

**Address by US Secretary of State George Shultz
on the tenth anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act
Helsinki, 1 August 1985**

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, let me first join my colleague from the Soviet Union and the others who have spoken here this afternoon in thanking the Government and people of Finland for their fine hospitality and good preparations for this Meeting. We all enjoy breathing the friendly air of Helsinki.

The modern political values that underlie our civilization were born in Europe. The belief in human progress, in intellectual freedom, in religious tolerance, in the rights of the individual against the State, and in a peaceful international order — these are the legacies that have been passed on to us by European thought and culture since the Enlightenment. At times, oppression, intolerance and war have banked the flames of this humane spirit. But always these values have stayed alive, offering hope and inspiration to mankind, that we might explore the outer reaches of knowledge, that we might ascend to a higher plane of human existence, that we might live in peace with our neighbours, that we might have faith in progress and in freedom for ourselves and our world.

Today, tragically, Europe is a divided continent. Yet the ideals of European civilization have not been extinguished. They live still in every nation, in every city and village, on every street, in every home, West and East. They bind Europe together. The barriers, the walls, the barbed wire and the weapons cannot truly divide Europeans from each other or from their heritage. The spiritual strength of European civilization cannot be broken by Government-made artifice.

Europe, let us not forget, has been divided before, though never so starkly. Vastly different political systems have lived side by side on this continent for hundreds of years. Empires, constitutional monarchies and dictatorships have stood beside republics and democracies. Religious wars over the centuries have caused the deaths of countless innocents. And in this century alone, the people of Europe have endured two world wars that ravaged their continent. Only the heroic efforts of the Western democracies and the Soviet Union saved Europe from Hitler's tyranny. Yet Europe has outlived even these times of trouble.

And the modern idea of liberty, since the eighteenth century, has continued to grow and flourish. It has survived all the historic conflicts and divisions of Europe because, even in the dark moments, the aspiration of individuals to speak, think, and travel freely throughout the continent was never extinguished. Belief in the rights of man has deep roots in European philosophy and history.

For now, we all live uneasily with the brutal and artificial division of this continent, even as we search for ways to end it. But nothing in human history has proven irreversible.

Perhaps no one here of my generation can confidently expect that the walls and the barbed wire will magically disappear in our lifetime, but surely the division must be altered within the lifetimes of many who are alive today.

And yet there are some things for which we can hope, now: that the idea of liberty in Europe may continue to grow, even in those areas of darkness behind the walls, and that peace may

reign over this continent, despite persistent confrontation between East and West. Today competing powers and political values are arrayed against each other in Europe. Their differences may be ultimately irreconcilable. We hope not. But tensions will exist so long as some persist in violating the most fundamental human rights. Yet can we not reduce the threat of armed conflict? Can we not achieve some greater measure of freedom for all Europeans, for all individuals? We, the inheritors of the European spirit, must keep it alive for future generations all across the continent.

These are the hopes that inspired the Helsinki Conference a decade ago. The statesmen at Helsinki understood that the twin goals of peace and greater freedom are intimately connected in Europe. They understood that we owed it to ourselves and to our children to keep the great European tradition alive, even in these difficult times.

Today we mark the tenth anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act. If any single lesson emerges from the history of the Final Act's first ten years, it is precisely that the interests of the individual human beings are a fundamental part of security and stability in Europe. Greater security and a more stable peace among our nations depend on greater freedom for the people of Europe.

The Final Act was an expression of the humane European tradition. It affirmed the most basic human rights and fundamental freedoms. It called for a freer flow of information, ideas and people. It offered the possibility for greater co-operation amongst States and peoples. It reaffirmed the basic principles of relations among States. And it recognized, in its structure and its purpose, that security, economic ties, human rights and contacts among people are all equally important and related to each other. Peace encompasses the totality of our relations.

In signing the Final Act ten years ago, we recognized as Governments that if we were to make progress toward greater security and more stable peace, we would have to go beyond the traditional agenda of Governments. We recognized that our security requirements must extend beyond walls and weapons, that they had to include finding ways to lessen suspicion, reduce obstacles, instil greater confidence and increase contacts among the peoples of Europe. And we recognized that these could only be achieved if commitments extended beyond our Governments to engage the hopes, goodwill and efforts of our peoples too.

And in fact, the Helsinki Final Act did engage the attention and enthusiasm of our peoples because it appealed to all that has bound European civilization together over the centuries, and because it opened the door to a better future. The Final Act described ways to span the gulfs, to break down at least some of the walls that had been put in place since 1945. It offered a definition of our common security that was both comprehensive and precise. It gave the citizens of all participating States the hope that they could develop their full potential and contribute to a better, safer world. But above all it sought to preserve the rights of individuals.

The message of the Final Act was that we can reduce the divisions in Europe, that we can ease the sufferings they have caused and that we can some day hope to see an undivided peaceful continent, if we are wise enough, practical enough, dedicated enough.

We all knew that it would not be easy to turn our hopes into reality. We knew that our expectations about what could be would have to be tempered by realism, that progress might come slowly.

And we knew that, as President Ford said, "History will judge this Conference not by what we say here today, but by what we do tomorrow — not by the promises we make, but by the promises we keep." But we also knew that the goals and principles we set down here were worth striving for.

The genius of the Final Act was that it was not merely an expression of goals and principles; it was also a programme of practical steps for turning our hopes into reality. It provided a standard toward which to strive and against which to measure our behaviour. Perhaps we shall not soon see the day when all nations meet that standard, but the effort, in and of itself, could lead to a more secure peace, greater individual freedom and thus a greater fulfilment of Europe's vast potential.

Can we look back over the past ten years and see some limited progress? I believe the answer is yes, though the reality of Europe's division remains. Let us review these past ten years and, in keeping with the wisdom of the Final Act, let us judge the progress in the most practical, concrete terms. Pious declarations are cheap. Real progress can only be seen in its effect on human beings.

The Final Act has had some practical effect.

Today journalists travel more easily between our countries. Large numbers of citizens in some East European countries have been reunited with their families in the West. By recalling what had been hoped for and what had seemed possible when the Final Act was signed, our review conferences at Belgrade and Madrid helped keep those hopes and possibilities alive. So, too, our recent meetings in Ottawa and our current negotiations in Stockholm keep our aspirations alive.

These achievements are not negligible. They have pointed the way we must take if we are to put our relations on a better and more stable basis in the future, and if we are to open up the possibility of freedom for all Europeans.

And yet, ten years after the signing of the Final Act, no one can deny the gap between hope and performance. Despite the real value of the Final Act as a standard of conduct, the most important promises of a decade ago have not been kept.

Let's look at the specifics.

In the Final Act, we all committed ourselves to treat in a positive and humanitarian way the applications of persons who wish to be reunited with members of their family. Yet, over the past five years, the number of Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality permitted to emigrate, mainly for family reunification, fell from over 51,000 to 896. The regrettable trend is the same for Soviet citizens of German and Armenian nationality.

There are over twenty cases of American/Soviet marriages in which the Soviet spouse has been denied exit permission two or more times, in spite of specific provisions of the Helsinki Final Act. Yury Balovlenkov, who married an American citizen in 1978, was on a hunger strike from March 25 to July 4 protesting six years of continued denial. He has seen only one of his two daughters and is in terribly weakened health.

The Final Act confirms the right of the individual to know and act upon the provisions of the agreement. Yet the citizens' group set up in Moscow to monitor implementation of the Final Act in the Soviet Union disbanded in September 1982 for fear of further persecution. Here is a group of enthusiastic Soviet citizens who were pleased and proud of the decision of their Government to sign the Helsinki Final Act. Yet today, Yury Orlov, the group's founder, languishes in remote Siberian exile after seven years in a labour camp. Founding member Anatoly Shcharansky, imprisoned on a false charge in 1977, has completed his term in the notorious Chistopol prison and is now serving out the rest of his thirteen-year sentence in one of the most brutal of Soviet labour camps. Imprisoned group member Anatoly Marchenko, currently serving a twelve-year sentence, has been permitted no correspondence with his family for more than a year. Group member Ivan Kovalyov's health has reportedly deteriorated badly since his transfer to labour camp. His wife and fellow group member Tatyana Osipova recently had her own five-year labour camp sentence extended by two years.

The founder of a peace group in Moscow, Sergei Batovrin, was first harassed, then put in a psychiatric ward, and then, when he persisted in advocating peace the way so many thousands of young people do in other countries, he was thrown out of his native land altogether. Other peace activists have met similar fates, as have those struggling for women's rights and free trade unions. The founders of a Social Democratic party in Moscow were jailed in January of this year.

On June 14, Bogdan Lis, Adam Michnik and Wladyslaw Frasyniuk were sentenced in Gdansk to terms ranging from two-and-a-half to three-and-a-half years on charges having nothing ostensibly to do with their real "crime" of leading the fight for free trade unionism — a right recognized in the Concluding Document of the Madrid Review Meeting. In the Soviet Union, Vladimir Klebanov's efforts to found a free trade union put him in a psychiatric hospital for four years.

Nor has abuse of psychiatric treatment been limited to trade unionists and peace activists. In the Ukraine, Vladimir Krailo, an Evangelical Baptist, has been interned in psychiatric hospitals since 1980 for his faith and his efforts to emigrate with his wife and fifteen children. He has refused an offer of freedom in exchange for renunciation of his faith.

All who would live an active religious life according to their faith, whether Christian, Jewish or Muslim, risk harassment, imprisonment or confinement in psychiatric institutions. Baptists, Ukrainian and Lithuanian Catholics, Russian Orthodox, Seventh Day Adventists and Pentacostals have all been increasingly subject to repression. Dina Shvedsova, Vasyly Kobrin, Father Alfonsas Svarinskas, Father Gleb Yakunin, Pastor Nikolai Goretoi and Pastor Viktor Valter are only a few of the Christians currently serving sentences of up to twelve years in prison or exile in the Soviet Union because of their faith. A small community of Pentacostals from the village of Chuguevka in the Soviet Far East has suffered grievously in the past several months. Ten community elders have been sentenced to up to five years in labour camp and the rest fired from their jobs. Six families have been threatened with losing custody of their children.

At least sixteen Jewish cultural activists, including nine teachers of the Hebrew language, have been arrested in the Soviet Union since last July, and many have been convicted on obviously trumped-up criminal charges to three or four years of imprisonment and labour camp. Iosif Berenshtein, currently serving a four-year term, was savagely beaten and stabbed

while in prison, and lost most of his vision. Yuly Edelshtein, who is serving a three-year term, is reportedly undergoing repeated beatings in his labour camp in Siberia, as part of an effort "to exorcise his religious fanaticism," according to camp authorities.

Abuzakar Rahimov, a Muslim from Tashkent in Soviet Central Asia, was sentenced to seven years in a strict regime labour camp in 1982 for distributing material about the Islamic faith, including translations from the Koran.

Last year in Czechoslovakia, seven priests and nuns were arrested for "obstructing State supervision over churches and religious orders."

Finally, the man who more than any other represents the ideals enshrined in the Final Act — Andrei Sakharov — remains totally isolated from the outside world — in exile, probably still in Gorky. Even as I speak, he may be in a hospital following his most recent hunger strike on behalf of decent medical treatment for his beloved wife. We have reason to believe he was force-fed to break his hunger strike.

We cannot talk about the Helsinki process without talking about human beings, for they are supposed to be the true beneficiaries of the Helsinki Final Act. The fate of these individuals, moreover, affects the actions of thousands, maybe millions, by showing what happens to those who dare exercise their rights and freedoms.

My country and most other countries represented here remain committed to the goal of putting the programme of the Final Act into practice in all of its provisions. We know that hard work and patience are needed. We believe that the truest tests of political intentions are actual steps to improve co-operation along States, to enhance contacts among people and to strengthen respect for individual rights. The provisions of the Final Act are indivisible. We must see progress in all areas. At next year's Vienna Review Conference we will have a chance to measure that progress again.

We are convinced that the future need not be as bleak as the recent past. As we look ahead toward the next decade of the CSCE process, we should also look back to the kinds of beneficial practical actions we listed then and measure ourselves against the standards we set.

We have an opportunity at the Stockholm Conference to find concrete ways to increase confidence and security in the military field. The package of specific measures proposed by the Western participants in Stockholm addresses some of the causes of war — miscalculation and misinterpretation. These measures can help ensure that existing forces are never used. They encourage greater openness about military forces and exchanges of information that would increase mutual understanding and reduce the risk of surprise attack. As President Reagan stated in Dublin over a year ago, and more recently in Strasbourg, we are prepared to discuss the principle of non-use of force, a principle to which the United States is committed, if this will bring the Soviet Union to negotiate agreements that give concrete meaning to that principle. A solution should be possible that adds to our security and contributes to peace in Europe and thereby, ultimately, to a better life for our peoples. We are prepared to move ahead in all areas in Stockholm and I was pleased to note in Mr. Shevardnadze's address that he expressed a positive attitude toward these negotiations.

We can contribute to our common security, to a more stable peace and to the future vitality of European civilization by steps directly affecting people's lives. The freedom of individuals to

determine their own destinies is not only a good ultimate objective, it is also a good place to start. Sustained improvements are vital; but concrete steps — to improve emigration, to allow spouses and dual nationals to unite with loved ones, to release human rights activists and religious teachers — these concrete steps are also important.

Each of us has the obligation to press forward wherever we can. One particularly urgent task is to stop the spread of chemical weapons. Too many times in recent years these weapons have been brutally employed, not only against military forces, but against innocent civilians. The proliferation and use of these weapons represent an ominous warning that long-accepted constraints are breaking down. We must all look to the steps we can take to halt the use of these weapons now, to prevent further proliferation, and to invigorate the effort in Geneva to move towards a verifiable treaty that would genuinely ban these weapons forever.

The United States and the Soviet Union have an opportunity to help build a more secure world in the arms control negotiations currently under way in Geneva, where I might say we advocate radical reductions in offensive nuclear armaments. And in November our leaders will meet to examine the whole spectrum of issues before us. We are ready and willing to seize the opportunity. Let our two countries begin the patient, serious work of resolving problems and reaching agreements of benefit to us both and to other countries as well.

Steps to reduce weapons and enhance security, steps to enhance economic and other exchanges, steps to relieve the suffering and enrich the lives of individuals — all these reinforce each other. They are part of the same broad programme of security and co-operation enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act. Taken together, they could lead us toward a new era in relations in Europe — one that could bring alive once again the promise of Helsinki and the larger promise of European history.

They are not massive or difficult steps to take. But they are important; they have a larger meaning. They require only courage and political will on the part of all of us.

Thank you.