European Communities, and other countries including my country, contained in Document No. BM/14. It is a vital point contemplated by the Final Act, which warrants the further implementation called for by that proposal. For these reasons my delegation is happy to include itself among the Proposal's co-sponsors.

Mr. President, the other proposals discussed by distinguished representatives will receive our serious consideration.

Thank you, Mr. President.

BASKET I STATEMENT REGARDING SELF-DETERMINATION
BY ROBERT FROWICK
Belgrade, November 14, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

In our continuing review of implementation of the Declaration of Principles, my delegation would like to turn now to the Eighth Principle relating to Respect for Equal Rights and Self-Determination of Peoples.

For the American people, the term "self-determination" invariably brings forth memories of President Woodrow Wilson and his suggested Fourteen Points for structuring a viable new political order in Europe following World War I. In reality, of course, the United States was born from the idea of self-determination in our War for Independence. It was with thoughts of "saving the world for democracy" and ensuring the "self-determination" of nations that the people of the United States, after protracted hesitation, broke its historic attachment to neutrality and isolationism in 1917 to throw American resources into the war that so fundamentally altered the political map of Europe in the second decade of this century.

After that conflict, President Wilson did his utmost, as we all know, to commit the United States to an active role in the inter-war League of Nations. But the fundamental predilection of the American public and the Congress to adhere to advice in President George Washington's farewell address that the United States stand aside from the struggles of others and concentrate on the development of our own vast regions of the North American continent prevailed. In time, that predilection would be seen as an anachronistic nostalgia for a past never to be recovered.

At the outbreak of World War II, the United States again hesitated to enter the battle. Only after a major attack on its forces did the United States actively join in the struggle. Once more, the American people were motivated by a deep and abiding desire to enable victims of aggression to recover hope for self-determination and freedom.

Not only did Americans shed their blood for these values, in the latter global struggle; in its aftermath, they gave unstintingly of their treasure -- again, to bolster forces of democracy, self-determination, and freedom.

Mr. Chairman, forgive me if these thoughts have focused on a period of history preceding the August 1975 signature of the Final Act. But I believe it is essential to recall these past events, in particular, for they have profoundly shaped the American conception of self-determination. Any attempt to set forth the American view of self-determination must take these traumatic experiences at least briefly into account.

Now, in this forum our immediate task is to complete a forthright review of the record of implementation of the Declaration of Principles since its signature at the highest level in Helsinki 27 months ago.

My delegation would like to reaffirm its total commitment to the precepts of Principle 8, which conform fully with the political ideals of the American people. Americans strongly endorse the concept of equal rights and self-determination and are joined in this endorsement by the other members of the Atlantic Alliance -- an alliance which could not exist without permanent respect for the right of self-determination.

Americans deeply believe that, as Principle 8 puts it, ". . . all peoples always have the right, full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external political status, without external interference, and to pursue as they wish their political, economic, social and cultural development". We would emphasize our support that "all peoples" should "always" command these rights. For in our view, states should be the servants of peoples and not the other way around.

The American people also support the "universal significance of respect for and effective exercise of equal rights and self-determination of peoples for the development of friendly relations among themselves as among all States". But we cannot allow our desire for friendly relations and lasting peace to mute our concern that self-determination of peoples must be fully respected. This is a matter of principle, which is at the very epicenter of American political thought. We think a lasting peace must be a just peace.

In taking a close look at the post-Helsinki period, my delegation concludes that unfortunately not all of the "peoples" of the participating states appear to have enjoyed the "right, in full freedom, to determine, when and as they wish, their internal and external status, without external interference . . ."

Due to admittedly extraordinarily complex vagaries of history, some peoples appear to us to have had to live with either internal or external systems -- or both -- that have strikingly little in common with their national traditions or aspirations. In the American conception, some have courageously adopted policies reflecting considerable self-determination externally, while maintaining maximum rigidity in their internal systems. Other peoples have sought prudently to build greater internal political, economic, and social self-determination, while curtailing attempts to chart an independent course in world affairs -- that is to say, a course advancing unequivocally their national interests.

In a most unfortunate case, within the American understanding of self-determination, we see a small nation of unusually gifted people, historically victimized by the power politics of numerically much stronger neighbors, seemingly unable to achieve self-determination in

either internal or external matters. One must sympathize with peoples whose inherited geo-political situation places them in an almost permanent vice between powerful, conflicting political systems -- especially when those peoples have recurrently called for help in times of need and almost invariably been denied effective assistance.

Americans can also sympathize with peoples of large states who have suffered unbelievable losses in the wars of this century and are determined that this will not happen again.

But, Mr. Chairman, Americans cannot sympathize with, or understand, the necessity apparently still felt by some to impose their internal and/or external systems on others. Such imposition demeans both the powerful neighbor state working its will and any peoples of the smaller states who may resignedly place their destiny in the hands of others. As a matter of principle, Americans categorically reject any doctrine that purports to justify such a denial of self-determination.

At the stage I meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the distinguished Foreign Minister of France made a memorable statement, which strikes at the heart of our discussion of self-determination, when he spoke of "the resolution never to consent to surrender oneself to a false security, never to consent to moral disarmament which softens the spirit of resistance, which betrays vigilance and which leads to serfdom". He went on to say: "Each nation should resolve to defend its peace, its security, for this is indispensable. He who abandons himself will be abandoned."

Mr. Chairman, my delegation realizes that the world we live in is a complex and dangerous one -- especially in the nuclear age. Every state participating in this Conference is surely determined to contribute to the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of international detente and cooperation. But this is not to say that we can solemnly sign documents like the Final Act, pledging to respect fundamental precepts of international comity like the Principle of Equal Rights and Self-Determination and then completely ignore pressures that may be exerted to deny practical realization of this principle. Only if we express, diplomatically, but with candor, our honest appraisal of implementation of the Declaration of Principles are we doing our job as the representatives of the peoples who have sent us here and in whose name we speak.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BASKET ONE - STATEMENT ON QUESTIONS
RELATING TO DISARMAMENT
BY ROBERT STRAND
Belgrade, November 15, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

Section II of the document on confidence-building measures and certain aspects of security and disarmament contains a brief but important statement recognizing the mutual interest of the participating states in lessening military confrontation and promoting disarmament.

Arms control has become a major and continuing concern of governments. We have learned that more arms do not necessarily create more security but may instead create new dangers by causing others to build still more arms in response. With the development of weapons of mass destruction and the development of ever more sophisticated and costly conventional arms, both the terrible risks and the economic burden of arms competition have grown geometrically. In recognition of the scope of the problem, the United States in 1961 established a separate, permanent agency of government to deal exclusively with disarmament issues. It was the first government to do this.

Lessening military confrontation and promoting disarmament are vital goals, but agreements which further their realization are among the most difficult to achieve. The former Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Dr. Fred Ikle, recently identified an important source of this difficulty, when he observed that the purpose of arms control agreements is, "to limit or reduce the means to wage war between potential belligerents whose fundamental antagonisms persist". Between states when harbor no such mutual antagonisms there is no military confrontation to lessen.

Thus arms control agreements must be carefully negotiated to protect the security of the parties involved and to assure that they do not create instabilities which increase the very risk of war they are designed to lessen. The obligations they create must be precise, and they must be verifiable. They require specialized, expert forums, bilateral or multilateral, and we have learned that they also, unfortunately, require a great deal of time to negotiate.

As many speakers before have already pointed out, CSCE is not an arms control forum. In the field of military security, the special contribution of CSCE has been to create a set of obligations to openness in the conduct of certain military activities whose full and consistent performance can enhance confidence among states and lessen the mistrust which makes the negotiation of arms control agreements so difficult. It is our task at this meeting to explore how those obligations can be performed more fully and more consistently.

At the same time, the Final Act, in the section to which I referred earlier, does record the critical importance the participating states attach to the achievement of measures to control and reduce arms. In our continuing review, therefore, I would like briefly to examine some of the experience of my government since Helsinki in arms control negotiations which bear upon security globally and in Europe.

-- Since the signature of the Final Act, the United States has concluded a Treaty and Protocol with the Soviet Union limiting peaceful nuclear explosions and complementing the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963 and the Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974. The U.S., the U.K. and the U.S.S.R. are now conducting formal negotiations for a comprehensive ban on nuclear explosions. As President Carter said in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly October 4, "My country believes that the time has come to end all explosions of nuclear devices, no matter what their claimed justification -- peaceful or military."

-- Recognizing that the United States, together with the U.S.S.R., has a special responsibility to limit its own nuclear weapons, my government has continued to seek agreement with the Soviet Union on the limitation of strategic offensive arms. These negotiations have raised the prospect that, for the first time, the numbers of strategic weapons will be reduced and restraints will be imposed on the development of new offensive systems. Meanwhile, both parties have stated their intention to continue to be guided by the limitations on the Interim Agreement on Strategic Offensive Arms which expired October 3.

-- As a principal nuclear state, the United States recognizes its special responsibility to assist other countries in meeting their legitimate energy needs while not contributing to the danger of proliferation of nuclear weapons. To this end my Government proposed last spring, and was gratified to see launched last month, an International Fuel Cycle Evaluation, to study every facet of the nuclear fuel cycle.

-- In talks in Vienna over the past four years, the Western participants, including the United States, have continued to seek mutual and balanced force reductions in central Europe, leading to a common, collective manpower ceiling in the reductions area. Because these talks are central to the security of Europe, we are determined to seek resolution of the problems that have impeded their progress so far.

-- The United States has played an active part in the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD). A U.S. initiative led to the negotiation, first on a bilateral basis with the Soviet Union and then in the CCD, of a Convention on the Prohibition of Hostile Uses of Environmental Modification Techniques, which was signed by 34 nations, including the United States, on May 18 of this year. The U.S. is presently engaged in serious bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union to develop draft conventions, for joint presentation to the CCD, eliminating chemical weapons and prohibiting weapons whose destructive

effect would be based on the natural decay of radioactive materials, rather than a nuclear explosion. In the U.N., the U.S. has supported the work of experts groups to develop a standardized reporting instrument to permit uniform, detailed and comparable national reporting of military expenditures.

-- Looking to the future, my Government welcomes next year's Special Session of the United Nations on Disarmament as an opportunity and a challenge to explore new avenues of approach to the problems of arms control and disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, in a statement to this body last week, the Distinguished Representative of Yugoslavia, recognizing that CSCE is not a forum for negotiation of arms control agreements, expressed the hope that "binding political statements" might nevertheless be made.

I would like to conclude my observations relating to the section of the Final Act on "Questions relating to disarmament" by repeating to this body binding political statements about the intentions of the United States with respect to three of the most crucial arms control issues of the day. These statements were made by President Carter in his address to the United Nations General Assembly on the day this meeting convened.

The first speaks to the question of limiting and reducing nuclear arms. I quote:

"The United States is willing to go as far as possible consistent with our security interest, in limiting and reducing our nuclear weapons. On a reciprocal basis we are willing to reduce them by 10 per cent, by 20 per cent, even by 50 per cent. Then we will work for further reductions to a world truly free of nuclear weapons."

The second statement addresses the problems of commerce in conventional arms. Again, I quote:

"We hope to work with other suppliers to cut back on the flow of arms and to reduce the rate at which the most advanced and sophisticated weapon technologies spread around the world. We do not expect this task to be easy or to produce instant results. But we are committed to stop the spiral of increasing sales."

The final statement addresses the momentous question of nuclear use. I quote:

"To reduce the reliance of nations on nuclear weaponry I hereby solemnly declare on behalf of the United States that we will not use nuclear weapons except in self-defense; that is, in circumstances of an actual nuclear or conventional attack on the United States, our territories or armed forces or such an attack on our allies."

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

BASKET ONE - PRINCIPLES 9 AND 10

BY SOL CHAIKIN

Belgrade, November 15, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

As we approach the conclusion of our review of implementation of the Declaration of Principles of the Final Act, my delegation wishes to comment further on Principles 9 and 10 -- concerning Cooperation among States and Fulfillment in good faith of international obligations under international law.

Ambassador Goldberg has already expressed United States views on some important aspects of the implementation of Principle 10, in particular, in his statement on language of the Final Act which asserts: "In exercising their sovereign rights, including the right to determine their laws and regulations . . . (the participating states) will conform with their legal obligations under international law."

Earlier in our review, Professor Hughes also spoke of the implementation of these same principles and noted some difficulties that had arisen in the period since signature of the Final Act.

Like Professor Hughes, I am a private citizen and not a professional diplomat. I am President of a large, well-known national union, and in addition I have the honor and responsibility to be a Vice President of the AFL-CIO. I represent many millions of the free trade union members of the United States, which together with their families, make up a tremendous body of public opinion in our country. Today I wish to discuss matters falling within the purview of the Final Act that are of direct interest to all of them and, thus, to our Government.

But first let us recall some of the precise language of Principles 9 and 10. It was agreed at Helsinki, in the context of cooperation among states, that the CSCE participants "confirm that governments, institutions, organizations and persons have a relevant and positive role to play in contributing toward the achievement of these aims of their cooperation." In pledging to honor their obligations under international law, the participating states specifically defined their obligations as those "arising from the generally recognized principles and rules of international law and those obligations arising from treaties or other agreements, in conformity with international law, to which they are a party." Moreover, in their promises at Helsinki to fulfill in good faith their obligations under international law, all participants reaffirmed the primacy of their obligations of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are looking upon our discussions at Belgrade with the expectation that we can have a frank and full exchange of views on the implementation of the Final Act to date and with

the hope that we can agree on further concrete measures to strengthen the CSCE process and its contribution to the overall construction of detente.

In the period since August 1975, my own country, which openly acknowledges its imperfections and seeks to correct them, has endeavored to bring its policies and practices fully into conformity with the Final Act. In this effort, the Congress of the United States has this year enacted legislation to facilitate the issuance of visas to members of communist trade unions. This legislation, I think I do not need to emphasize, has not been universally popular among all of us in the United States. But it is now the law of the land, a solemn obligation of my Government, and it is honored.

I regret to say, however, that on the other hand some of the obligations incurred by the Soviet Union in subscribing to abovementioned precepts of the Final Act do not appear to have been similarly honored.

Mr. Chairman, I have with me a copy of an invitation addressed on September 6 by President George Meany of the AFL-CIO to Academician Andre Sakharov, winner of the Nobel Prize and fearless champion of human rights, and five other Soviet citizens to attend a convention of the AFL-CIO in December. This invitation was sent from Washington to Academician Sakharov and the other invitees in early September through the ordinary mail. But what has transpired since then is a mystery. We cannot confirm that the invitation every reached Mr. Sakharov, and neither has Mr. Meany ever received a reply.

After sending these invitations, Mr. George Meany, President of the AFL-CIO, wrote to President Carter asking his help in encouraging the Soviet authorities to issue exit visas for our invited guests and of course to allow them to return home. It is our belief that since we have changed our own visa policies, it remains to be seen whether individuals and groups who are in the mainstream of American democratic thought can effectively invite Russians with whom they wish to meet.

I might add that the American Embassy in Moscow has sent a formal diplomatic note to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs officially supporting Mr. Meany's invitation to Mr. Sakharov. Yet, uncertainty continues to cloud the question of whether Mr. Sakharov is permitted to receive his mail from Mr. Meany and to dispatch a reply, and whether the visas will be issued.

Now, this appears to be a clear-cut violation of the "Freedom of Transit" guarantees of the Universal Postal Convention and thus a failure to honor obligations under international law and the Final Act. If this is so, and it certainly appears to be, then the obvious result will be for many millions of Americans, to conclude that our unilateral change in visa policy has failed to persuade the Soviet authorities to ameliorate theirs. This could only, in many minds in our own country, cast doubt upon our own efforts to go to great lengths to perfect compliance with the Final Act.

Mr. Chairman, I cite this case not to damage the atmosphere of this important meeting at Belgrade but to attempt to ascertain what has happened to a piece of mail sent from my country to a distinguished citizen of the Soviet Union. If there is an explanation of what has transpired, my delegation would be most eager to hear it. In the meantime, we feel obliged to draw attention to what appears to be a violation of pledges undertaken by all of us in Principles 9 and 10 of the Final Act.

May I conclude by reiterating what has often been stressed here at Belgrade by Ambassador Goldberg -- namely that the American people, and certainly this is true of the American workers, will only support the process of detente provided the process is humane and just and if solemn pledges, like those endorsed at Helsinki at the highest level, are truly respected.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

BASKET ONE
RIGHT OF REPLY
BY MR. CHAIKIN
Belgrade, November 15, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

My country does not yield to any other, its intense and abiding desire to implement and strengthen the principles of the Final Act.

We reject the contention, however, that a dialogue relating to implementation poisons the atmosphere. On the contrary, it will strengthen our objectives, notwithstanding the fact that some countries are unaccustomed to it, or embarrassed by it. We are here to review the implementation of the Principles agreed to -- to see how they are working out. We do not agree that a proper "understanding" of this review means that we must avoid mention of any violations of the Principles.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the response from the distinguished representatives of the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic and I have waited in vain to hear a clear, simple, response to my question, relating to the Sakharov letter. Instead of dialogue, we have diversion and other non-responsive accusations. Could we not now have an answer? Five separate letters were mailed September 6. It is now November 15th. Will you or will you not issue a visa so that Academician Sakharov might attend the AFL-CIO convention? Will you or will you not permit him to return home to the Soviet Union?

BASKET I STATEMENT REGARDING PRINCIPLE X
BY REPRESENTATIVE BUCHANAN
Belgrade, November 16, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

I am a Member of Congress representing the Sixth Congressional District of Alabama and serve on this delegation as a member of our CSCE Commission.

In concluding the United States' review of implementation of the Declaration of Principles today I would like to comment on Principle 10, fulfillment in good faith of obligations under international law. This Principle has provided the basis for much of my delegation's comment here at Belgrade. Indeed, this conference was created to review the record of compliance and to take further steps toward the implementation of the particular commitments made by the 35 signatory countries in Helsinki on August 1st, 1975, in the final accords. In affixing his signature, President Ford of the United States, expressed the profound hope of the American people that the solemn promises of Helsinki would indeed be kept by the signatory nations. Our purpose here is to take an honest look at the promises we made, to assess the extent to which at this point in history we have kept those promises and to decide together the things we need to do to work toward their more complete fulfillment.

At the outset, I want to associate my delegation with the statement yesterday by the distinguished representative of Poland. If I understood him correctly, he emphasized that the Final Act was constructed not as a treaty or a legally-binding agreement, but as a document consisting of declarations of intent backed by political and moral commitments made at the highest level. This interpretation of the Final Act is shared by the United States.

Now, let us look again at some of the specific commitments we have made under Principle 10. We pledged to "fulfill in good faith" -- like the distinguished Ambassador of Portugal, I believe the term "good faith" could use special emphasis -- "obligations under international law, both those...arising from the generally recognized principles and rules of international law and those arising from treaties or other agreements..." We also pledged that in exercising our "sovereign rights, including the right to determine...laws and regulations", we would "conform with legal obligations under international law".

My country has taken these obligations very seriously. Since the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, we have created a CSCE Commission in Washington bringing together representatives of our Legislative as well as Executive Branches of Government.

My colleagues and I have been endeavoring to ensure that for our part our laws and regulations will be made to conform with obligations we have accepted under the Final Act. We have held numerous hearings, carried out study missions to a majority of the CSCE Participant States, and issued to our Government various recommendations, some of which have already been translated into law. Practical results to date include removal of longstanding visa restrictions on visits to the United States by members of certain political parties and a parallel lifting of restrictions against travel by Americans to certain countries long off-limits to our citizens.

I wish to assure my colleagues that the United States will continue its efforts toward full compliance on its own part as well as to encourage other signatories to do the same.

It seems appropriate to here acknowledge our mutual indebtedness to those courageous individuals in various signatory countries who often at grave personal risk have had the courage to stand up to their own governments and say "You made promises at Helsinki and you must keep them". The Final Act specifically encourages, in Principle 9, such acts by organizations and individuals and we applaud and support those efforts.

Americans believe the truest form of patriotism is that which can face up to the wrongs within one's own society and take action to right such wrongs. A very substantial part of the work of the Congress is directed toward making our system more just and more protective of the rights guaranteed American citizens in the United States Constitution. Similarly, it is our duty here to work toward the protection and fulfillment of the rights guaranteed in the Helsinki Final Accords.

In the first American speech on Basket I, Professor Joyce Hughes said, "My experiences in the United States have led me to believe that promises on paper can become realities in the world". My delegation looks with hope and with commitment toward the time when the promises of Helsinki shall in fact become realities for all the people in each of the signatory states.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude my remarks by noting that in the judgment of the United States Delegation our sometimes difficult debate in the review of implementation of principles has had the merit of stimulating at least the beginning of a candid dialogue on fundamental precepts designed to guide relations between our respective states. As we move on to our consideration of new proposals, I wish to underscore the commitment of my delegation to an objective study of all the new proposals as well as other issues which we will have to consider before the end of the Belgrade meeting. In doing so, we believe that we will be meeting "in good faith" our obligations to the Final Act as we all seek to carry forward our talks to a successful result -- one that will meet the hopes and expectations of all the people that we represent here.

BASKET ONE - SPEECH REGARDING
PRINCIPLE VII: THE "INTERVENTION"
OBJECTION AND THE "NATIONAL LAWS
AND REGULATIONS" DEFENSE BY
AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG
Belgrade, November 17, 1977

Mr. Chairman:

At the outset of my remarks this morning, I would like formally to associate the Delegation of the United States with the remarks made by the distinguished representative of The Netherlands yesterday and today and the similar statements made by other delegations.

Several distinguished representatives have again objected in our discussion of Principle VII to discussion aimed at specific violations of the human rights guaranteed by the Final Act by naming particular states, categories or specific cases. They have alleged that such criticism is "intervention" in contravention of Principle VI, and that in any event the events in question are no more than the normal application of their own national law and thus no proper concern of anyone else.

In so saying they raise two questions of fundamental importance, and I would like to set forth my own Delegation's views on one of them in somewhat greater detail than we have done thus far.

The first question is this: When one government makes critical comments about the performance of another in the implementation of Principle VII or other human rights provisions of the Final Act, is this in some sense an illicit interference in the latter's domestic affairs? Our answer is "no". Such criticism is neither unlawful nor otherwise improper, and should not in my view in any way affect the smooth flow of bilateral relations. May I point out that, in raising this issue, no delegation is seeking, as some delegations have stated, to instruct any country as a teacher might do. It is a rare teacher to acknowledge, as I have done here, that his or her method is not perfect! Further, students are not prone to challenge their teacher. I have not detected any hesitation on the part of any delegate to express his or her views and this is the way it should be. But let us proceed here in the same spirit exhibited by President Carter in an interview with American correspondents, October 28, at the White House. In a statement before he accepted their questions, Mr. Carter announced the United States "will make proposals to the Soviets before long on the constraint of conventional arms sales around the world."

He said: "we are the worst violator at this time; the Soviets perhaps next; and the French, British, Belgians, to some degree participate in this excessive arms sale.

"We all feel that it should be cut back," he said, adding that the question of how to do it is "very difficult to address."

In any event we are not here to preach at one another but to review the implementation of the Final Act after more than two years since its execution. This we are mandated to do.

I might note, Mr. Chairman, that I have heard some Representatives complaining about the tone in which some of those views have been expressed. This is somewhat surprising. We are not a debating society or public speaking class, and what is important in our discussions is not tone but content, not the way speeches are delivered but what they say.

So let me explain our views on the first of the two issues I mentioned earlier. In doing so, may I first address the strict question of lawfulness, i.e., whether this kind of conduct amounts to an "intervention" and is therefore contrary to international law as provided in the UN Charter. The Final Act itself, in Principle VI, prohibits intervention in the general terms of the first paragraph of that Principle, but goes on to cite specifically three kinds of activities which make clear the intent and purpose of the general language. Thus, "intervention" is used in the Final Act in its ordinary international law meaning, and it would be fruitful to spend a moment examining what that meaning is.

The most explicit and authoritative source on this point is the Declaration of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations. The long negotiating history of the relevant section of that Declaration indicates that no form of activity constitutes an unlawful intervention unless it involves a use or threat of force, or some other acute and serious form of coercion. That is to say, an "intervention" is an action aimed not at persuasion but at compulsion. At some points the text of the Friendly Relations Declaration makes this clear by mentioning "coercion" explicitly, or "force," which is by definition coercive. At other points it does so by indicating the great magnitude or severity of the interference and its intended objective (as where it rules out "interference or attempted threats against the personality of the state" or interference designed to deprive a state of the "right to choose its political system").

In other words, Mr. Chairman, this brief text reflects the commonsense conclusion that it would be fruitless to try to make unlawful the efforts of states to influence the conduct of others by means that fall short of an effort to coerce or compel. Such a legal rule, if taken seriously, would cause virtually the whole of diplomatic intercourse to grind to a halt.

This analysis, incidentally, is even more strongly supported by the language of the relevant provision of the Helsinki Final Act itself -- Principle VI, which is of the same form as the Friendly

Relations text on intervention (i.e., a general prohibition of "intervention" followed by specific prohibitions defining the general prohibition). All of the examples in Principle VI refer explicitly to the threat or use of force or other coercion. Even though the Final Act is not a treaty, it is an important international document making extensive use of established legal concepts and concluded by Governments at their highest level, and can certainly be taken into account as evidence of what those concepts mean in international law.

So the first point, Mr. Chairman, is that mere criticism by one government of the conduct of another, specifically in the context of the Final Act, is not the sort of activity which can constitute unlawful intervention, and as a practical matter it could not be.

Even if this were not so, however -- and this is the second point -- the particular kind of criticism we are talking about here could not properly be considered an intervention. For an intervention must be directed at a matter solely within the domestic jurisdiction of another state, and the fulfillment by a state of international human rights standards is not such a matter.

Why is this so? The most fundamental reason, often overlooked, is that a state's fulfillment of its obligations under international law cannot, by definition, be a matter purely within its own domestic jurisdiction, and all members of the United Nations and signatories of the Final Act have such obligations relating to the protection of human rights. First, there are the general obligations of Articles 55 and 56 of the UN Charter, which any important and continuing human rights violation would contravene. And, of course, the Final Act is explicit on this point. Additionally, most states have other important human rights obligations under treaties to which they are party. Indeed, so widespread is this network of treaty obligations, and so vast and pervasive the practice of the UN and other international bodies in asserting the existence of certain fundamental international human rights principles, that some of these basic principles now can be said to have become a part of general international law, either as a part of the law of the UN Charter or otherwise. As high an authority as the International Court of Justice has so indicated.

The point is: we are all subject to broad international legal obligations concerning human rights, and, in plain language, a state's fulfillment of its international legal obligations is not exclusively its own business.

Mr. Chairman, may I remind us that another source of international law is the overt practice of states. And here, both the vast practice of the UN that I have already mentioned, as well as the practice of

individual states in their bilateral relations or as members of international organizations, overwhelmingly confirms the proposition that commentary on the extent of a state's fulfillment of international human rights standards is not an intervention in domestic affairs. Were this not the case, there would be, for example, vast sections of blank pages in the records of every UN General Assembly, which in fact are filled with expressions of concern or even condemnation by many, many governments about the condition of individual human rights at various places around the world.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, reference to "intervention" in the manner asserted by some delegations here is without foundation in the Final Act, in international law, or I daresay even in the practice of the governments that now raise it here in Belgrade. But perhaps it will be said that the real point has to do not so much with inconsistency with the language of the Final Act or with international law, but with the purpose and spirit of this conference. Here I can only repeat: we simply cannot comprehend how it can be claimed, at a conference called by all signatory states to review the commitments embodied in the Final Act, that no specific discussion of concern with fulfillment of those commitments can properly be heard.

Now let me turn to the second question I mentioned at the outset: the issue that arises when what is perceived by one state as a default by another state on a commitment contained in the Final Act, is explained by the latter as simply the normal application of its own laws or regulations. What does the Final Act have to say about how to resolve such a difference of view?

Consider, for example, two rights about which the problem has arisen in discussions at this Belgrade conference: the "right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties," or the right to "seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers". (The former is stated in Principle VII. The latter, being stated in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is incorporated by the final paragraph of Principle VII and underlies some of the specific provisions of Basket Three.)

Now, there is no explicit provision in the Final Act which would justify a state's limitation of these or other human rights by means of the adoption or application of its own laws. Principle VII does, however, incorporate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in toto, and that Declaration contains (in its Article 29) a general limiting clause as follows:

"in the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of

others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society."

This states the basis of permissible limitation of the right of freedoms of information, and presumably also of the right to know and act upon rights and duties, which can be said to embrace the whole gamut of rights covered by the Final Act and Universal Declaration. Moreover, I believe it has been argued by some that the right of freedom of information as expressed in the Final Act is, for parties to the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, subject to limitation on the terms stated in Article 19 of the Covenant, which contains a clause broadly similar to that in the Universal Declaration. I should note now only that clearly no provision of the Covenants or other human rights treaties can properly be invoked by a Participating State to produce narrower human rights obligations for itself under the Final Act than those of other Participating States.

This provision indicates that the bases on which a state might legitimately place limits on internationally established human rights boil down to three simple points:

First, any such limits must be embodied in national law;

Second, the application of such national law in the particular case must pass certain international tests; and

Third, determining whether it passes those tests is not a judgment left solely to the discretion of the state whose law it is.

So, for example, where a government claims the right to prevent its citizens from receiving a certain kind of information, notwithstanding its international commitments to respect their right to do so, at the very minimum it must ground its claim on some local law or regulation uniformly and not arbitrarily applied. But mere inconsistency with national law is not enough. The law in question, when applied in the particular case, must meet international standards.

Those standards refer, for example, to the "protection of national security" or "public order". These are broad and somewhat elastic concepts. But they are by no means infinitely elastic, and indeed have a core of hard meaning which would enable us to reject claims based on certain kinds of laws on their face. I would suggest that this is true, for example, of a law the effect of which is to prohibit dissemination or receipt of information which is critical of or opposed to the current government or regime, or its policies. Leaving aside the fact that such a law would simply negate the right of freedom of information as a political right, the overwhelming weight of the experience of the Participating States suggests that the free flow of

such opinion poses no clear and present danger to the security or public order of a state: a number of our governments are constantly faced with it from both within and without. Indeed a good deal of our experience suggests that genuine threats are in the end more likely to arise from the repression of this kind of opinion, rather than its free exchange.

A more complicated problem arises when it appears that a government may have impeded the exercise of a right -- say, the right to know and act upon one's rights -- by the unwarranted use of a law which on its face seemed unexceptionable. For example, a person active in the promotion of human rights may be charged with theft, embezzlement, espionage, or some other breach of the ordinary criminal law. Certainly, the mere fact that the individual is charged with a common crime does not settle the issue, if the circumstances otherwise suggest that the arrest and prosecution is a pretext for evading international human rights commitments and deterring the exercise of those rights at home. In such a case other Participating States are entitled to evaluate those circumstances for themselves -- including such factors as the justifiability of choking off the supply of information through conducting a closed trial. They are entitled to draw their own conclusions and express them.

Both of these examples illustrate the most fundamental of the three points I mentioned earlier: that no state is free to make the determination all by itself whether the limitations it imposes on human rights meet the established international criteria. That is the very object and purpose of embodying human rights standards in a regime of reciprocally accepted rules and principles, rather than in a collection of unilateral statements of high resolve and good intentions. Were this not the case, the concepts I have mentioned could soon be stretched by any government beyond the reasonable limits of their ordinary meaning, under the immediate felt pressure to justify this or that overly repressive policy or action. In the long run, Mr. Chairman, no government is infallible in this respect, no government is immune from this temptation, no government is any longer entitled to the right to make these determinations unilaterally. This is perhaps the strongest of the admittedly fragile guarantees, to the ultimate beneficiaries of international human rights standards -- the people, that those standards will not be permitted to shrivel into insignificance through a series of spurious interpretations.

May I add one point, for the sake of clarity, in closing, I have been discussing what the Final Act provides in reference to the legitimate basis for a state's limiting human rights through adoption of national laws and regulations. This question is not to be confused with that addressed by Principle I, in its reference to a state's right to determine its laws and regulations. Principle I states, in

its second sentence, that the Participating States will "also respect each other's right freely to choose and develop its political, social, economic and cultural systems as well as to determine its laws and regulations." The effect of this language is, among other things, to make it explicit that the right to determine one's laws and regulations is one of the rights inherent in sovereignty. It says nothing, of course, about the circumstances, if any, in which those laws might properly place limits on human rights -- a question addressed elsewhere, as I have already indicated. Indeed, Principle X, in order to make this fact quite clear, states:

"In exercising their sovereign rights, including the right to determine their laws and regulations, they will conform with their legal obligations under international law; they will furthermore pay due regard to and implement the provisions in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe."

BASKET I - STATEMENT ON NEW HUMAN RIGHTS AND OTHER
PROPOSALS IN SUBSIDIARY WORKING BODY S (PRINCIPLES)
BY U.S. REP. (GREENWALD), DECEMBER 2, 1977

Mr. Chairman:

There was a very productive plenary this morning that added to our workload in this body.

I realize that many delegations will not yet have had an opportunity to study BM/60, the comprehensive proposal on respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, introduced this morning by the United States Delegation and fifteen other Delegations. I will not, therefore, speak to this proposal in detail today, though we would hope that our working body will give it the closest attention in the days to come. I would only wish to stress again that we consider this general, non-controversial reaffirmation of the commitment of the 35 CSCE States to the provisions of the Seventh Principle a minimal and necessary ingredient of the Belgrade Meeting's concluding document. It treats classical civil and political rights and economic and social rights without discrimination. It recognizes that, as the Final Act provides, all the Principles are of primary importance. The experience of the past two years and the review of implementation that this meeting has conducted in the past two months, have shown the need for all the participating states to make a clear statement on this important matter.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation has not had time to study carefully either BM/62, the proposal of the Hungarian Delegation on the right to work, or the proposals of the Bulgarian and GDR Delegations on the UN covenants and the rights of women. I would say now only that we welcome these proposals. There are no doubt matters of detail that will need to be discussed carefully as

we move into the drafting stage. We consider, however, that by introducing these proposals the three delegations are joining with the sixteen sponsors of BM/60 in the belief that our concluding document will need to pay special attention to human rights. It may be questioned whether it would be most appropriate to do so by a general affirmation of the sort suggested by the sponsors of BM/60 or by the more specific method begun by the Hungarian, Bulgarian and GDR Delegations. The United States Delegation is prepared to work on either approach. Should the latter approach be considered most desirable, we could, for example, consider moving beyond BM/60 to formulate several additional, more specific human rights proposals. As I said, these are matters of detail and style, but we welcome what seems to be a growing consensus that the implementation experience and the concerns of our people-- East and West--require that we pay particular attention to human rights as we draft and negotiate the Belgrade Meeting's concluding document.

I will try to be very brief in my comments about the three proposals that we have been discussing since yesterday's session. I would associate myself with many of the remarks of the distinguished representative of Ireland on BM/47, the proposal submitted by the Delegation of Yugoslavia concerning national minorities. We note that the distinguished representative of Yugoslavia said yesterday that "What is important is the idea and not always the exact wording." We are sympathetic to the idea and hope that exact wording can in fact be found.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks made yesterday by the distinguished representative of France about BM/55, the proposal of the German Democratic Republic dealing with implementation of the Final Act. We think that there is a promising nucleus of an idea here that can be worked upon.

I apologize, Mr. Chairman, for ending my statement on a rather negative note, particularly since there have been so many positive developments today. I must, however, also address a few words to BM/54, a proposal of the

German Democratic Republic. This proposal calls on the participating states "to prevent the activities of fascist, revanchist and neo-nazi organizations, which are contrary to international law and to the Final Act of Helsinki, and to forbid by law the dissemination of fascist, racist, revanchist and nazi ideology and of war propaganda."

Mr. Chairman, as I read this text and as I listened to its sponsor and several other speakers at yesterday's session, I thought that we had been magically removed from the Sava Center and from the CSCE meeting back to the bad old days of the Cold War. My Delegation does not consider that there is a danger of "fascist, revanchist, and neo-nazi organizations" or their ideologies triumphing in any of the participating states. We do not think this is an issue on which we should be spending our valuable and limited time. Let us look to the experiences of the past two years and to the real and pressing requirements of the future rather than tell each other war stories.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BASKET ONE STATEMENT REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS PROPOSALS

BY R. SPENCER OLIVER

Belgrade, December 12, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

On behalf of the delegation of the United States, I wish to address the proposals concerning human rights which are before this subsidiary working body. As we all know, December 10 was Human Rights Day throughout the world and, in my country, President Carter has designated this week as Human Rights Week.

I will speak on behalf of BM/60, the proposal put forward by my delegation and fifteen others, which calls for a reaffirmation of our collective and continuing respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief.

Before doing so, however, I would like to say a few words about proposals BM/62, 63 and 64, which concern the specific human rights proposals pertaining to the right to work, equal rights for women, and the International Covenants of Human Rights. As my delegation said on December 2, we welcome these proposals, especially since they support our position that the concluding document of this meeting should most definitely pay special attention to human rights.

Mr. Chairman, I can say at this time that my delegation can support, in principle, all three proposals although we may suggest some additional language which we believe would strengthen their import and would reserve on some of the language now therein contained because it has some different, and perhaps undesirable, connotations in my own country.

For instance, proposal BM/62, submitted by the delegation of Hungary is known as the right to work proposal. We have, in the United States, many so-called right-to-work laws. They are, however, considered to be laws which prevent trade unions from acting on behalf of workers. These laws are generally considered anti-labor, pro-business, and are associated with the more conservative, as well as right-wing, forces in my country. I am sure that these forces and the delegation of Hungary would not wish to associate themselves together without due consideration of what they were doing.

My delegation does believe, Mr. Chairman, that everyone should have the right to a job and not just any job, but a job of his or her choice, in a field or profession in which he or she wishes to work. We believe that this right to a job should include safeguards

such as occupational safety standards, sick leave, paid vacations, regular promotions, cost-of-living wage increases and many other rights which are contained in the clauses of virtually all contracts negotiated between our trade unions and the managers and owners. We also believe that every person should have the right not to work, to withhold their labor if they do not have or cannot obtain the kinds of benefits and standards which I have just enumerated.

It is only when working people have the right to speak for themselves, through representatives of their own choosing; to refrain from working when conditions are intolerable; to pursue grievances against management; and, if they so desire to change jobs when they wish -- that the "free and full development of the human person", as the Hungarian proposal says, can indeed be attained.

And, Mr. Chairman, we firmly believe that no person should be denied a job or fired from a job because he chooses to exercise rights guaranteed by provisions of the Final Act or other international agreements. We are particularly concerned when citizens of any participating state are dismissed from their jobs simply because they applied to emigrate, or because they practiced their religion, or because they exercised simple freedom of speech or assembly. It is unfortunate that there are instances when any citizen who applies to emigrate immediately loses that right to a job. We have taken note of this regrettable practice and protested against it in many other forums, including this one. We would hope that the sponsors of BM/62 will consider additional language in their proposal which would condemn the denial of jobs to those who seek to exercise fundamental human rights mentioned in the Final Act, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international agreements.

With regard to proposal BM/63, introduced by the delegations of Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic, the delegation of the United States particularly welcomes this initiative. Our President, Jimmy Carter, has been outspoken in support of equal rights for women and is vigorously supporting legislative, administrative, and even constitutional measures to ensure these rights.

Mr. Chairman, let me say a few additional words about proposal BM/64, also submitted by Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic, which refers to the reaffirmation of the significance of the International Covenants on Human Rights. We also welcome this proposal and with a few additional words, can support its inclusion in the concluding document of this Belgrade Meeting. As is well known, the President of the United States signed these documents as this meeting was beginning last October. We are not only actively

pursuing the possibility of acceding to them, but earnestly hope that the promises they contain will indeed become reality for all people everywhere. We would, therefore, suggest some additional words which would provide not only for their ratification and accession but also for strict and total adherence to them by all of the participating states.

We are concerned that many of the provisions of these noble documents have not been observed, even by nations which have ratified them.

That, Mr. Chairman, brings me to discussion of BM/60, the proposal which the United States, along with many other nations, has introduced and supported. I should note, Mr. Chairman, that the sixteen cosponsors of BM/60 have submitted to the Secretariat today the following addendum to their proposal: the full title of the seventh principle has been added to the body of the text so that the second paragraph now reads "Resolve to implement unilaterally the provisions of Principle 7 of the Final Act relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief." These freedoms were, of course, always implicit in the proposal, and we are pleased to respond to the suggestion that we have received that they be made explicit by repeating the full title of the principle. This proposal calls for the participating states to renew our collective resolve to implement -- unilaterally, bilaterally, and in multilateral forums -- the provisions of Principle Seven of the Final Act relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion, or belief.

We believe, Mr. Chairman, that this renewed commitment is necessary and appropriate, especially since so much attention here and in other forums has been devoted to the discussion of implementation -- or lack of implementation, of the important promises made in Principle Seven. As President Carter, in his report to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, said a few days ago "The broad principles of Basket One concerning relations among states continue to be better respected than those principles concerning relations between states and their peoples, though genuine security in Europe requires removal of the threat of arbitrary arrest or persecution no less than removal of the threat of war".

We are concerned, therefore, when we observe repeated violations of human rights in certain signatory countries, violations which directly contradict the promises which were made in Helsinki more than two years ago. We are also concerned when some signatory states, whose record on human rights is particularly poor, refuse to even discuss these matters in this important forum. We cannot help but notice the inconsistency of these positions when, for instance,

one country two days ago celebrated Human Rights Day by unleashing a barrage of criticism against my country and other Western nations through their official media and propaganda organs, while at the same time holding under house arrest those citizens who wanted to merely assemble peacefully to silently join their friends and colleagues in observance of this important day.

And, Mr. Chairman, we are gravely concerned about the fate of those men and women who have been subjected to harassment, arrest, imprisonment, and exile because they did nothing more than to take seriously the promises made by all of us in Helsinki.

My delegation has mentioned the names of some of these people in the Plenary and in Basket III. As the Chairman of our delegation has said, we do not mention names to be confrontational, but merely to illustrate our concerns over lack of implementation of the human rights provisions of the Final Act by certain countries. We have expressed our specific concern for the members of the Helsinki monitoring groups because we feel that the treatment they have received should be of direct concern to this Belgrade meeting. We have spoken forthrightly of our concern for the fate of those who sit today in prisons without contact with their families or lawyers, without charges formally against them, in violation not only of the Helsinki Final Act, and the Declaration and Covenants on Human Rights and Civil and Political Rights, but also in violation of rights supposedly guaranteed by their own laws.

There are others, like Mykola Rudenko and Oleksei Tykhy, founders of the Ukrainian Group to Promote Observance of the Helsinki Accord in the U.S.S.R. who were given maximum sentences -- 12 and 15 years loss of freedom, respectively -- for merely exercising the rights which Principle Seven guarantees. We could go on and mention other names, other denials of fundamental human rights, including the names of political prisoners, of people who are in prison or exile because they merely sought to practise their religion or to express their opinions or thoughts, or follow the dictates of their conscience. It is sufficient, at this time, however, to say only, as Vice President Mondale said a few days ago when he spoke on behalf of human rights activists, that their lives "are a testament to moral courage like few we will see in our time. And because of their courage... because of their unyielding commitment to liberty... those who enter the moral conflict... all those struggling to be free... have companions in every corner of the world today".

In addition, Mr. Chairman, Vice President Mondale went on to remark that our nation's policies are "not aimed at any country, or ideology, or political philosophy, right or left. This is not a propaganda war. And we expect the same standards which we apply to

others will be applied to our nation as well. We do not claim our own record is perfect. Indeed it is not. And we welcome constructive criticism from any source".

"The rights we affirm for all peoples, including our own, are embodied in every major international agreement on this subject of the past 30 years... No government which signed those documents can justly claim that our efforts to enforce them are an interference in their internal affairs."

And, Mr. Chairman, with regard to this meeting Mr. Mondale went on to say that "The Belgrade Conference is a step in a process which has just begun, but it is an historic step. For the first time, an international forum is faced with the demands of human conscience to raise the standard of performance of governments in the treatment of individual rights. We will continue to insist that human rights be addressed by the signatories to the Helsinki accords".

Mr. Chairman, I think those words adequately express the position of our delegation.

We sincerely hope that this proposal will be considered seriously and supported by all delegations because we think that citizens of all the participating states are looking to this meeting with hope and for renewed faith in the pledges that our leaders made on our behalf in Helsinki. We are well aware of the long and arduous road that lies ahead as we work together to implement all of the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act. The pledges we made in Helsinki truly do represent an historic step forward -- but the noble goals which they encompass are not new. The Helsinki Final Act has given fresh hope that these noble goals are within our reach. Human rights is one of the most important of those goals. The struggle for human rights is not a lofty or impractical endeavor. To the contrary, it has a direct bearing on international security, as recognized by Secretary of State George Marshall in a famous speech at the opening of the United Nations General Assembly nearly thirty years ago. He said:

"Systematic and deliberate denials of basic human rights lies at the root of most of our troubles and threaten the work of the United Nations. It is not only fundamentally wrong that millions of men and women live in daily terror, subject to seizure, imprisonment, and forced labor without just cause and without fair trial, but these wrongs have repercussions in the community of nations. Governments which systematically disregard the rights of their own people are not likely to respect the rights of other nations and other people and are likely to seek their objectives by coercion and force in the international field."

These words, Mr. Chairman, are still applicable to many parts of the world today. My delegation believes that it is necessary and appropriate for this meeting to renew our pledge to the promises made in Principle Seven.

Thank you.

BASKET II STATEMENT REGARDING
COMMERCIAL AND SCIENTIFIC EXCHANGES
BY AMBASSADOR ALBERT W. SHERER
Belgrade, October 12, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

Although political and security questions were at the origin of the discussions which led to the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the areas of commercial and scientific exchange have become a key element in the Final Act. The second section reflects the increasing tempo of these exchanges over the last decade. Furthermore, implementation of its provisions, we believe, can provide an impetus for the fruitful progress we seek in other areas.

Charter two of the Final Act provides a vehicle for promoting fruitful economic activities among all CSCE participants, particularly between those with different social, political and market systems. Mutually beneficial and reciprocal economic relations can provide material benefits to both sides and, as those benefits grow, can smooth contacts and understanding in other spheres. This section sets down a concrete charter of responsibilities for both Eastern and Western nations based on the understanding that it is in their mutual interest to increase trade, industrial cooperation and scientific exchange.

While we have agreed to these goals, we must at the same time recognize the distance that will separate us. Uncertainty, for example, is the enemy of both centrally planned and market economies. In order to lay a firm base for increased trade, availability of their products and services, as well as of the prices at which they will be offered and received. Western suppliers, moreover, require reliable bases from which to forecast end-user needs, developments in the use of imported products and processes, and ability to pay. The progressive and reciprocal reduction of such uncertainties should also be matched by mutual efforts to promote to expand exchanges -- quantitatively and qualitatively.

The United States is dedicated to a principle of trade and exchange free from all barriers not inherent in the comparative costs of production and transport. Free trade based on comparative advantage or international division of labor requires that each side benefit more from imports than loses from exports. The theory of international trade thus ensures that each nation may gain while not imposing sacrifices or unfair costs on other. There is substance to this theory. Our East-West relationships may be nourished by pursuing its fulfillment as prescribed in the Final Act.

To be sure, as with other sections of the Final Act, progress is often slow. Its pace should not be discouraging. The United States

is sincerely anxious to see improvements in business contacts and facilities, and we have noted important strides in that direction made by some Eastern countries. The provision of adequate economic and commercial information is vital to the success of trade and industrial cooperation. In that sphere, there has been progress, but simply not enough of it.

It must be remembered that Western business interests, in their negotiations regarding trade, joint ventures and cooperative agreements with the East, must get answers to their questions and have other requisite information. If they are frustrated in their endeavors, they will lose interest -- to the detriment of the principles and possibilities enunciated in the Final Act. Successful implementation of section two requires that old habits and traditions should be changed. Improvements in this area will pay substantial dividends to both sides.

Another matter of concern is the insufficiently rapid progress the United States has noted in the promotion of eased, informal contact and collaboration among scientists. The world community of scholars is among our most valuable resources and the language of science is universal. Within that community freedom to converse is essential to progress.

Scientific research cannot bring mankind its potential benefits if researchers are kept apart and their conversations muffled.

All the aspects of the second section contain particular questions, of the kind outlined above, which the United States delegation intends to discuss in detail. The dialogue in the subsidiary working groups offers all participants an opportunity to remove misunderstandings and replace them with new, mutual comprehension. The American delegates are confident that the process of talking out our problems is a constructive one, prerequisite to the concrete advances in cooperation the Belgrade Conference can stimulate.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my country's deep appreciation for the excellent work of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe in facilitating implementation of the provisions of the Final Act. The United States looks forward to its further involvement in this process and in particular to the report of the Executive Secretary on Environmental Topics which will be given at the 33rd Session.

And finally, let me note that we have consulted with representatives of our business community and I can report that their interest in expanding trade with the East has not flagged. The Final Act has increased their expectations. They are following our work with interest.

It is for all of these reasons that the United States calls for a sequential and documented review of the provisions of section two. It will be through this process, and through the careful examination of new proposals aimed at improving and expanding implementation, that mutually desired progress will be achieved for the benefit of all participating states.

BASKET TWO - STATEMENT REGARDING
GENERAL PROVISIONS
BY ALTON JENKINS
Belgrade, October 18, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

My comments this afternoon will be brief and will address only the "general provisions" under Commercial Exchanges. I wish to reserve the right to address the other sub-sections as we reach them in our sequential review.

The United States is generally pleased with the expansion of its two way trade with the non-market economy countries of the East over the past several years. Between 1973 and 1976, our total trade with these countries has risen from \$2.3 billion to \$4.4 billion, an increase of nearly 100 percent. This is reassuring and indicates that our efforts at the governmental level and the efforts of our business communities are bearing fruit. Yet, when we compare the present volume of our trade with the potential that exists, we are disappointed that expansion is not taking place at a faster rate and that there has not been any appreciable improvement in the diversification of the structure of our two way trade.

As a market economy country, the United States can only make its business community aware of opportunities, and to foster trade based on free market principles. We have already stated our dedication to a principle of trade and exchange free from all barriers not inherent in the comparative costs of production and transport.

Unfortunately, in the international market place the principles of free trade are not observed in total and therefore the benefits of comparative advantage are limited. We have to admit that obstacles to trade do exist. Yesterday the distinguished speaker from Belgium outlined the nature and extent of the major obstacles. I see no need to cover the same ground. His analysis was comprehensive. The distinguished speaker from The Netherlands noted the need for reciprocity in eliminating obstacles to trade. The United States government joins in the view that effective reciprocity is the sine qua non for the removal of existing barriers to commercial exchanges.

During the plenary debates and at yesterday's Working Group session there were repeated references to MFN. The United States Trade Act of 1974 provides the legislative authority for the granting of MFN. It does not deny MFN to any country but sets the minimum conditions that must be met before negotiations for a bilateral trade agreement can proceed. If these conditions are satisfied and a trade agreement is negotiated, MFN is extended. Our Trade Act reflects the interests and concerns of the American people. MFN is but one part of a "normal" commercial relationship. Before MFN can be granted, we have to be assured that adequate reciprocity is available.

We believe that tariff and certain non-tariff barriers can be most constructively reduced in the relevant multilateral fora. For example, we note the work to eliminate obstacles to the development of trade by many Helsinki signatories in GATT and the MTF, as well as some of the work done by the ECE.

The availability of credits, we also realize, is of considerable importance to the East. The United States has amply briefed Eastern countries on the legal requirements and conditions under which we can grant official credits. Eastern states, in the meantime, have been able to get adequate credit from private US sources. US legal lending limits are designed to protect our banks from over-commitment to any borrower and are thus nondiscriminatory.

We believe improved implementation of commitments under the Final Act's section on commercial exchanges can contribute to better trading relations generally. While the quantity and quality of East-West contacts has improved since Helsinki, Eastern control of trade still isolates the Western seller from end-users. Facilities are rationed to preferred "chosen instruments" or preferred Western connections. Economic/commercial information is still inadequate relative to the legitimate needs of Western businessmen. We believe implementation in those areas must be improved if trade is to be developed on a satisfactory basis. The United States will have more to say about these specific subjects as we continue our review of Basket Two.

BASKET TWO - PRESENTATION ON
BUSINESS CONTACTS AND FACILITIES
BY ALTON JENKENS
Belgrade, October 21, 1977

Mr. Chairman:

The provisions of Basket II confront the specific problems and possibilities of East-West trade and today I would like to take up the provisions of the subsection on business contacts and facilities.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, my government sees considerable inherent value in the improvement of business contacts and facilities. Fruitful business contacts pay extraordinary dividends all down the line. They build mutual confidence, trust and understanding between businessmen. Men and women who are schooled in different economic and social systems learn from each other, develop an understanding of each others' manner of doing business, and develop more rational approaches to the negotiation of contracts. Both sides become aware of the others' needs with regard to buying and selling relationships. The desire to expand trade can be voiced by governments, but we are firmly convinced that unless countries have access to each other's markets, in terms of contacts, facilities and information, their total trade with each other will reflect that fact and will remain unsatisfactory from the point of view of either side.

I would like to highlight some of our concern about the successful implementation of this section of the Final Act. First, we believe that end user access is vital to successful trade relations. In Hungary, Poland, and to some extent, Czechoslovakia and Romania, access to end users has improved since Helsinki, especially for those firms that have had repeated business dealings. In a general sense, however, US businessmen, dealing through foreign trade ministries and their subdivisions, do not receive proper or sufficient information on the actual needs of the buyer. Our businessmen have also complained that isolation from Eastern end users often results in requests for proposals which are not specific enough; that in effect US vendors must guess what the Eastern buyers really need. This lack of information due to a lack of access to end users and technical people forces companies to repeat costly design work before preparing tenders and to spend an inordinate amount of time trying to reconcile differences in technical capabilities and costs. Consequently, frustration, as we have already pointed out, sometimes causes a businessman to pull out, to cut his losses, and the expansion of trade between diverse economic systems therefore suffers a setback.

As we have noted, some progress in end user access has occurred. We can also point to the provisions of the US-Romanian Trade Agreement and the US-Romanian Long Term Agreement on Economic, Industrial and Technical Cooperation as models for the mutual development of closer

trade relations and for fora to discuss and establish possible improvement of business contacts. We have consulted with representatives of our business community on the specific question of access to end users and have asked them for suggestions on how improvements could be made from their point of view. Let me summarize two such suggestions. The first calls for "free contact between prospective vendors and the end users with the Foreign Trade Organization purchaser in attendance. This would promote the transfer of information on the end user's needs without minimizing the Foreign Trade Organization's prerogative to negotiate prices." Another notes that "the foreign trade ministry should continue to act as the purchasing agency for the end user -- but after the delivery of the product to the end user, after-sales contacts should be permitted to be arranged directly between the end user and the supplier. This would still retain the primary position of the foreign trade ministry but permit the end user and the total system to benefit from the support expertise that we stand ready and willing to provide for them."

Mr. Chairman, it is quite clear from these practical suggestions from American businessmen actively engaged in East-West trade that there is no intention to by-pass or change existing trade institutions. Rather, the main interest is in finding ways within the established system to facilitate and to improve the process through which goods and services move from producer to end-user.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that business contacts in general are vital to the development of trade. In this respect, we would like to commend the work of the various binational economic councils and governmental commissions in improving business contacts generally. But contacts between East and West are still hampered by such practices as the refusal to provide multiple entry-exit visas. This situation causes considerable hardship and psychological stress when businessmen who are permanently stationed in the East have to enter or exit quickly because of a personal emergency or commercial necessity. We are dismayed that at least one Eastern country (USSR) has introduced increasingly restrictive visa practices which even hamper the exit of businessmen. The US remains prepared to extend multiple entry visas -- we have no exit visa requirements -- to resident Eastern businessmen on a reciprocal basis. We urge all participating states to work towards this goal.

Even in cases where visas have been made available, restrictions on areas in which foreign businessmen can travel are not only bureaucratic headaches for governments monitoring such travel, but also undermine the confidence and trust which is essential to improved trade. As with multiple entry and exit visas, we remain prepared to discuss the abolishment of closed areas on a reciprocal basis.

Another provision of this subsection which is of vital importance to the American businessman is the commitment to accelerate the conduct of business negotiations. We are concerned that US firms spend millions of dollars preparing and revising bids. Recently a number of large projects which had been the subject of protracted and costly negotiations were shelved or discarded entirely, because of the long delays in concluding an agreement. Unfortunately long delays are still quite frequent in East-West commercial negotiations. The US notes with pleasure the work being done by the UN Economic Commission for Europe and the International Chamber of Commerce in the field of simplifying and standardizing the preparation of contracts.

The US believes that specific implementation measures in the area of improving working conditions of foreign commercial representatives are vital to the expansion of trade. Although the total number of Western firms, including US companies, represented in the USSR and Eastern Europe has grown since Helsinki, we would still like to see more progress. Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia have enacted legislation allowing Western companies to open representative offices and we applaud this. But, US firms have sometimes been forced to wait inordinately long periods of time before receiving accreditation, and then sometimes have not been provided permanent office space or living quarters. Lack of office space, telephones, telex facilities, good secretarial help and living quarters are chronic problems for Western businessmen in the East.

We further believe that, despite some welcome progress in the area of provision of necessary information on legislation and procedures relating to the establishment of permanent business representation -- notably in Romania, Poland and the GDR -- more needs to be done. We would encourage that Eastern nations work to simplify their procedures and make more information available to Western businessmen who are planning to seek accreditation. There have been cases where US businessmen, because of delays and lack of sufficiently clear information about accreditation procedures, have been discouraged from applying, and have been forced to conduct their operations from third countries or third-country offices all of which slows down the efficient conduct of trade negotiations.

For our part, the US has acted favorably on several requests by Eastern commercial organizations to expand and facilitate their operation in the United States, both in terms of personnel and scope of activity. For example, we have suggested an arrangement under which Soviet trade representation officials could directly engage in commercial transactions, a function ordinarily precluded because of such officials' diplomatic status. We have given the same body permission to move some of its personnel to NYC, the commercial nerve center

of the US, under nondiscriminatory conditions. We have permitted the establishment and expansion of existing Eastern commercial organizations, with participation of Eastern personnel, on the basis of mutual interest.

We have also offered to consider favorably new forms of commercial establishment if it can be demonstrated that such organizations can lead to a mutually advantageous expansion of trade, e.g., US invitation to USSR to establish a representative banking office in NYC so that banking and commercial interests of both countries might be better served.

Finally, the US would like to urge that medium and small firms be allowed to play a larger role in trade relations with the East. With regard to the problems of small and medium sized businesses, the US would like to identify itself with the comments of the Irish delegate. Up to now, some Eastern countries have been overly selective in choosing the US firms that they allow to establish permanent representation. The tendency is to favor only the largest, who presumably will negotiate contracts on a high volume basis. This discriminates against smaller Western firms which have the will and unique capabilities to conduct international trade, but, for some reason, do not find it profitable to maintain a full time permanent representative. It would be convenient if Eastern countries would consider favorably the possibility of two or more companies sharing an office or subletting. In reality, small and medium firms often offer specialized products and services which would be of particular interest to Eastern economies. Eastern nations are mistaken to believe that it is only the large corporation which is capable of fulfilling their needs.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to describe, in some detail, our Delegation's views concerning the specific provisions of this important subparagraph of Basket Two. I do not want to seem unduly pessimistic. If I have spent more time pinpointing problems than in lauding progress, it is because the US believes that a constructive and businesslike discussion of these points can lead toward the goal of increased trade to the mutual benefit of all. Thank you.

BASKET TWO - STATEMENT REGARDING
EXCHANGE OF ECONOMIC AND COMMERCIAL INFORMATION
BY ALTON L. JENKENS
Belgrade, October 26, 1977

Mr. Chairman:

I would like to speak today about the importance of economic and commercial information to the further development of East-West trade. Information is the basis of all trade. Even the simplest form of trade, the buying and selling of products between two parties, can not take place without some basis of understanding between them. They must know the characteristics of the product to be bought, as well as its price and the availability of specific quantities over time. But when trying to develop a long-term, stable and mutually beneficial trading relationship, especially between countries with different economic and social systems, much more information is necessary. Nor is it enough to give information solely to chosen instruments or through bilateral exchanges. What is needed is a diffusion of information on as wide a basis as possible.

A company new to the market, or even an established firm seeking to expand its role, needs to be able to estimate both current and future demand for its products. This means that the company must know what types of competitive products are being imported and exported. It must know in what quantities and at what prices similar products are being produced and consumed domestically. It must know what the prospects for economic growth in this and competitive sectors are; and it must know whether growth in demand is expected either through public or private consumption. In countries where hard currency is allocated by plan, the businessman must know whether hard currency is, will be, or can be allocated for the prospective purchase. Bankers being asked to syndicate or participate in loans must have reliable information on the balance of trade in goods and services, balances on tourism, government expenditures, remittances, grants, investments and investment income as well as short and long-term capital movements. Where information is incomplete, unreliable, or inaccessible, results are bound to be less than satisfactory to both parties.

I would like to refer to something said the other day by the distinguished representative of Bulgaria who stated that it was also the responsibility of Western governments to inform their businessmen about trade with Eastern countries. I couldn't agree more. While there is no conceivable way for my government to reach every single businessman in America, I would like to give a few examples of the things we are doing, and I would like to add that we welcome specific suggestions from all signatories as to what we might be doing better.

The office of the US government responsible for making businessmen aware of East-West trade opportunities is the Bureau of East-West Trade of the Department of Commerce and it works in conjunction with the various economic and commercial sections of the US embassies in East European countries. I have here with me a list of some thirty-five publications put out by the Bureau of East-West trade, many on a regular basis. The Bureau publishes monthly trade statistics, quarterly analyses, and annual reports on East-West trade. As an example of the type of publication that we think is particularly useful in fostering trade, I would like to mention a recent publication analyzing joint venture agreements in Romania.

But publication is not enough. The Bureau of East-West Trade also advises US businessmen on how to do business in Eastern Europe and in turn receives counsel from the business community through the Business Advisory Committee on East-West Trade. It also has initiated outreach seminars on East-West trade in various areas of the United States. Government representatives from the US and Eastern Europe have participated in these seminars and the business response has been very favorable. The purpose of our East-West trade awareness program is to provide the US business community with a realistic appraisal of the business opportunities that exist in the Eastern countries, and to be sure that businessmen are aware of the assistance they can obtain from the US Government. I might add that the Department of Commerce operations are complemented by offices in the Departments of State and Treasury.

Concerning the publication of information about the US economy, I think I can safely say that our record is impressive. I won't impose upon your patience too long, but I would like to point to a few key publications. First of all there is the Foreign Trade Statistical Series published monthly by the Census Bureau -- this reports exports and imports (in separate volumes) on a commodity by country basis. There are also annual volumes which report on a world area and country by commodity basis.

I would like to draw your attention to: the US Industrial Outlook, an annual publication which analyzes trends in production in some 200 US industries; the Business Conditions Digest which provides a monthly look at many of the economic indices found most useful by business forecasters and analysts; the Survey of Current Business which on a monthly basis provides analyses and statistics on all phases of the US economy; and the Federal Reserve Bulletin which gives monthly information on the nation's finances and capital markets. There are of course many others. For example, every five years the US Government conducts a census of manufactures, and makes a survey of manufactures annually.

I have run the risk of boring you merely to illustrate the types of things that can be done. We don't expect every country, particularly the smaller ones, to publish on the scale the US does. But there is no reason why other large and complex economies should not be publishing at a comparable level.

Let me say frankly that the US feels that the record of implementation with respect to economic and commercial information has been less than satisfactory, and this is very disappointing, given the importance of economic and commercial information to the development of trade. For example, while we were pleased that the Soviet Union has begun to publish quarterly statistics on exports, imports and trade turnover with individual countries and groups of countries, we were disappointed that the press run for the 1975 USSR Statistical Annual has been reduced. That so large and complex an economy as that of the Soviet Union makes so few details available about its economic development and its plans is a continuing disappointment, particularly when such information would only make it easier for all to trade with the Soviet Union.

I was glad to hear the explanation of the Romanian delegate on Monday of some of the information made available by the Government of Romania. The distinguished delegate of Romania mentioned the Romania statistical yearbook. However, the edition for 1976 (covering 1975 data) was published six months later than the previous year meaning data on the Romanian economy was unavailable for a full year.

We also welcomed the economic information contained in the Romanian President's speech in February of 1976, but we feel that this type of information should be published, and on a regular basis, thus making it possible to make comparative analyses over time.

Some countries, notably Poland and Hungary, do a good job in this area, while others like Czechoslovakia and the GDR could make many improvements. Of all the Eastern European countries only two (Hungary and Czechoslovakia) report their trade statistics to the UN Statistical Office, and these at only the 2- and 3-digit SITC level.

The criteria which should be met by every country are, as stated in the Final Act, "economic information should be of such a nature to allow adequate market analysis and to permit the preparation of medium and long-term forecasts."

What types of information are necessary to allow market analyses and forecasts? The US Government has submitted a list of economic and commercial information most necessary to the further development of East-West trade to the ECE. It is what we characterize as a benchmark list -- that is we tried to set out the universe of data which was

essential, fully knowing that it would not be possible for all countries to begin publishing such data overnight. I will not go into this list here.

Today, I would like to emphasize three types of economic and commercial information as being particularly important to the development of East-West trade. The first is foreign trade statistics. Foreign trade statistics are the starting point for any market research. They are also excellent indicators of trends and changes in the domestic economy. But foreign trade statistics to be useful must report both exports and imports separately and indicate either the country of origin or country of destination. They must be of sufficient detail to identify unique products. They must be reported in consistent terms, i.e., in either volume or value or, even more preferably, with a volume and value notation for each item. There should not be large categories of residuals. In order to be useful, the appropriate exchange rates, or conversion coefficients should be stated. The data should be detailed, complete, timely, regular and widely available.

Secondly, we would like to stress the importance of full balance-of-payments information. Balance-of-payments data go beyond simple trade data and include especially important figures on invisibles, and investment flows, as well as the other traditional items. We are not requesting mere statistical esoterica; in an increasingly interdependent world, a fact recognized by the Final Act, businesses and banks need to know the whole picture of financial movements into and out of a given country.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly when trading with a centrally-planned economy, there is a great need to know details of the plan. Since the plan is the central economic instrument, this need should be obvious. Foreign trade plans are particularly important. It should be clear where hard currency is being allocated, and a businessman bidding on a contract should be told where and in which planning period the contract will be granted.

Again, balance-of-payments information and plan information should be detailed, complete, timely, regular, and widely available.

I would like to make just a few comments about the subject of marketing since the ability to market properly is so closely linked to good economic information. It is in the best interests of both Western and Eastern countries to be able to conduct market research. All of the information requested today would facilitate this task. In addition, this strikes us as an area which is particularly ripe for joint efforts. Along these lines we are delighted that bilateral marketing seminars with the USSR are going to be getting underway soon. The value of information exchanged in these seminars we hope will be outstanding. We also commend the work of the ECE in the field of marketing.

We would like to underline the importance of marketing both as a pivotal means by which a country can diversify and expand its exports, and also as a key tool in providing a product which is readily acceptable. Proper marketing also means providing adequate after sales servicing in order to ensure that the product will continue to be acceptable. While governments can create an atmosphere conducive to the expansion of trade, it is successful marketing techniques which move the products through the system.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by saying that the US Government feels that economic and commercial information and marketing are areas where we can and should move forward, where the benefits to all are considerable, and where concrete, positive steps would give real meaning to the spirit of Helsinki.

BASKET TWO - STATEMENT REGARDING
INDUSTRIAL COOPERATION

BY KAREN TAYLOR
Belgrade, October 28, 1977

Mr. Chairman:

We have been listening with interest to the preceding discussion on industrial cooperation. The US supports long-term industrial cooperation and believes this form of economic cooperation can serve a useful purpose in fostering the expansion of trade and economic ties. Industrial cooperation projects often lead to the diversification of goods produced, an expansion of consumer choice, and can also aid developing states in achieving greater economic growth and industrial development. At the same time, however, the United States believes that industrial cooperation, regardless of its form, must have a valid economic/commercial basis, in other words that it must be commercially justifiable. When it includes this element, then it can lead to a mutually beneficial expansion of trade.

Although my government recognizes the utility of intergovernmental agreements as a means of encouraging industrial cooperation, as a market economy nation, the United States cannot dictate the types of economic activity in which its firms choose to engage. Specific details concerning individual projects, we believe, should generally be a matter of discussion between contracting parties. Moreover, we regard industrial cooperation as one of several types of normal economic interchange which need not, and indeed should not, be singled out for special preferential treatment, but which should be facilitated, just as other forms of trade are facilitated. In this regard, we applaud the work of the various binational economic councils, chambers of commerce, and joint commercial commissions in creating a favorable atmosphere for the undertaking of industrial cooperation.

We also note with pleasure changes in national legislation which have permitted or facilitated the formation of joint ventures and other projects along this line particularly in Hungary, Poland, and Romania. At the same time while we all welcome the steps taken to facilitate industrial cooperation, further improvements can be made: (a) where requirements for countertrade become obstructive to long range East-West trade expansion; (b) where general business contacts and facilities are deficient; and (c) where informational problems hamper negotiating and bidding procedures.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to weigh in too heavily on the negative aspects of this subject, because we do see much potential benefit to both parties resulting from industrial cooperation, but there are some particular practices which come under the category of industrial cooperation which pose problems. Basically, here I am talking about countertrade practices, and more particularly demands by Eastern governments of Western firms to accept payment in goods which do not result from the particular production enterprise being considered.

A negative reaction is developing among American firms to increased pressure on the part of the Eastern Europeans and the Soviet Union to conduct more and more trade under countertrade contracts. While some arrangements may be justified on economic terms, others are disadvantageous to Western companies insofar as they require firms to take as payment products which cannot be marketed profitably. Pressure of this sort can force companies into accepting unwanted products in order to close a deal, resulting in temptations to dispose of the Eastern product at a lower than fair market price.

We believe undue pressures on individual companies to take products which they cannot readily or profitably market in the West can be destructive to East-West trade in the long run. Quite frankly, the need to buy and absorb the cost of a product it does not need, or cannot market, can deter a company from returning to the Eastern market. One must question whether growing dependence on "captive exporters" -- exporters who must buy in order to sell -- is an efficient marketing technique.

In order to foster the growth of industrial cooperation projects, we believe it is essential to improve the facilities for those involved in negotiating and implementing a given project, especially for experts and technicians who must work in areas remote from large urban centers where accommodations are not always so readily available as they are in capitals. In particular, we wish to stress the importance of establishing good communications facilities and agreeable living conditions. As the number of projects increase, many firms which do not have accredited offices will enter the scene in Eastern countries. These companies will not have the benefits of a local representative and on-going contacts with host country officials. They will require special assurances of cooperation from Eastern authorities in providing office space, living quarters and communications.

Mr. Chairman, in order to further encourage Western firms to participate in industrial cooperation, we believe that Eastern states will have to improve the quality of the information relating to proposed projects. An effort to be more forthcoming on sharing economic data will, in the end, help Western partners better serve Eastern needs and also importantly reduce costs. While we acknowledge the efforts of some states to improve the distribution of such information -- it has been generally good, particularly after a company has signed a contract -- there are still problem areas, e.g., detailed information and adequate technical contact needed for the bidding processes.

Finally, let me say a word about the instrument which makes industrial cooperation possible - contracts. East-West trade contracts, in the past, have sometimes been vaguely worded as to the responsibility of each party. The result is often costly revision of project studies

and heavy penalties for Western partners, and delays or otherwise unsatisfactory performance in the eyes of Eastern partners. If agreement could be reached on standards for contractual provisions many disputes would undoubtedly be prevented. Contracts between participating parties in industrial cooperation should have specific references to possible dispute settlement, legal liability and recourse, and arbitration methods. We heartily applaud the work of the ECE, both on the general conditions of industrial cooperation and the Experts Group on Contracts practices. This is a fine example of an existing body taking on intensified responsibility in areas of its competence.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have not conveyed an undue feeling of negativism on this subject. This was not my intent. If I have pointed to specific situations, it has been merely to illustrate problems, the alleviation of which, we believe, would facilitate industrial cooperation and East-West trade.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BASKET TWO - STATEMENT REGARDING
COOPERATION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
BY MICHAEL T. DIXON
Belgrade, November 2, 1977

Mr. Chairman:

The section of Basket Two on cooperation on science and technology is of special interest to the United States. We have a large and active scientific community which is anxious to increase the frontiers of scientific research. The provisions on science and technology provide not only a thorough and exhaustive description of the principal subject and themes for scientific inquiry, but also establish the guidelines for bilateral and multilateral contacts among all scientists of the Participating States.

The Final Act clearly sets out the need for scientific and technical cooperation as a means to resolve problems of common interest, and to improve the conditions of human life. The Final Act recognizes that there are several ways to expand scientific cooperation, including improvements in the exchange and dissemination of scientific and technological information, improvements in exchanges, conferences and cooperation, and through the wider use of commercial channels.

Much significant progress has occurred in this area. For example, currently, the United States has some sixty scientific and technical agreements in force with East European countries and the Soviet Union, many of them signed since the Final Act. In this respect we can point to the excellent results which have followed from the eleven scientific and technological agreements that the US has signed with the Soviet Union. In 1976 alone, over 1,863 Soviet and American scientists participated in exchange programs under the auspices of these agreements. Also, since the signing of these agreements, the number of active collaborative research projects has increased over 59 percent. In addition, numerous scientific and technical agreements (between 55 and 60) have been signed by US firms with the Soviet Union's State Committee on Science and Technology. Cooperation with the countries of Eastern Europe, although on a smaller scale, has also expanded satisfactorily.

While the US has been very active bilaterally in this field, it has also participated in multilateral cooperative efforts, and supports the science programs of the ECE and the UN. In this respect, we are pleased with the consideration being given in the ECE to implementing the section of the Final Act which calls for the bringing together of young scientists and technologists with eminent specialists in their fields. As an example of the type of multilateral exchange we view as especially helpful, all Eastern European countries contribute seismic data to the US Geological Survey which allows the timely location and assessment of earthquakes worldwide. Data from Eastern Europe are indispensable to the operation of this US Geological Survey program.

At the same time, there still are difficulties, particularly with the Soviet Union, concerning the availability of unpublished technical information, reciprocity in exchange of published information, the mailing of scientific periodicals and papers, the granting of exit visas to Soviet scientists, and the granting of entry and exit visas to US scientists.

The Soviet Union still fails to provide unpublished technical information such as preprints even to participants in joint projects. We do understand that this restriction is due to the lengthy review process required for Soviet publication. However, the US has made repeated requests for the regulations that pertain to this unpublished data, so that we might better understand the Soviet procedures in these matters. We have also made repeated requests for an improved exchange of information.

Similarly, the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) in the US Department of Commerce makes available its entire inventory to the Soviet Union at cost, but has thus far been unable to gain general reciprocal privileges with the Soviet Information Center VINITI.

Mail containing scientific periodicals and papers from the West and addressed to Soviet scientists has been returned marked undeliverable. Western journals, of the most technical nature, have been censored before delivery.

One particular obstacle is that US scientific exchangees who are in the Soviet Union for over six months are faced with cumbersome procedures to get exit visas. This difficulty combined with the difficulty of getting re-entry visas in effect discourages most exchangees from leaving until their stay is concluded. The US Government continues to believe this practice is an obstacle to cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I must emphasize that direct contacts and the exchange of scientists is a deeply felt issue in the American and Western scientific communities. Today, many international scientific and technical societies will hold meetings only in countries that guarantee free entrance to all members. Nevertheless, despite world scientific opinion, the Soviet Union frequently denies visas for attendance at meetings in the USSR, as well as exit visas for its own scientists to travel to meetings.

There have been problems in other countries, as well. For example, Romania has cancelled scheduled visits of its scholars to the United States.

The United States believes that the accomplishments of the work already begun, as well as the potential of the work to be undertaken, are of vital importance, and for many reasons. The world scientific community

is just that, a world scientific community. There should be no barriers based on nationality or ideology which inhibit the free flow of basic scientific information, the exchange of scientists, the active participation of all scientists in national and international fora, workshops or seminars. The world community of scholars is among our most valuable resource. But within the scientific community, the freedom to communicate is essential to progress. As the American delegate stated earlier in our plenary discussions, "scientific research cannot bring mankind its potential benefits if researchers are kept apart and their conversations muffled."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BASKET TWO - STATEMENT REGARDING
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
BY JOHN BORBRIDGE
Belgrade, November 7, 1977

Mr. Chairman:

The United States, as a highly industrialized country, was one of the first to note that unimpeded technological progress risked unacceptable damage to our environment, and thus to our way of life. As such the United States welcomes the specific provisions of section Five of Basket Two, which recognize that protection of the environment is a necessary concomitant to technological progress, and of deep concern to all participating states.

As is stated in the Final Act, the increasingly crucial need to protect and improve the environment requires increasing coordination among local, national and international efforts to improve the quality of life, and to upgrade the biosphere. In my home state of Alaska, we are particularly sensitive to how fragile each unique environment is. And it is particularly heartening that distinguished bodies, such as this one, which have been wrestling with the fragile political environment for years, are now turning to the question of how cooperative intergovernmental efforts can be utilized on behalf of the environmental heritage of present and future generations.

The US interest in all environmental protection issues, we believe, is well documented by our domestic and international activity. A bilateral agreement with the Soviet Union, for example, embraces cooperation in eleven general environmental fields relating to all eight fields of cooperation listed in the Final Act. There are 41 projects, some 22 of which involve the US Environmental Protection Agency. The forms of cooperation include the exchange of printed material, participation in joint symposia, exchange of samples, and joint testing of equipment and methodologies. The exchange of specialists has been the most common form cooperative endeavor with approximately 100 Soviet scientists and administrators visiting Environmental Protection Agency facilities during a typical 12 month period. Less extensive but significant and useful research-grant programs have been under way with Poland and Yugoslavia. Seven bilateral cooperative research efforts have been formalized with these two countries and special project activity of this type has been discussed with Romania and Hungary. Since mid-1975 the EPA has received some 55 visitors from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, many of whom were over and above the experts who participate in bilateral programs with the EPA. Furthermore, the EPA maintains a Documents Exchange Program with Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia.

US participation in multilateral activities, often relates, Mr. Chairman, to the issues singled out in the Final Act even if such participation is not the "result" of the Act. A particularly relevant

example is US participation since 1973 in a WHO/UNDP sponsored project in Poland aimed at developing plans and implementing comprehensive control of water and air pollution and solid waste in a highly industrialized area. In addition, US has participated in Habitat (human settlements), in the UN Man and the Biosphere program, and participates as observer in the Mediterranean program of the UN Environment Program in which the littoral states are seeking to arrest land-based pollution of the Sea.

By far, the most direct implementation of the environmental portion of the Final Act has taken place in the UN Economic Commission for Europe, in respect to two specific recommendations: (1) the monitoring and evaluation of the long range transport of air pollutants and (2) the adequate prediction of environmental consequences of economic activities.

Implementation of the recommendation on long range transport of air pollutants, as we all know, has been given priority in the ECE. The United States fully supports the work being done as a means of encouraging constructive cooperation among the European nations on a significant, shared environmental issue as well as an opportunity to participate in an activity with possible direct relevance to a similar problem emerging in North America. We note that while there has not yet been a decision in the ECE to hold a high level meeting on the environment, that there has been almost unanimous agreement that the long range transport of air pollutants would be a suitable topic for such a meeting. We await with interest the report of the ECE Executive Secretary which will be given to the Thirty-third Annual Meeting to be held in 1978. We are convinced that the ECE is an extremely capable body for dealing with environmental issues, and that the methods utilized by the ECE in dealing with these issues are those most likely to result in concrete solutions.

The ECE has embarked on a number of activities with regard to the environmental impact assessment recommendation contained in the Final Act including a wide-ranging discussion on this subject at the February Senior Environmental Advisers meeting. We note with pleasure that general interest was expressed in including public participation in the assessment process and that it was agreed that the ECE should sponsor a seminar on assessment as a priority activity. Environmental impact assessment, we hope, will continue to command considerable attention in the ECE framework as participating states refine their respective environmental impact assessment processes. The US looks forward to a fruitful exchange of experience, technology, and methodology in this important aspect of environmental activity.

While we all can note considerable progress in the past few years, and while we can applaud the broad attention the environment has received, Mr. Chairman, we can ill afford to be self-satisfied or self-complacent. The US has to note that, while allowing foreign visitors

open access to our key personnel and laboratories, some countries have denied US visitors similar access on a number of occasions. We can understand the usual underlying rationale of security but the US, hoping to maintain a constructive and reciprocal approach, must at the same time urge others to be more forthcoming.

On a related matter, the United States is disappointed that a better balance between benefits and costs related to environmental cooperation has not been achieved. An initial imbalance was expected, and we undertook our operations with that consciously in mind in order that a stimulus would be provided to further environmental programs, to accustom our partner countries to work more openly on environmental problems. After working cooperatively for several years, Mr. Chairman, the US must state its intention to seek greater mutuality of benefit.

I hope that these last few remarks will not be interpreted by our distinguished colleagues as being overly negative. Indeed, the US views this part of the Final Act and its implementation record to date as a manifest example of cooperation. We have come here to study issues and to take steps toward improving our common environment. Our actions must be a solid step toward stimulating cooperative activities and promoting an increasingly intricate set of interlocking relationships. This is imperative, Mr. Chairman, because, while other sections of the Final Act are an articulation of our respective countries' efforts that our world must not end with a bang, our concern in this hall with the environment must be an equally determined objective that it does not end with a whimper.

BASKET THREE - SUMMARY OF STATEMENT
HUMAN CONTACTS
BY GUY CORIDEN
Belgrade, October 17, 1977

In his first human contacts intervention on October 17, U. S. Delegate Guy Coriden spoke primarily of the American record of compliance with Basket Three's human contacts provisions, stressing particularly the automaticity and flexibility of our visa laws. He spoke of the large numbers of immigrants accepted into the United States each year and the fact that there are no numerical limitations on the immigration of immediate relatives of U. S. citizens. Our entry visa practices, while not perfect, are under present review and fees are moderate for immigrant visas, and reciprocally determined for non-immigrant visas. In March of this year, Mr. Coriden continued, the last remaining restrictions on the use of U. S. passports for travel to any country were removed. The United States also does not impose any restrictions or require exit visas for emigration.

Mr. Coriden then turned to a discussion of Eastern emigration practices which the United States finds particularly objectionable. Although he did welcome the fact that figures on emigration from Eastern Europe had increased in recent months, the U. S. representative went on to comment, "Numbers, however, do not tell the whole story, especially when we are talking about human beings and their natural desire to be with their families. Contrary to our common pledges to deal in a humanitarian spirit with cases of family reunification, some signatory states have continued to mete out what we would consider to be arbitrary refusals to permit persons to rejoin their relatives."

As examples of arbitrary refusals, Mr. Coriden mentioned the case of a 72-year-old woman who, although never having had access to state secrets, has been barred from joining her daughter in the United States on these grounds. He also cited the case of a woman and her family who have been refused permission to emigrate because authorities "are not satisfied" with the relative with whom they wish to be reunited -- her father who left the country during World War II.

Another case of concern in the United States involved a 69-year-old woman denied permission to join her son in Texas ostensibly because she lives in a "closed" area.

BASKET THREE STATEMENT
BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG
Belgrade, October 18, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

Yesterday several delegations, including my own, called attention to a particularly disturbing development in one of our participating states. This is, a court trial for several citizens who only wanted to talk to their government about the Final Act. I have a new fact to add. It is contained in a news dispatch of the United Press International of yesterday which I now quote in exact text:

"The French Communist Party Daily Humanite charged Monday Czechoslovakia has barred its reporter from covering the Prague trial of four supporters of the Charter 77 Human Rights Document.

"Humanite, which has been increasingly critical of Soviet bloc political repression recently, said Czechoslovak authorities have refused to grant an entry visa to the paper's reporter, Marcel Veyrier.

"We regret this, Humanite said, and we sharply protest against a refusal which will deprive our readers of direct information on a trial challenging human rights for which we are fighting."

BASKET THREE - STATEMENT REGARDING
VISA POLICIES
BY GUY CORIDEN
Belgrade, October 19, 1977

Yesterday, the delegates of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union stated that my delegation's remarks concerning the trial in Czechoslovakia of Charter '77 signers were an intervention in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia. One of those delegates then referred unfavorably to my country's visa policies. Does that mean that the delegate was interfering in our internal affairs or does it mean that they feel there is a double standard on intervention in internal affairs? For our part we believe that our purpose here can be fulfilled only by asking questions, seeking clarifications, and generally inquiring further into actions relating to the Final Act. We have answered questions about our visa policies and stand ready to discuss that or any other aspect of U.S. implementation. We do not consider questions or comments as interventions in internal affairs and believe that there is no ground for any other delegation's doing so.

We recognize that no delegate here can, at this time, change an action or a law of his government. We hope, however, that all delegates are committed to carrying out the Final Act and will supply information which will help us all to understand how to cooperate in further implementation. Indeed, if we do not probe for clarification, our interventions will be a series of unilateral statements passing each other in the air. Inquiry or directly-related comment is not interference. It is the only means we have of carrying out our task here.

Implementation, as we all know, concerns what we have accomplished and where we have failed. We must look at both sides if we are to make progress. Most inquiries that I have heard here have been honest attempts to gather information which would lead to an understanding of, not just one case, but the situation of a series of cases.

The American public has a great interest in these matters, and it would help us if we had the facts to give them. Also, some of these matters might deserve further expansion in our concluding document.

The distinguished Soviet delegate mentioned that character references from one's place of work are no longer required for exit visa applicants. But applicants still need a large number of documents, and they do not always know all the required procedures. Perhaps the Soviet delegate could tell us where a list of such procedures exist, and if it does not exist, perhaps his government could later consider making such lists available.

We also realize that refusing an applicant on the grounds of state security is within the purview of a sovereign state, but here there seems to be a problem in knowing what is meant by the term "state security." It would be most helpful if we could get a good definition of the term and the practice, if it does exist.

I hope that in the next few days the distinguished Soviet delegate will provide us with answers to these questions. We have other questions for other countries and hope that this way, we can begin a dialogue.

BASKET THREE - SUMMARY OF STATEMENT
HUMAN CONTACTS
BY GUY CORIDEN
Belgrade, October 20, 1977

American representative Guy Coriden expressed disappointment at Soviet responses to his questions during yesterday's meeting and "negative attitude" expressed so far. Mr. Coriden noted that the questions he asked arose from the long-standing interest of the American people in problems of emigration from the Soviet Union. While respecting the Soviet delegate's right not to answer questions, United States representative said his colleague's responses could help to clarify continuing puzzlement over obstacles and delays. Mr. Coriden then noted he could talk in detail about America's experiences in youth and sports exchanges, in which the United States had both positive and negative experiences, but he would defer such discussion to a later time. He concluded by noting that since general discussion thus far had not led to an increased dialogue, more specifics would have to be mentioned throughout our discussions.

BASKET THREE - SUMMARY OF STATEMENT
INFORMATION
BY GUY CORIDEN
Belgrade, October 24 and 26, 1977

The Basket III review of implementation phase of the Belgrade Meeting witnessed some of its sharpest East-West exchanges over differences in the interpretation of the information provisions of the Final Act. While much of the discord stemmed from Soviet and East European contentions that the U.S. radios, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, operate in violation of the Final Act and constitute interference in the internal affairs of other states, Western dissatisfaction with Eastern treatment of journalists also occasioned some heated discussion.

In this area of review, the U.S. also raised issues pertaining to other sections of the Final Act, specifically family reunification and human rights, which were of particular concern.

On the first day of information review, October 24, a Czechoslovak statement labeling RFE/RL saboteurs and accusing the radios of conducting unfriendly campaigns constituting interference in other countries' internal affairs, occasioned a pointed U.S. response. The United States representative, Guy Coriden, responded that he was not surprised by the statements of the Czechoslovak delegate, but, he continued, "I don't believe the Czechoslovaks are concerned about RFE/RL because they think the radios really threaten their government or will cause its downfall. I think they're worried because it's through these stations the Czechoslovak people first heard the text of Charter '77 and first heard what was happening to its signers--that they were being dismissed from their jobs and otherwise harassed."

In his intervention on implementation of the provisions concerning working conditions for journalists, October 26, Mr. Coriden noted that the value of a free press had been vividly described by the FRG and French representatives. He added, however, that the United States also recognizes the need for an active free press to insure that as much information as possible is available to the public. Contrary to East European charges that Western media produce inaccurate and hostile accounts, of their countries, U.S. media are concerned with quality as is apparent from the presence of ombudsmen at many newspapers.

Noting that "pure truth like pure beauty is a rare and wonderful thing," the U.S. delegate rejected the notion that the governmental control espoused by Eastern states insures the veracity of press reports. He further stated that governments should not obstruct either the dissemination of information or the work of those who disseminate it.

Mr. Coriden continued to say that the U.S. had hoped that Basket III provisions in improving journalists' working conditions would eliminate many obstacles, so that all journalists working in any of the participating states would be granted unimpeded freedom to move into and throughout the country in which they are working, would be able to contact their sources freely, and would not be penalized for what they report. Many states did conclude agreements reciprocally issuing multiple entry and exit visas for newsmen, a development that improved correspondents' working conditions. However, the U.S. found the Czechoslovak imposition this spring of certain conditions for journalists' entry into that country regrettable. There were other disturbing incidents. This February for the first time in seven years, a U.S. correspondent, George Krinsky, was expelled from Moscow. In June, Robert Toth was detained and questioned for 13-1/2 hours, ostensibly in connection with a report on parapsychology, a pseudo-science, which he had received. Actually, Mr. Toth was questioned solely on his contacts with the Helsinki Monitoring Group and its members who had just been arrested: Shcharansky, Orlov and Ginsburg.

BASKET THREE - RIGHT OF REPLY
REGARDING RFE/RL
BY GUY CORIDEN
Belgrade, October 28, 1977

I reject the contention of the Soviet, Polish and GDR representatives that the United States is hiding these radios. I explained in fair detail how their policy is made. I talked about the Board for International Broadcasting, about the funding for the radios. It is perfectly clear that no one is hiding anything.

What really bothers our colleagues is not that these radios are located on foreign territory or that they broadcast in foreign languages. I can't believe that these countries are so weak, so unsure of themselves that they really think the activity of these radios will cause their governments to fall or cause them lots of internal difficulties. I think what they fear rather is what their people learn from the radios -- that 22 men have been imprisoned for several years because they insisted on their right to emigrate, that there are people like Joseph Begun who was fired in 1972 after he applied to emigrate, that another man since 1970 constantly fears being labeled a parasite because he has been denied his right to work.

This is what really bothers our colleagues and rather than hiding behind charges of psychological warfare they might as well admit it.

BASKET THREE - STATEMENT REGARDING
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION
BY GUY CORIDEN
Belgrade, October 28, 1977

I would like to open my remarks by responding to some of the comments made by certain delegates during yesterday's interventions.

The distinguished representative of the GDR referred to a country whose language is English, with a population of 200 million, and which only published 7,000 copies of the Final Act. After lengthy consultations with members of our delegation, we agreed that the reference was no doubt to our country.

I do remember during the negotiations at Geneva that we stressed we had no way of assuring that our free press would publish copies of the Final Act. We did say that our governments would publish abundant copies and would make them available to anyone who wanted them for free -- which we have indeed done.

Delegates of the GDR and Soviet Union also complained of problems in getting their information circulated in the West. Language is one problem. But I would also ask our colleagues to take a look at the quality of the information they publish; things written in committee tend to be of a lower quality than those competing on an open market. Our colleagues also have the opportunity to present their views and comments freely in American newspapers.

On the question of our visa forms, I grant that they are complex, but are presently under review, and I will report the views expressed here to the responsible authorities.

Leonid Brezhnev said in 1973: "To live in peace we must trust each other and to trust each other we must know each other better." He was well aware of the need for broad knowledge.

My distinguished Soviet colleague, and others, said yesterday that certain information is not welcome in his country. It disturbs me when someone decides what information is worthy to enter a country or not. Having only part of the facts almost inevitably leads to a distortion of one's appreciation of a situation. And it is the distortion that can cause problems.

We deeply believe that understanding, detente and peace are shared responsibilities. Where there is a distortion we are all endangered. As the Eisenhower Presidential Study Commission concluded: "it is clear that a people uninformed or misinformed is a danger to itself and a potential threat to its neighbors. Thus, a precondition

for world peace is international freedom of information." We therefore support these radios which our Soviet colleague spoke of in such an unkind way yesterday. I propose to deal with the question, not historically, but in the present day.

In the not too distant past, there were a number of things said by our governments which did not lead to greater understanding.

But the radios are private organizations, controlled by the Board for International Broadcasting which is composed of American citizens, appointed by the President. The radios' mission, as defined in a 1976 statement of RFE/RL "is to encourage a constructive dialogue with the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union by enlarging their knowledge of developments in the world at large and in their own countries... In pursuit of this mission, RFE/RL provide listeners as accurately and quickly as possible with knowledge of and balanced perspective on both the outside world and developments within their own societies." The statement goes on to list eleven restraints which the radios are to observe so as to avoid exacerbating situations.

It is a serious matter, in our view, that these radios are being jammed. There must be a strong public interest in the radios, otherwise there would be no point in having 2,000 jammers to block their broadcasts.

There are several international agreements which bear on radio broadcasts, including Article 19 of the UN Declaration on Human Rights, the International Telecommunications Convention and the Final Act's Preamble in which the participating states "make it their aim to facilitate the free and wider dissemination of information of all kinds."

Radio Moscow is one of the great competitors of RFE/RL. But it is difficult to see how other statements could be more inflammatory than Radio Moscow's output. There seems to be a potentially ridiculous double standard operating here.

As John Stuart Mill said a long time ago: "The peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is that it is robbing the human race: posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. We can never be sure that the opinion we are endeavoring to stifle is a false opinion; and if we were sure, stifling it would be an evil still."

We hope that it will be possible for those countries that are jamming to take a careful look at what they're doing and see which is the greater evil.

BASKET THREE - SUMMARY REGARDING
CULTURAL EXCHANGE
BY GUY CORIDEN
Belgrade, November 2, 1977

On November 2, the US delegate to Basket III made his major intervention on cultural exchange under the Final Act. Noting that culture is of considerable interest to the United States, as evidenced by Washington's many cultural organizations and endowments, Mr. Coriden spoke of the US cultural philosophy which strives to further individuals' development and participation in cultural events. The real advancements made in the cultural field are those that affect the individual. In the words of Thomas Carlyle: "The great law of culture is: Let each become all that he was created capable of being...and show himself at length in his own shape and stature, be these what they may."

Mr. Coriden went on to discuss cultural dissemination and exchanges, noting that both had to revolve around organizations, but that the US had found cultural agreements in these areas limiting and cumbersome. The US prefers leaving room for private initiative. Although our government understands that some countries operate only under government controlled agreements, the US looks forward to the day when such agreements will "wither away."

The US representative then discussed a number of bureaucratic problems with and obstacles to increased cultural exchange. In the United States the government plays a limited role in cultural life, an area where individuals and private organizations have the last word. Governmental involvement in the exchanges thus serves to add one more step to an already complicated process.

In addition, financial considerations often play a role in the willingness of some artists to participate in the exchange program. For example, a top US philharmonic orchestra received a fee of \$2,500 per concert from one Eastern European country in 1976, while one pianist from that country was paid twice as much per performance in the US.

Noting Eastern complaints of a cultural imbalance between Eastern and Western consumption of cultural products from the other, Mr. Coriden reminded participants that the US has a large and very competitive cultural market. This competitiveness extends to all cultural media, including the cinema, television and book publishing. Not only is foreign culture competing against other foreign materials, but against US products as well. In addition, several Eastern states had complained that their films, when shown, were screened only in small theaters. Noting that the trend in the US is toward smaller theaters, Mr. Coriden suggested that it was better to have several showings of a film in small theaters than one in the Hollywood Bowl.

In the non-market area of cultural exchange the US delegate noted, the government is able to do much more. Governmental support is extended to organizations like the American Film Institute and the film program of the Museum of Modern Art. The US Embassy in Moscow recently proposed an exchange of young film directors as one means to stimulating future cinema exchanges. Several government sectors, the reinstatement of the International Media Guarantee program, a scheme designed to facilitate purchase of US cultural materials by countries with non-convertible currencies, is being discussed. The US is also signatory to the Florence agreements and recommended that the 13 CSCE signatories who do not adhere would be in better compliance with the Final Act if they did so. Mr. Coriden also emphasized that the US is receptive to worthwhile cultural exports. As an example he cited the interest aroused in the United States by the Hungarian Kodaly method of musical education.

In closing, the US representative stressed that cultural activity in his country is determined by a free play of forces responding to interests and tastes not controlled or mandated, but educated and educatable.

BASKET THREE - SUMMARY OF
CULTURAL EXCHANGES
BY GUY CORIDEN
Belgrade, November 4, 1977

Replying to comments made throughout the week by various Eastern representatives, US delegate Coriden answered the charge that Western governments had done little to encourage increased cultural exchange activities. He noted that considerable efforts--financial and otherwise--had been expended in carrying out the exchanges. Financially, Mr. Coriden noted, there was little difference between the American government's and American public's role since all expenses had to eventually be paid by the public, and the American public had already paid a great deal. Some Soviet artists have been able to earn over a million dollars a year through the exchanges. They are good and they deserve it, according to Mr. Coriden, but one should not ignore the fact that it is money the American public is giving towards cultural exchanges.

The US delegate then spoke of the Moscow Book Fair, whose praises had been sung previously by the Soviet delegate, and emphasized the controversial nature of the Fair among American publishers. While 25 publishers did attend and did have good experiences there, Mr. Coriden continued, a large number did not go because they were denied access to authors in the Soviet Union. Of those who did go, most sold their books and attendance was good, but problems of censorship arose; there were five books they would not exhibit.

These are little things, Coriden continued, but like getting a drop of soup on your shirt, it tends to ruin the whole outfit.

BASKET III STATEMENT REGARDING EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES
BY PROF. ANDRZEJ KORBONSKI
Belgrade, November 7, 1977

Mr. Chairman,

We come today to examine a fitting topic with which to end the first round of our Basket III discussions, since cooperation and exchanges in the field of education depend to a large extent on the other Basket III provisions -- on increased human contacts, a wider dissemination of and access to information about each other, and greater knowledge of and interest in each other's cultures. The first two subheadings of the section, which deal more generally with the expansion and improvement of the educational and scientific exchanges, are of particular interest in this regard.

As a professor of political science at the University of California, and one who has taken part in numerous exchanges, I am made aware each day of the significant role education plays in formulating people's opinions about themselves, their neighbors, and the world around them. By learning about each other, we learn to stop fearing each other. It is therefore especially gratifying for me to note the generally positive effects and impetus the Final Act has had on expanding educational exchanges -- and the increased understanding they bring -- between the people of East and West.

The past two years have, in fact, probably witnessed the largest expansion of the exchanges with the East since they first began 20 years ago. In the two years since the Helsinki summit, general bilateral exchange agreements were negotiated for the first time with Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary; exchange problems were expanded with Yugoslavia, Poland, and Romania; a modest reciprocal exchange program was initiated with the German Democratic Republic; and a new, expanded three-year Program of Exchanges was signed with the Soviet Union. Other bilateral exchange initiatives have included the creation of joint research commissions with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, the expansion of the International Visitors' Program, and the continuation of the Fulbright exchanges.

Furthermore, since August 1975, direct contacts have increased between educational and other non-governmental institutions of East and West, including the first direct agreement between a Soviet and American university in October 1976, direct agreements between American universities and their counterparts in Poland, Yugoslavia and Romania, and exchanges between the National 4-H Council and agricultural specialists in Poland and the Soviet Union and between the YMCA and the Soviet State Committee on Youth Organizations.

Our exchanges with the other participating states have also been progressing favorably; during the 1975/1976 academic year, over 10,000

West European students were studying in American universities and American students could choose from close to 400 programs for study abroad in most of the countries of Western Europe. These exchange activities -- conducted openly and freely between private organizations -- have been successfully expanding and improving without the need for intergovernmental agreements.

It has always been my government's policy that such private, direct exchanges -- whose significance the Final Act recognizes and which characterize all of our exchanges with Western Europe -- are the most effective means of conducting both cultural and educational exchanges. The individual plays the central role in education, and it should be up to individuals to decide where and what they need to study.

We feel very strongly that the role of the governments -- both East and West -- should be, above all, to facilitate rather than to regulate exchanges, and we shall work for that purpose in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, both official and private exchanges have generally brought positive results directly to the participating scholars and institutions and indirectly to expanding contacts and mutual understanding among people.

Admittedly, the American private and public sector recently have had to reduce the funds available for the exchanges and have thus reduced the possibilities for enlarging the programs. Part of the reason for this is financial; organizations such as the Ford Foundation, the most important private contributor to the exchanges, have had to cut back on their support of all programs. Increased administrative costs have also eaten into every program's modest budget; more funds could be made available to support substantive programs if they did not have to be used to iron out many of the bureaucratic and administrative problems which plague so many of our exchanges with the East. These problems have, unfortunately, persisted and have encouraged a reluctance to expand existing programs and increase their funding.

The Final Act calls on the participating states not only to expand cooperation in education and science, but also to improve that cooperation, specifically in the area of access to educational institutions. While there has been some improvement in certain countries, restrictions on access to archives, to material within those archives, and to their card catalogues, remain problems which unnecessarily hinder the work of many scholars.

Some of the problems American exchange students continue to face are exemplified by the situation of one American student researching the Uzbek language in Soviet Central Asia who had to wait 7 months before he received permission to use the facilities of the Uzbek Academy of Sciences. He worked there for one day, was promised he could return the next, left his notes in the Academy, and was told the next day he could not re-enter because his notes did not pertain to the research he was officially conducting.

American exchange students also continue to complain of problems receiving permission to travel on official research trips within the visiting country, and some exchange applicants are refused entry permission for political, not scholarly reasons. Many Eastern scholars still find it difficult to leave their countries to conduct research abroad and to maintain the foreign contacts needed for their work. Bureaucratic delays, last minute rejections of American candidates, and postal interference are also problem areas which frustrate and complicate the exchange programs.

In summary, though, we have generally been pleased with the expansion of the educational exchanges, with the benefits they have brought, and with the effect the Final Act has had on the process. We have sought to facilitate and encourage more direct agreements and are eager, with the resolution of the problems which remain, to expand further the contacts, visits and research ventures among our countries' most valuable resources -- today's students and tomorrow's policy makers.

BASKET THREE - SUMMARY OF STATEMENT
EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE
BY CONGRESSMAN PAUL SIMON
Belgrade, November 8, 1977

Speaking November 8 on educational exchange and the teaching of foreign languages in the United States, U.S. Delegate, Congressman Paul Simon, noted that scholars often feel constrained studying in Eastern Europe and are subjected to a variety of restrictions. Scientists, for example, are unable to meet freely with their counterparts.

In dealing with the problem of foreign language study, Congressman Simon conceded that the U.S. does lag behind its European partners. As an illustration of the scope of the problem, Simon noted that there are more teachers of English in the Soviet Union, than students of Russian in the U.S. He went on to attribute this imbalance, in part to the United States' relative geographical isolation and to the fact that the national government is unable to dictate to local school systems or private universities what courses they should require. The government is, however, anxious to correct any shortcomings the U.S. may have in implementing the Final Act. As a result, President Carter, on congressional urging, has agreed to appoint a commission to study ways to promote language study in the U.S.

BASKET THREE - SUMMARY OF STATEMENT
BY GUY CORIDEN
Belgrade, November 10, 1977

On November 10, the United States representative, Guy Coriden, departed briefly from the general education theme, to note an exchange of notes between the United States and Bulgaria which reciprocally eliminated travel controls on diplomats in the two countries.

In speaking to the substance of the education provisions, Mr. Coriden scored the fact that bureaucratic complications are a serious problem in educational exchange. While institutes in Eastern Europe may decide that one of their number deserves the opportunity to study abroad, the receiving universities in the U.S. quite often have chosen a different candidate, one who they feel better qualified to participate in their particular programs. When faced with a candidate they have not chosen and for whom they have no program, universities will either reject or shuffle the individual to another institution. Such situations, notwithstanding Eastern skepticism, constitute the bureaucratic problems Western delegations have mentioned.

With regard to the question of equivalency of degrees, as in many CSCE states the U.S. government does not establish standards for degrees and as such cannot enter into agreements on equivalency. Discussions on this subject are now being carried out in the UNESCO framework and stated Mr. Coriden, the U.S. believes this forum is the most suitable and appropriate multilateral channel for such discussions. He went on to note, that in the United States' bilateral exchanges with the Soviet Union the question of degree equivalency has been addressed on a number of occasions, including not only one bilateral seminar devoted specifically to this topic but also during discussions between university officials from both countries during private and U.S. government-sponsored visits.

With regard to textbooks, Mr. Coriden hastened to disagree with the Soviet delegate's assessment that there has been no movement by the West in this area. As with the question of degree content, the U.S. government has no authority over textbook content or selection. It has, however, facilitated both financially and otherwise an increasing number of exchanges involving, for example, the American Association of Publishers and the Library Association with their Soviet counterparts which have addressed this question. Likewise, the U.S. has discussed with the Soviet Union plans for a study on how we treat each other in our history and geography textbooks. In September, an American delegation made up of representatives from the private sector and local government officials with responsibility in this field was prepared to depart for Moscow for preliminary talks on the study. At the last minute, however, arrangements for the trip fell through.

BASKET THREE STATEMENT REGARDING
PROPOSAL CSCE/BM/49
BY REPRESENTATIVE MILLICENT FENWICK
Belgrade, November 23, 1977

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In discussing the present proposal, BM/49, calling on the participating States not to restrict citizens from communicating with official representatives from other states, it is important to remember that this proposal touches an important element of the lives of the people in the countries we represent.

One of the purposes of diplomatic missions abroad is to be of service to people, to facilitate their travel, and to widen their knowledge. In denying access to these facilities, certain states are engaged in an unfortunate and grave deprivation of the goals of CSCE.

I must say a few words more. It is an awesome occasion for me to speak here today. I am immensely moved by the names of the sovereign countries represented here and by the fact that the hopes of all people in the world are represented here.

We are at this table to bring about a furthering of the goals contained in the Helsinki Final Act which all our chiefs of state signed more than two years ago. None of us should treat the commitments we have signed lightly. We should not flinch from the difficulties which arise. Although each of our countries is different, that does not change what we are supposed to do. We have come a long way to promote the goals and ideas of the Final Act and have learned a great deal, but still have a great deal more to learn. I sincerely hope that those who do not agree will say so honestly so that we may further the goals of this Act.

Which brings me back to BM/49. Granting citizens access to diplomatic missions is not a difficult request. People should be able to freely walk in and out of foreign embassies. These are simple human thoughts and aspirations. I hope that this important body will take up this simple desire in the humanitarian spirit in which it was offered.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BASKET III -- STATEMENT
IN SUPPORT OF CULTURAL COOPERATION YEAR
BY SUSAN PEDERSEN
Belgrade, December 5, 1977

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to make a few comments with regard to BM/10, the proposal of Yugoslavia, on designating 1980 a year of cultural cooperation between CSCE states.

My delegation is on the whole sympathetic with the sentiments exhibited in BM/10 and would support the idea of naming 1980 a year of cultural cooperation. We do, however, have a few problems with the scope of activities now envisioned by the proposal.

As a result, we would suggest that it might be advisable to somewhat shorten the length of BM/10. This could perhaps be accomplished by including a lesser degree of specificity of the activities to be outlined in our concluding document. We could, for example, agree to encourage activities in the sphere of television and radio in our schools, libraries, and publishing firms, but allow these institutions more leeway in deciding specifically what programs they would be willing or able to undertake.

Such an abbreviation would additionally meet with our support in view of the financial obligations the participating States would be called upon to assume should all points of this proposal, particularly those dealing with the proposed scientific cultural conference, be implemented. As was mentioned earlier, U.S. government policy in the field of culture has been only to assist organizations or individuals that wish to become involved in a particular cultural activity. It is not ordinarily a governmental policy to initiate such undertakings. As a result, our cultural exchange budget is rather restricted and we would be hesitant to put all our eggs in one basket, so to speak.

I would like to state again, Mr. Chairman, that my delegation does support naming 1980 a year of cultural cooperation between CSCE states.

Thank you.

BASKET THREE STATEMENT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES BY
ESTER KURZ

I would like to make some brief comments on BM/30, the proposal presently under discussion.

As one of the sponsors of the proposal, my delegation would like to stress the positive effects this modest text would have on furthering implementation of the relevant Final Act provisions on educational access and exchanges.

As our delegation noted during the discussions reviewing implementation, our experience with the various educational exchanges has generally been a positive and beneficial one. American scholars participating in the exchanges have benefitted from the exposure they have received to different societies and the possibilities they have been offered to expand their research.

One continuing complaint of many participants has, however, centered around problems they have encountered in gaining access to archival materials. Often, these problems involved obtaining materials which were not included in a scholar's original request because he was not aware of their existence while planning his research.

Providing lists and catalogues of open archival material would therefore go a long way to resolving such problems by providing all interested scholars with the full information they need to plan and outline their exchange program, or even to decide on the feasibility of participating in an exchange. It would also facilitate the implementation of several specific provisions of Basket Three's section 4 which calls on the participating States to grant scholars, teachers and students "the opportunity to use relevant scholarly scientific and open archival materials" and, to increase "the exchange of information on facilities for study...and the exchanges of educational and scholarly information such as university publications and materials from libraries."

Including the text of BM/30 in our final document would help further these specific goals without changing the Final Act and would help improve the quality of the educational exchanges and the possibilities of their further expansion.

PRESS RELATIONS

Except for the plenary session during the first week of the Belgrade Meeting, all sessions were closed to the press. This made the work of correspondents covering the meeting especially difficult, as they were forced to rely entirely on information about the proceedings provided them by delegates, without access to the actual meetings themselves. In order to facilitate their work so the public might know what was going on, and what the American delegation was doing, Myron Hoffmann, the delegation press spokesman, held regular briefings. These occurred twice daily during the early stages of the review of implementation. Later, briefings were held on an average of once a day. These briefings were open to all correspondents who wished to attend, regardless of nationality. The point of the briefings was to give a broad picture of proceedings in general, and especially to discuss activities and approaches of the American delegation. As it was not possible to be fully acquainted with all proceedings when as many as three meetings might be going on simultaneously, Mr. Hoffmann regularly invited the "basket chiefs" of the American delegation to discuss at what the American delegation was doing in their particular subsidiary working bodies.

Hoffmann met often with correspondents individually or in small groups in response to their requests.

Ambassador Goldberg himself was as available to the press as his busy schedule would allow. He gave numerous interviews to representatives of all the media, and held occasional press conferences.

All members of the delegation were available to the press to discuss their particular area of interest and responsibility.

STATEMENT TO THE PRESS
MADE BY MYRON HOFFMANN
Belgrade, October 25, 1977

We are pleased with progress thus far. We have made a good beginning in the direction of a thorough and detailed review of implementation of the Final Act. There is a general recognition among all the delegations that while progress has been made in the two years since Helsinki, much remains to be done. The will to proceed seriously, without polemics, but with candor, is evident. The groundwork has been laid for constructive work in the subsidiary working groups.

We have spoken frankly in the plenary sessions, and intend to continue in that vein in the working groups. We will cite specific violations of the Final Act and mention specific cases to illustrate problem areas. We will criticize others constructively, and expect to be criticized ourselves in the same spirit.

We are optimistic that the process begun at Helsinki will be advanced significantly here in Belgrade. As a delegation, we intend to assert vigorously the obligation of all signatories of the Final Act to continue to pursue all the goals of that document.

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MYRON HOFFMANN
Belgrade, November 7, 1977

SUMMARY

Mr. Hoffmann discussed the Plenary and the various proposals that were made there. Three U.S. statements were handed out at the briefing.

Mr. Hoffmann mentioned that there are several newly-arrived public members in Belgrade, as well as Congressman Paul Simon.

The Basket III discussion centered on educational exchanges. Mr. Korbonski was the first speaker, followed by the Canadian delegate. The latter complained that as far as cultural exchanges are concerned, access is too restrictive in some countries to some individuals. That is, certain authors who don't write as is prescribed are still denied international contacts. They are often discriminated against, harassed, and even exiled. Their works appear only in "Samizdat". The interventions by the Americans and the Canadians gave rise to fairly sharp responses by the Soviet delegate, who felt the statements were provocative. He said it would be difficult to respond to the American delegate regarding the student in the Uzbek library. He was after all only one of 48,000 foreign students in the U.S.S.R. A number of other delegations contributed to the discussion.

PRESS BRIEFING
BY MYRON HOFFMANN
Belgrade, November 15, 1977

SUMMARY

Hoffmann briefed the press immediately following the close of the Basket I discussions where Mr. Chaikin delivered a statement. The statement focused on the question of whether or not the invitation from George Meany of the AFL-CIO to Academician Sakharov and five others to attend a convention in the United States in December was ever delivered, and whether or not the people in question would be allowed to attend and then return home.

Both the Soviets and the GDR responded to the question attacking American society with broadsides about weaknesses in our society and alleged American human rights violations. Mr. Chaikin exercised his right of reply. He rejected the contention that we were poisoning the atmosphere. He asked for some simple answers. He addressed these questions to the Soviets in this way: "Will you or will you not deliver the letters? Will you or will you not issue a visa so that Academician Sakharov might attend the AFL-CIO convention? Will you or will you not permit him to return home to the Soviet Union?"

Mr. Chaikin was also present at the press briefing and read his entire right of reply statement to them. He also gave additional details regarding the incidents and the people invited.