

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH
31st August, 1977

ISD/163

78

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Political Committee

From: T. Solesby

As agreed at the Political Committee meeting on 23rd August, 1977, I attach draft overall summaries of the four main sections of the country papers on human contacts (ISD/140(Revised)). The attached drafts would be revised by the International Secretariat when we receive the final country paper texts now being prepared by those Allies taking part. Similar overall summaries would also be prepared by the Secretariat for the country papers on information (ISD/144(Revised)).

If you have any comments I should be grateful to receive them by 9th September.

Enclosures.

(This summary has been compiled by the Secretariat on their own responsibility)

HUMAN CONTACTS

FAMILY MEETINGS: OVERALL SUMMARY

According to the attached country papers, considerable difficulties still exist as regards family visits from Eastern countries to the West, although the problems are not as widespread or intense as for family reunification. The main obstacle in some countries is refusal of applications, especially to certain categories of applicants, with some lack of priority for urgent cases. Even where the attitude towards applications is more flexible, restrictions on foreign currency and the need for affidavits of support cause considerable difficulties. The most restrictive countries are the USSR, Romania, GDR (non-urgent working age), with Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia only recently showing some small signs of lessening their highly restrictive approach to cases involving "illegals".

Family visits from the West into Eastern countries are far easier, though significant problems still exist. The most restrictive attitudes are shown by Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia to "illegals", though there have been some small signs of greater flexibility.

In general there have been only modest improvements since Helsinki, and the basic attitudes remain unchanged.

CURRENT PRACTICES

The attached country papers appear to show that the following are the main obstacles in the current practices of Eastern countries to freer movement as regards family meetings (though the position differs from country to country).

Family visits from Eastern countries

(i) The undertaking to consider applications "favourably" is only imperfectly and unevenly implemented. The basic difficulty is that many applications to leave Eastern countries for family meetings are still refused, often repeatedly over many months or years.

(ii) Certain categories of applicants experience particular difficulties either for economic reasons (e.g. those of working age (especially males), specialists, professionals) or for political/"legal" reasons (e.g. visits to "illegal" emigrants, politically unorthodox applicants or relatives).

(iii) In most countries "cases of urgent necessity" are not given "priority treatment" and indeed are refused.

(iv) "The preparation and issue" of exit documents is often not effected "within reasonable time limits". The completion of

ISD/163

applications is especially difficult and time-consuming, and the subsequent consideration of applications by authorities can take a long time.

(v) Applications sometimes do "modify the rights ... of the applicant or member of his family". Though rarer and less serious than in the case of family reunification, persistent applicants for family meetings occasionally experience some discrimination.

(vi) Families from all countries cannot travel together because of the need to leave one member behind as a "hostage".

(vii) Visits cannot always be taken "on a regular basis" because of limits to frequency and duration.

(viii) Other procedural difficulties include difficulty in obtaining information on procedures, and failure by all countries to give the reason for a refusal or even in some cases to notify the refusal at all.

(ix) Fees are not always "acceptable".

(x) Currency restrictions in all countries considerably inhibit family visits abroad. Affidavits of support are sometimes compulsory: even when not compulsory they are a practical necessity or highly desirable in order to circumvent the severe difficulties caused by currency restrictions.

(xi) In considering applications, an unduly restrictive interpretation is often placed on what relationships qualify as "family" for purposes of Family Meetings.

(xii) Applications are often dealt with subject to "distinction as to the country of origin or destination". It is frequently easier to visit relatives in Socialist countries. The following differences have been noted in some countries: applicants have a higher chance of success and, to varying degrees, fees are lower, no affidavit of support is required, procedures are easier, time limits are longer, no "hostage" is required.

(xiii) It is sometimes difficult to obtain access to Western Embassies for the purpose of seeking information on procedures to be followed.

Family visits into Eastern countries

(xiv) While the obstacles to the entry of Western visitors to Eastern countries for family visits are far fewer than those to the exit of would-be Eastern visitors, applications for certain categories of people are still sometimes refused or subject to long delays; and several Eastern countries have compulsory requirements to exchange a minimum amount of foreign currency.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE HELSINKI

Family visits from Eastern countries

Some Allies have experienced a limited rise in the number of Eastern visitors for family meetings from several Eastern countries; but the pattern has been uneven, with other Allies experiencing no improvement or even a deterioration. In the case of Romania the overall balance has been downwards. There has been a little less discrimination by a few Eastern countries against certain categories of applicants (working age, to visit "illegal" emigrants), and a few instances of quicker handling of urgent cases.

In addition, some Eastern countries have made small procedural improvements (less delay, less expensive documents, more foreign exchange) but there has been limited deterioration also (more delay, harder access to Western Embassies).

Family visits into Eastern countries

Some Allies have noted a small improvement in handling difficult applications, but there has also been some small deterioration. Compulsory currency conversion regulations have been both slightly improved and worsened.

Note: The tables are intended for use together with the attached country papers. It is possible only to give an approximate idea in the tables of comparative performances.

FAMILY VISITS FROM EASTERN COUNTRIES

While the country papers appear to show that all countries marked with X in the tables cause significant difficulties in the aspects indicated, the following would seem to have a particularly restrictive attitude towards family visits from Eastern countries to the West: USSR, Romania; Bulgaria ("illegals")?, Czechoslovakia ("illegals")? GDR (non-urgent working age).

	USSR	BULGARIA	CSSR	GDR	HUNGARY	POLAND	ROMANIA
Refusal of applications	X ++	X ++	X ϕ ++	X ϕ ++	m ++	m ϕ ++	X ϕ ++
Discrimination in treatment of applications for economic reasons (e.g. working age, specialists)	X	X	m	X ++	m ++	(?)	X
Discrimination in treatment of applications for political/"legal" reasons (e.g. "illegals")	X	X ++	X ++	(?)	X	(?)	(?)
Refusal or delay in urgent cases	m ++	m	X	m	O	O	X
Delay in (a) completing application (b) processing application(*)	X m/X	X O ++	X O	X O	m O	X O/m	X m ϕ
Measures against applicants	m	m	O	O	m	m	m
Family "hostage"	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Limits to (1) frequency of visits (2) duration of visits	m O	m m	m m	m X	X m	O O	X O
Information on procedures not easily available	X	O	O	O	O	O	m
Reason for refusal not given	X	X	X	X	m	X	X
High cost of exit documents (**)	X ++	m	O	O	O	m	O
Restrictions on foreign currency	m	X	X ++	X ++	X ++	X	X
Need for affidavit of support	O	X	X	X	X	X	X
Restrictive interpretation of "family"	X(?)	X	X ++	X	m ++	(?)	(?)
Discrimination in favour of Socialist countries	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	probably not
Access to Western Embassies	X	X	O	m ϕ	O	O	m

FAMILY VISITS TO EASTERN COUNTRIES

Refusal or delay in granting applications in "difficult" cases	X	X ++	X ++	X ϕ ++	m	X	m
Compulsory currency conversion	(?)	O	X ϕ	X	X	m	O ++

Difficulties encountered from Current Practices

X great-considerable difficulties
m small-moderate difficulties
O very little or no difficulty

Developments since Helsinki

++ small/moderate improvement for several Allies; or, considerable improvement for one or two Allies and small/none for others
 ϕ small/moderate deterioration
 $\phi\phi$ marked deterioration

Note (*) O - up to 3 months
m - 4-6 months
X - 7 months plus

(**) O - one week's average earnings or less
m - about two weeks
X - more than two weeks

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

(This summary has been compiled by the Secretariat on their own responsibility)

HUMAN CONTACTS

FAMILY REUNIFICATION: OVERALL SUMMARY

According to the attached country papers, this appears to be the area of most difficulty within the human contacts field. The main obstacle is refusal of applications, especially to certain categories of applicants, and in some countries lack of priority for urgent cases. The other main obstacle is discrimination against and harassment of applicants and their families. In addition there are substantial obstacles of a procedural nature. The most restrictive countries are the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Romania and GDR (working age); with Bulgaria as well as Czechoslovakia only recently showing some small signs of lessening their highly restrictive approach to cases involving "illegals". In general there have been only modest improvements in this area since Helsinki, and the basic attitudes remain the same. Two Allies have experienced certain considerable improvements, but special factors have been present.

CURRENT PRACTICES

The attached country papers appear to show that the following are the main obstacles in the current practices of Eastern countries to freer movement as regards family reunification (though the position differs from country to country).

(i) The undertaking to consider applications "in a positive and humanitarian spirit" is only imperfectly and unevenly implemented. The basic difficulty is that many applications to leave Eastern countries for family reunification are still refused, often repeatedly over many months or years. In several countries the refusal of first applications is almost the normal pattern. Cases on representation lists of Allied Embassies receive somewhat better treatment, often only after repeated intervention, sometimes at the highest levels.

(ii) Certain categories of applicants experience particular difficulties either for economic reasons (e.g. those of working age (especially males), specialists, professionals) or for political/"legal" reasons (e.g. reunification with "illegal" emigrants, politically unorthodox applicants or relatives).

(iii) Some cases involving the reunification of children (including minors) with their parents are among those which are still refused or subject to long delays: though now relatively few in number the humanitarian arguments for their solution are strong.

(iv) Urgent cases are often not given "special attention" and indeed are refused.

(v) Applications are often not dealt with "as expeditiously as possible". The completion of application procedures is very difficult and time-consuming in all countries and subsequent consideration of applications by authorities can take a long time in most of them.

(vi) In all but one country applications do frequently "modify the rights ... of the applicant ... or of his family" who suffer discrimination and harassment.

ISD/163

(vii) Other procedural difficulties include difficulty in obtaining information on procedures (much more so than for family meetings and travel), and failure by all countries to give the reason for refusals or even in some cases to notify the refusal at all.

(viii) Fees are not always "at a moderate level".

(ix) There are often high additional compulsory payments in the way of re-imburements to the state for education costs.

(x) Applications can sometimes not be renewed at "reasonably short intervals"; fees are often charged on renewals and not just "only when applications are granted" (though fees on renewals are sometimes low).

(xi) "Meetings and contacts" may not always take place while applications are still under consideration.

(xii) In considering applications restrictive interpretation is often placed on what relationships qualify as "family" for the purposes of Family Reunification.

(xiii) The amount of "household and personal effects" which successful applicants can take with them is sometimes very limited. Property sometimes has to be sold at low prices and some belongings are confiscated.

(xiv) "Distinction as to the country of origin or destination" is made in some Eastern countries, where it is easier to obtain permission to leave for family reunification in other Socialist countries.

(xv) It is sometimes difficult to obtain access to Western Embassies in order to seek information on procedures.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE HELSINKI

In general there has been only little improvement since Helsinki, and the basic attitudes remain unchanged.

Two Allies have experienced substantial increases in family reunifications from the Soviet Union, GDR, Poland and Romania, but extraneous factors have been present. The improvement has not always been maintained: in particular, since late 1976 the GDR has taken a harder line with applications for the FRG, as well as refusing to accept re-applications and preventing family visits to applicants.

Other Allies have found little if any improvement with the Soviet Union as regards the rate of family reunifications and one Ally has experienced a much slower resolution rate.

Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Romania have made an effort to improve their bad record by resolving some outstanding cases on several representation lists. For Czechoslovakia these mainly involved children. The improvement by Romania in recent months followed a considerable initial hardening of attitude after Helsinki (except towards one Ally). Apart from its special treatment of the FRG, the GDR has been relatively forthcoming on outstanding cases to one Ally. A similar improvement has been noted by one Ally with Poland, but another has experienced backlog.

Some slight easing of attitude towards reunification with "illegal" emigrants can be seen especially in Bulgaria and GDR but with some hardening of interpretation of "family" by the Soviet Union and Poland.

There have been some small procedural improvements (less delay, simpler procedures, less expensive documentation, lower fees for renewals, shortening of period between renewals) but also some small deterioration (more difficult procedures).

A notable deterioration has been the increased campaign against applicants in Romania.

PERFORMANCE OF INDIVIDUAL EASTERN COUNTRIES

Note: The tables are intended for use together with the attached country papers. It is possible only to give an approximate idea in the tables of comparative performances.

FAMILY REUNIFICATION

While the country papers appear to show that all countries marked with X in the tables cause significant difficulties in the aspects indicated, the following would seem to have a particularly restrictive attitude towards family reunification from Eastern countries to the West: USSR, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria ("illegals"?) , GDR (working age).

	USSR	BULGARIA	CSSR	GDR	HUNGARY	POLAND	ROMANIA
Refusal of applications (a) overall	X ++	X	X	X ++ ϕ	m	X ++	X ++ ϕ
(b) on representation lists	X ϕ	o/m ++	m ++	m ++	m ++ ϕ (?)	m ++ ϕ	X/m ++
Discrimination in treatment of applications for economic reasons	(?)	(?)	m	X	X	X	X (?)
Discrimination in treatment of applications for political/"legal" reasons (e.g. "illegals" abroad)	X	X ++	X ++(?)	(?)	X	X	X(?)
Refusal of children cases	X (?)	m	m (?)++	X	O	O	O(?)
Refusal or delay in urgent cases	X	X	X	X	O	O	X
Delay in (a) completing applications	X ++	X ++ ϕ	X	X	X	X	X
(b) processing applications(*)	m o	o ++	o	X(?)++	o	m(?)	m/X
Measures against applicants	X	X	X	X	m	m	X ϕϕ
Information on procedures not easily available	X	X	(?)	(?)	o	X	m
Reason for refusal not given	X	X	X	X	m	X	X
High cost of exit documents (**)	X ++	m	o	o	m ++	X	m
High additional compulsory payments e.g. education costs	(?)	m	X	o	(?)	X	X
Unable to renew applications at short intervals	m ++	m	o	X ϕ	o	o	o
Fees charged for renewals	o ++	m	m	m	o	m	m
Unable to make family meetings while applications pending	X	o	m	X ϕ	m	o	o
Restrictive interpretation of "Family"	X	(?)	(?)	m ++	m (?)	X ϕ	(?)
Undue limitation on personal effects, confiscation, etc. of property	X	m (?)	m	o	m (?)	o	X
Discrimination in favour of Socialist countries	Yes	Probably	Yes	Probably	(?)	Probably none	Probably none
Access to Western Embassies	X	X	o	m ϕ	o	o	o

Difficulties encountered from Current Practices

X great-considerable difficulties
m small-moderate difficulties
o very little or no difficulty

Developments since Helsinki

++ small/moderate improvement for several Allies; or, considerable improvement for one or two Allies and small/none for others
ϕ small/moderate deterioration
ϕϕ marked deterioration

Note (*) O - up to 3 months
m - 4-6 months
X - 7 months plus

(**) O - one week's average earnings or less
m - about two weeks
X - more than two weeks

(This summary has been compiled by the Secretariat on their own responsibility)

HUMAN CONTACTS

BINATIONAL MARRIAGES: OVERALL SUMMARY

According to the attached country papers, this is an area in which considerable difficulties still exist. However, the difficulties are not so widespread as in the case of family reunification, and a degree of tolerance is shown even by the USSR and Czechoslovakia which take a hard line in some other areas of human contacts. Aspects which cause most hardship are permission to marry in some countries and to leave after marriage in other countries. The most restrictive (all as regards permission to marry) seem to be Romania and the GDR (though GDR/FRG treatment is more flexible) followed by Bulgaria. In general there have been only modest improvements since Helsinki, and the basic attitudes remain unchanged.

CURRENT PRACTICES

The attached country papers appear to show that the following are the main obstacles in the current practices of Eastern countries as regards binational marriages (though the position varies from country to country).

(i) The undertaking to consider applications "favourably and on the basis of humanitarian considerations" is only imperfectly and unevenly implemented. The basic difficulty is that a considerable number of applications to enter or leave for marriage, to marry and to leave after marriage, are still refused, sometimes repeatedly over many months or years. In some instances first applications seem to be refused almost as a normal pattern. In all countries, exit to marry can be difficult, in some countries impossible.

(ii) Certain categories of applicants experience particular difficulties for economic reasons (e.g. certain professions) or political/"legal" reasons (e.g. unorthodox fiancé(e), "illegal" emigrants). Males of Eastern countries have an especially difficult time.

(iii) Applications are often not dealt with speedily especially as regards marriage, exit after marriage and (the less frequent) exit for marriage visas.

(iv) Applications do sometimes "modify the rights ... of the applicant or of ... his family"; cases of discrimination and harassment occur.

(v) Other difficulties, as regards e.g. fees, re-applications, household and personal effects, which are encountered in family reunification are also experienced in leaving after marriage. (See Summary and Country Paper on Family Reunification.)

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE HELSINKI

Some modest evidence has been seen of a more forthcoming attitude towards applications in a few Eastern countries, and some Allies have experienced considerable improvement in Poland.

ISD/163

Some small easing of attitude towards marriage with "illegal" emigrants has been noted in Bulgaria. There has also been some lessening of delays in handling applications by a few Eastern countries. Romania's attitude on the other hand has significantly deteriorated as regards numbers of successful applications and the campaign against applicants, and in a lesser way, in its speed of handling applications to marry; although there has been some small improvement since late 1976 in Romania's resolution of outstanding cases on the representation lists of some Allied countries.

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

PERFORMANCE OF INDIVIDUAL EASTERN COUNTRIES

Note: The tables are intended for use together with the attached country papers. It is possible only to give an approximate idea in the tables of comparative performance.

BINATIONAL MARRIAGES

While the country papers appear to show that all countries marked with X in the tables cause significant difficulties in the aspects indicated, the following would seem to have a particularly restrictive attitude towards binational marriages: GDR, Romania, followed by Bulgaria.

	USSR	BULGARIA	CSSR	GDR	HUNGARY	POLAND	ROMANIA
Refusal of applications							
(a) to enter for marriage	m	m	m	0	0	0	0
(b) to leave for marriage	X	X(?)	X	m	m	m	m
(c) to marry	0	X ++	0	X ++	m	0	X φφ
(d) to leave after marriage	m	m	0	0	m	X ++	0
Discrimination in treatment of applications (economic, political "illegal")	X	X ++	m	0	X	0	0
Discrimination in treatment of applications involving males of Eastern countries	m	X	m	0(?)	X	m	0
Delay in dealing with applications							
(a) to marry	m	m/X φ	0 ++	X	0/m	0	X φ
(b) to leave after marriage	m ++	m	m ++	0/m	0	m/X	0/m
Measures against applicants	X	(?)	m(?)	X	0(?)	m ++	X φφ
Discrimination in favour of Socialist countries	Yes	Probably	Yes	Probably	(?)	probably none	possibly some

Difficulties encountered from Current Practices

- X great-considerable difficulties
- m small-moderate difficulties
- 0 very little or no difficulty

Developments since Helsinki

- ++ small/moderate improvement for several Allies; or, considerable improvement for one or two Allies and small/none for others
- φ small/moderate deterioration
- φφ marked deterioration

- Note (*)
- 0 - up to 3 months
 - m - 4-6 months
 - X - 7 months plus

- (**)
- 0 - one week's average earnings or less
 - m - about two weeks
 - X - more than two weeks

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

(This summary has been compiled by the Secretariat on their own responsibility)

HUMAN CONTACTSTRAVEL AND TOURISM: OVERALL SUMMARY

According to the attached country papers, considerable difficulties still exist as regards travel from Eastern countries to the West. However, these difficulties are less widespread and intense than for family meetings, reunification or marriage. The main obstacle in some countries is refusal of applications for travel and tourism, particularly as regards the USSR, Romania and GDR (non-urgent working age). The other major obstacle is lack of foreign currency. Private individuals are most restricted, but group tourism is also limited.

Entry by Western travellers into Eastern countries is relatively easy, though some problems still exist. The GDR seems the only Eastern country which does not encourage Western tourism (though it has many FRG visitors to families and friends).

In general there have been only modest improvements since Helsinki, and the basic attitudes remain unchanged.

CURRENT PRACTICES

The country papers appear to show that the following are the main obstacles in the current practices of Eastern countries to freer movement as regards travel and tourism (though the position varies from country to country).

Eastern travellers to the West

(i) There has been only imperfect and uneven implementation of the undertakings in the Final Act to "facilitate wider travel" and "promote the development of tourism". In particular many applications to leave Eastern countries for these purposes are refused or subject to long delay. The difficulties are especially great for private individuals. Opportunities for group tourism are also often very limited.

(ii) Some categories of applicants experience special difficulties e.g. certain professions and the politically unorthodox.

(iii) A major factor in limiting travel and tourism from all Eastern countries to the West is restriction on the availability of foreign currency (especially for private travel and tourism) in some countries. This is provided only once every few years, in several cases in amounts that make individual travel almost impossible without outside assistance. This restriction partly reflects economic difficulties but also the low priority for making currency available for this purpose.

(iv) Procedures are complex and time-consuming and consideration of applications can take a long time.

ISD/163

(v) Families cannot travel together because of the need in all Eastern countries to leave one member behind as a "hostage".

(vi) Legal limits are also often imposed on duration and/or frequency of visits.

(vii) The reason for refusals is often not given, and refusals are sometimes not even notified.

(viii) Exit documents are sometimes costly.

(ix) In some countries the cost of air tickets obtained there is artificially high.

(x) It is almost always easier to visit other Socialist countries.

(xi) It is sometimes difficult to obtain access to Western Embassies in order to seek information on procedures.

Western travellers to Eastern countries

There are far fewer obstacles to the entry of Western visitors to the East than vice versa. However there are still considerable difficulties.

(i) In some Eastern countries entry applications are refused or subject to long delay in difficult cases (e.g. ex-citizens, certain categories of professions).

(ii) In the GDR entry procedures are cumbersome and long.

(iii) Large areas of the Soviet Union are closed to foreigners.

(iv) For the GDR and Soviet Union fixed itineraries have to be agreed beforehand.

(v) Several Eastern countries have compulsory requirements to exchange a minimum amount of foreign currency which can be burdensome.

(vi) Some Eastern countries lay down various inhibiting requirements as regards accommodation e.g. prior hotel bookings.

(vii) Inadequacies in Eastern tourist facilities to some extent still inhibit the growth of tourism, including discriminating high cost of hotels in the Soviet Union.

(viii) There are examples of difficulties in the way of contacts and meetings between religious faiths, institutions, etc.

(ix) Bulgarian and Polish entry visas are not cheap, especially the Bulgarian border entry visa (single: about \$18) (though some tourists to Bulgaria do not need visas). This does not really constitute a significant obstacle.

General comments

The contrast between on the one hand the lack of restrictions by Western countries on travel abroad and the comparative ease with which Western tourists are allowed into Eastern countries, and the difficulty for Eastern nationals to leave their countries on the other hand, is reflected in the gap between the large numbers of Western travellers to Eastern countries and the smaller number of Eastern travellers to Western countries.

There are other difficulties, the removal of which would seem required by the general undertakings (Basket III main preamble, human contacts mini-preamble) to facilitate contacts as well as to facilitate freer movement (but which do not fall under any of the main sub-chapters of Basket III):-

- (a) imposition of unduly high duties on gifts and monies provided by persons in other States;
- (b) difficulties sometimes apparently experienced in telephone and letter communication with individuals in foreign countries.

DEVELOPMENTS SINCE HELSINKIEastern travellers to the West

There have been some increases in the numbers of travellers from some Eastern countries, sometimes mainly travelling for professional reasons (e.g. Czechoslovakia, Romania) and sometimes involving increases in group tourism to a few Allies (Bulgaria, Hungary, Soviet Union), but with only a few, if indeed any, more private individual travellers or tourists. Trends have in several cases shown increases for some Allies and decreases for others, but in the case of Romania a downward trend predominates except for professional travel.

Some Eastern countries increased their foreign currency allotments, though they remain low. The Soviet Union reduced the still high cost of its exit documentation.

Western travellers to Eastern countries

A notable small improvement was the abolition by Bulgaria of the compulsory currency conversion requirement; but Czechoslovakia raised their requirement still higher. Most Eastern countries continued to improve their tourist hotel facilities.

Since Helsinki several Eastern countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Soviet Union) have made proposals to Western countries for reciprocal agreements to ease visa controls; while it has sometimes been possible for Western countries to agree, in other instances the proposals cause difficulties for the Allies.

At the same time, while Eastern countries have sometimes accepted Western proposals to ease visa control, they have failed to accept most such proposals (Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Soviet Union).

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE

PERFORMANCE OF INDIVIDUAL EASTERN COUNTRIES

Note: The tables are intended for use together with the attached country papers. It is possible only to give an approximate idea in the tables of comparative performances.

EASTERN TRAVELLERS TO THE WEST

While the country papers appear to show that all countries marked with X in the tables cause significant difficulties in the aspects indicated, the following would seem to have a particularly restrictive attitude towards travel and tourism from Eastern countries to the West: USSR, Romania; GDR (non-urgent working age).

	USSR	BULGARIA	CSSR	GDR	HUNGARY	POLAND	ROMANIA
Refusal of applications (a) for professional visitors (state enterprises)	O ++	O	O ++	O	O	O	O ++
(b) for individual private travel/tourism	X	X	X ++	X +	O ++	O	X + (?)
(c) for group tourism	X +	m ++	m	X	O ++	O	X
Discrimination in treatment of applications for economic or political reasons	X	X	X	X	m	m	O
Restriction on foreign currency	X(?)	X	X ++	X ++	X ++	X	X
Delay in (a) completing applications	X	X	X	X	m	X	X
(b) processing applications (*)	O/m	O/m	O(?)	O/m	O	O	O/m
Family "hostage"	X	X(?)	X	X	X	X	X
Limits to (a) frequency of visits	(?)	m	X	m(?)	X/m	O	X
(b) duration of visits	O	m	X	X	m	O	O
Reason for refusal not given	X(?)	X	X	X	m	X	X
High cost of exit documents (**)	X ++	m	O	O	O	m	O
Discrimination in favour of Socialist countries	yes	yes	yes	great	yes	yes	probably not
Artificially high cost of air tickets from Eastern countries	O	X	X	O	O	O	O
Access to Western Embassies	X	X	O	m	O	O	m

WESTERN TRAVELLERS TO EASTERN COUNTRIES

Refusal or long delay in granting applications in difficult cases	X	X ++	X	X ++	O	O ++	O
Cumbersome and long procedures	O	O	O	X	O	O	O
Considerable closed areas	X	X	O	O	O	O	O
Need for prior itinerary	X	O	O	X	O	O	O
Compulsory currency conversion	O(?)	O ++	X	m	m	X	X ++(?)
Various requirements as regards accommodation	X	X	O	X	O	O	X ++(?)
Inadequate tourist facilities (hotels, etc.)	m ++	m ++	m ++	X	m ++	m ++	O ++
Difficulties for contacts among religious faiths	m	O(?)	X	O	O	O	O

Difficulties encountered from Current Practices

X great-considerable difficulties
 m small-moderate difficulties
 O very little or no difficulty

Developments since Helsinki

++ small/moderate improvement for several Allies; or, considerable improvement for one or two Allies and small/none for others
 + small/moderate deterioration
 ++ marked deterioration

Note (*) O - up to 3 months (**) O - one week's average earnings or less
 m - 4-6 months m - about two weeks
 X - 7 months plus X - more than two weeks

DECLASSIFIED - PUBLICLY DISCLOSED - PDN(2012)0003 - DÉCLASSIFIÉ - MISE EN LECTURE PUBLIQUE