

Madrid. These states refuse to grant their citizens freedom of circulation and information, the right to form free trade unions, and exercise their union rights. They have prohibited several religious groups, and intimidated their members. Many of those same governments carry out a policy of forced assimilation on a cultural and linguistic level, and compel citizens of other national or ethnic groups to work in other regions or to leave their country. This policy revives antagonisms of the past and, by the animosities it foments, constitutes a danger for the future.

This, indeed, is the tragedy of all this: Not only are the heavy controls, the repression, the forced assimilation, really unnecessary for any reasonable government, but in themselves they build up further resentments and pressures which require even greater suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms. This is a vicious circle which (as we have seen) ultimately destroys economic initiative and growth, cultural creativity and scientific innovation. It certainly makes a mockery of the ideals of the Helsinki process.

Let us, for the sake of dialogue, accept the argument often put forward by marxist-leninist governments -- that the concept of the autonomous individual with certain inalienable human rights, is not a valid one for their systems of philosophy and government. What we have been talking about, however, can be understood in other terms which surely are valid universally -- the dignity of the human being. Nearly every case of non-compliance with the Final Act with which we have dealt today, concerns the effect on citizens of signatory states of the arbitrary decisions of officials. We can generally judge the sincerity of governments in the concerns they profess for the well-being of their citizens, by the extent to which they protect their citizens from the arbitrary, malicious and irresponsible exercise of power by bureaucrats, officials, and the so-called "Organs of Security".

We have been told repeatedly that the constitutions and laws of the countries of Eastern Europe, and of the Soviet Union in particular, are in harmony with the undertakings of those countries under the Helsinki Final Act and of the Madrid Concluding Document. We only conclude, therefore, that when actions and decisions conflict with these undertakings, it must be because some minor official, for reasons only known to himself, and without the knowledge or authority of senior officials,