



From The Minister of State

Peter Blaker MP

Foreign and Commonwealth Office

London, SW1A 2AH

5

GNZ 441518/1	
JAN 1981	
OFFICER	REGISTRY
	Action Taken

7 January 1981

Dear Robert,

Thank you for your letter of 16 December to Peter Carrington enclosing one from your constituent, Mr B Dickson of 31 Delhi Parade, Belfast, about Soviet treatment of Moisei Tonkonogy.

The Government deeply deplore the unjust persecution and harassment of all the victims of Soviet and Eastern European oppression. The sort of treatment recorded in Mr Dickson's letter is, of course, a violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and of the Helsinki Final Act which the Soviet Union solemnly undertook to observe.

It is for reasons such as these that we and other Western delegations have pressed at Madrid for a thorough evaluation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. We consider that the maximum pressure should be brought to bear on these countries to live up to their undertakings in the Helsinki Final Act. Our Delegation in Madrid have therefore already raised the question of the many forms of repression practised by the Soviet Union including the harassment of Jews and the prevention of people from emigrating. Where appropriate they have illustrated their points by quoting individual cases, and they have, as I said in the House of Commons on 3 December last, made clear the strong feelings of the British people about such conduct.

/The

The Reverend Robert Bradford MP  
House of Commons



The United Kingdom Delegation has also taken a leading role in drawing up and tabling a proposal which calls on participating states to improve their record in certain named fields of human rights, including the treatment of those who seek the freedom to practise their religion.

Our Delegation are fully briefed on such cases as that of Mr Tonkonogy and you can assure your constituent that they will continue to raise these matters in Madrid as long as we consider it necessary.

The CSCE Review Meeting in Madrid is, incidentally, due to continue until next March. Although the period up to the Christmas adjournment on 19 December was mainly devoted to reviewing implementation of the Helsinki Final Act by signatory states since the Belgrade Review in 1977, leaving detailed consideration of new proposals to the post-Christmas period, delegations can raise questions of implementation at any time throughout the course of the meeting.

*Yours sincerely,*

*Peter Staker.*

# PRESS RELEASE

## FOREIGN & COMMONWEALTH OFFICE

No 145

Thursday, 13 November 1980  
12.30

### REVIEW MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE.

The following is the text of the speech delivered this morning by Mr Blaker, Minister of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, at the Review Meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Madrid:-

1. I SHOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS MY GREAT PLEASURE AND SATISFACTION IN REPRESENTING THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT HERE IN MADRID AT THIS SECOND MAJOR FOLLOW-UP MEETING IN THE CSCE PROCESS. I SHOULD LIKE ALSO TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY OF PAYING TRIBUTE, THROUGH YOU MR PRESIDENT TO THE SPANISH GOVERNMENT FOR UNDERTAKING THE HEAVY RESPONSIBILITIES OF BEING HOST COUNTRY OF THIS MEETING, AND TO THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, HIS EXCELLENCY AMBASSADOR PEREZ HERNANDEZ, FOR THE EFFICIENCY AND PATIENCE WITH WHICH HE AND HIS STAFF HAVE BEEN HANDLING THE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THIS AND FOR THE PREPARATORY MEETING.

2. THE BRITISH DELEGATION HAVE COME HERE FOR A REASON WHICH CAN BE SIMPLY STATED: WE WANT TO STRENGTHEN SECURITY AND DEVELOP COOPERATION WITH ALL THE COUNTRIES REPRESENTED HERE. IF THERE WERE NO DIFFICULTY IN THIS, THERE WOULD BE NO NEED FOR THIS MEETING, AND THERE WOULD BE NO POINT IN IT IF WE BELIEVED THAT THESE DIFFICULTIES WERE BEYOND THE POWER OF REASONABLE MEN TO OVERCOME. WE ARE MORE OPTIMISTIC THAN THAT. THE CSCE IS A POLITICAL PROCESS. WE HAVE COME HERE TO PRACTISE THE ART OF THE POSSIBLE WITH PATIENCE, WITHOUT POLEMICS, AND WITH THE AIM OF MAKING PROGRESS ON THE BASIS OF THE FINAL ACT.

3. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FINAL ACT IS TWOFOLD. FIRST, IN THE PRINCIPLES GUIDING RELATIONS BETWEEN PARTICIPATING STATES OUR 35 COUNTRIES COMMITTED THEMSELVES TO A FRAMEWORK FOR THE CONDUCT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. UNDERLYING THIS FRAMEWORK ARE MANY ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW. WE WERE ALL COMMITTED TO OBSERVE THESE BEFORE THE SIGNATURE OF THE FINAL ACT, AND WE REMAIN SO NOW. THE FINAL ACT ITSELF HAS NO LEGAL FORCE BUT IS RELEVANT TO ALL THE MAJOR POLITICAL PROBLEMS OF EUROPE. IT ALSO NATURALLY APPLIES TO BERLIN WHICH ALREADY BENEFITS FROM THE QUADRIPARTITE AGREEMENT OF 3 SEPTEMBER 1971.

News Department,  
Foreign & Commonwealth Office, Downing Street (West), S.W.1.

01-233-8618

2.

4. MRCHAIRMAN, A DEGREE OF COMPETITION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IS INEVITABLE. THE SIGNATORIES OF THE FINAL ACT RECOGNISED THIS: BUT THEY LOOKED FOR A HEALTHIER BASIS FOR THEIR RELATIONS THAN THAT OF STRUGGLE BY ALL MEANS SHORT OF WAR. THEIR AIM WAS NOT ONLY THAT COMPETITION SHOULD KEEP WITHIN THE LIMITS SET BY INTERNATIONAL LAW. THAT, AFTER ALL, WOULD HAVE ADDED NOTHING TO WHAT WE HAD ALREADY. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FINAL ACT IS IN WHAT IT ADDED. AN EXPECTATION WAS CREATED THAT, FOR THE SAKE OF EUROPEAN SECURITY AND COOPERATION, A CERTAIN RESTRAINT WOULD BE OBSERVED IN THE BEHAVIOUR OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES; THAT THE PURSUIT OF NATIONAL OR IDEOLOGICAL ADVANTAGE WOULD NOT BE CARRIED TO THE POINT AT WHICH TENSION WOULD BE RAISED THROUGH DISREGARD OF THE LEGITIMATE INTERESTS OF OTHER PARTIES. THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT, TOGETHER WITH THEIR PARTNERS IN THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY REMAIN WHOLEHEARTEDLY ATTACHED TO THIS FRAMEWORK OF RELATIONS, ESTABLISHED ON PAPER IN THE FINAL ACT. WITHOUT IT, THE BASIS FOR COOPERATION, AND THE WHOLE PROCESS OF DETENTE, ARE UNDERMINED. FURTHERMORE, THE PRINCIPLE OF SOVEREIGN EQUALITY, THE FIRST OF THE TEN PRINCIPLES OF THE FINAL ACT, HAS SPECIAL VALUE FOR A NUMBER OF THE COUNTRIES REPRESENTED HERE, WHO SEE IT AS STRENGTHENING THEIR DETERMINATION TO PLAY THEIR OWN INDIVIDUAL PART IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF EUROPE. OUR AIM IS TO SEE THE ENTIRE FRAMEWORK OF THE FINAL ACT RESPECTED IN PRACTICE, TO THE BENEFIT OF US ALL. THE FIRST TASK OF THE REVIEW MEETING IS TO CONSIDER THOSE MATTERS IN WHICH THE FRAMEWORK IS NOT BEING FULLY RESPECTED; AND TO CONSIDER WHAT REMEDY IS NECESSARY. THERE IS NOTHING NEGATIVE ABOUT THIS APPROACH. MY GOVERNMENT HAS NOT FAILED TO NOTICE AND TO WELCOME THE MANY POSITIVE DEVELOPMENTS IN OUR CONTINENT SINCE WE LAST MET IN BELGRADE. BUT UNFORTUNATELY THAT IS NOT THE WHOLE PICTURE.

5. THE SECOND ESSENTIAL FEATURE OF THE FINAL ACT WAS THAT IT EXPRESSED OUR HOPES FOR THE FUTURE, AND BECAME A SYMBOL OF THEM. IT PROVIDED A STIMULUS TO INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION IN MANY FIELDS, WHICH REMAIN OF GREAT IMPORTANCE TO BRITAIN AS TO OTHER PARTICIPANTS. WE VALUE OUR MULTILATERAL AND BILATERAL LINKS WITH COUNTRIES IN ALL PARTS OF EUROPE, AND OUR WISH IS TO DEVELOP THEM FURTHER. I KNOW FROM MY OWN EXPERIENCE HOW VALUABLE PERSONAL CONTACTS AT MINISTERIAL LEVEL CAN BE. BUT THE CSCE MADE ALSO A MORE DISTINCTIVE CONTRIBUTION, IN THE EXTENT TO WHICH IT STRESSED THE FREE EXERCISE OF PERSONAL RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS, AS THE FOUNDATION FOR GREATER UNDERSTANDING AMONG OUR PEOPLES. THE FINAL ACT THUS BECAME A SYMBOL OF OUR HOPES FOR A PEACEFUL EVOLUTION - FOR THE BREAKING DOWN OF ARTIFICIAL BARRIERS SEPARATING PEOPLE IN THE EAST FROM THOSE IN THE WEST - FOR INCREASING OPENNESS OVER THE WHOLE OF EUROPE - AND ULTIMATELY FOR A STATE OF AFFAIRS IN WHICH PERSONAL FREEDOM WOULD BE ENJOYED EQUALLY THROUGHOUT OUR CONTINENT. IT IS ONLY UNDER SUCH CONDITIONS THAT WE CAN HOPE FOR FULL UNDERSTANDING TO BE ACHIEVED, AND FOR THE UNDERLYING ASPIRATIONS OF ALL THE PEOPLE OF EUROPE TO BE PROPERLY REFLECTED IN THE POLICIES OF ALL THEIR GOVERNMENTS. WE SAID AS MUCH IN PRINCIPLE VII:- QUOTE THE PARTICIPATING STATES RECOGNISE THE UNIVERSAL SIGNIFICANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS,

3.  
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  
UNQUOTE.

6. THUS THE DIRECT LINK BETWEEN PERSONAL FREEDOMS AND PEACE WAS MADE  
CLEAR IN THE COMMITMENTS WE UNDERTOOK AT HELSINKI. IT SHOULD ALSO  
BE OBVIOUS, IF ONE LOOKS AT THE COMPETITION IN MILITARY POWER  
BETWEEN EAST AND WEST, THAT THERE IS A LINK BETWEEN GREATER  
OPENNESS AND GREATER STABILITY. WHO CAN DOUBT THAT THE  
PROSPECTS FOR ESTABLISHING AN ADEQUATE MILITARY BALANCE AT A  
MUCH LOWER LEVEL OF FORCES WOULD BE GREATLY IMPROVED, IF THE  
SUBJECT OF MILITARY EXPENDITURE, AND THE OBJECTIVES OF IT, WERE  
AS OPEN TO FREE PUBLIC DEBATE AND QUESTIONING IN ALL COUNTRIES  
AS THEY ARE, FOR EXAMPLE, IN MY OWN? OPENNESS IS USUALLY A  
GOOD GUIDE TO PEACEFUL INTENTIONS. AS LORD CARRINGTON SAID IN HIS  
SPEECH TO THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN SEPTEMBER;  
QUOTE IN MILITARY MATTERS, THE MORE IS KNOWN, THE LESS IS FEARED,  
THE MORE IS CONCEALED, THE MORE IS SUSPECT. UNQUOTE

7. WE ARE ALL COMMITTED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF ALL THE PRINCIPLES.  
BUT AT CERTAIN TIMES CERTAIN PRINCIPLES WILL CRY OUT FOR OUR  
PARTICULAR ATTENTION. IN THE VIEW OF MY GOVERNMENT, A SECOND  
MAIN TASK OF THIS REVIEW MEETING SHOULD BE TO INSIST UPON BETTER  
IMPLEMENTATION OF PRINCIPLE VII ON RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND  
FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS. FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THAT PRINCIPLE MAY BE  
A LONG WAY OFF IN SOME COUNTRIES. EVERYTHING CANNOT BE ACHIEVED  
AT ONCE. BUT OUR PEOPLE ARE ENTITLED TO EXPECT CONSTANT AND  
VISIBLE PROGRESS IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION. THIS IS THE LEAST THAT  
WILL FULFIL THE PLEDGES MADE AT HELSINKI.

8. IT WILL BE CLEAR, FROM WHAT I HAVE SAID ALREADY, THAT THE  
BRITISH GOVERNMENT CONSIDER THAT THIS REVIEW MEETING SHOULD  
CONCENTRATE UPON ESSENTIALS. EVENTS HAVE RAISED SERIOUS QUESTIONS  
ABOUT WHETHER WE CAN RELY UPON THE FRAMEWORK PROVIDED BY THE FINAL  
ACT FOR THE CONDUCT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, AND ABOUT WHETHER  
ALL PARTICIPATING STATES ARE PREPARED TO HONOUR THEIR PART OF THE  
HELSINKI BARGAIN. THESE QUESTIONS MUST BE ANSWERED HERE AT MADRID.  
IF THERE REMAIN DOUBTS ABOUT THE FUNDAMENTAL COMMITMENT TO THE  
FINAL ACT OF ONE OR MORE OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES, THERE CAN  
BE NO FAITH IN NEW PROPOSALS WHICH REST ONLY UPON PIOUS HOPES. THE  
CSCE REVIEW PROCESS DOES NOT, OF COURSE, PRESUPPOSE AGREEMENT AT  
EVERY STAGE. IF WE CANNOT, AT THIS MEETING, RESOLVE THE BASIC  
ISSUES THAT HAVE ARISEN, WE CAN ONLY MAKE THIS CLEAR - AND  
LOOK FORWARD TO TRYING AGAIN, AT THE NEXT REVIEW MEETING. THIS  
IS NOT A TIME WHEN IT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO SEEK JUST AN  
APPEARANCE OF SUCCESS, THROUGH A RANGE OF AGREEMENTS ON SECONDARY  
ISSUES, OR ON A PROGRAMME OF CSCE MEETINGS WHICH WOULD BE NOTHING  
MORE THAN ACTIVITY FOR ACTIVITY'S SAKE. ANY INTERNATIONAL  
INSTITUTION OR PROCESS WHICH SIDESTEPS THE MAJOR ISSUES WHICH  
ARE RELEVANT TO IT, AT ONCE LOSES RESPECT. THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

DO NOT WISH THAT TO HAPPEN TO THE CSCE. THE IDEALS WHICH WE ESTABLISHED IN THE FINAL ACT MUST BE PRESERVED, NOT DILUTED.

9. I VIEW WITH CONCERN THE COURSE TAKEN BY THE PREPARATORY MEETING WHOSE MANDATE WAS TO PREPARE THE AGENDA AND MODALITIES FOR THIS REVIEW MEETING. THE PREPARATORY MEETING SHOULD HAVE BEEN ABLE TO BUILD UPON THE CONSENSUS OF BELGRADE, AND TO HAVE COMPLETED ITS WORK QUICKLY. INSTEAD IT WAS FACED FOR MORE THAN NINE WEEKS WITH A SERIES OF PROPOSALS APPARENTLY AIMED AT TRANSFORMING THE NATURE OF THE CSCE PROCESS. THE GOAL OF FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FINAL ACT IS AT THE VERY HEART OF OUR PROCESS.

ATTEMPTS WERE MADE, HOWEVER, TO REDUCE TO A MINIMUM THE PROVISION IN OUR AGENDA FOR THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE FINAL ACT. FURTHERMORE, ATTEMPTS WERE MADE TO QUALIFY THE COMMITMENT OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES IN THE FINAL ACT TO FURTHER FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS: TO QUALIFY THIS IN A MANNER WHICH WOULD HAVE RESERVED TO CERTAIN STATES THE JUDGEMENT ON WHETHER THE APPROPRIATE POLITICAL CONDITIONS EXISTED FOR HOLDING ANOTHER MEETING. THESE ATTEMPTS DID NOT WIN CONSENSUS. BUT THE COST OF THE PROLONGED ARGUMENT HAS BEEN HIGH, IN TERMS BOTH OF THE PUBLIC CREDIBILITY OF OUR PROCESS AND OF THE POLITICAL ATMOSPHERE OF THIS MAIN MEETING. I THEREFORE HOPE THAT THE UNFINISHED TASK OF THE PREPARATORY MEETING WILL RAPIDLY BE COMPLETED.

10. TURNING THEN TO THE REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION ITSELF, A SEVERE SHOCK HAS BEEN GIVEN TO INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL CONFIDENCE BY THE INTERVENTION OF THE SOVIET UNION IN AFGHANISTAN, AND THE CONTINUED SOVIET MILITARY OCCUPATION OF THAT COUNTRY. THE FACTS ARE WELL KNOWN. THEY LED TO THE CONVENING OF A SPECIAL SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND TO CONDEMNATION OF THE SOVIET ACTION BY 104 MEMBERS. WE ARE CONCERNED WITH THE EFFECT OF THESE EVENTS UPON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE. IT IS IN THAT CONTEXT THAT I RAISE THEM. AT THE END OF THE SECTION ON PRINCIPLES IN THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT THE PARTICIPATING STATES DECLARED QUOTE THEIR INTENTION TO CONDUCT THEIR RELATIONS WITH ALL OTHER STATES IN THE SPIRIT OF THE PRINCIPLES UNQUOTE GUIDING RELATIONS BETWEEN THEMSELVES. THE EXISTENCE OF THIS PROVISION, WHEN COMPARED WITH WHAT HAS BEEN HAPPENING IN AFGHANISTAN, RAISES THE MOST DISTURBING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE LIGHT IN WHICH THE SOVIET UNION VIEWS ITS COMMITMENTS UNDER THE FINAL ACT. THE ESSENTIAL BASIS OF CONFIDENCE IN RELATIONS BETWEEN EAST AND WEST IN EUROPE HAS SUFFERED SEVERELY BECAUSE OF THE KIND OF BEHAVIOUR WE HAVE WITNESSED IN AFGHANISTAN. A SOUNDLY-BASED RELATIONSHIP IN EUROPE DEMANDS THAT NONE OF THE PARTICIPATING STATES SHOULD PURSUE NATIONAL OR IDEOLOGICAL AMBITIONS BY UNACCEPTABLE MEANS AT THE EXPENSE OF OTHER COUNTRIES IN OTHER AREAS. IT DEMANDS STRICT OBSERVANCE OF OBLIGATIONS UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW. NOT THE LEAST DISTURBING ASPECT OF THE EVENTS IN AFGHANISTAN IS THE APPARENT ASSUMPTION THAT THE END OF MAINTAINING IN POWER A PARTICULAR TYPE OF REGIME JUSTIFIES THE USE OF MEANS WHICH ARE CLEARLY CONTRARY

5.

TO INTERNATIONAL LAW. IT MUST BE MADE CLEAR HERE THAT THAT VIEW IS REJECTED. NOTHING - NO TALK OF SOLIDARITY OR INTERNATIONALISM OR BROTHERHOOD - CAN OVERRIDE THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL CONDUCT OR EXCUSE THEIR VIOLATION, IN EUROPE OR ELSEWHERE.

11. THE CONCLUSION WHICH ONE IS BOUND TO DRAW FROM THE EVENTS IN AFGHANISTAN IS THAT THE FRAMEWORK WHICH WE THOUGHT WE HAD ESTABLISHED AT HELSINKI FOR THE CONDUCT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS HAS BEEN GRAVELY UNDERMINED. IN SHORT, THE SOVIET UNION, HAVING CONFIRMED AT HELSINKI AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL ITS INTENTION TO CONDUCT ITS RELATIONS WITH ALL OTHER STATES IN THE SPIRIT OF THE PRINCIPLES CONTAINED IN THE DECLARATION IN THE FINAL ACT, HAS COMPREHENSIVELY FAILED TO DO SO IN THE CASE OF AFGHANISTAN, INDEED IT WOULD BE SIMPLER TO SAY THAT IT HAS DONE PRECISELY THE OPPOSITE. THE SOVIET UNION HAS BROKEN EVERY ONE OF THE PRINCIPLES.

12. WHAT, THEN, IS NECESSARY AS THE REMEDY? THERE CAN BE ONLY ONE ANSWER - THOSE WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DAMAGE MUST NOW REPAIR IT. THEY MUST DO SO BY ACCEPTING THE NECESSITY FOR A SETTLEMENT IN AFGHANISTAN WHICH WILL ENABLE THE AFGHAN PEOPLE TO CHOOSE A GOVERNMENT ACCEPTABLE TO THEMSELVES, AND WHICH WILL RESTORE THAT COUNTRY TO GENUINE INDEPENDENCE. WE DO NOT SUGGEST THAT THIS CSCE REVIEW MEETING IS THE RIGHT FORUM FOR NEGOTIATIONS TO DEAL WITH THE PROBLEM OF AFGHANISTAN. BUT A POLITICAL SETTLEMENT THERE MUST BE FOUND IF CONFIDENCE IN EUROPE IS TO BE REPAIRED AND THE BASIS FOR COOPERATION RESTORED.

13. THAT IS OUR OBJECTIVE. IT FOLLOWS FROM THIS THAT BRITISH POLICY IS DIRECTED NOT TOWARDS RAISING TENSION, BUT TOWARDS FINDING MEANS WHEREBY IT CAN GENUINELY BE LOWERED. THIS ENTAILS CONCRETE MEASURES RATHER THAN ATMOSPHERIC ONES. WE SHALL, FOR OUR PART, MAINTAIN FULLY ALL THOSE AGREEMENTS IN THE FIELD OF EAST/WEST RELATIONS WHICH CONCERN US. WE SHALL PURSUE THE ARMS CONTROL NEGOTIATIONS IN WHICH WE ARE ENGAGED, IN THE BELIEF THAT PROGRESS TOWARDS DISARMAMENT MUST COME THROUGH SPECIFIC AGREEMENTS DEALING WITH THE MILITARY BALANCE, WHICH PRODUCE CLEARLY IDENTIFIABLE AND MEASURABLE, AS WELL AS VERIFIABLE, RESULTS. IN THE CSCE, THE TREATMENT OF THE MILITARY ASPECTS OF SECURITY MUST TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE EVENTS TO WHICH I HAVE REFERRED. THESE EVENTS HAVE UNDERMINED THE VALUE - WHICH WAS ALWAYS MORE POLITICAL THAN MILITARY - OF THE CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES WHICH WERE NEGOTIATED AT HELSINKI. THE TIME CALLS FOR NEW MEASURES WHICH ARE OF GENUINE MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE AND WHICH COVER THE WHOLE TERRITORY OF EUROPE. THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT HAVE ALWAYS HAD DOUBTS ABOUT THE VALUE OF COMMITMENTS WHICH CANNOT BE VERIFIED AND OF DECLARATIONS ON THE NON-USE OF FORCE OR DIFFERENT KINDS OF FORCE, WHICH ADD NOTHING TO OUR OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER. THIS IS NOT, IN OUR VIEW, THE CORRECT APPROACH TOWARDS DISARMAMENT. FURTHERMORE, IT IS COMPLETELY INPLAUSIBLE SO LONG AS SOVIET FORCES REMAIN IN MILITARY OCCUPATION OF AFGHANISTAN. FIRST THINGS MUST COME FIRST.

6.

14. I RETURN NOW TO THE SECOND MAIN TASK OF THIS REVIEW MEETING - TO PROMOTE BETTER IMPLEMENTATION OF PRINCIPLE VII ON RESPECT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS, AS WELL AS OF RELATED PROVISIONS IN THE BASKET III CHAPTERS ON HUMAN CONTACTS AND ON INFORMATION. I HAVE RECOGNISED THAT FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF PRINCIPLE VII BY ALL MAY BE A LONG WAY OFF. WE ARE NOT EXPECTING THAT LONG-ESTABLISHED ATTITUDES CAN BE TRANSFORMED OVERNIGHT, OR THAT THE ROLE OF THE INDIVIDUAL CAN IMMEDIATELY BE GIVEN FULL VALUE WHERE IT HAS LONG BEEN SUPPRESSED. STILL LESS ARE WE SEEKING TO INTERVENE IN THE AFFAIRS OF OTHERS IN A WAY CONTRARY TO PRINCIPLE VI AND TO THE ESTABLISHED PRINCIPLES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW WHICH IT REFLECTS. WHAT IS IMPORTANT IN THE CASE OF PRINCIPLE VII, AND FOR THE INTEGRITY OF THE PRINCIPLES IN THE FINAL ACT, IS THAT A PROCESS OF IMPROVEMENT - THE PROCESS OF PEACEFUL EVOLUTION AS I HAVE CALLED IT - SHOULD BE MAINTAINED IN A CONSTANT AND VISIBLE WAY.

15. I SHALL NOT GO INTO DETAIL NOW ABOUT PRACTICES WHICH WE REGARD AS INCONSISTENT WITH THE FINAL ACT. WE SHALL HAVE TO SPEAK LATER IN THIS MEETING ABOUT SUCH MATTERS AS THE GREATLY INCREASED CAMPAIGN OF REPRESSION WHICH THE SOVIET AUTHORITIES HAVE BEEN WAGING AGAINST DISSIDENTS OF ALL KINDS IN THE LAST TWO YEARS. ARRESTS AND HEAVY SENTENCES CONTINUE. BUT IN KEEPING WITH THE MODERATE AND PRACTICAL APPROACH WHICH I HAVE JUST DESCRIBED, I WILL STATE FOUR GENERAL AREAS IN WHICH IMMEDIATE PROGRESS SEEMS BOTH NECESSARY - IN ORDER TO PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF THE FINAL ACT - AND POSSIBLE.

16. THE FIRST AREA CONCERNS THE EXPLICIT CONFIRMATION IN THE FINAL ACT OF FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, AND OF THE RIGHT OF THE INDIVIDUAL TO KNOW AND ACT UPON HIS RIGHTS AND DUTIES, IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS. THE EFFECTIVE EXERCISE OF CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS - ALSO CONFIRMED IN THE FINAL ACT - REQUIRES, AT THE VERY LEAST, THAT PERSONS SHOULD NOT BE PROSECUTED OR OTHERWISE PERSECUTED FOR CRITICISING MALPRACTICES WHOSE EXPOSURE EMBARRASSES THE AUTHORITIES, OR FOR EXPRESSING, IN A NON-VIOLENT MANNER, THEIR VIEWS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE FINAL ACT, INCLUDING PRINCIPLE VII, IN THEIR OWN COUNTRY. THE PERSECUTION IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES OF THE SMALL GROUPS OF PEOPLE WHO HAVE TRIED TO MONITOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT IS A DIRECT AFFRONT TO THE INTEGRITY OF THE FINAL ACT. IT ALSO APPEARS WHOLLY UNNECESSARY. CAN IT SERIOUSLY BE ARGUED THAT THIS DEGREE OF FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION WOULD JEOPARDISE THE POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SYSTEM IN ANY COUNTRY?

17. THE SECOND AREA CONCERNS THE FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL TO PRACTISE HIS RELIGION. THERE IS MUCH EVIDENCE THAT IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES SERIOUS OBSTACLES ARE PLACED IN THE WAY OF THE PRACTICE OF RELIGION, AND THAT PERSONS ARE SUBJECTED TO DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF THEIR RELIGION. AGAIN, THIS IS NOT ONLY CONTRARY TO THE FINAL ACT, IT IS ALSO UNJUSTIFIABLE BY ANY ARGUMENT, UNDER ANY POLITICAL OR SOCIAL SYSTEM.



18. THE THIRD AREA CONCERNS THE COMMITMENT UNDER BASKET III OF THE FINAL ACT WHEREBY OUR STATES MADE IT QUOTE THEIR AIM TO FACILITATE THE FREER AND WIDER DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION OF ALL KINDS UNQUOTE. QUOTE APART FROM THIS PROVISION, I REGARD FREEDOM OF INFORMATION AS, IN ITSELF, ONE OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS WHICH SHOULD BE RESPECTED UNDER PRINCIPLE VII. BUT IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES, A WIDE CENSORSHIP IS STILL MAINTAINED, AND THE AUTHORITIES SEEK TO CONTROL THE INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO THEIR PEOPLE IN A MANNER WHICH IS WHOLLY INCONSISTENT WITH RESPECT FOR FREEDOM OF THOUGHT. A NOTABLE EXAMPLE OF REGRESSION IN THIS FIELD IS THAT SINCE 23 AUGUST THE SOVIET UNION HAS REINTRODUCED A PRACTICE WHICH IT HAD ABANDONED BEFORE THE CONCLUSION OF THE FINAL ACT, OF JAMMING FOREIGN BROADCASTS IN THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE. WHY TURN THE CLOCK BACK LIKE THIS? THE COMMITMENT TO FREER AND WIDER DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION OF ALL KINDS, IN WHICH THE SOVIET UNION JOINED AT HELSINKI, WAS RIGHT THEN, AND IT IS RIGHT TODAY. IF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT HAD DECIDED FOR SOME REASON TO CEASE THEIR OWN HEAVY SCHEDULE OF BROADCASTING TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES, ONE WOULD STILL CONDEMN THE JAMMING BUT COULD AT LEAST REGARD IT AS A BALANCED EXPRESSION OF A PECULIAR POLICY. BUT EVERYONE KNOWS THAT THIS IS NOT THE CASE. THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT APPEAR TO INTERPRET THE FINAL ACT AS GIVING THEM LATITUDE BOTH TO BROADCAST AND TO JAM. THIS IS A POSITION WHICH THEY CANNOT POSSIBLY SUSTAIN. THE ONLY JAMMING DEVICE COMPATIBLE WITH THE FINAL ACT IS THE QUOTE OFF UNQUOTE SWITCH ON THE RADIO SET.

19. THE FOURTH AREA CONCERNS FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT. IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE HUMAN CONTACTS CHAPTER IN BASKET III, THERE HAS BEEN IN SOME COUNTRIES A WELCOME REDUCTION IN THE DIFFICULTIES FACING PEOPLE WHO WISH TO LEAVE THOSE COUNTRIES, WHETHER TEMPORARILY OR PERMANENTLY, FOR FAMILY REUNIFICATION OR OTHER REASONS. IN CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES, HOWEVER, THE ISSUE OF EXIT VISAS OR THEIR EQUIVALENT, IS STILL STRICTLY LIMITED, IN A MANNER WHICH CONFLICTS WITH THE FINAL ACT'S PURPOSES BOTH IN THE HUMANITARIAN FIELD, AND IN THAT OF PROMOTING WIDER UNDERSTANDING AMONG PEOPLES.

20. THESE, THEN, ARE FOUR AREAS CONCERNING HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS IN WHICH THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT CONSIDER IT MOST NECESSARY FOR PROGRESS TO BE MADE IN THE PERIOD AHEAD, BETWEEN THIS MEETING IN MADRID AND THE NEXT REVIEW MEETING. AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME IN THIS MEETING, THE BRITISH DELEGATION WILL BE READY TO JOIN WITH OTHERS IN PUTTING FORWARD PROPOSALS ON THESE POINTS. NONE OF THEM TOUCHES THE FUNDAMENTAL POLITICAL STRUCTURE OF SYSTEMS WHICH ARE DIFFERENT FROM OUR OWN. THEY ARE ALL PRACTICAL, GIVEN THE EXISTING DIFFERENCES IN SYSTEMS. BUT THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT DO NOT ACCEPT THAT THE PATH TO GREATER TOLERANCE AND FREEDOM THROUGHOUT EUROPE SHOULD BE BLOCKED ON ACCOUNT OF THE FEATURES OF ANY ONE SYSTEM. TO CLAIM THAT IT WAS SO BLOCKED WOULD BE TO NEGATE THE DECLARED DETERMINATION OF ALL OUR GOVERNMENTS TO RESPECT AND PUT INTO PRACTICE ALL THE PRINCIPLES WHICH WE AGREED UPON AT HELSINKI.

21. BY ITS PROMISE OF FREEDOM FOR THE INDIVIDUAL, THE FINAL ACT OF HELSINKI PLANTED SEEDS OF HOPE ACROSS EUROPE. BY THEIR PLEDGES OF RESTRAINT THE SIGNATORIES OF THE FINAL ACT PREPARED THE GROUND ON WHICH MUTUAL TRUST MIGHT SPRING UP. THE CONTINUED SUPPRESSION OF HUMAN RIGHTS HAS STUNTED THE GROWTH OF HOPE. AND THE INVASION OF AFGHANISTAN HAS TRAMPLED ON THE FIRST SHOOTS OF TRUST. BUT WE HAVE NOT ABANDONED OUR HOPES AND WE ARE READY TO WORK WITH OTHERS TO REBUILD THE TRUST.

22. MR CHAIRMAN, THE PEOPLE OF MY COUNTRY, AND PERHAPS NOT ONLY OF MY COUNTRY, ARE ASKING CERTAIN QUESTIONS. MUST EUROPE REMAIN DIVIDED? MUST RELATIONS WITHIN OUR CONTINENT ALWAYS BE AS THEY ARE TODAY? ARE THE REPRESENTATIVES OF 35 STATES POWERLESS TO EFFECT ANY IMPROVEMENT? WOULD IT BE RIGHT FOR THIS CONFERENCE ITSELF TO DISPERSE LEAVING MATTERS ESSENTIALLY WHERE THEY WERE BEFORE?

23. TO ALL THESE QUESTIONS MY GOVERNMENT ANSWERS: NO. WE BELIEVE THAT THE DISAGREEMENTS BETWEEN OUR COUNTRIES ARE WASTEFUL AND DESTRUCTIVE. THAT THE DIVISION IN EUROPE IS UNNATURAL. THAT THIS CONTINENT OF OURS, WHICH LONG ANTECIPATED THAT DIVISION, WILL AS LONG OUTLAST IT. THAT NOTHING IN OUR PROBLEMS IS IMMUTABLE. THAT THE CURE FOR OUR ILLS LIES IN OUR OWN HANDS. THAT THE PLACE TO MAKE A FRESH START IS MADRID, AND THAT THE TIME TO DO SO IS NOW.

# Britain and US lead attack on Kremlin

By Hella Pick

Britain and the United States launched a concerted attack on the Soviet Union at the Madrid security conference yesterday. Mr Peter Blaker, the British Minister of State, and Mr Griffin Bell, who headed the US delegation, blamed the Soviet Union for disrupting detente.

Germany's Foreign Minister, Hans Dietrich Genscher, phrased his strictures more moderately, and coupled them with an earnest appeal to the Soviet Union, as well as to East Germany, to continue the process of cooperation in Europe. Norway, Switzerland, and Sweden all voiced their deep concern over the deterioration in East-West relations.

Hungary and Czechoslovakia were the only two Communist block countries to speak. But they were routine speeches, justifying the Soviet presence in Afghanistan as an act of friendship, and denying that they had any reason to feel guilty over human rights viola-

tions.

Hungary always tries to keep a low profile at the Helsinki conferences, aware that its human rights record is good, and that its foreign policy is best tailored to that of the Soviet Union. Czechoslovakia, staunchly loyal to Moscow, left it to the Soviet Union to lead the counter-offensive to the Western speeches yesterday.

Mr Griffin Bell said that "The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan cast a dark shadow over East-West relations which no meeting, no pronouncement, nothing in fact but the total withdrawal of Soviet troops can dispel."

Mr Blaker echoed this: "The essential basis of confidence in relations between East and West in Europe has suffered severely because of the kind of behaviour we have witnessed in Afghanistan," he said. The Soviet Union, he advised, must restore "genuine independence to Afghanistan."

On human rights, the chief

US delegate castigated the Soviet Union and its allies for their "lamentable record of continued denial of human rights," and singled out those who are now imprisoned, or like Professor Andrei Sakharov, condemned to internal exile for their efforts to monitor Soviet compliance with the human rights provisions of the Helsinki Declaration.

Reflecting President Carter's consistent efforts to express support for these activists, Mr Griffin Bell, in one of the last appearances of the Carter Administration at an international forum, again named "the remarkable group" of Soviet dissidents, including Dr Yuri Orlov and Anatoly Shcharansky, who are in prison. He added, amidst applause: "When Andrei Sakharov was banished, some of our best hopes for a spirit of security and cooperation in Europe were banished with him."

Mr Blaker promised that he

would have more to say about "the greatly increased campaign of repression which the Soviet authorities have been waging against dissidents of all kinds in the last two years." He was also greatly incensed by the resumption by the Soviet Union of the jamming of Western broadcasts, including those of the BBC. Jamming, which was resumed soon after the strikes broke out in Gdansk last summer, is, he said another example of Soviet regression.

The British minister said afterwards that there was "nothing negative" in his speech, and asserted that "a soundly based relationship in Europe demands that none of the participating states should pursue national or ideological ambitions by unacceptable means." But he stood by his view that the Soviet Union, in its action in Afghanistan, had violated "all 10 principles" of the Helsinki Declarations' code of international conduct.

Germany's Foreign Minister argued that "the occupation of Afghanistan not only affects that country, but convulses the world." He added: "It affects the nub of cooperation so essential for the safeguarding of peace."

But he was still more concerned that the Soviet Union should not believe that it could risk another intervention elsewhere, or evoke the Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty to justify intervention within the Communist block.

With Poland in mind, and also perhaps Yugoslavia, Mr Genscher said that detente could not withstand such a blow: "Everyone must know that this applies to a breach of sovereignty of any country outside or inside Europe, and is valid for every country regardless of its state and social system, regardless whether it belongs to a block or not."

But the German Foreign Minister went beyond strictures and warnings to urge the

Soviet Union, and especially East Germany, to "continue on the road of cooperation."

The first test of such cooperation must come this week in Madrid, where it will soon become apparent whether the Madrid conference breaks up after the plenary session or continues to work at strengthening the Helsinki Declaration.

UPI adds from Moscow: A delegation of US arms control experts, including a senior adviser to Mr Reagan, said yesterday that Soviet officials have shown no willingness to renegotiate the SALT 2 treaty.

The American group also pressed the Russians for explanations of their invasion of Afghanistan, their intentions toward Poland, and their actions in the sphere of human rights.

Mr Reagan has said he opposes the arms control treaty in its present form and would not submit it to the Senate for ratification.

GUARDIAN

CSES

# Britain hits at Russians

**BRITAIN led a hard-hitting attack yesterday against Russia's intervention in Afghanistan.**

The attack came on the second day of the 35-state European Security Conference in Madrid.

Minister of State Peter Blaker said the invasion had violated every key principle adopted at the first conference in Helsinki five years ago. He

added: "A severe shock has been given to international relations and international confidence by Russia's intervention in Afghanistan."

Mr. Blaker also accused Russia of "a greatly increased campaign of repression against dissidents in the last two years."

The conference has still failed to agree on an agenda because of Russian attempts to limit the time spent discussing human rights.

, 19

CSCE

## Russia is slammed over human rights

By EDWARD OWEN in Madrid

IN a united attack on the Russians, the West yesterday accused the Soviets of blatantly violating the Helsinki agreement.

Both Britain and the United States delivered stinging opening speeches to the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe in Madrid as they ridiculed the East's pledge made in Helsinki five years ago, for greater freedom of thought, religion, information, and movement.

Mr Peter Blaker, Minister of State at the Foreign Office, said: "The basis of confidence in relations between East and West in Europe has suffered severely."

The U.S. delegation's co-chairman, Judge Griffin Bell, condemned the Russians' "lamentable record of continued denial of human rights."

He added: "The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan cast a shadow over East-West relations which nothing but the total withdrawal of Soviet troops can dispel."

With an agenda for the full meeting still not agreed, a conference delegate said: "We have a hard line but with a soft centre. We must continue."

"The future of Poland, let alone the world, is at stake."