



***CAN THE RABBIT
SAVE ITSELF?***

1980

CAN THE RABBIT SAVE ITSELF?

(concerning the Madrid Conference)

August 1, 1980 will mark the fifth anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement at the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe by the heads of states of all the European countries, United States and Canada. Two years ago the representatives of the same countries assembled in Belgrade at a follow-up Conference to evaluate the implementation of the Final Act. They did not attain that objective however, and departed for home, leaving behind a meaningless communique. Another follow-up Conference will be held in November of this year, in Madrid. The 'communist world' has already begun preparations for this Conference.

The arrival of the Polish boss, E. Gierek, in Paris and his negotiations with Valery Giscard d'Estaing is only one tip of the huge iceberg of propaganda which the Kremlin has conceived. In addition to Gierek, secret diplomatic missions from other countries belonging to the Warsaw Pact, have journeyed to the Western countries which signed the Helsinki Accords. The objective of each of those missions is easy to surmise; it is analogous to the objective of Gierek's visit to France, which he explained as follows: "to agree that there shall not be such misunderstandings in Madrid as there had been in Belgrade". "Misunderstanding" is the term used to describe the address of the American delegate, who denounced the Soviet Union for flagrant violations of human rights. The Soviet delegate protested against the speech, threatening to leave the Conference. Mindful of this threat, other Western delegates failed to support the chairman of the American delegation, and his address — the only courageous and factual one — was reduced to a "voice in the wilderness". It appears that at the Madrid Conference the 'communist world' does not even want to hear any individual disapproving statements.

The aforesaid prompts the following questions:

— Will the Madrid Conference not degenerate to the same level of performance as the Belgrade Conference — vacuous rhetoric — ending with the same kind of a meaningless communique?

— And is it important, generally speaking, for the people of the Western world to know what is really involved in that Conference and how it will end?

In order to answer these questions, it is necessary to be mindful of the following:

— the overall text and meaning of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference;

— why the Belgrade Conference was not productive;

— who is interested in the unproductivity of the Madrid Conference;

— what threat is posed by the unproductivity of the Madrid Conference.

II

The General Text and Meaning of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference relating to Security and Cooperation in Europe

At the time the Helsinki Conference was held, it was the thirtieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War, yet not only has no peace treaty been drawn (a rare occurrence in history) but there is even no expectation of one. This is so only because the Soviet Union stubbornly refuses to enter into any negotiations for the drafting of such a treaty and thus continues to maintain substantial armed forces on the boundaries to which it had extended itself by the end of the war. As a result, the Western world finds itself under the continuous threat of a sudden attack by the Soviet Armies.

The lawful way out of this intolerable situation is by way of a peace treaty. Such a peace treaty, as is well known, would, in the first place, proclaim the end of the state of war, which means that the parties would immediately be bound to reduce their armies to a peace-time level.

Having refused to participate in a drafting of a peace treaty, the Soviet Union devised a substitute instead. It advanced the idea of negotiations for the creation of a climate

of security and cooperation for the U.S.S.R. and its satellites with the Western countries, on the basis of the situation as it actually existed at the time of their proposal. The West, under continuous threat of a military attack, sought at least some measure of security and therefore agreed to hold the Helsinki Conference. Following protracted negotiations, the Final Act of the Helsinki Accords was ultimately drawn up and signed by the heads of 35 countries, participating in the Conference.

It turned out to be a palliative which provided some real benefits for the Soviet Union but only illusory security to the West. Based on the text, the Helsinki Accords can be divided into two unequal parts. The first part confirms the "status quo"; that is, it legalizes the presence of Soviet armed forces in the center of Europe and approves of the retention by the Soviets of all the territorial and political gains which they acquired during the Second World War.

The first part of the Act was drawn up for the benefit of the Soviet Union. It proves that Soviet policy prevailed, because the postwar European boundaries, as imposed by the Soviet Union, were recognized. And in this manner, the division of Germany and the enslavement of the Baltic Nations in addition to other countries of Eastern Europe were made permanent. At the same time, the German Democratic Republic, Kremlin's illegitimate child, was inducted by way of the back door into the family of the Eastern European nations.

The first part of the Act also includes all the provisions which relate to the so-called cooperation. These provisions favor the increased flow to the U.S.S.R. of Western credits and technical and technological know-how, which gives the Kremlin the opportunity not only to continue the arms race and maintain a huge army, but to keep postponing the economic catastrophe, a continuing menace because of the insatiability of the Soviet military machine, as well.

In what way did the Kremlin reciprocate for such a generous gift? With a mere promise. The U.S.S.R. assured the West that it would not be attacked and as evidence of the sincerity of its promise, the U.S.S.R. gave its consent for insertion of the provisions relating to freedom, human rights and the free exchange of ideas, information and people among nations, in the third chapter of the Final Act.

The U.S.S.R. is a closed society. Trust in the governments of such countries constitutes inexcusable naivete. But if the commitments, which the Soviet Union made in accordance with the third chapter of the Act, were to be honored by them, this would give the Soviet community a measure of openness, and this, in turn, would make it possible for the West to have some security, or at least, present some semblance of a minimal repayment for the advantages obtained by the Soviets. But the Soviet Union was unwilling to pay anything.

Not even a half year after Brezhnev affixed his signature to the Final Act, he made it understood at the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, that to the U.S.S.R. only the first part of the Final Act has any binding significance. The Third Chapter of the Final Act and the requirement for its implementation Brezhnev characterized as an attempt by the West "to exploit this document as a cover for meddling in the internal affairs of the socialist countries with a view of indulging in anti-communist and anti-Soviet demagoguery in the style of the 'cold war', (Soviet newspaper: Pravda; 5-2-1975).

III

Why the Belgrade Conference Was Not Productive

The West should have known about the pronouncements of Brezhnev and should have been prepared for a firm response to the traditionally equivocal Soviet treatment of international treaties, i e. **exploit the rights but ignore the obligations.**

It was a complicated matter to prepare for the Belgrade Conference. The citizen groups in favor of monitoring the implementation of the Helsinki Accords, which were organized in the U.S.S.R. in 1976, particularly the Russian and Ukrainian groups, sent indisputable proof of the fact that the Kremlin was not abiding by the provisions of the Third Basket, to the governments of all 35 countries which participated in the Conference. This was further confirmed by the court trials, being held in the Soviet Union, at which, members of the Helsinki Monitoring Groups were being prosecuted at the very time when the Belgrade Conference was in session. The Soviets didn't even bother to conceal the fact that they

were prosecuting such Russians as Orlov, Ginsberg, Sharan-sky and such Ukrainians as Rudenko, Tychyj, Lukianenko, Marynovych and Matusevych solely for their membership in the Helsinki Monitoring Groups.

Actually the accused were only attempting to compel the Soviet state to conform to its own laws, but their lawful efforts were skillfully masked by the authorities in order to charge them arbitrarily with "anti-Soviet propaganda" and "defamation of the Soviet regime". Against the background of material submitted to the Belgrade Conference by the Helsinki Monitoring Groups, the court trials constituted a good basis for a vigorous protest, which could have been extended to the termination of the Conference itself, provided the Soviets did not release the human rights activists who had been arrested only because they were monitoring the implementation of the Helsinki Accords. But this would have meant an unconditional retreat upon the part of the Soviet government. This the Soviets could not afford to do nor did they intend to do, because the Final Act, with the exception of the Third Basket, was still indispensable to them; in the first place, as an international document, which secures the Soviet acquisitions in Europe; in the second place, as a document which favors the disarmament of the West and opens a legal channel for the infiltration of ideas and people from the East to the West. Moreover, that document was even more necessary to the Kremlin as a diplomatic smoke screen to cover up Soviet aggressive actions in other regions of the world; actions, which were already in the process of preparation.

Unfortunately, the West did not take a firm stand at the Belgrade Conference. Again Moscow's diplomacy triumphed. The West preferred peace and because of this was ready to make endless concessions. Like the rabbit, which is immobilized by the mesmerizing stare of the serpent, the West headed straight toward the jaws. The Conference progressed along the route which was designated by the Soviet delegation. There were discussions about cooperation, achievements in trade and educational and cultural exchanges, . . . but not about human rights. Most of the sessions were closed and the public did not even know what was transpiring. Finally, the Conference ended in idle talk, without leaving even a trace behind it.

IV

Who Is Interested in the Unproductivity of the Madrid Conference?

The answer to this question is simple; he who is served by the present situation in Europe and in the entire world. Soviet superiority in strategic nuclear weapons in Europe amounts to 13 percent. They manifest an even greater superiority in conventional arms. In Middle and Northern Europe NATO has 2700 cannons and 700 tanks as against 10,000 cannons and 20,000 tanks attributed to the Warsaw Pact. The Soviet SS-20 missiles are reported to number 1370, whereas NATO has only 386 of comparable systems. The Soviets have amassed such an arsenal of nuclear weaponry, including intercontinental intermediate range missiles, that it is sufficient to destroy all of civilization on this earth. This awesome power is concentrated in the hands of a small clique, which heads the one-party military-police machine. In such circumstances one can always be ready for atomic blackmail or even for an annihilating catastrophe.

In such circumstances, the role of individuals, who are waging a war within the Soviet Union itself, on behalf of law and basic rights and against military adventures, is inestimable. But because of their struggle, because they are attempting to counteract the adventurism of this clique of rulers, the human rights activists are being brutally persecuted in the Soviet Union. The main thrust is against the Helsinki Monitoring Groups. At the time that this pamphlet is being prepared (early January) the Lithuanian, Armenian and Georgian Monitoring Groups report large losses in membership. A few days previous to that report, additional arrests of persons within those groups were made, i. e. Atanas Terliackisa, a Lithuanian and Valentyna Pailodze, a Georgian woman. The Ukrainian and Lithuanian groups continue to survive only because of continuous replacement of arrested members by new members.

Ten members of the Ukrainian group were sentenced to long prison terms; five were sent out of the country. Arrested and awaiting trial are: Petro and Wasyl Sichko (father and son), Petro Rozumnyj, Jaroslaw Lesiw, Witaly Kalyny-

chenko and Mykola Horbal. The trial of another member, Włodymyr Malynowycz, had only begun. Due to replacements the Moscow monitoring group has also been holding on, but like the others, it has sustained heavy losses. Seven members received sentences of imprisonment and exile; six were sent out of the country and an additional one, by the name of Victor Nekipailov, was arrested. Simultaneously one of the closest co-workers of Academician Sakharov, a well known human rights activist, Tetiana Vielikanova, was also arrested, while a case was started against another, equally well known participant in the human rights movement, named Malva Landa.

In the Crimean Tartar group, singled out for arrest were such noted activists in their national movement as Mustafa and Reshat Dzemiliev. Christian believers likewise have suffered casualties in their ranks. Just to name a few: the head of the Church of the Seven Day Adventists, 83 year old Włodymyr Shelkov, was sentenced to five years of hard labor; an Orthodox priest, Rev. Hlib Jakunina and theologian Rehelson were taken into custody. Many others are meeting the same fate, for throughout the entire territory of the Soviet Union, whoever refuses to bow down before its highhanded authority, is subject to arrest.

It is not only through arrests however, that the State exercises its authority. It has made much use of criminal elements, who are especially trained and sent out in bands to kill human rights activists covertly, in gangster-like style. During the past few years the following were killed in this manner: the Russian writer and translator, Konstantyn Bohatyirow; Ukrainians, the list of which includes painter Alla Horska, Rostyslaw Paleckyj, writer Helik Snieheerov, composer Włodymyr Iwasiuk, archbishop Metodej Mencaka and Mykola Iwasiuk. Three Armenians were executed as a result of false charges and spurious trials.

Despite the arrests, the severe sentences and outright killings, human rights activists continue their stubborn struggle. The intensity of that struggle is manifested by the acts of self-immolation. Following the example set by Jan Palach, the Czech, who expressed his protest against the Soviet occupation in that horrifying manner, in the U.S.S.R., Ilya Rypa — a Latvian, Romas Kalanta — a Lithuanian, Ivan

Makuch — an Ukrainian, Musa Mamut — a Crimean Tartar and Liapin — a Russian, all perished as living torches.

This is the manner in which the Soviet human activists are fighting and this is the manner in which the Soviet authorities are retaliating. But what about the West? Infiltration of Chekist ideas (Cheka — former Bolshevik secret police) and people into the West bears fruit. Regardless of the acts of Soviet aggression beyond Soviet borders, which are periodically repeated, regardless of the raging fury of the despotic Soviet rulers within Soviet borders, the Western liberals are still nurturing their illusions about “liberalization”, “rebirth”, “convergence” and the “de-ideologization”, of Soviet communism. This communism, even in its present state, remains appealing to the “leftist” liberals. The Western governments however, for the most part, merely yearn for peace to-day, without thinking about to-morrow, and therefore do not want to confront the Soviet Union with any truth which the latter might find displeasing.

Consequently the Soviet Union was successful in preventing the production of the neutron bomb. Now, relying upon those same attitudes, it seeks to prevent the placement of additional intermediate range ballistic missiles in Europe by NATO. A state of affairs, which allows the Soviet Union to maintain a permanent arms superiority in Europe, is consistent with its aims and so it desires to stabilize such a state. In view of this goal, the Madrid Conference, if it should insist on conducting a true appraisal of the implementation of the Helsinki Agreement, would not be in the interest of the Soviet Union. So the Kremlin wants to reduce it to the level of aimless conversation.

V

What Threat is Posed by the Unproductivity of the Madrid Conference?

If the Soviets were to achieve their goals, it would be a real tragedy for Europe and the world. The Soviet Union has pursued its offensive for many years. It is obvious that the Kremlin is striving, in the first instance, to conquer the Third World. This action is being taken in three major directions: in Africa and Latin America, with the assistance of

Cuba; in Southeastern Asia with the help of Vietnam; and in the Middle East, with its own forces and all the resources of the Soviet Union.

By intervening in Afghanistan, the Soviet armies have covered a broad expanse of the borders of Iran and Pakistan, thus establishing a spearhead position from which to conduct an offensive for the occupation of the area abutting on the Persian Gulf.

It is well known that Soviet occupation of other lands is always preceded by disorder and revolt in those countries which the Soviets desire to occupy. The first phase of such a preliminary action has already occurred in Iran. Khomeini has created great chaos in that country and in doing this, has laid the foundation for the next uprising. Following the second or third uprising, the Soviet armies will move into the country and enmasse will head for the Persian Gulf. This will not present too much difficulty because the United Nations has helped the Kremlin in the attainment of such a goal by proclaiming the Indian Ocean a neutral zone. The aim is to prevent the United States from having an opportunity to come to the early rescue of Iran. Moreover, the U.S.S.R. navy is continuing its course of mastering the wide expanse of the world's oceans, while Cuba, together with Nicaragua, can be counted upon to fan the "flames of revolution" in Latin America.

Meanwhile, what will be happening in Europe? Probably nothing. Lulled by the rhetoric and promises, Europe will savor its "security" under the umbrella of the Soviet armed forces as long as this will be convenient to the Kremlin. At the appropriate time however, even in the European countries, terror will build up, uprisings will commence and the Soviet armed forces will come to the "aid of their fellow-Europeans"...

When will this happen? We do not know. Marshal Oharkov has not shown us his operational charts. But in following the course of events, we have observed that those countries were "liberated", which the Kremlin marked for liberation and at the time that they were marked for liberation. None of the international treaties nor the Helsinki Accords were able to prevent this, nor shall they be able to prevent this. Without any hesitation, the Soviet Union violates any treaty, when it is expedient to do so. Out of the 25 non-aggression treaties,

which were signed by the U.S.S.R. prior to the Second World War, during and following the war, 24 of them were violated by the U.S.S.R. ; one was violated by Hitler.

We repeat, we were not shown the operational charts. But we are certain that they include Europe and the United States. **The domination of the entire world** is the declared goal and the Kremlin will not settle for less. If this is to your liking, then having read this pamphlet to this point, simply cast it aside. If not, then let us search together for a route to a different future.

Now the time has come to answer the following question:

VI

Can the Rabbit Really Save Itself?

No, it cannot. Paralyzed by the hypnotic stare of the serpent, the rabbit will surely crawl into its jaws — and it will be swallowed up. Although it will be consumed by terror, as evidenced by its motions of shuddering and resisting, and even squealing, it will not be able to stop. Indeed, there is **no hope of survival for that rabbit.**

Fortunately however, Europe does not have to become "that rabbit". It can take a firm stand at the Madrid Conference. It can prevail upon the Soviet Union to discharge the obligations which it voluntarily assumed by signing the Final Act of the Helsinki Accords. It can induce the Soviet Union to free immediately all the imprisoned activists of the human rights movement and to proclaim a general amnesty for all political prisoners.

We believe that the fighters for human rights in the U.S.S.R. must be saved at any cost. Their freedom to-day is the assurance of our freedom, and perhaps our very life, to-morrow. Otherwise, our present apathy will be converted into bloody tremors and possibly, in the not too distant future, into the obliteration of the world. What is needed **now** is the firmness and readiness to stand fast by our demands to the very end, even at the risk of invalidating the Final Act. For of what use is an agreement, which at present does not give the West any actual benefits, and to-morrow may be renounc-

ed by the Soviets, when they decree that it has become useless to them?

What source can endow the Western governments with the courage necessary for that kind of firmness? **Only the will of their people!**

Therefore the citizens of all the European countries, United States and Canada should:

a. — demand from their government officials, their Senators and Congressmen and members of Parliament, that the official delegations which will journey to Madrid, be instructed to expose at that Conference, all the violations of the Helsinki Accords and to demand the liberation from the prisons, the psychiatric clinics and concentration camps, of all the human rights activists and all the political prisoners in the U.S.S.R. and in the countries of Eastern Europe;

b. — demand from their government officials, that their delegations be instructed to repudiate the Helsinki Accords, if the Communist bloc of nations refuses to free the human rights activists and to discharge its obligations in conformity with the provisions of the Third Basket of the Helsinki Accords;

c. — organize community groups in all the countries which were signatories to the Helsinki Accords, for the purpose of monitoring the preparations for the Madrid Conference as well as the Madrid Conference itself, by sending community representatives to Madrid.

The Madrid Conference must become the turning point leading to real security and cooperation. Otherwise, the Madrid Conference will cause Europe to advance into the abyss of communist enslavement just as surely as the rabbit advances into the jaws of the serpent.

Western Representatives of the Ukrainian Helsinki
Monitoring Group in Kiev
Gen. Petro Grigorenko, Chairman

GENERAL PETRO GRIGORENKO

General Petro Grigorenko is one of the best known and most respected of the human rights activists from the Soviet Union. Born in Ukraine in 1907, the General pursued a successful military career, winning high honors and positions. Unable however, to accept the abuses of the Soviet political system, he began to speak out in defense of human and national rights. The Soviets retaliated by imprisoning him in a psychiatric hospital as "mentally incompetent". This did not deter him, upon his release, from continuing his efforts on behalf of human rights, as a member of the Ukrainian Helsinki Monitoring Group in Kiev and the Moscow Helsinki Committee.

When General Grigorenko came to the United States for medical treatment a few years ago, the Soviets seized upon this opportunity to deprive him of Soviet citizenship and forbade him to return to the Soviet Union. In his new-found freedom, despite his advancing age, he redoubled his efforts on behalf of the human rights cause and as Chairman of the Western Representation of the Ukrainian Helsinki Committee, is conducting a vigorous campaign along with other Ukrainian dissidents now in the Western World: speaking, writing, and testifying at various hearings conducted by interested government commissions in many capitals of the world as well as at such international forums, as the NATO delegates' sponsored Hearing in Ottawa, the International Sakharov Hearing, and many others.

The immediate goal of the Ukrainian Helsinki Committee which General Grigorenko heads, is: to awaken the 'West' to the peril of advancing communism and the inhumanity of the regime which it has spawned; to press for the release of all human rights activists and political prisoners behind the Iron Curtain; to expose completely the continuing violations of the Helsinki Accords by the Soviets, at the follow-up Conference to be held in Madrid in 1980; and to motivate the signatory-states of the Helsinki Accords to recognize the indisputable proof of the ruthless crushing of human rights by the Soviet Union and to take appropriate action to compel Soviet compliance with the Helsinki Final Act or repudiate it totally as a worthless scrap of paper.



