

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Matlock, Jack F.: Files
Folder Title: Divided Spouses (3)
Box: 24

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name MATLOCK, JACK: FILES

Withdrawer

JET 5/2/2005

File Folder DIVIDED SPOUSES 3/7

FOIA

F06-114/7

Box Number 24

YARHI-MILO

2410

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
9539	MEMO	DOBRIANSKY TO POINDEXTER RE MEETING WITH ANATOLY MICHELSON [5 - 5] R 6/25/2009 F2006-114/7	1	3/27/1986	B1
9540	MEMO	DOBRIANSKY/MANDEL TO POINDEXTER RE APPOINTMENT REQUEST FOR MR. MICHELSON [6 - 6] R 6/25/2009 F2006-114/7	1	3/20/1986	B1
9541	MEMO	SAME TEXT AS DOC #9539 [9 - 9] R 6/25/2009 F2006-114/7	1	3/27/1986	B1
9542	MEMO	SAME TEXT AS DOC #9540 [11 - 11] R 6/25/2009 F2006-114/7	1	3/20/1986	B1

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name MATLOCK, JACK: FILES

Withdrawer

JET 5/2/2005

File Folder DIVIDED SPOUSES 3/7

FOIA

F06-114/7

Box Number 24

YARHI-MILO

2410

ID	Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
9543	MEMO	SAME TEXT AS DOC #9539 [14 - 14] R 6/25/2009 F2006-114/7	1	3/27/1986	B1
9544	MEMO	SAME TEXT AS DOC #9540 [15 - 15] R 6/25/2009 F2006-114/7	1	3/20/1986	B1

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

1953

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20508

March 20, 1986

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN M. POINDEXTER

FROM: PAULA DOBRIANSKY/JUDYT MANDEL ^{PD} ^{JM}

SUBJECT: Appointment Request for Mr. Michelson

Mr. Anatoly Michelson has requested a meeting with you within the next three weeks. Specifically, he would like to discuss his long-standing divided family case. In June 1956, Mr. Michelson, as Director of the Soviet Engineer Bureau, travelled to Austria and defected. Since his defection thirty years ago, he has tried to get his wife and son out of the Soviet Union. Attached at Tab I is a report from the Congressional Record which describes in detail Mr. Michelson's situation. If your schedule permits, we recommend that you meet with him.

^{PD FOR} Matlock concurs. State also endorses such a meeting for it will afford Michelson's case greater visibility.

RECOMMENDATION

That you meet with Mr. Michelson.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Attachment:

Tab I Report from Congressional Record



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 96th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 126

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1980

No. 31

Senate

ANATOLY MICHELSON

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, for almost 2 years I have patiently heeded the advice of State Department officials in the attempt to rectify one of the most heart-rending human tragedies in the last quarter century. Today, I must turn away from their advice and relate to my colleagues and the American people the story of one American's personal ordeal and mental anguish suffered at the hands of an insensitive Soviet Government.

Mr. President, in June 1956, in a small Moscow apartment, Anatoly Michelson kissed his wife, Galina, and his 7-year-old daughter Olga goodbye. The young, creative and talented engineer was then Director of the Soviet Central Engineering Bureau, and had been selected as a member of a group of Russian businessmen and government officials to visit Austria. Michelson knew he would not return to Russia, his family did not.

Several months before this scheduled trip, disillusioned with Soviet totalitarianism, Michelson had decided to defect, believing, naively that the Soviet

Government would permit his family to join him. After arriving in Austria, Michelson sought and received asylum and immediately began to appeal for his family's release. His 24-year nightmare had started.

Michelson spent the next 7 years in West Germany. While there his appeals were sent through the Soviet Ambassador in Bonn, the Soviet and German Red Cross, German Department of State and the International Red Cross. Nothing happened. In 1963 he moved to the United States and began to appeal for help from the U.S. Government.

Over the next 16 years his cause was championed by 20 Members of Congress, including 15 Senators, 12 of whom are still here. Four administrations have made personal appeals through Secretaries of State or Presidents. Each time, except once, their efforts fell on deaf ears.

His story was published in newspapers in London and West Germany, Philadelphia, Pa., Canton, Ohio, Sarasota, Fla., New York, Washington, D.C., and Portland. Each one portrayed the agony, loneliness and frustration experienced by a family trying to deal with an intractable and heartless government.

Once, a short-lived ray of hope brightened Michelson's day. That was in March 1967, after the former Senator Hugh Scott had issued repeated pleas to Aleksey Kosygin and the London Sunday Telegraph reported on Michelson's plight just prior to the Russian Premier's visit to England. Soviet officials unexpectedly informed Galina and Olga that their application for visas to travel to the United States would be approved and for Anatoly Michelson it appeared a dream was about to come true. The U.S. State Department received the same signal. Over the next few months letters were exchanged between Galina, Olga, and Anatoly as the family anticipated an end to its ordeal and joyful reunion. It all fell apart, on June 30, 1967, when the Soviet Government showed its most cruel side. Galina and Olga were coldly notified that their applications for visas had been disapproved.

One might ask why. We did. In response to queries from Members of Congress the Soviets wrote:

Please be informed that their application was thoroughly considered by proper Soviet authorities. At the present time the answer was unfavorable for Mr. A. Michelson.

Mr. President, since that unjust blow, Michelson has continued to seek freedom for his loved ones. Appeals have been made time and again by Members of this body. The White House has placed the Michelson case first on its list of hardship requests. The Red Cross had pleaded through the League of Red Cross Societies. The United Nations has appealed in his behalf, and the Commission on Security and Cooperation, which monitors the Helsinki accords, presented his case. All efforts were fruitless.

In 1977 Anatoly Michelson moved to my State, Oregon, and soon thereafter requested my help. I, too, have now experienced the frustration and anger of Senators GLENN, MUSKIE, SCHWEIKER, METZENBAUM, MCGOVERN, STONE, PERCY,

WILLIAMS, KENNEDY, and others before them. In a time of so-called detente, when we were appealing in the name of human decency, urging the Soviets to demonstrate good will and compassion, our pleas were met with callousness and implied disdain. I, personally, not only received this treatment in correspondence, but also in meeting with Ambassador Dobrynin.

Mr. President, we have recently witnessed, as a result of the Soviet invasion into Afghanistan, a flood of articles and editorials proclaiming and bemoaning the fact that detente is dead. Several claim that the United States has lost its chance to continue toward the goal of peaceful coexistence. I, for one, question whether that chance was ever a reality. I, for one, question the thoughts and motive of a government which seems to take a sadistic delight in punishing a family whose only crime is having a desire to be reunited in a free country. Some would say that one cannot translate an isolated incident to national foreign policy. I say that there are hundreds of cases such as this one, and that these are indicators that detente to us was a dream of world stability and to the Soviets it was a political expedient. Recent world events certainly lend credibility to that theory.

Mr. President, I do not intend to let this matter drop. I will persist in pressing the Soviets to attend to this matter and live up to the spirit and intent of the Helsinki accords. I welcome any of my colleagues who wish to join in this effort. This family has suffered enough. Galina is now 58 and almost blind from the work she was made to perform since her husband left. Olga is now 31. At age 8 she was humiliated in front of her schoolmates and branded as the daughter of a traitor. She was later denied the chance to go to college. Anatoly, now 61, has a serious heart condition. Yet all this does not seem to make a difference to the Soviets who continue to display insensitive, singleminded and unforgiving attitude toward three helpless people.

Mr. President, the facts are clear. They show me that Soviet promises are empty, that Soviet attitudes toward human life are cold, ruthless, and based on political motives. It shows me that we, as a nation, can expect little from a country that totally disregards the dignity of a man and of all mankind.

FILE
DIVIDED
SPONSOR

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20505

March 24, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR THOMAS GIBSON

FROM: JACK F. MATLOCK
SUBJECT: Anatoly Michelson

All Soviet human rights cases are difficult to resolve, but Michelson's is particularly complex. He did not emigrate legally from the Soviet Union but defected to the West in 1956. This makes the Soviets even more hard line in dealing with his pleas for family reunification.

I sympathize fully with Michelson's tragic plight, and we continue to raise his case, along with others, when we discuss specific human rights problems with Soviet leaders. As you know, the President has made human rights a top priority on our agenda with the Soviets.

Paula Dobriansky of this office met with Michelson only last week, and as a symbol of our ongoing concern we are recommending that John Poindexter meet with him in the near future.

With regard to Michelson's options, I can only recommend that he, and we, continue to persevere. I know this is not an encouraging response, but I cannot with any honesty suggest that I know of other approaches which hold out any more hope for Mr. Michelson.

cc. Linas Kojelis

Shcharansky FILE DIVISION
1953 Add-on ST-005-2

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20508

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

ACTION

March 27, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN M. POINDEXTER

FROM: PAULA DOBRIANSKY ^{AD}

Natl Sec Advisor
has seen

SUBJECT: Meeting with Anatoly Michelson

Per your comments on my earlier memo (Tab I), I believe it is highly unlikely that you will experience a repeat of the Bonner case. Last week, I met with Michelson for 45 minutes. He was very pleased that the NSC is taking an interest in his current situation. For this reason, I am confident he would not pursue any actions or make any comments embarrassing to the Administration. In fact, I think he would publically compliment the Administration's concern for his particular circumstances and its steadfast policy for dealing with other divided spouse cases.

In a meeting with you, Mr. Michelson would provide you with the details of his situation, probably give you a letter from himself to the President, and propose another "exchange" (i.e. Shcharansky) when and if appropriate. He has not asked to see the President, but he hopes that the President will be made aware of his plight.

Michelson does believe in quiet diplomacy if it will secure the release of his wife and son. In fact, we have repeatedly raised his case in meetings with Soviet officials - most recently, in the Shultz/Ryzhkov exchange. In December, Baldrige delivered a letter from the President to Gorbachev in which a number of divided spouse cases were addressed, including Michelson's; and it was raised during the November Summit. His case is also on the divided families list which is regularly provided to Soviet officials.

^{Jm} Matlock concurs. State also endorses such a meeting for it will not only afford Michelson's case greater visibility but will offset the repercussions of the Bonner meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That you meet with Mr. Michelson.

Approve J

Disapprove _____

Attachment:

Tab I March 20 Memo w/Congressional Record report

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED

NLRR 606-114/7 729539

BY CW NARA DATE 6/25/09

DECLASSIFIED 1/21/05 (1)

1953

NLRR 106-114/7 #9540

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

BY Ci NARA DATE 6/25/09

March 20, 1986

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN M. POINDEXTER

FROM: PAULA DOBRIANSKY/JUDYT MANDEL ^{PD} ^{JM}

SUBJECT: Appointment Request for Mr. Michelson

Mr. Anatoly Michelson has requested a meeting with you within the next three weeks. Specifically, he would like to discuss his long-standing divided family case. In June 1956, Mr. Michelson, as Director of the Soviet Engineer Bureau, travelled to Austria and defected. Since his defection thirty years ago, he has tried to get his wife and son out of the Soviet Union. Attached at Tab I is a report from the Congressional Record which describes in detail Mr. Michelson's situation. If your schedule permits, we recommend that you meet with him.

^{PD FOR} Matlock concurs. State also endorses such a meeting for it will afford Michelson's case greater visibility.

RECOMMENDATION

That you meet with Mr. Michelson.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Attachment:

Tab I Report from Congressional Record

*I don't want a repeat of the Bremer story. What does he want me to do?
Does he believe in quiet diplomacy?
Have we written the Soviets about this? When?
What is our record on his case?
What will he say after the meeting? J?*



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 96th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 126

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1980

No. 31

Senate

ANATOLY MICHELSON

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, for almost 2 years I have patiently heeded the advice of State Department officials in the attempt to rectify one of the most heart-rending human tragedies in the last quarter century. Today, I must turn away from their advice and relate to my colleagues and the American people the story of one American's personal ordeal and mental anguish suffered at the hands of an insensitive Soviet Government.

Mr. President, in June 1956, in a small Moscow apartment, Anatoly Michelson kissed his wife, Galina, and his 7-year-old daughter Olga goodbye. The young, creative and talented engineer was then Director of the Soviet Central Engineering Bureau, and had been selected as a member of a group of Russian businessmen and government officials to visit Austria. Michelson knew he would not return to Russia, his family did not.

Several months before this scheduled trip, disillusioned with Soviet totalitarianism, Michelson had decided to defect, believing, naively that the Soviet Government would permit his family to join him. After arriving in Austria, Michelson sought and received asylum and immediately began to appeal for his family's release. His 24-year nightmare had started.

Michelson spent the next 7 years in West Germany. While there his appeals were sent through the Soviet Ambassador in Bonn, the Soviet and German Red Cross, German Department of State and the International Red Cross. Nothing happened. In 1963 he moved to the United States and began to appeal for help from the U.S. Government.

Over the next 16 years his cause was championed by 20 Members of Congress, including 15 Senators, 12 of whom are still here. Four administrations have made personal appeals through Secretaries of State or Presidents. Each time, except once, their efforts fell on deaf ears.

His story was published in newspapers in London and West Germany, Philadelphia, Pa., Canton, Ohio, Sarasota, Fla., New York, Washington, D.C., and Portland. Each one portrayed the agony, loneliness and frustration experienced by a family trying to deal with an intractable and heartless government.

Once, a short-lived ray of hope brightened Michelson's day. That was in March 1967, after the former Senator Hugh Scott had issued repeated pleas to Aleksey Kosygin and the London Sunday Telegraph reported on Michelson's plight just prior to the Russian Premier's visit to England. Soviet officials unexpectedly informed Galina and Olga that their application for visas to travel to the United States would be approved and for Anatoly Michelson it appeared a dream was about to come true. The U.S. State Department received the same signal. Over the next few months letters were exchanged between Galina, Olga, and Anatoly as the family anticipated an end to its ordeal and joyful reunion. It all fell apart, on June 30, 1967, when the Soviet Government showed its most cruel side. Galina and Olga were coldly notified that their applications for visas had been disapproved.

One might ask why. We did. In response to queries from Members of Congress the Soviets wrote:

Please be informed that their application was thoroughly considered by proper Soviet authorities. At the present time the answer was unfavorable for Mr. A. Michelson.

Mr. President, since that unjust blow, Michelson has continued to seek freedom for his loved ones. Appeals have been made time and again by Members of this body. The White House has placed the Michelson case first on its list of hardship requests. The Red Cross had pleaded through the League of Red Cross Societies. The United Nations has appealed in his behalf, and the Commission on Security and Cooperation, which monitors the Helsinki accords, presented his case. All efforts were fruitless.

In 1977 Anatoly Michelson moved to my State, Oregon, and soon thereafter requested my help. I, too, have now experienced the frustration and anger of Senators GLENN, MUSKIE, SCHWEIKER, METZENBAUM, MCGOVERN, STONE, PERCY,

WILLIAMS, KENNEDY, and others before them. In a time of so-called detente, when we were appealing in the name of human decency, urging the Soviets to demonstrate good will and compassion, our pleas were met with callousness and implied disdain. I, personally, not only received this treatment in correspondence, but also in meeting with Ambassador Dobrynin.

Mr. President, we have recently witnessed, as a result of the Soviet invasion into Afghanistan, a flood of articles and editorials proclaiming and bemoaning the fact that detente is dead. Several claim that the United States has lost its chance to continue toward the goal of peaceful coexistence. I, for one, question whether that chance was ever a reality. I, for one, question the thoughts and motive of a government which seems to take a sadistic delight in punishing a family whose only crime is having a desire to be reunited in a free country. Some would say that one cannot translate an isolated incident to national foreign policy. I say that there are hundreds of cases such as this one, and that these are indicators that detente to us was a dream of world stability and to the Soviets it was a political expedient. Recent world events certainly lend credibility to that theory.

Mr. President, I do not intend to let this matter drop. I will persist in pressing the Soviets to attend to this matter and live up to the spirit and intent of the Helsinki accords. I welcome any of my colleagues who wish to join in this effort. This family has suffered enough. Galina is now 58 and almost blind from the work she was made to perform since her husband left. Olga is now 31. At age 8 she was humiliated in front of her schoolmates and branded as the daughter of a traitor. She was later denied the chance to go to college. Anatoly, now 61, has a serious heart condition. Yet all this does not seem to make a difference to the Soviets who continue to display insensitive, singleminded and unforgiving attitude toward three helpless people.

Mr. President, the facts are clear. They show me that Soviet promises are empty, that Soviet attitudes toward human life are cold, ruthless, and based on political motives. It shows me that we, as a nation, can expect little from a country that totally disregards the dignity of a man and of all mankind.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON D.C. 20505

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ACTION

March 27, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN M. POINDEXTER

FROM: PAULA DOBRIANSKY ^{TD}

SUBJECT: Meeting with Anatoly Michelson

Per your comments on my earlier memo (Tab I), I believe it is highly unlikely that you will experience a repeat of the Bonner case. Last week, I met with Michelson for 45 minutes. He was very pleased that the NSC is taking an interest in his current situation. For this reason, I am confident he would not pursue any actions or make any comments embarrassing to the Administration. In fact, I think he would publically compliment the Administration's concern for his particular circumstances and its steadfast policy for dealing with other divided spouse cases.

In a meeting with you, Mr. Michelson would provide you with the details of his situation, probably give you a letter from himself to the President, and propose another "exchange" (i.e. Shcharansky) when and if appropriate. He has not asked to see the President, but he hopes that the President will be made aware of his plight.

Michelson does believe in quiet diplomacy if it will secure the release of his wife and son. In fact, we have repeatedly raised his case in meetings with Soviet officials - most recently, in the Shultz/Ryzhkov exchange. In December, Baldrige delivered a letter from the President to Gorbachev in which a number of divided spouse cases were addressed, including Michelson's; and it was raised during the November Summit. His case is also on the divided families list which is regularly provided to Soviet officials.

^{dm} Matlock concurs. State also endorses such a meeting for it will not only afford Michelson's case greater visibility but will offset the repercussions of the Bonner meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That you meet with Mr. Michelson.

Approve _____

Disapprove _____

Attachment:

Tab I March 20 Memo w/Congressional Record report

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED

NLRR F06-114/7 #9541

BY CW NARA DATE 6/25/09

DECLASSIFIED (RE/OKS O)

1953

NLRR F-06-114/7 #9542

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 2050E

BY Cil NARA DATE 6/25/09

March 20, 1986

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN M. POINDEXTER

FROM: ^{PD} PAULA DOBRIANSKY/JUDYT MANDEL SM

SUBJECT: Appointment Request for Mr. Michelson

Mr. Anatoly Michelson has requested a meeting with you within the next three weeks. Specifically, he would like to discuss his long-standing divided family case. In June 1956, Mr. Michelson, as Director of the Soviet Engineer Bureau, travelled to Austria and defected. Since his defection thirty years ago, he has tried to get his wife and son out of the Soviet Union. Attached at Tab I is a report from the Congressional Record which describes in detail Mr. Michelson's situation. If your schedule permits, we recommend that you meet with him.

^{PD FOR} Matlock concurs. State also endorses such a meeting for it will afford Michelson's case greater visibility.

RECOMMENDATION

That you meet with Mr. Michelson.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Attachment:

Tab I Report from Congressional Record

I don't want a report of the Bonner story. What does he want us to do? Does he believe in quiet diplomacy? Have we written the Soviets about him? When? What is our record on his case? What will he say after the meeting?



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 96th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 126

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1980

No. 31

Senate

ANATOLY MICHELSON

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, for almost 2 years I have patiently heeded the advice of State Department officials in the attempt to rectify one of the most heart-rending human tragedies in the last quarter century. Today, I must turn away from their advice and relate to my colleagues and the American people the story of one American's personal ordeal and mental anguish suffered at the hands of an insensitive Soviet Government.

Mr. President, in June 1956, in a small Moscow apartment, Anatoly Michelson kissed his wife, Galina, and his 7-year-old daughter Olga goodbye. The young, creative and talented engineer was then Director of the Soviet Central Engineering Bureau, and had been selected as a member of a group of Russian businessmen and government officials to visit Austria. Michelson knew he would not return to Russia, his family did not.

Several months before this scheduled trip, disillusioned with Soviet totalitarianism, Michelson had decided to defect, believing, naively that the Soviet Government would permit his family to join him. After arriving in Austria, Michelson sought and received asylum and immediately began to appeal for his family's release. His 24-year nightmare had started.

Michelson spent the next 7 years in West Germany. While there his appeal

His story was published in newspapers in London and West Germany, Philadelphia, Pa., Canton, Ohio, Sarasota, Fla., New York, Washington, D.C., and Portland. Each one portrayed the agony, loneliness and frustration experienced by a family trying to deal with an intractable and heartless government.

Once, a short-lived ray of hope brightened Michelson's day. That was in March 1967, after the former Senator Hugh Scott had issued repeated pleas to Aleksey Kosygin and the London Sunday Telegraph reported on Michelson's plight just prior to the Russian Premier's visit to England. Soviet officials unexpectedly informed Galina and Olga that their application for visas to travel to the United States would be approved and for Anatoly Michelson it appeared a dream was about to come true. The U.S. State Department received the same signal. Over the next few months letters were exchanged between Galina, Olga, and Anatoly as the family anticipated an end to its ordeal and joyful reunion. It all fell apart, on June 30, 1967, when the Soviet Government showed its most cruel side. Galina and Olga were coldly notified that their applications for visas had been disapproved.

One might ask why. We did. In response to queries from Members of Congress the Soviets wrote:

Please be informed that their application was thoroughly considered by proper Soviet authorities. At the present time the answer was unfavorable for Mr. A. Michelson.



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 96th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 126

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1980

No. 31

Senate

ANATOLY MICHELSON

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, for almost 2 years I have patiently heeded the advice of State Department officials in the attempt to rectify one of the most heart-rending human tragedies in the last quarter century. Today, I must turn away from their advice and relate to my colleagues and the American people the story of one American's personal ordeal and mental anguish suffered at the hands of an insensitive Soviet Government.

Mr. President, in June 1956, in a small Moscow apartment, Anatoly Michelson kissed his wife, Galina, and his 7-year-old daughter Olga goodbye. The young, creative and talented engineer was then Director of the Soviet Central Engineering Bureau, and had been selected as a member of a group of Russian businessmen and government officials to visit Austria. Michelson knew he would not return to Russia, his family did not.

Several months before this scheduled trip, disillusioned with Soviet totalitarianism, Michelson had decided to defect, believing, naively that the Soviet Government would permit his family to join him. After arriving in Austria, Michelson sought and received asylum and immediately began to appeal for his family's release. His 24-year nightmare had started.

Michelson spent the next 7 years in West Germany. While there his appeals were sent through the Soviet Ambassador in Bonn, the Soviet and German Red Cross, German Department of State and the International Red Cross. Nothing happened. In 1963 he moved to the United States and began to appeal for help from the U.S. Government.

Over the next 16 years his cause was championed by 20 Members of Congress, including 15 Senators, 12 of whom are still here. Four administrations have made personal appeals through Secretaries of State or Presidents. Each time, except once, their efforts fell on deaf ears.

His story was published in newspapers in London and West Germany, Philadelphia, Pa., Canton, Ohio, Sarasota, Fla., New York, Washington, D.C., and Portland. Each one portrayed the agony, loneliness and frustration experienced by a family trying to deal with an intractable and heartless government.

Once, a short-lived ray of hope brightened Michelson's day. That was in March 1967, after the former Senator Hugh Scott had issued repeated pleas to Aleksey Kosygin and the London Sunday Telegraph reported on Michelson's plight just prior to the Russian Premier's visit to England. Soviet officials unexpectedly informed Galina and Olga that their application for visas to travel to the United States would be approved and for Anatoly Michelson it appeared a dream was about to come true. The U.S. State Department received the same signal. Over the next few months letters were exchanged between Galina, Olga, and Anatoly as the family anticipated an end to its ordeal and joyful reunion. It all fell apart, on June 30, 1967, when the Soviet Government showed its most cruel side. Galina and Olga were coldly notified that their applications for visas had been disapproved.

One might ask why. We did. In response to queries from Members of Congress the Soviets wrote:

Please be informed that their application was thoroughly considered by proper Soviet authorities. At the present time the answer was unfavorable for Mr. A. Michelson.

Mr. President, since that unjust blow, Michelson has continued to seek freedom for his loved ones. Appeals have been made time and again by Members of this body. The White House has placed the Michelson case first on its list of hardship requests. The Red Cross had pleaded through the League of Red Cross Societies. The United Nations has appealed in his behalf, and the Commission on Security and Cooperation, which monitors the Helsinki accords, presented his case. All efforts were fruitless.

In 1977 Anatoly Michelson moved to my State, Oregon, and soon thereafter requested my help. I, too, have now experienced the frustration and anger of Senators GLENN, MUSKIE, SCHWEIKER, METZENBAUM, MCGOVERN, STONE, PERCY,

12,
WILLIAMS, KENNEDY, and others before them. In a time of so-called detente, when we were appealing in the name of human decency, urging the Soviets to demonstrate good will and compassion, our pleas were met with callousness and implied disdain. I, personally, not only received this treatment in correspondence, but also in meeting with Ambassador Dobrynin.

Mr. President, we have recently witnessed, as a result of the Soviet invasion into Afghanistan, a flood of articles and editorials proclaiming and bemoaning the fact that detente is dead. Several claim that the United States has lost its chance to continue toward the goal of peaceful coexistence. I, for one, question whether that chance was ever a reality. I, for one, question the thoughts and motive of a government which seems to take a sadistic delight in punishing a family whose only crime is having a desire to be reunited in a free country. Some would say that one cannot translate an isolated incident to national foreign policy. I say that there are hundreds of cases such as this one, and that these are indicators that detente to us was a dream of world stability and to the Soviets it was a political expedient. Recent world events certainly lend credibility to that theory.

Mr. President, I do not intend to let this matter drop. I will persist in pressing the Soviets to attend to this matter and live up to the spirit and intent of the Helsinki accords. I welcome any of my colleagues who wish to join in this effort. This family has suffered enough. Galina is now 58 and almost blind from the work she was made to perform since her husband left. Olga is now 31. At age 8 she was humiliated in front of her schoolmates and branded as the daughter of a traitor. She was later denied the chance to go to college. Anatoly, now 61, has a serious heart condition. Yet all this does not seem to make a difference to the Soviets who continue to display insensitive, singleminded and unforgiving attitude toward three helpless people.

Mr. President, the facts are clear. They show me that Soviet promises are empty, that Soviet attitudes toward human life are cold, ruthless, and based on political motives. It shows me that we, as a nation, can expect little from a country that totally disregards the dignity of a man and of all mankind.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

ACTION

March 27, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN M. POINDEXTER

FROM: PAULA DOBRIANSKY ^{TD}

SUBJECT: Meeting with Anatoly Michelson

Per your comments on my earlier memo (Tab I), I believe it is highly unlikely that you will experience a repeat of the Bonner case. Last week, I met with Michelson for 45 minutes. He was very pleased that the NSC is taking an interest in his current situation. For this reason, I am confident he would not pursue any actions or make any comments embarrassing to the Administration. In fact, I think he would publically compliment the Administration's concern for his particular circumstances and its steadfast policy for dealing with other divided spouse cases.

In a meeting with you, Mr. Michelson would provide you with the details of his situation, probably give you a letter from himself to the President, and propose another "exchange" (i.e. Shcharansky) when and if appropriate. He has not asked to see the President, but he hopes that the President will be made aware of his plight.

Michelson does believe in quiet diplomacy if it will secure the release of his wife and son. In fact, we have repeatedly raised his case in meetings with Soviet officials - most recently, in the Shultz/Ryzhkov exchange. In December, Baldrige delivered a letter from the President to Gorbachev in which a number of divided spouse cases were addressed, including Michelson's; and it was raised during the November Summit. His case is also on the divided families list which is regularly provided to Soviet officials.

^{Jm} Matlock concurs. State also endorses such a meeting for it will not only afford Michelson's case greater visibility but will offset the repercussions of the Bonner meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

That you meet with Mr. Michelson.

Approve

Disapprove

Attachment:

Tab I March 20 Memo w/Congressional Record report

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Declassify on: OADR

DECLASSIFIED

NLRR 106-714/7 # 9543

BY CW NARA DATE 6/25/07

DECLASSIFIED / RE/CASCO

15
1953

NLRR F06-114/7 #9544

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

BY CU NARA DATE 6/25/69

March 20, 1986

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN M. POINDEXTER

FROM: PAULA DOBRIANSKY/JUDYT MANDEL ^{PD} ^{JM}

SUBJECT: Appointment Request for Mr. Michelson

Mr. Anatoly Michelson has requested a meeting with you within the next three weeks. Specifically, he would like to discuss his long-standing divided family case. In June 1956, Mr. Michelson, as Director of the Soviet Engineer Bureau, travelled to Austria and defected. Since his defection thirty years ago, he has tried to get his wife and son out of the Soviet Union. Attached at Tab I is a report from the Congressional Record which describes in detail Mr. Michelson's situation. If your schedule permits, we recommend that you meet with him.

^{PD FOR} Matlock concurs. State also endorses such a meeting for it will afford Michelson's case greater visibility.

RECOMMENDATION

That you meet with Mr. Michelson.

Approve _____ Disapprove _____

Attachment:

Tab I Report from Congressional Record

I don't want a repeat of the Bonner story. What does he want us to do? Does he believe in quiet diplomacy? Have we written the Soviets about him...? When? What is our record on his case? What will he say after the meeting? J.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 96th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 126

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1980

No. 31

Senate

ANATOLY MICHELSON

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, for almost 2 years I have patiently heeded the advice of State Department officials in the attempt to rectify one of the most heart-rending human tragedies in the last quarter century. Today, I must turn away from their advice and relate to my colleagues and the American people the story of one American's personal ordeal and mental anguish suffered at the hands of an insensitive Soviet Government.

Mr. President, in June 1956, in a small Moscow apartment, Anatoly Michelson kissed his wife, Galina, and his 7-year-old daughter Olga goodbye. The young, creative and talented engineer was then Director of the Soviet Central Engineering Bureau, and had been selected as a member of a group of Russian businessmen and government officials to visit Austria. Michelson knew he would not return to Russia, his family did not.

Several months before this scheduled trip, disillusioned with Soviet totalitarianism, Michelson had decided to defect, believing, naively that the Soviet

Government would permit his family to join him. After arriving in Austria, Michelson sought and received asylum and immediately began to appeal for his family's release. His 24-year nightmare had started.

Michelson spent the next 7 years in West Germany. While there his appeals were sent through the Soviet Ambassador in Bonn, the Soviet and German Red Cross, German Department of State and the International Red Cross. Nothing happened. In 1963 he moved to the United States and began to appeal for help from the U.S. Government.

Over the next 16 years his cause was championed by 20 Members of Congress, including 15 Senators, 12 of whom are still here. Four administrations have made personal appeals through Secretaries of State or Presidents. Each time, except once, their efforts fell on deaf ears.

His story was published in newspapers in London and West Germany, Philadelphia, Pa., Canton, Ohio, Sarasota, Fla., New York, Washington, D.C., and Portland. Each one portrayed the agony, loneliness and frustration experienced by a family trying to deal with an intractable and heartless government.

Once, a short-lived ray of hope brightened Michelson's day. That was in March 1967, after the former Senator Hugh Scott had issued repeated pleas to Aleksey Kosygin and the London Sunday Telegraph reported on Michelson's plight just prior to the Russian Premier's visit to England. Soviet officials unexpectedly informed Galina and Olga that their application for visas to travel to the United States would be approved and for Anatoly Michelson it appeared a dream was about to come true. The U.S. State Department received the same signal. Over the next few months letters were exchanged between Galina, Olga, and Anatoly as the family anticipated an end to its ordeal and joyful reunion. It all fell apart, on June 30, 1967, when the Soviet Government showed its most cruel side. Galina and Olga were coldly notified that their applications for visas had been disapproved.

One might ask why. We did. In response to queries from Members of Congress the Soviets wrote:

Please be informed that their application was thoroughly considered by proper Soviet authorities. At the present time the answer was unfavorable for Mr. A. Michelson.

Mr. President, since that unjust blow, Michelson has continued to seek freedom for his loved ones. Appeals have been made time and again by Members of this body. The White House has placed the Michelson case first on its list of hardship requests. The Red Cross had pleaded through the League of Red Cross Societies. The United Nations has appealed in his behalf, and the Commission on Security and Cooperation, which monitors the Helsinki accords, presented his case. All efforts were fruitless.

In 1977 Anatoly Michelson moved to my State, Oregon, and soon thereafter requested my help. I, too, have now experienced the frustration and anger of Senators GLENN, MUSKIE, SCHWEIKER, METZENBAUM, MCGOVERN, STONE, PERCY,

17

WILLIAMS, KENNEDY, and others before them. In a time of so-called detente, when we were appealing in the name of human decency, urging the Soviets to demonstrate good will and compassion, our pleas were met with callousness and implied disdain. I, personally, not only received this treatment in correspondence, but also in meeting with Ambassador Dobrynin.

Mr. President, we have recently witnessed, as a result of the Soviet invasion into Afghanistan, a flood of articles and editorials proclaiming and bemoaning the fact that detente is dead. Several claim that the United States has lost its chance to continue toward the goal of peaceful coexistence. I, for one, question whether that chance was ever a reality. I, for one, question the thoughts and motive of a government which seems to take a sadistic delight in punishing a family whose only crime is having a desire to be reunited in a free country. Some would say that one cannot translate an isolated incident to national foreign policy. I say that there are hundreds of cases such as this one, and that these are indicators that detente to us was a dream of world stability and to the Soviets it was a political expedient. Recent world events certainly lend credibility to that theory.

Mr. President, I do not intend to let this matter drop. I will persist in pressing the Soviets to attend to this matter and live up to the spirit and intent of the Helsinki accords. I welcome any of my colleagues who wish to join in this effort. This family has suffered enough. Galina is now 58 and almost blind from the work she was made to perform since her husband left. Olga is now 31. At age 8 she was humiliated in front of her schoolmates and branded as the daughter of a traitor. She was later denied the chance to go to college. Anatoly, now 61, has a serious heart condition. Yet all this does not seem to make a difference to the Soviets who continue to display insensitive, singleminded and unforgiving attitude toward three helpless people.

Mr. President, the facts are clear. They show me that Soviet promises are empty, that Soviet attitudes toward human life are cold, ruthless, and based on political motives. It shows me that we, as a nation, can expect little from a country that totally disregards the dignity of a man and of all mankind.

Done 4/10 10
5/10/86

MSG FROM: NSPJD --CPUA TO: NSFEG --CPUA
To: NSFEG --CPUA

04/03/86 12:4

*** Reply to note of 04/02/86 15:40

NOTE FROM: Paula Dobriansky

Subject: Michelson

I have apprised Mr. Michelson. We will clear him in and the two gentlemen who are handling his case -- Peter Lefkin and Robert Arsenault. Judyt Mandel will also attend. Many thanks.

cc: NSJEM --CPUA

FILE
DIVIDED
1953
SPOUSES

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

April 8, 1986

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN M. POINDEXTER

FROM: PAULA DOBRIANSKY/JUDYT MANDEL ^{TD JM}

SUBJECT: Meeting with Anatoly Michelson

You are scheduled to meet with Mr. Anatoly Michelson (pronounced Michaelson) on April 10, at 3:00 p.m. He will be accompanied by his attorney, Peter Lefkin, and Bob Arsenault, an Associate at the Center for Applied Linguistics.

As you know, Michelson would like to discuss his long-standing divided family case. In June 1956, as Director of the Soviet Engineer Bureau, he travelled to Austria and defected. Since his defection thirty years ago, he has tried to get his wife and daughter out of the Soviet Union. Attached at Tab I is a report from the Congressional Record which describes in detail Michelson's situation.

In the meeting, Mr. Michelson will provide you with the specifics of his case, give you a letter from himself to the President, and propose another "exchange" (to include his family) when and if appropriate. He has not asked to see the President but hopes that he will be made aware of his plight.

Below are suggested talking points for your use in the meeting.

- Express concern for Michelson's circumstances.
- Note that we have recently raised his case in meetings with Soviet officials (Shultz/Ryshkov exchange, Baldrige visit to Moscow in Dec. 1985, November Summit).
- Reassure him that this Administration is deeply committed to resolving all outstanding family reunification cases.
- Mention that we will pursue all possible options so as to reunite Michelson's family, but cases such as his are particularly difficult and Soviets have rarely agreed to allow families of defectors to leave.

Matlock  concurs.

Attachment:

Tab I Congressional Record



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 96th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 126

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1980

No. 31

Senate

ANATOLY MICHELSON

Mr. PACEWOOD. Mr. President, for almost 2 years I have patiently heeded the advice of State Department officials in the attempt to rectify one of the most heart-rending human tragedies in the last quarter century. Today, I must turn away from their advice and relate to my colleagues and the American people the story of one American's personal ordeal and mental anguish suffered at the hands of an insensitive Soviet Government.

Mr. President, in June 1956, in a small Moscow apartment, Anatoly Michelson kissed his wife, Galina, and his 7-year-old daughter Olga goodbye. The young, creative and talented engineer was then Director of the Soviet Central Engineering Bureau, and had been selected as a member of a group of Russian businessmen and government officials to visit Austria. Michelson knew he would not return to Russia, his family did not.

Several months before this scheduled trip, disillusioned with Soviet totalitarianism, Michelson had decided to defect, believing, naively that the Soviet Government would permit his family to join him. After arriving in Austria, Michelson sought and received asylum and immediately began to appeal for his family's release. His 24-year nightmare had started.

Michelson spent the next 7 years in West Germany. While there his appeals were sent through the Soviet Ambassador in Bonn, the Soviet and German Red Cross, German Department of State and the International Red Cross. Nothing happened. In 1963 he moved to the United States and began to appeal for help from the U.S. Government.

Over the next 16 years his cause was championed by 20 Members of Congress, including 15 Senators, 12 of whom are still here. Four administrations have made personal appeals through Secretaries of State or Presidents. Each time, except once, their efforts fell on deaf ears.

His story was published in newspapers in London and West Germany, Philadelphia, Pa., Canton, Ohio, Sarasota, Fla., New York, Washington, D.C., and Portland. Each one portrayed the agony, loneliness and frustration experienced by a family trying to deal with an intractable and heartless government.

Once, a short-lived ray of hope brightened Michelson's day. That was in March 1967, after the former Senator Hugh Scott had issued repeated pleas to Aleksey Kosygin and the London Sunday Telegraph reported on Michelson's plight just prior to the Russian Premier's visit to England. Soviet officials unexpectedly informed Galina and Olga that their application for visas to travel to the United States would be approved and for Anatoly Michelson it appeared a dream was about to come true. The U.S. State Department received the same signal. Over the next few months letters were exchanged between Galina, Olga, and Anatoly as the family anticipated an end to its ordeal and joyful reunion. It all fell apart, on June 30, 1967, when the Soviet Government showed its most cruel side. Galina and Olga were coldly notified that their applications for visas had been disapproved.

One might ask why. We did. In response to queries from Members of Congress the Soviets wrote:

Please be informed that their application was thoroughly considered by proper Soviet authorities. At the present time the answer was unfavorable for Mr. A. Michelson.

Mr. President, since that unjust blow, Michelson has continued to seek freedom for his loved ones. Appeals have been made time and again by Members of this body. The White House has placed the Michelson case first on its list of hardship requests. The Red Cross had pleaded through the League of Red Cross Societies. The United Nations has appealed in his behalf, and the Commission on Security and Cooperation, which monitors the Helsinki accords, presented his case. All efforts were fruitless.

In 1977 Anatoly Michelson moved to my State, Oregon, and soon thereafter requested my help. I, too, have now experienced the frustration and anger of Senators GLENN, MUSKIE, SCHWEIKER, METZENBAUM, MCGOVERN, STONE, PERCY,

2

... human decency urging the Soviets to demonstrate good will and compassion. Our pleas were met with callousness and implied disdain. I, personally, not only received this treatment in correspondence, but also in meeting with Ambassador Dobrynin.

Mr. President, we have recently witnessed, as a result of the Soviet invasion into Afghanistan, a flood of articles and editorials proclaiming and bemoaning the fact that détente is dead. Several claim that the United States has lost its chance to continue toward the goal of peaceful coexistence. I, for one, question whether that chance was ever a reality. I, for one, question the thoughts and motive of a government which seems to take a sadistic delight in punishing a family whose only crime is having a desire to be reunited in a free country. Some would say that one cannot translate an isolated incident to national foreign policy. I say that there are hundreds of cases such as this one, and that these are indicators that détente to us was a dream of world stability and to the Soviets it was a political expedient. Recent world events certainly lend credibility to that theory.

Mr. President, I do not intend to let this matter drop. I will persist in pressing the Soviets to attend to this matter and live up to the spirit and intent of the Helsinki accords. I welcome any of my colleagues who wish to join in this effort. This family has suffered enough. Galina is now 58 and almost blind from the work she was made to perform since her husband left. Olga is now 31. At age 8 she was humiliated in front of her schoolmates and branded as the daughter of a traitor. She was later denied the chance to go to college. Anatoly, now 61, has a serious heart condition. Yet all this does not seem to make a difference to the Soviets who continue to display insensitive, singleminded and unforgiving attitude toward three helpless people.

Mr. President, the facts are clear. They show me that Soviet promises are empty, that Soviet attitudes toward human life are cold, ruthless, and based on political motives. It shows me that we, as a nation, can expect little from a country that totally disregards the dignity of a man and of all mankind.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 2050E

April 8, 1986

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN M. POINDEXTER

FROM: PAULA DOBRIANSKY/JUDYT MANDEL ^{PD} SM

SUBJECT: Letter from Keith Braun re Wife Being Held Hostage
by Soviet Government

Attached at Tab I is a letter for your signature to Keith Braun, a divided spouse, who wrote to you (Tab II) regarding his wife, Svetlana. Braun is asking you to raise the issue of divided spouses, and in particular his own case, with the Soviets at every opportunity.

Matlock, Ray ^{Ray}, and Sestanovich concur.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the letter at Tab I.

Approve _____

Disapprove _____

Attachments:

Tab I Letter to Braun
Tab II Incoming

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. Braun,

Thank you for your letter of March 16. I fully appreciate the pain and anguish felt by you and your wife.

We, too, are concerned about the Soviet Union's unwillingness to respect fundamental human rights and are particularly dismayed by its failure to live up to its commitment in the Helsinki Final Act "to deal in a positive and humanitarian spirit with the applications of persons who wish to be reunited with members of their family."

Please be assured that we will continue to raise your situation and those of other divided spouses at all levels in meetings with Soviet officials. Presently, we look on the Bern CSCE Human Contacts Expert's Meeting as an excellent opportunity to stress our interest in progress on family reunification cases. We are looking for practical results consistent with ideals so well expressed in the Helsinki Accords to which all the nations participating in the Bern meeting are signatories.

Sincerely,

Mr. Keith Braun
25251 Maplebrooke
Southfield, Michigan 48034

2334

25251 Maplebrooke
Southfield, MI 48034
313-256-7646
March 16, 1986

Handwritten initials

Vice Admiral John Poindexter
National Security Adviser
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Vice Admiral Poindexter:

I am in desperate need of your assistance. I am married to a Soviet, Svetlana Braun, who despite our compliance with Soviet law is being held hostage by the Soviet government.

Svetlana has twice been denied formally the right to live with me. On January 24, she again applied to live with me in this country.

Svetlana represents the qualities that this administration extolls. She believes that our marriage was arranged by God and that if I will love her everything will be alright. She writes that she cannot imagine her life without me and ~~that~~ all her dreams are bound up in me.

The Soviet violation of the rights of an American citizen, for I have a right to have my wife live with me, is outrageous and raises serious questions about the Soviets' ability to live up to its international commitments. I want to urge you to raise this issue with the Soviets at every opportunity (I should mention that there are 22 other Americans similarly victimized.)

In discussing this situation with the Soviets, I believe that it should be raised in the bilateral context with the clear emphasize on the Soviet violation of the rights of American citizens.

Thank you for your attention and I look forward to hearing from you.

Respectfully,

Handwritten signature of Keith Braun
Keith Braun

Robiansky

→ FILE DIVIDED
SPOUSAS *MT*

National Security Council
The White House

86 APR 9

AIO: 45

System # _____
Package # 1953
DOCLOG B AIO 01



	SEQUENCE TO	HAS SEEN	DISPOSITION
Bob Pearson	<u>1</u>	<u>P</u>	<u>F</u>
Rodney McDaniel	_____	_____	_____
Don Fortier	_____	_____	_____
Paul Thompson	<u>2</u>	<u>A</u>	_____
Florence Gantt	<u>3</u>	_____	_____
John Poindexter	<u>4</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>A</u>
Rodney McDaniel	_____	_____	_____
NSC Secretariat	_____	_____	_____
Situation Room	_____	_____	_____

I = Information A = Action R = Retain D = Dispatch N = No further Action

cc: VP Regan Buchanan Other RBM, ~~DRF~~ DRF

COMMENTS

Should be seen by: _____
(Date/Time)





United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 96th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 126

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1980

No. 31

Senate

ANATOLY MICHELSON

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, for almost 2 years I have patiently heeded the advice of State Department officials in the attempt to rectify one of the most heart-rending human tragedies in the last quarter century. Today, I must turn away from their advice and relate to my colleagues and the American people the story of one American's personal ordeal and mental anguish suffered at the hands of an insensitive Soviet Government.

Mr. President, in June 1956, in a small Moscow apartment, Anatoly Michelson kissed his wife, Galina, and his 7-year-old daughter Olga goodbye. The young, creative and talented engineer was then Director of the Soviet Central Engineering Bureau, and had been selected as a member of a group of Russian businessmen and government officials to visit Austria. Michelson knew he would not return to Russia, his family did not.

Several months before this scheduled trip, disillusioned with Soviet totalitarianism, Michelson had decided to defect, believing, naively that the Soviet Government would permit his family to join him. After arriving in Austria, Michelson sought and received asylum and immediately began to appeal for his family's release. His 24-year nightmare had started.

Michelson spent the next 7 years in West Germany. While there his appeals were sent through the Soviet Ambassador in Bonn, the Soviet and German Red Cross, German Department of State and the International Red Cross. Nothing happened. In 1963 he moved to the United States and began to appeal for help from the U.S. Government.

Over the next 16 years his cause was championed by 20 Members of Congress, including 15 Senators, 12 of whom are still here. Four administrations have made personal appeals through Secretaries of State or Presidents. Each time, except once, their efforts fell on deaf ears.

His story was published in newspapers in London and West Germany, Philadelphia, Pa., Canton, Ohio, Sarasota, Fla., New York, Washington, D.C., and Portland. Each one portrayed the agony, loneliness and frustration experienced by a family trying to deal with an intractable and heartless government.

Once, a short-lived ray of hope brightened Michelson's day. That was in March 1967, after the former Senator Hugh Scott had issued repeated pleas to Alleksey Kosygin and the London Sunday Telegraph reported on Michelson's plight just prior to the Russian Premier's visit to England. Soviet officials unexpectedly informed Galina and Olga that their application for visas to travel to the United States would be approved and for Anatoly Michelson it appeared a dream was about to come true. The U.S. State Department received the same signal. Over the next few months letters were exchanged between Galina, Olga, and Anatoly as the family anticipated an end to its ordeal and joyful reunion. It all fell apart, on June 30, 1967, when the Soviet Government showed its most cruel side. Galina and Olga were coldly notified that their applications for visas had been disapproved.

One might ask why. We did. In response to queries from Members of Congress the Soviets wrote:

Please be informed that their application was thoroughly considered by proper Soviet authorities. At the present time the answer was unfavorable for Mr. A. Michelson.

Mr. President, since that unjust blow, Michelson has continued to seek freedom for his loved ones. Appeals have been made time and again by Members of this body. The White House has placed the Michelson case first on its list of hardship requests. The Red Cross had pleaded through the League of Red Cross Societies. The United Nations has appealed in his behalf, and the Commission on Security and Cooperation, which monitors the Helsinki accords, presented his case. All efforts were fruitless.

In 1977 Anatoly Michelson moved to my State, Oregon, and soon thereafter requested my help. I, too, have now experienced the frustration and anger of Senators GLENN, MUSKIE, SCHWETKER, METZENBAUM, MCGOVERN, STONE, PERCY,

them. In a time of a similar detente when we were appealing in the name of human decency, urging the Soviets to demonstrate good will and compassion, our pleas were met with callousness and implied disdain. I, personally, not only received this treatment in correspondence, but also in meeting with Ambassador Dobrynin.

Mr. President, we have recently witnessed, as a result of the Soviet invasion into Afghanistan, a flood of articles and editorials proclaiming and bemoaning the fact that detente is dead. Several claim that the United States has lost its chance to continue toward the goal of peaceful coexistence. I, for one, question whether that chance was ever a reality. I, for one, question the thoughts and motive of a government which seems to take a sadistic delight in punishing a family whose only crime is having a desire to be reunited in a free country. Some would say that one cannot translate an isolated incident to national foreign policy. I say that there are hundreds of cases such as this one, and that these are indicators that detente to us was a dream of world stability and to the Soviets it was a political expedient. Recent world events certainly lend credibility to that theory.

Mr. President, I do not intend to let this matter drop. I will persist in pressing the Soviets to attend to this matter and live up to the spirit and intent of the Helsinki accords. I welcome any of my colleagues who wish to join in this effort. This family has suffered enough. Galina is now 58 and almost blind from the work she was made to perform since her husband left. Olga is now 31. At age 8 she was humiliated in front of her schoolmates and branded as the daughter of a traitor. She was later denied the chance to go to college. Anatoly, now 61, has a serious heart condition. Yet all this does not seem to make a difference to the Soviets who continue to display insensitive, singleminded and unforgiving attitude toward three helpless people.

Mr. President, the facts are clear. They show me that Soviet promises are empty, that Soviet attitudes toward human life are cold, ruthless, and based on political motives. It shows me that we, as a nation, can expect little from a country that totally disregards the dignity of a man and of all mankind.

2.
1953

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

April 8, 1986

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN M. POINDEXTER

FROM: PAULA DOBRIANSKY/JUDYT MANDEL ^{TD JM}

SUBJECT: Meeting with Anatoly Michelson

You are scheduled to meet with Mr. Anatoly Michelson (pronounced Michaelson) on April 10, at 3:00 p.m. He will be accompanied by his attorney, Peter Lefkin, and Bob Arsenault, an Associate at the Center for Applied Linguistics.

As you know, Michelson would like to discuss his long-standing divided family case. In June 1956, as Director of the Soviet Engineer Bureau, he travelled to Austria and defected. Since his defection thirty years ago, he has tried to get his wife and daughter out of the Soviet Union. Attached at Tab I is a report from the Congressional Record which describes in detail Michelson's situation.

In the meeting, Mr. Michelson will provide you with the specifics of his case, give you a letter from himself to the President, and propose another "exchange" (to include his family) when and if appropriate. He has not asked to see the President but hopes that he will be made aware of his plight.

Below are suggested talking points for your use in the meeting.

- Express concern for Michelson's circumstances.
- Note that we have recently raised his case in meetings with Soviet officials (Shultz/Ryshkov exchange, Baldrige visit to Moscow in Dec. 1985, November Summit).
- Reassure him that this Administration is deeply committed to resolving all outstanding family reunification cases.
- Mention that we will pursue all possible options so as to reunite Michelson's family, but cases such as his are particularly difficult and Soviets have rarely agreed to allow families of defectors to leave.

Matlock concurs.

Attachment:

Tab I Congressional Record

20

U.S. News & WORLD REPORT

APRIL 21, 1986

\$1.95

FILE
DIVIDED
FAMILIES

TEXAS TAKES A TUMBLE



FAMILIES



Elena Kaplan, 27, a university student, married Gary Talanov of Novato, Calif., in 1978. She has been denied permission to emigrate 10 times



They are ordinary-looking Soviet citizens, but their faces mask frustration and despair. For up to 30 years, in one case, they have appealed to join a husband or wife in America. Moscow says no. Now, diplomats from 35 nations, including the U.S.S.R., are hearing their petitions

From Russia with love

■ "We appeal to you to reunite our families," the letter begins. "Fathers have never seen their children. Wives are left to fend for themselves without husbands. Even visitation is often forbidden."

The plea comes from partners in Soviet-American marriages whose separation puts them in a kind of limbo between the superpowers. The petition is being submitted in mid-April to a Bern, Switzerland, conference on improving people-to-people contacts among the 35 nations that signed the 1975 Helsinki Accords. Those agreements were seen as guaranteeing reunification of families and the right of binational couples to choose their country of residence.

The Soviet citizens on these pages are among 20 "divided spouses" plus three whose marriages were blocked by Moscow. Their cases are being pursued by a U.S. delegation headed by scholar Michael Novak of the American Enterprise Institute and Ambassador Sol Polansky of the State Department. Novak, who supplied the photos to *U.S. News & World Report*, will present the cases at the Bern conference.

Some U.S. officials are heartened by recent Soviet gestures. Before last November's Geneva summit, Kremlin leader Mikhail Gorbachev announced the impending release of 10 members of divided families. In February, he promised settlement of such cases "in a humane and positive spirit."

Yet the couples, while hopeful, are braced for disappointment. They have been let down before. Five of the Soviet citizens face a further complication: They are Jewish. Last year, Moscow allowed only 1,140 Jews to emigrate. Some 15,000 of the "refuseniks" remain.

Most Soviet-American couples say their plight stems from recurrent chills in superpower relations or mere bureaucratic whim. "This nightmare does not go away," says Anatoly Michelson, 67, who has not seen his wife Galina in 30 years. "She is afraid we will die before we meet again." Michelson, an engineer in Sarasota, Fla., left the Soviet Union in 1956 for a vacation in Austria and never returned. "I thought I would get my wife and daughter out soon," he recalls. "I was naive."

The Soviets have rejected his family's requests to emigrate 22 times. "Every time my daughter, Olga, applies, she gets fired," Michelson reports. "She was an architect. The only job she can get now is one as a laborer in a doll factory. I have a grandson who is 7, and I have never seen him."

The last time Yuri Balovlenkov's wife Elena, a teaching nurse in Baltimore, visited him was in August, 1982. Soviet officials have refused his exit-visa requests 14 times. "They said he had access to classified information, but he didn't,"



Matvey Finkel, 38, married Susan Graham of Spokane, Wash., in 1979. She was then barred from the U.S.S.R. until 1983, but now is a temporary resident



Engineer Yuri Balovlenkov, 37, married Baltimorean Elena Kusmenko in 1978. To protest separation, he staged hunger strikes in 1982 and 1985



Galina Michelson, 65, has been denied permission to join her husband Anatoly in Sarasota, Fla. He left the U.S.S.R. 30 years ago



Engineering student Svetlana Ilyinichna, 22, married attorney Keith Braun of Southfield, Mich., in 1984. Her third appeal to emigrate is pending



Sonia Melnikova-Eichenvald, 38, was refused permission to emigrate 12 times before she married Michael Lavigne of Berkeley in 1985









FAMILIES



Victor Novikov, 55, regards Elizabeth Condon of Lynn, Mass., as his wife, though the Soviets blocked their marriage, and her visits, in 1979



Roman Kuperman, 29, worked as a biologist until he married Frances Pergericht of Chicago in 1982. They had a baby girl, Natalie, on March 10, 1986

Дорогой папа здравствуй!
 Папа! Я очень скучаю
 без тебя.  
 Я очень хочу быть с
 тобой.  
 В школе у меня все хо- 
 рошо. 
 По контрольной по ма-
 тематике я получил 5.
 
 Крепко тебя целую
 твой сын.



Tamara Tretyakova, 39, married Simon Levin of Illinois in 1978. Their son, Mark, wrote the letter on the left to a father he has never seen



Dmitri Vlasenkov, a 27-year-old photographer, took the pictures on these pages. Married in 1981, he has sought to live with his wife in New Jersey

says his wife, 32. "He was a computer engineer for an economic consulting firm. The KGB also told him I was a Central Intelligence Agency plant, that I wasn't in love with him and that I only married him so he would spy for the United States. That's all ridiculous." Meantime, Yuri Balovlenkov has staged two prolonged hunger strikes, lost a number of jobs and has never seen one of his two small daughters.

Since 1979, Victor Novikov has wanted to marry his American fiancée, Elizabeth Condon, a high-school teacher in Lynn, Mass. She has not been allowed back in the U.S.S.R. After Novikov applied to emigrate, he was fired from his job as a chemist. Yet an exit-visa request was later denied on the ground he was a "valuable scientific worker." Another time, officials said he did not know Condon well enough. They met in 1967. He is now 55. She is 43.

Visits to the U.S.S.R. are allowed for some. Susan Graham of Spokane, Wash., works as a nanny and sees her Soviet husband Matvey Finkel on off hours. Michael Lavigne of Berkeley, Calif., and his wife Sonia Melnikova-Eichenvald live together in Moscow but expect that he will be forced to leave the country soon.

Keith Braun, a 26-year-old lawyer in Southfield, Mich., recently was granted permission to visit his 22-year-old wife Svetlana, an engineering student. But he will be able to stay only about 10 days. "I don't want just to visit her," he says. "I want to *live* with her." She had tried unsuccessfully for exit visas to join him in the U.S., and when they are apart, Braun says, "she feels terribly alone."

Sometimes, the strain is too much. Elena Kaplan, a Soviet citizen, and Gary Talanov, 29, of Novato, Calif., were married eight years ago. After many refusals of visa requests, their relationship deteriorated, and he filed for divorce in California. She objected, and he dropped the suit. Now, she has filed for legal separation.

Yet most of the couples persist. Roman Kuperman, a Soviet biologist, and his American wife Frances Pergericht, 33, a Chicago lawyer, had their first child in March. "During my labor, he called the hospital several times," Pergericht says. "He tried to be involved in the birth. Now, I feel so depressed. It's beyond comprehension that they won't let me go there to show my husband his baby daughter."

Simon Levin, 35, an engineer from Deerfield, Ill., has also been kept from seeing his child. Levin, then a Soviet citizen, emigrated to Israel in 1978 before his son Mark was born. His wife Tamara Tretyakova has been trying to join him.

The Kremlin refused, citing security. Says Levin: "She left her security job 10 years ago. The real reason is I'm Jewish, and they don't like it because I left the country."

Levin recently received a letter from his son. Between drawings of flowers are the Cyrillic letters meaning: "I would like to be with you very much." At one point on the page, Mark drew a hoped-for symbol of friendship—a U.S. flag and a Soviet flag.



Letter from son Mark to Simon Levin

by Susanna McBee with Miriam Horn

FILE

A NEW BEGINNING FOR DIVIDED SPOUSES

AMBASSADOR MICHAEL NOVAK
HEAD, U.S. DELEGATION

PLENARY STATEMENT
APRIL 22, 1986

LET ME BEGIN BY THANKING MY FELLOW DELEGATES FOR THE GOOD SPIRIT SHOWN IN OUR WORK SO FAR. WE ARE HERE, IN THE NAME OF ORDINARY PEOPLE EVERYWHERE, TO REVIEW "DEVELOPMENTS IN HUMAN CONTACTS" SINCE MADRID. IT IS EASY FOR EACH NATION TO SEE WAYS IN WHICH OTHER COUNTRIES FALL SHORT OF COMMITMENTS WE ALL MADE TOGETHER, IN ONE ANOTHER'S PRESENCE, AND IN THE PRESENCE OF ORDINARY PEOPLE EVERYWHERE. THIS MORNING THE DISTINGUISHED DELEGATE OF THE SOVIET UNION URGED EVERY NATION HERE TO SEE ITS OWN FAULTS. ALAS, HE DID NOT SHOW US HOW. HE DID NOT PRACTICE WHAT HE PREACHED. WE HOPE THAT LATER ON HE WILL.

TODAY I WOULD LIKE TO COVER THREE POINTS: FIRST, AN AREA IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES IS REVIEWING ITS OWN CONDUCT IN THE LIGHT OF NEW REALITIES SINCE MADRID; SECOND, A WELCOMING NOTE FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS IN EASTERN EUROPE SINCE HELSINKI; THIRD, A PROPOSAL TO MAKE THE BERN MEETING A LANDMARK FOR "SEPARATED SPOUSES."

BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION, HOWEVER, PERMIT ME TO NOTE A QUESTION OF SCALE AND DEGREE. FIRST, AS ALL THE WORLD OPENLY EXPERIENCES, HUMAN CONTACTS FLOW MOST FREELY AMONG THE FREE PEOPLE OF THE FREE NATIONS. SECOND, HUMAN CONTACTS FLOW LESS FREELY WITHIN THE NATIONS LED BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY: ALTHOUGH NOT SO FREELY AS IN THE FREE WORLD, BETTER THAN TEN YEARS AGO. LAST OF ALL COME MOVEMENTS FROM THE FREE WORLD INTO THE COMMUNIST WORLD, AND FROM THE LATTER OUT. HERE IS THE REAL BARRIER. HERE IS OUR REAL SUBJECT. THIS IS EXPRESSED IN THE METAPHOR "IRON CURTAIN," IN THE GREAT WALL THROUGH THE CENTER OF EUROPE, AND IN THE "PROBLEM" OF HUMAN CONTACTS. AT HELSINKI AND MADRID, ALL OUR GOVERNMENTS COMMITTED THEMSELVES TO LOWERING THE BARRIERS SEPARATING EAST FROM WEST. IN MEETING THAT TASK, THE UNITED STATES WANTS TO DO ITS SHARE.

CRITICISM BEST BEGINS AT HOME. IN THE UNITED STATES, CRITIZING GOVERNMENT IS A FAVORITE HABIT OF OUR CITIZENS. THUS, THOMAS JEFFERSON WARNED HIS CONTEMPORARIES THAT THE AMERICAN COMMITMENT TO "LIBERTY AND JUSTICE FOR ALL" WOULD REQUIRE A CONSTANT SET OF "REVOLUTIONS." THERE IS NEVER ENOUGH LIBERTY. THERE IS NEVER ENOUGH JUSTICE. PROGRESS MUST BE INCESSANT. EVERY GENERATION MUST ATTEMPT A NEW BEGINNING. SINCE JEFFERSON ESTIMATED THAT THE AVERAGE GENERATION LASTS 18-1/3 YEARS, HE THOUGHT AMERICA SHOULD HAVE A "REVOLUTION" EVERY 18-1/3 YEARS. THAT IS THE SECRET TO OUR NATION'S DYNAMISM, AND TO OUR FASCINATION WITH "NEW BEGINNINGS."

IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN CONTACTS, CONCERNING BOTH IMMIGRANT AND NON-IMMIGRANT VISAS, OUR NATION FACES AN UNPRECEDENTED VOLUME OF DAILY DECISIONS. OUR DELEGATION LISTENED WITH CARE TO REFORMS ON OUR PART SUGGESTED HERE BY OTHERS.

ON THIS PLANET, LIBERTY IS MORE SCARCE THAN OIL. THEREFORE, MILLIONS OF PERSONS CONSTANTLY SEEK OUT THE FREE

35

NATIONS. OF THESE, PERHAPS AS MANY COME TO OUR COUNTRY AS TO ALL OTHER NATIONS COMBINED. STEADILY, MORE THAN 500,000 LEGAL IMMIGRANTS SETTLE IN THE UNITED STATES EACH YEAR, ALONG WITH ANOTHER 70,000 REFUGEES. THIS COMES TO ABOUT SIX MILLION NEW IMMIGRANTS EACH DECADE. IT IS AS IF WE ADDED A NEW POPULATION THE SIZE OF SWITZERLAND EVERY YEAR. IT MEANS THAT 2,400 IMMIGRATION VISAS MUST BE PROCESSED EVERY SINGLE WORKING DAY OF EVERY YEAR.

STILL, THIS NUMBER DOES NOT INCLUDE THE MILLIONS OF FOREIGN CITIZENS LIVING AND WORKING IN THE UNITED STATES, WHO STREAM THROUGH OUR BORDERS WITHOUT DOCUMENTS. THE CUMULATIVE NUMBER OF THESE UNDOCUMENTED ONES IS ESTIMATED TO BE TWELVE MILLION. TRYING TO CONTROL THIS FLOW HAS LED TO MANY PERPLEXITIES.

FOR EXAMPLE, WE NOW REQUIRE A VALID VISA FOR ALL VISITORS (EXCEPT CANADIANS). THIS SCREENING MECHANISM IMPOSES AN INCONVENIENCE, ESPECIALLY ON THOSE WHOSE OWN COUNTRIES DO NOT REQUIRE U.S. CITIZENS TO HAVE VISAS. AGAIN, CURRENT VISA LAW CONTAINS PROVISIONS BARRING A VERY SMALL NUMBER OF VISITORS ON GROUNDS OF ACTIVISM IN CERTAIN IDEOLOGICAL CAUSES. TO MANY IN THE U.S., EVEN THIS SMALL NUMBER OF EXCLUSIONS SEEMS CONTRARY TO THE OPENNESS WE CHERISH. FRESH DEBATE UPON THIS QUESTION IN THE GOVERNMENT, IN CONGRESS AND AMONG THE PUBLIC IS UNDERWAY.

JUST THE SAME, IN 1985 ALONE (A TYPICAL YEAR), MORE THAN SIX MILLION CITIZENS FROM AROUND THE WORLD ENTERED THE U.S. ON NON-IMMIGRANT VISAS -- AS TOURISTS, STUDENTS, VISITORS, ETC. FOR THEM, 24,000 NON-IMMIGRANT VISAS (ON AVERAGE) WERE ISSUED EVERY WORKING DAY.

BY CONTINUING TO BE A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS, THE UNITED STATES IS THREE-WAYS BLESSED. IN THE NEWCOMERS, WE SEE OURSELVES. THEY TIE US TO THE WHOLE HUMAN RACE. THEY ENLARGE OUR SPIRITS. WE WELCOME THEM, AS WE WELCOME, TOO, THOSE WHO COME FOR SHORTER PERIODS.

NONETHELESS, IN THE PROCESS OF ISSUING MORE THAN 26,000 VISAS OF ONE KIND OR ANOTHER EVERY WORKING DAY, WE KNOW THAT WE GENERATE SNAFUS, MAKE MISTAKES, CAUSE SOME DELAYS, AND NEED CONSTANTLY TO REVIEW OUR METHODS OF OPERATION AND THE CHANGING PATTERNS OF GLOBAL MOBILITY. THERE ARE MANY DEBATES IN AMERICA TODAY ABOUT SEVERAL ASPECTS OF OUR VISA POLICIES. NO ONE HESITATES TO CRITICIZE OUR GOVERNMENT; TO DO SO IS OUR WAY OF LIFE. WE WANT TO DO THINGS BETTER. IN OUR VIEW, IMPROVEMENT IS ALWAYS NECESSARY.

THE SECOND POINT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE IS THAT THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES CAN HARDLY HELP WELCOMING IMPROVEMENTS REGARDING HUMAN CONTACTS IN SEVERAL EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES. THAT THERE ARE DIFFERENT SOCIAL SYSTEMS AND DIFFERENT IDEOLOGIES IS NO EXCUSE FOR THE DIMINISHMENT OF HUMAN CONTACTS. AS THE DISTINGUISHED REPRESENTATIVE OF AUSTRIA POINTED OUT LAST WEEK, "EVEN AMONG COUNTRIES WITH DIFFERENT SOCIAL SYSTEMS, PROBLEMS CONCERNING HUMAN CONTACTS NEED NOT ARISE." THE BORDERS BETWEEN AUSTRIA AND TWO OF ITS EASTERN

NEIGHBORS, IN THIS RESPECT, ARE NOW REMARKABLY OPEN. WE WELCOME THAT. WE PRAISE THE COUNTRIES INVOLVED. AGAIN, ALTHOUGH POLAND'S ISSUANCE OF PASSPORTS IS SOMETIMES ARBITRARY, IT IS UNDENIABLE THAT POLES ARE MORE FREE TO TRAVEL ABROAD AND TO EMIGRATE THAN THEY WERE FOUR YEARS AGO. WE WELCOME THAT. IT IS ONLY HONEST TO PRAISE REAL PROGRESS ENGENDERED BY THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT.

HERE I DO NOT WANT TO BE MISUNDERSTOOD. THE ORDINARY PEOPLE OF EASTERN EUROPE ARE FAR FROM BEING AS FREE AS THEY HAVE EVERY RIGHT TO BE. IN THESE MATTERS, THEORIES OF MORAL EQUIVALENCE ARE INTELLECTUALLY EMPTY. FOR COMMUNIST NATIONS, HUMAN CONTACTS BASED UPON INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND INDIVIDUAL CHOICE PRESENT PROFOUND DIFFICULTIES. WHEN PLANNERS PLAN HUMAN CONTACTS, ORDINARY HUMAN WILL -- UNPREDICTABLE AND UNCONTAINABLE -- IS AN ANNOYANCE, WHICH THEY CAN HARDLY HELP WANTING TO REDUCE, STEER AWAY, OR PREVENT. NONETHELESS, IT IS ADMIRABLE THAT SOME STATES, LED BY ELITES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, ARE TRYING TO INCORPORATE THE HELSINKI NOTIONS OF INDIVIDUAL CHOICE INTO THEIR PRACTICES. THIS IS A STEP FORWARD FOR MILLIONS OF ORDINARY PEOPLE, WHOSE EXPERIENCE CRIES ALOUD FOR IT.

THE THIRD POINT I WANT TO RAISE CONCERNS ONE SMALL CATEGORY OF HUMAN CONTACTS CASES: DIVIDED SPOUSES. BY THIS IS MEANT, IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, THE MARRIAGE OF TWO CITIZENS FROM TWO DIFFERENT STATES IN WHICH, FOR SOME REASON OR ANOTHER, ONE OF THE TWO MARRIED SPOUSES IS PREVENTED BY STATE AUTHORITIES FROM LEAVING THAT COUNTRY. ACCORDING TO THE FINAL ACT, ALL SUCH COUPLES SHOULD BE ABLE TO JOIN EACH OTHER IN TIMELY AND PERMANENT FASHION, AS THOSE INDIVIDUALS CHOOSE.

PLEASE NOTE, MR. CHAIRMAN, THAT MANY OF THOSE WHO PARTICIPATE IN HUMAN CONTACTS UNDER SEVERAL OF THE SUB-HEADINGS OF THE FINAL ACT -- IN SPORTS EVENTS, AS STUDENTS, AS TOURISTS, IN CULTURAL EXCHANGES, IN TRAVEL FOR PERSONAL OR PROFESSIONAL REASONS -- ARE YOUNG. FROM TIME TO TIME, THEY MEET OTHER YOUNG PEOPLE IN THEIR HOST COUNTRY. THEY FALL IN LOVE. THEY MARRY. WHAT COULD BE MORE NATURAL? WHAT COULD BETTER EXEMPLIFY "MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND CONCORD" ACROSS STATE FRONTIERS?

CONSIDER THE TWO LARGEST POPULATIONS REPRESENTED IN THIS ROOM, THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. WHEN U.S. CITIZENS MEET SOVIET CITIZENS, THEY OFTEN, QUITE SPONTANEOUSLY, LIKE ONE ANOTHER. WHEN YOUNG PERSONS FROM OUR TWO COUNTRIES MEET, THEY SOMETIMES FALL IN LOVE AND MARRY. MY DELEGATION -- AND, I AM SURE, THE SOVIET DELEGATION -- WISHES TO GO ON RECORD IN FAVOR OF LOVE AND ROMANCE. I BELIEVE ALL DELEGATIONS HERE WILL JOIN US. LOVE, BOTH FAITHFUL AND ROMANTIC, IS THE GREAT STORY OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION -- WHOSE BEWITCHMENTS NO ONE EVER BETTER DESCRIBED THAN THE GREAT SWISS WRITER, DENIS DE ROUGEMONT, IN LOVE IN THE WESTERN WORLD.

BETWEEN THE USSR AND THE USA, THERE ARE, AT THE PRESENT TIME, TWENTY-ONE CASES OF SEPARATED SPOUSES. SINCE OURS ARE

76
NATIONS OF 270 MILLION AND 235 MILLION CITIZENS RESPECTIVELY, SURELY WE CAN FIND A CONSTRUCTIVE WAY TO BRING SUCH PERSONS TOGETHER SWIFTLY, ROUTINELY, AND IN A POSITIVE SPIRIT. WE KNOW THIS CAN BE DONE, BECAUSE RECENTLY IT WAS DONE. AT THE TIME OF THE GENEVA SUMMIT, ELEVEN SUCH COUPLES WERE ALLOWED TO REUNITE. THEIR CASES WERE, IN ALL CRUCIAL RESPECTS, LIKE THE TWENTY-ONE REMAINING.

I HASTEN TO POINT OUT THAT APPROXIMATELY 100 MARRIAGES OCCUR EVERY YEAR IN THE SOVIET UNION BETWEEN AMERICAN AND SOVIET CITIZENS. THE SOVIET UNION SOLVES MOST OF THESE CASES AT THE FIRST, OR SECOND, OFFICIAL REQUEST. WE APPLAUD THIS COMPLIANCE WITH THE FINAL ACT. WE WERE ALSO GLAD TO SEE THE RELATIVELY SUDDEN SOLUTION OF 11 OF THE 33 LONG-STANDING CASES, ON THE OCCASION OF THE GENEVA SUMMIT.

THE HEARTBREAKING ASPECT OF THE REMAINING CASES HAS THREE ASPECTS. FIRST, THE REASONS GIVEN FOR DENIAL BY SOVIET OFFICIALS OFTEN VARY AND CONTRADICT EACH OTHER. SECOND, THE REASONS GIVEN SEEM NO DIFFERENT IN PRINCIPLE FROM THOSE OF THE CASES SOLVED ON THE OCCASION OF THE GENEVA SUMMIT. THIRD, THE REAL REASON SEEMS TO BE, NOT THE ONES EXPRESSED, BUT REASONS OF STATE.

NO WONDER, THEN, THAT THE DIVIDED SPOUSES ARE MADE TO FEEL LIKE PAWNS. THEY ARE SOMETIMES TOLD -- WE HAVE HEARD THE SAME WORDS IN THIS VERY ROOM -- THAT ON SUCH CASES AS THEIRS THERE WILL BE NO ACTION UNTIL THE INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL SITUATION IMPROVES. THIS MEANS THAT INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN THE SOVIET UNION ARE NOT UNALIENABLE. IT MEANS THAT INDIVIDUALS ARE REGARDED AS INSTRUMENTS OF THE STATE. IT MEANS THAT THE REAL REASON FOR NOT MOVING ON THESE CASES IS THE PRIORITY OF THE STATE OVER INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS. IT MEANS THAT THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT IS NOT PERMITTED TO FUNCTION FOR INDIVIDUAL SOVIET CITIZENS, BUT ONLY FOR THE SOVIET STATE.

MR. CHAIRMAN, WE HAVE BEEN TOLD THAT THE SOVIET UNION DOES NOT REGARD THE INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS INHERENT IN THE HELSINKI VISION OF HUMAN CONTACTS AS ENDS IN THEMSELVES, ONLY AS MEANS. THE SOVIET UNION DOES NOT REGARD INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AS "ABOVE" OTHER MATTERS, WE HAVE BEEN TOLD. BUT AS ITEMS TO BE TRADED, LIKE COMMODITIES, FOR OTHER COIN. FOR THE CITIZENS OF FREE NATIONS, THIS NOTION IS BOTH UNACCEPTABLE AND ABHORRENT TO WHAT THEY MEAN BY "HUMAN." INDIVIDUALS ARE NOT ANTS IN AN ANT-HILL, SHEEP IN A HERD, BEES IN A BEE-HIVE. THEY ARE SELF-DIRECTING CENTERS OF INSIGHT AND CHOICE.

IF CURRENT SOVIET AUTHORITIES REALLY DO REGARD THE HUMAN BEING AS AN INSTRUMENT OF POLICY, A PAWN UPON THE CHESS BOARD, A MEANS RATHER THAN AN END ITSELF, THEY ARE UNDERESTIMATING THE HISTORICAL GENIUS, THE COURAGE, AND THE CONSCIENCE OF GREAT PEOPLES WE HAVE ALL LEARNED TO LOVE AND ADMIRE.

MR. CHAIRMAN, MY DELEGATION BELIEVES THAT A NEW MOMENT MAY BE AT HAND IN THE SOVIET UNION, IN WHICH HUMAN BEINGS WILL COME AT LAST TO BE TREATED AS ENDS, NOT AS MEANS. HUMAN BEINGS, SO

26

MANY RUSSIAN ARTISTS HAVE TAUGHT US DOWN THE CENTURIES, ARE THE MOST VALUABLE AND PRECIOUS BEINGS IN THE UNIVERSE. THEY ARE SUCH BECAUSE OF THE BURNING CONSCIENCE WITHIN THEM, WHICH THE STATE CANNOT TAKE AWAY FROM THEM, WHETHER UNDER THE CZAR OR IN THE GULAG.

FOR THAT REASON, WE BELIEVE THAT SOVIET AUTHORITIES, UNDER FRESH LEADERSHIP, WILL TAKE A FRESH APPROACH TO HUMAN BEINGS -- AND FIRST OF ALL TO THESE FEW CASES OF LOVE DIVIDED, THE 21 SEPARATED SPOUSES.

AT GENEVA, FOR ELEVEN HAPPY COUPLES, SUCH A SOLUTION MEANT MERCY, BEYOND THE MERE LETTER OF THE LAW. AT GENEVA, IT MEANT GENEROSITY, BEYOND A NARROW SENSE OF THE "INTERESTS OF THE STATE." TO BRING THE REMAINING TWENTY-ONE COUPLES TOGETHER WILL ALSO REQUIRE STATESMANSHIP. IT WILL REQUIRE RESPECT FOR THE PROFOUND AND UNPREDICTABLE PATHS OF LOVE BETWEEN MAN AND WOMAN. TOLSTOY WOULD HAVE UNDERSTOOD THIS, AS WOULD ALL THE GREAT WRITERS AND POETS OF OUR MUTUAL HUMANISTIC AND LITERARY TRADITIONS. THERE ARE TIMES WHEN POLITICS AND IDEOLOGY MUST YIELD TO LOVE. HUMANE VALUES ARE DEEPER THAN POLITICS AND IDEOLOGY; THEY ARE, IN FACT, THEIR SOLE JUSTIFICATION.

SOME ISSUES BEFORE THIS EXPERTS MEETING ARE DIFFICULT AND INVOLVE LARGE NUMBERS. THESE CASES OF SEPARATED SPOUSES INVOLVE SMALL NUMBERS.

IN THE SECOND INSTANCE, I MUST ALSO POINT OUT THAT IN THREE OF THE PAIRS OF DIVIDED SPOUSES, BOTH SPOUSES WERE ORIGINALLY CITIZENS OF ONE COUNTRY, BUT ONE HAS BECOME A CITIZEN OF ANOTHER, AND IT IS IN THE LATTER THAT BOTH HAVE CHOSEN TO BE REUNITED. THE FINAL ACT CALLS FOR FAVORABLE ACTION IN SUCH CASES, TOO. ONE OF THESE COUPLES, ANATOLY AND GALINA MICHELSON, HAVE NOW BEEN HELD APART FOR THIRTY YEARS. WHEN STATES ARE POWERFUL, INTERNATIONAL IN THEIR REACH AND SCOPE, SECURE, MATURE -- SUCH STATES ACQUIRE NEW REASONS FOR SHOWING A POSITIVE SPIRIT ALSO IN SUCH CASES.

BERN MIGHT WELL MARK A NEW BEGINNING IN AT LEAST THIS ONE TYPE OF CASE, OF SUCH NUMERICAL SIMPLICITY. THEREFORE, MR. CHAIRMAN, CAN WE NOT RECOMMEND THAT ALL THE GOVERNMENTS SIGNATORY TO THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT AND THE MADRID CONCLUDING DOCUMENT CELEBRATE THE BERN MEETING BY RESOLVING THE RELATIVELY FEW CASES ON THE REPRESENTATION LISTS OF ALL OF US? CAN WE NOT WIPE THE SLATE CLEAN? LET THESE FEW PAINFULLY SEPARATED MEN AND WOMEN COME AT LAST TOGETHER. LET THERE BE PEACE IN THIS SMALL NUMBER OF HUMAN COUPLES -- AS A SYMBOL OF THE WIDER PEACE WE ALL SEEK. LET THERE COME FROM BERN A HARBINGER FOR ALL THE WORLD TO SEE AND TO ADMIRE.

THIS WOULD BE BUT A MODEST GESTURE, MR. CHAIRMAN. MY DELEGATION RECOMMENDS IT TO THE CONSIDERATION OF ALL THE DELEGATES GATHERED HERE IN BERN. THIS SPRING IN BERN, WE ARE MAKING A NEW BEGINNING. HERE ALL OF US ARE PLEDGING THAT OUR NATIONS WILL DO BETTER IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE HELSINKI FINAL ACT. WHAT WOULD CONSTITUTE A BETTER STARTING PLACE? THE

NUMBERS OF CASES ARE SMALL, AND LOVE BETWEEN MARRIED PERSONS TOUCHES HUMAN HEARTS EVERYWHERE. MY DELEGATION WOULD WELCOME -- AND FULLY PRAISE -- ALL STEPS MADE IN THIS DIRECTION. A SMALL GESTURE, WE WOULD REGARD IT AS QUITE SIGNIFICANT: WIPING THE SLATE CLEAN, FOR MERCY'S SAKE, IN THE NAME OF A NEW BEGINNING IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN CONTACTS.



NEWS PHOTO / JOSEPH F. WIEDELMAN

osse Pointe Yacht Club, Jeri Eckardt runs along the shore of Lake St. Clair accompanied by her dogs, Ms. Eckardt jogs four miles every day, a routine she has maintained for the last five years.

Congress to hear divided spouses' plea

Detroit lawyer Keith Braun, like more than two dozen other Americans separated from family members in the Soviet Union, wants his plight to be part of the agenda when U.S. and Soviet leaders meet in Washington later this month.

To that end, the Divided Spouses Coalition, of which Braun, 27, is a leader, will meet with Deputy Secretary of State John C. Whitehead Sept. 12, a week before Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze arrives for talks with U.S. officials.

It will be the first gathering of the group — which includes Americans separated from spouses and, in some cases, children — since February and will include sessions with members of Congress, Braun said.

"We want these violations of the rights of U.S. citizens to be considered part of the bilateral talks," he said. "We must send a message to the Soviets that they cannot intentionally violate the Helsinki agreements and still build confidence among Americans that they can comply with arms control pacts."

"The situation has gotten worse since early this year," said Braun who married his wife, Svetlana, Aug. 9, 1984. Since then, he has seen her only six times, most recently during a two-week visit that ended June 8. He has written nearly 600 letters to her and telephones each week, at a cost of about \$100 an hour.

"There was no secret about our intentions when we got married," he said. "The Soviets married us and they knew then."

Svetlana, 23, recently graduated as an engineer and soon will apply for an exit visa for the fourth time. Her third application to come to the United States was denied in late June.

U.S. State Department lists show 21 divided families — including the Brauns — have cases pending before the Soviet government.

News Staff Writer Robert Aikens



Keith Braun

NE

PROFESSIONAL SEMINAR CONSULTANTS, INC.

established 1967

OFFICE OF CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION

established 1980

RALPH H. FOLSOM, J.D., LL.M.

Director

JOHN H. MINAN, J.D., MBA.

Associate Director

Office of Continuing Legal Education

Professional Seminar Consultants

Professors of Law

University of San Diego

School of Law

619-260-4600

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Barbara B. Aldave

Professor of Law
University of Texas
School of Law

Michael W. Gordon

Professor of Law
University of Florida
College of Law

Peter B. Maggs

Professor of Law
University of Illinois
College of Law

Christopher Osakwe

Professor of Law
Tulane University
Law School

Kathleen M. Price

Professor of Law
University of Minnesota
Law School

John B. Quigley, Jr.

Professor of Law
Ohio State University
College of Law

Cynthia A. Samuel

Professor of Law
Tulane University
Law School

Paul B. Stephan, III

Professor of Law
University of Virginia
School of Law

Glen E. Weston

Professor of Law
George Washington University
National Law Center

CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS

3194 Lawson Boulevard
Oceanside, New York 11572
(516) 536-7292

Marvin E. Weisberg

President
CM-633-21

Paul V. Elmstrom

Vice President

KRESGE'S

Also Available At ...

MAKING CONTACT

Anncr:

Next, a VOA Editorial, reflecting the views of the U.S. Government.

Voice:

The Swiss city of Bern is now the focus of intense interest for many people living on both sides of the boundary dividing Europe. There, the thirty five nations that signed the Helsinki Accords are reviewing the status of human contacts between the people of East and West.

"Human contacts" is the phrase the Helsinki Final Act uses to cover all kinds of programs that bring people together, exchanges involving everyone from scholars and scientists to sports stars. But the most urgent issue under discussion in Bern is the matter of *restoring* the most fundamental of all human contacts: between husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, parents and children who, while members of the same family, are citizens of different governments. They are people for whom the split between East and West has meant the separation of families.

A fundamental fact divides the nations that joined together to sign the Helsinki Accords. Not all nations are alike in respecting the right of every person to emigrate.

The Helsinki Accords make clear that uniting divided families is a humanitarian matter, not subject to the changing winds of political relations. But in many Eastern Bloc regimes, reunification of families is overshadowed by the political considerations of states wary of giving their people freedom to choose whether to leave or stay. More than a quarter of a million East Germans await permission to join their relatives in the West. In the Soviet Union, ordinary people are often alleged to possess "state secrets" that prevent their leaving. In other cases, Soviet

authorities have said that permission to join family members in America is a casualty of "the poor state of bilateral relations" -- despite the language of Helsinki. In systems where private rights and relations have no claim against the state, the political aims of governments create immense private anguish.

Sometimes, of course, families are reunited. But the method is arbitrary, and releases do not guarantee that the policy will change, or that similar cases will also be resolved. The ordinary waiting period is measured in years.

No one has waited longer than Anatoly and Galina Michelson. Married many years ago in the Soviet Union, the Michelsons have been separated since Anatoly left that country during the post-Stalin "thaw" in 1956, hoping that a new era of liberalized emigration laws would allow his wife to join him in the West. That was thirty years ago. Soviet authorities have denied Mrs. Michelson permission to join her husband twenty two times since then. Once, after authorities promised an exit visa, Mrs. Michelson sold everything she owned, and prepared to meet her husband. Final permission never came. That was nineteen years ago.

No one can replace the three decades Soviet authorities took from the Michelsons. Anatoly, now sixty seven years old, is in poor health. His wife is legally blind. Mr. Michelson wants only to live the rest of his life with his wife -- and the daughter he last saw as a little girl, as well as the granddaughter he has never met. "I don't have another thirty years to wait," he says.

At the time of the Geneva summit, the Soviet Union allowed some families to reunite. But hundreds of people remain separated. Let expanded "human contacts" between our nations take place as old contacts are renewed, and let the bonds of families once split apart be joined again.

Anncr:

That was a VOA Editorial, reflecting the views of the U.S. Government.

Sonia Melnikova-Eichenvald
Ulitsa Sedova, 10, 2, 66
Moscow USSR 129323
180-7794
Born March 17, 1947, Moscow

Michael N. Lavigne
1529 Visalia Avenue
Berkeley, California 94707
(415) 527-8563
Born September 16, 1946, New Jersey

Michael and Sonia met in November, 1983, and were married in Moscow by the relevant authorities on April 25, 1985.

Before marriage to Michael, Sonia had been refused twelve times since 1979 to join her sister in the West. No reasonable explanation was ever given.

As Michael's wife, Sonia was refused permission to go to the United States twice, on August 10, 1985 and on March 17, 1986. She was also refused twice on appeal. The reason: "It is undesirable for you to join your husband in the United States."

Sonia had been an architect, but lost her job upon her first application to emigrate. Michael, giving up his work in a large American advertising agency, was able to stay in Moscow for almost three years, first on as a nanny for a family in the American Embassy and then as an administrative assistant at the New Zealand Embassy. When, on May 10, 1986, he had to travel to America for family reasons, his visa was considered expired, and he was not allowed to return.

Sonia will apply again in September 1986.

TRANSLATION

The following letter was sent to 100 Soviet organizations including newspapers, magazines, party and government agencies.

Dear Comrades:

We, citizens of the USSR, are united by a single fate--we are separated from our spouses, citizens of the United States. We turn to you for assistance.

Each of us ~~ix~~ married an American citizen in accordance with Soviet laws. Our marriages were concluded in Moscow at the Palace of Marriages No. 1 in the presence of witnesses. We were given marriage licenses attesting to our union. The Moscow City Soviet of Deputies wished us happiness and joy in our lives together.

Soviet law does not forbid marriages with citizens of other countries. These families have the right to freely choose their place of residence in the country of either spouse. This law not only does not allow administrative agencies to intervene in this choice, but on the contrary guarantees all necessary assistance in resolving practical problems.

In accordance with this law our families have chosen the United States as our place of residence. This has been denied in each of our cases. The majority of us have never received an explanation of the reasons for this denial; we have never received assurances that at some future time our cases will be resolved.

After our marriages we were all separated. Some of us have not seen our spouses for years, while others have had only short visits when spouses were able to come to the USSR. We, the Soviet spouses, are not allowed even such visits. Children are growing up without having seen their fathers; others will be born into a world with no father.

We are people just like you. We love our husbands, wives and children. We have committed no crimes and we have nothing against the Soviet people. We want peace for all and basic human happiness for ourselves. Why must we pay such a high price for the right to have a family when this right is unconditionally guaranteed by Soviet law?

You who read this letter will go home tonight, you will kiss your husband or wife, you will play with your children and sit down to supper in the circle of your family. Think about us and do everything in your power to help us. We hope that you will deem it possible to support our efforts to reunite our families with party and state agencies.

With respect,

Roman Kuperman
Svetlana Braun
Matvey Finkel
Sophia Melnikova-Eichenwald
Tamara Tretyakova
Dmitri Vlasenkov
Sergei Petrov

27

SELF-INTERVIEW WITH SOVIET-AMERICAN DIVIDED SPOUSES GATHERED ON 20 MAY 1986 NEAR THE MONUMENT TO A.I. HERTZEN AND N.P. OGAREV AT THE LENIN HILLS IN MOSCOW

WHO ARE WE?

We are Soviet citizens, husbands, wives and children of American citizens, with whom we are artificially divided. All of us have for many years appealed to Soviet authorities with only one request: to let us live together with our families in the country of our choice--the United States; to not destroy our families, our lives, the lives of our children. All of us have received refusals to our appeal with no legal reason, with no explanation. We all live in lasting separation from those dear to us. Galina Goltzman-Michelson and her daughter Olga are "veterans": they have not seen their husband and father for thirty years; he has never seen his grandson. Yuri Balovlenkov, who has been trying to join his wife and two daughters since 1978, has never seen his youngest child, and saw his older daughter only once. Here also are Tamara Tretyakova and her son Mark who is eight. Mark has never seen his father, although he speaks by telephone to him every week. A letter to his father saying "Daddy, I want to be with you very much" was recently published by the American magazine U.S. News and World Report, together with photographs of everyone present today. Sergei Petrov is also here. He has seen his wife only twice in five years. The fate of Susan Graham and Matvey Finkel is only a little happier than the rest: after many years of struggle and refusals U.S. citizen Susan Graham was permitted to live temporarily in Moscow, not however because she was married to Matvey, but because she, a philologist with a master's degree, managed to find a job as a nanny in the family of a western correspondent. But Matvey and Susan see further separation ahead as they have decided that their first child, expected in early January, should be born in the United States where he will be welcome and will not face the ordeal which his parents now face. Such "happiness" is clearly ephemeral: Sonia Melnikova-Eichenwald's husband Michael Lavigne also sacrificed his career of a copywriter in California and was ready to do any work in Moscow which would give him the chance to stay with his wife. He worked as a nanny for two children in the family of an American diplomat, as an administrative assistant in a small western embassy, etc., but when his last contract expired he inevitably had to leave the USSR. For over half a year Svetlana Braun has been waiting for a brief visit from her husband. For just a month, a "generous" gift from the Soviet authorities, this couple will be a family again. What then? Again bitter parting at Sheremetyevo and long months, perhaps years, waiting for the next meeting. And any such meeting may prove to be the last. This happened to the Kuperman-Pergericht family. A year passed after their last meeting. A daughter, Natalie, was born recently in America. But the young mother and the new-born baby are refused even a short visit to the USSR. In the Soviet press now an entire campaign is unfolding, using the story of one unhappy couple, which has not survived the eight-year ordeal of separation, to blacken and discredit all divided couples. They try to show us as immoral people, as toys in the hands of the State Department. Our marriages, completed in full agreement with Soviet law, are being cynically ridiculed. Even the fact that some of us have children and some even grandchildren, even long years of our loyalty to each other do not convince the authors of these articles in our genuine feelings and genuine suffering. In such conditions of persecution and badgering our lives are becoming absolutely unbearable.

IS THERE ANY OFFICIAL EXPLANATION FOR OUR SITUATION?

No. OVIR just gives us oral replies and does not give any official reason. We appealed as a group to various Soviet legal bodies: the Ministry of Justice, Public Prosecutor's Office, legal newspapers and magazines--requesting a reply as to any legal obstacles preventing our exit from the USSR. All addressees admitted their incompetence in this question.

IS IT POSSIBLE THAT THOSE WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR OUR PROBLEM VALUE OUR CONTRIBUTION TO SOVIET SCIENCE, ECONOMY AND ART SO MUCH THAT IT BECOMES AN OBSTACLE TO OUR LEAVING?

The following facts not only answer this question but also cast light on our real position

Tamara Tretyakova, an engineer, lost her job when she first applied to join her husband in 1978. Having survived polio as a child, she is an invalid. She found a job in a special artel for handicapped people and works at home making boxes for medicines. She earns about 8 rubles per month which obviously does not provide a living wage, but it protects her, the mother of an eight-year-old son, whom Tamara raises without her husband, from ridiculous accusations of a so-called "parasitic way of life".

Roman Kuperman lost his job as a biologist in a scientific^{research} institute. It proved to be "incompatible" with his marriage to an American. Roman works as a messenger with a 70 ruble salary. Sonia Melnikova-Eichenwald lost her job as an architect long before she married Michael. In 1979 she first applied for reunification with her only sister, who emigrated in 1976. This application was denied 10 times in 5 years. Having no means of subsistence, Sonia earned a living by taking in occasional drafting work. Matvey Finkel, an engineer-metallurgist, sells monthly passes for the subway. Galina Goltzman has worked all 30 years since her husband has been in the U.S. at a clothing factory. She is now retired on a 70 ruble per month pension. Her daughter Olga was not permitted to get a higher education. She has changed jobs many times because she is fired each time she renews her application to join her father. Yuri Balovlenkov, a computer engineer, has not worked in his profession since 1978. After two long hunger strikes, which ended in the still unfulfilled promise of UVIR to give him an exit visa in January 1985, his health is so undermined that employment is a serious problem. Sergei Petrov is a professional photographer. After he married an American he lost any chance to get a job and was expelled from the Union of Photographers. His hunger strike in 1982 attracted international public attention to his case but closed the doors of Soviet publishing houses forever.

WHY WE CHOSE TODAY TO GET TOGETHER

Today, 20 May 1986, is a very special day for us for many reasons. Exactly six months ago General Secretary Gorbachev met in Geneva with President Reagan. This meeting inspired new hopes among all peoples of the world for a better and safer future. It also raised our hopes, because just before the summit ten Soviet spouses received permission to join their American husbands and wives. We can only speculate about what prevented Soviet authorities from solving in this humanitarian manner the other 10-15 remaining divided spouses cases and about how the "lucky ones" were chosen. Half a year has passed since then but none of those remaining here received permission. On the contrary, new refusals followed. We are entering the second half of the year following the Geneva Summit with our hopes fading. We look now to the horizon for the next summit meeting. Will it take place? What will it bring mankind? What will it bring for our families?

Today also marks the ~~last~~ sixth and final week of the Bern Conference on Human Contacts, attended by the signatory countries of the Helsinki Agreement. We know that the head of the American delegation Michael Novak presented our cases to the conference. Some of our spouses were invited to Bern and spoke to the delegates about our tragic situation. Some delegates listened to these testimonies with tears in their eyes. We wish to believe that these words reached the Soviet representatives as well. Not before, not during this conference were any of our families reunited. Today the last week of the conference begins. What will it bring for us?

This week also marks three months since the opening of the 27th Party Conference and of General Secretary Gorbachev's political report. M.S. Gorbachev spoke directly of the necessity "to decide in a humane and positive spirit the question of family reunification and marriages". This he included among the most important measures needed to create a complete system of international security. Our problem alone among those mentioned by Gorbachev does not demand enormous expense and effort from all sides, but merely a genuinely humane approach to resolve the issue as quickly as possible. Our letters to the Party Congress went unanswered or followed their usual route to the Ministry of the Interi

Another more modest reason but still significant for us, today is the 29th birthday of Roman Kuperman. Dear Roma--we wish you a happy birthday and from our hearts wish that you will soon be together with your wife and daughter, not just for a week or a month but forever.

WHY DID WE CHOOSE THIS PLACE FOR OUR MEETING?

160 years ago in 1826 two young boys came to this place and standing on the steep slope of the Vorobyev (now Lenin) Hills they embraced and swore to sacrifice their lives for the struggle against tyranny and serfdom, for freedom and happiness for all people. These two friends were to become the revolutionaries-democrats Alexander Hertzzen and Nikolai Ogarev. Both friends stayed true to their oath at the Vorobyev Hills ~~and~~ for the rest of their lives, which they both ended in emigration. 20 years ago the ashes of Ogarev were brought back to Moscow and interned at the Novo-Devichy Monastery. Ten years ago Moscow authoriti

decided to erect a monument at this place to honor the friendship of these two great men. The work was completed by two sculptors, also friends. This work proved to be the last for one of them: after an unsuccessful attempt to emigrate for Israel he was deprived of all possibility for creative work.

WHY WE HOLD THE SLOGAN WITH THE LATIN WORDS "VIVOS VOCO"

These words translate as "Appeal to the Living". They were the motto of the newspaper published in emigration by Hertzzen and Ogarev. It was a call to people to fight injustice. It was proposed to engrave these words on the monument but the authorities refused. We pay honor to Hertzzen and Ogarev by bringing these words to their monument. These words have special symbolic meaning for us as well. During the long years of our struggles to be reunited with our families we have appealed over and over to all possible Soviet government, party, administrative, publishing and legal bodies, to Soviet writers, artists composers, to the Soviet people to support us. Sometimes they expressed their sympathy but noone really tries to help us. Pleading their incompetence, all the addressees pass our letters to the visa department of the Ministry of the Interior, where we are informed by phone or in person that we are refused again. Many of us appealed to Brezhnev, to Andropov, to Chernenko. As a young woman, Galina Goltzman even appealed to Khrushchev. These people are all now dead, so we readdress our appeal to the living.

Respected Members of the Central Committee and Politburo of the Communist Party of the USSR--

Respected Members of the Soviet Government--

Respected General Secretary Gorbachev--

HEAR US!

Signatories of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights--

Signatories of the Helsinki Final Act--

All people who care for the fate of mankind and for the fate of individuals who make up humanity--

HEAR US!
VIVOS VOCO!

Yuri Balovlenkov
Svetlana Braun
Galina Goltzman-Michelson
Roman Kuperman
Sonia Melnikova-Eichenwald
Sergei Petrov
Tamara Tretyakova
Matvey Finkel