

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

**Collection:** Speechwriting, White House Office of:  
Research Office, 1981-1989

**Folder Title:** 05/04/1988 Remarks: National Strategy  
Forum, Chicago, IL (Robinson-Griscom/Barbara) (3)

**Box:** 380

---

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](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

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

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

(Robinson)  
April 29, 1988  
12:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1988

Thank you, Morris, and thank you all. It's a pleasure to be back in Chicago -- Chicago always has been my kind of town -- and an honor to be able to speak to you, the members of the National Strategy Forum. I'll keep my remarks brief today so that we'll have ample time for questions. I often recall that George Washington gave an inaugural address of just over 100 words and went on to become a great President. Then there was William Henry Harrison. Harrison spoke at his inauguration for nearly 3 hours, caught pneumonia, and was dead within a month.

And I told Harrison to keep it short.

Now, preparing for the coming Moscow summit is, of course, a very earnest business, but I've discovered over the years that even U.S.-Soviet relations have their lighter side -- and it's become something of a habit with me to collect stories from inside the Soviet Union. I thought I might begin today by sharing one that has become a favorite of mine.

It seems an American and a Soviet were comparing political freedom in their two countries. The American boasted: "Why, I could go to the front gates of the White House and shout, 'Down with Reagan!' and nothing would happen to me."

"But comrade," answered the Soviet, "we have just the same freedom in the Soviet Union. I could go to the gates of the Kremlin, shout 'Down with Reagan!' and nothing would happen to me."

But as you know, our agenda for U.S.-Soviet relations has four main parts -- regional conflicts, bilateral exchanges, arms reductions, and human rights. I've spoken elsewhere at some length about the first three. Today I'd like to take a moment to discuss with you the subject dealt with in such an amusing but powerful way in the story I just told -- the subject of human rights.

We Americans of course use the phrase "human rights" often. We know that the promotion of human rights represents a central tenet of our foreign policy; we even believe that a passionate commitment to human rights is one of the special characteristics that helps to make America, America. And it is worth noting that the American emphasis on human rights represents much more than merely a vague respect for human dignity. No, part of our heritage as Americans is a very specific and definite understanding of human rights -- a definition of human rights that we can assert to challenge ourselves and our own institutions, and that we can hold up as a standard for all the world.

Ultimately, our view of human rights derives from our Judeo-Christian heritage and the view that each individual life is sacred. It takes more detailed form in the works of the French and English writers of the 18th-century Enlightenment. Government, they argued, should derive its mandate from the consent of the governed, this consent being expressed in free elections. And there you have the first human right, the right to have a voice in Government -- the right to vote.

Elected governments would reflect the will of the majority, but the Enlightenment writers and our own Founding Fathers gave the concept of human rights still more definite, specific form. For they held that each individual has certain rights that are so basic, so fundamental to his dignity as a human being, that no government -- however large the majority it represents -- no government may violate them.

Freedom of speech. Freedom of religion. Freedom of assembly. Freedom of the press.

These and other rights enshrined in the Constitution consist in severe limitations upon the power of Government. They are rights -- and this is another, basic point -- they are rights that every citizen can call upon our independent court system to uphold. They proclaim the belief -- and represent a specific means of enforcing the belief -- that the individual comes first: That the Government is the servant of the people, and not the other way around.

In the Soviet Union, the contrast could hardly be more pronounced. Yes, certain articles in the Soviet Constitution might appear to deal with human rights -- but not when one understands the way the Soviets themselves understand that Constitution.

Lenin -- if you will, the Founding Father of the Soviet state -- stated in a report to the Soviet Communist Party: "[W]e constitute the single legal party in Russia.... We have taken away political freedom from our opponents...."

Within the Party itself, Lenin asserted that decision-making was to be tightly concentrated at the top. By the way, you might note the use of the word "democracy" in this quotation: "Soviet socialist democracy is not in the least incompatible with individual rule and dictatorship.... What is necessary is individual rule, the recognition of the dictatorial powers of one man.... All phrases about equal rights are nonsense."

It is against this background that the Soviets interpret their Constitution. Consider, for example, Article 50:

"In accordance with the interests of the people and in order to strengthen and develop the socialist system, citizens of the U.S.S. R. are guaranteed freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly, meetings, street processions, and of demonstration."

That of course sounds very much like the guarantees of human rights in our own Constitution. But the way Article 50 is actually applied in the Soviet Union, freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly are granted -- only if they accord with the interest of the people and if it strengthens and develops the socialist system. And who decides what is in the interest of the people? Who decides what strengthens the socialist system?

The answer, of course, is simple: The Communist Party.

In the Soviet Union, then, it is not the individual who comes first. It is not even the State that comes first. It is the Communist Party -- and within the Party, the leadership at the highest reaches. Human rights as we understand them -- the civil and political rights basic to the dignity of every human being -- possess no standing.

None of this is new, of course. And while it is always useful to remind ourselves of these basic distinctions between our two systems, today I have much more in mind. For in recent months, the Soviet Union has shown a willingness -- albeit a very limited willingness -- to respect at least some human rights. It is my belief that there is hope for still further change, hope that in the days ahead the Soviets will grant further recognition to the fundamental civil and political rights of all men.

But before discussing our hopes for the future, I'd like to turn for a moment to a subject that the Soviets themselves often raise.

The United States may recognize civil and political rights, the Soviets often assert, but what of economic and social rights? The Soviets point out, for example, that while the United States has an unemployment problem, everyone in the Soviet Union is guaranteed a job. Or they point to the American problem of homelessness. Or to racial discrimination. Believe me, I heard quite a lot about this when Mr. Gorbachev was in Washington -- and it deserves a full response.

To begin with, so-called economic and social "rights" -- it would probably be more fitting to use the term economic and social "conditions" -- belong to an essentially different category from civil and political rights. The economic and social conditions in any society are constantly changing -- new social groupings constantly taking shape; new markets forming as old markets disappear. Yet there is nothing shifting about civil and political rights like freedom of speech or worship: They are

constant and immutable, forever basic to the dignity of each human being.

But to proceed to the substance of the Soviet charges: Yes, the United States has social and economic failings, serious ones.

Unemployment remains too high. As a free people, we have created an economic expansion that over the past 5 years has created nearly 16 million jobs -- but we need to do more.

Homelessness is indeed a problem, an agonizing one. To some extent, we are bound in dealing with it by our very commitment to liberty: Laws have been passed in recent years that make it illegal to force those who live on our sidewalks into hospitals or shelters unless they represent a threat to society or themselves. It is true that as a free people, we spend hundreds of millions of dollars a year through our Federal and State governments to care for the homeless. As a free people, our churches, synagogues, and a host of volunteer organizations do much to provide the homeless with food, clothing, and medicines. And yet -- there is no denying that the problem remains.

Racial discrimination -- our strides as a free people during just the past three decades have been dramatic. Yet the problem lingers, and we continue to battle bigotry and prejudice.

The problems, as I said, are serious -- no one would seek to deny that. Yet in freedom we are constantly confronting them, criticizing ourselves, always seeking to do better.

But consider, if you will, the social and economic failings of the Soviet Union itself.

We know, for example, that there are considerable tensions between the various peoples of the Soviet Union -- the issue is so sensitive, indeed, that I will do no more than mention it in passing.

Is there homelessness in the Soviet Union? Not exactly; those on the streets are often picked up on charges of vagrancy or parasitism.

But housing in the Soviet Union is more cramped than that in any other developed country in the world. The figures indicate that there are approximately 2 people for every room in the Soviet Union, compared to an average of 2 rooms for every person in the United States. In 1983, nearly one-third of all Soviet urban housing had no hot water, while nearly one-tenth had no water at all. At the current rate of construction, the per capita space available to Soviet citizens will begin to approach the Western standard in 150 years.

It's true that unemployment as we understand it does not exist in the Soviet Union -- without a free labor market, it cannot. But today, the Soviet standard of living remains barely one-third that of our own -- while the average Soviet citizen lives less well than does an American living at the official U.S. poverty line. Soviet food shortages, to name just one example, have become famous the world over.

"Why is there a meat shortage in the Soviet Union?" goes another Soviet joke. Answer: "Because the Party has made great strides toward Communism, and the cattle just couldn't keep up."



Now, I do not mean to suggest that the Soviet economy has made no progress. But the limited successes of the past arose largely from constant additions to the labor force and the availability of inexpensive resources. Now that these have been to a great extent depleted, the Soviet Union is no longer closing the gap between itself and the West. Indeed, given the enormous new creativity of Western technology, the gap is likely to widen.

I have no desire here to berate the Soviets. I mention their backwardness because in recent months -- and this is a development of tremendous significance -- in recent months they have begun to mention it themselves. Soviet economists have begun to publish articles about Soviet shortcomings -- one recent article dealt frankly and in detail with the inadequacies of Soviet housing. The Soviet press is filled with stories about the need for progress. And, of course, Soviet economic progress is one of Mr. Gorbachev's chief aims.

And this brings us back to the subject of the day, human rights. For I believe that the Soviets may at last be coming to understand something of the connection -- the necessary and inextricable connection -- between human rights and economic growth.

The connection between economic productivity and certain kinds of freedom is obvious. Private plots take up only 4 percent of the arable land in the Soviet Union but account for a quarter of the produce, because the owners of those plots are free to keep the rewards of their own labor. Freedom of information, to provide another example, will clearly prove vital

if Soviet scientists are to have any hope of reaching Western standards.

And yet there is a still deeper connection.

For it is the individual who is always the source of economic creativity -- the trained mind that produces a technical breakthrough, the imagination that conceives of new products and markets. And in order for the individual to create, he must have a sense of just that -- his own individuality, his own self-worth. He must sense that others respect him -- and yes, that his nation respects him. Respects him enough to permit him his own opinions. Respects the relationship between the individual and his God enough to permit him to worship as he chooses. Even respects him enough to permit him, if he chooses to do so, to leave.

The Soviets should recognize human rights because it is the right thing to do. But if they begin to recognize human rights for other reasons -- because they seek economic growth, or because they want to enter into a more normal relationship with the United States and other nations -- well, I want to say here and now, that's fine by me.

The signs, as I've said, have been hopeful.

Over the past 3 years, some 300 political and religious prisoners have been released from labor camps. More recently, the incarceration of dissidents in mental hospitals has slowed. During the past 20 months, no one has been sent to prison under Article 70 of the Soviet Constitution, the article the Soviets had previously used as their umbrella law for imprisoning

dissidents. And while the press remains tightly controlled by the Party and state, we've seen the publication of stories on topics that used to be forbidden -- topics like crime, drug addictions, corruption, even police brutality.

These changes are limited, very limited, and the basic standards contained in the Helsinki Accords still are not being met. But we applaud the changes that have taken place -- and urge the Soviets to go farther. And if I may, I'd like now to share with you a brief summary of the human rights agenda that I'll be pressing in my meetings with Mr. Gorbachev. It has four main aims.

First, freedom of religion. Despite the recent relaxation of some controls on the exercise of religion, it is still true that no church, synagogue, mosque, or other house of worship may exist unless the government has granted it permission. Large numbers of the faithful suffer -- the entire Ukrainian Catholic Church, for example, has been declared illegal. Many are in prison for acts of worship. And yet -- to quote the Universal Declaration of Human Rights -- "everyone has a right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion." I know you agree: It's time for the Soviets to bring government regulation of religion to an end.

Second, freedom of speech. I regret to say that there are still many men serving long prison sentences at hard labor in Siberian camps for offenses that involve only the spoken or written word. Yet the clear, internationally-recognized standard, as defined, once again, in the Universal Declaration of

Human Rights, is that -- and I quote -- "everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression." The Soviet Union must grant full recognition to this basic human right. And I know you join me in urging them to begin freeing, right now, every last person imprisoned for nothing more than the expression of his views.

Emigration, third, has long represented a matter of great concern to us. The Universal Declaration states that, quote, "everyone has a right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country." It is true that during the past 12 months, more people have been permitted to leave the Soviet Union than during the preceding 6 years. And it is true as well that the numbers of those permitted to leave for short trips -- often family visits -- has gone up. We're heartened by this progress. But we cannot be satisfied until the Soviets grant all their peoples complete freedom of movement.

In the meantime, I'll raise one point in particular with Mr. Gorbachev. You see, the Soviets refuse many the right to leave on the grounds that they possess secret information -- even though they had ended their secret work many years before, and whatever information they had has become public or obsolete. I will urge Mr. Gorbachev to review these cases -- and to free these people and their families.

This brings me now to the fourth and final area I want to discuss, the institutionalization of progress.

As I've said a number of times now, we welcome the human rights progress that the Soviets have made -- and believe there

is good reason to hope for still more. Yet it is only being realistic to point out that we have seen progress in the Soviet Union before. Khrushchev permitted relatively wide freedoms, particularly freedom of speech. The intellectual and cultural life of the Soviet Union underwent a kind of thaw, a kind of springtime.

But it was a springtime followed by winter -- for Khrushchev's relaxations were fiercely reversed. And for the nearly three decades until our own day, oppression and stagnation -- and, yes, fear -- once again became the determining characteristics of Soviet life.

So, too, <sup>Next nothing!</sup> "perestroika" -- today's new openness -- may come suddenly to an end -- unless the Soviets take steps to make it permanent, to institutionalize it. Deep reforms are needed. New laws must be passed. And the courts must be granted a measure of independence.

Of course, none of this can be accomplished quickly. But there is one specific reform the Soviets can make, one that in itself would do much to ratify their progress and hearten their peoples. I mentioned that for some 20 months now, no one has been sent to prison under Article 70, what is in effect an anti-dissident article. I would suggest -- and indeed, in Moscow I will suggest -- that it is time for Article 70 to be rewritten or struck.

Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom to emigrate -- and the willingness to make new freedoms permanent:

These are our hopes -- these are our prayers -- for the future of human rights in the Soviet Union.

In granting greater liberty, I am confident, the Soviets will discover that they have made possible economic growth. But even more important, the recognition of human rights in the Soviet Union will advance the cause of peace. For in the words of Andrei Sakharov -- a man who has suffered much under the Soviet system, but who has also experienced the benefits of "glasnost" -- in the words of Andrei Sakharov: "Human rights, peace, and security are indivisible [Barbara, please get the exact quotation from Lisa Jameson]."

Thank you all, and God bless you.

And now I'd be happy to answer your questions.

10-24-85 UN

I am convinced that international trust, mutual understanding, disarmament, and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish, and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live.

Bomb

(Robinson/ARD)

May 2, 1988

3:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1988

Thank you, Morris, and thank you all. It's a pleasure to be back in Chicago -- Chicago always has been my kind of town -- and an honor to be able to speak to you, the members of the National Strategy Forum. I'll keep my remarks brief today so that we'll have ample time for questions. But I can't help but reflect here at the opening that it can be pretty tough in this State for a Chief Executive. In fact, let me tell you what The Illinois State Register had to say about the occupant of the White House. They said, and I quote, "the craftiest and most dishonest politician that ever disgraced an office in America." Can you believe that? Of course that wasn't me they were writing about, that was Abraham Lincoln. Come to think of it, I must be doing something right.

As you know, our agenda for U.S.-Soviet relations has four main parts -- regional conflicts, bilateral exchanges, arms reductions, and human rights. I've spoken elsewhere at some length about the first three. Today I'd like to take a moment to discuss with you the subject dealt with in -- the subject of human rights.

We Americans of course use the phrase "human rights" often. We know that the promotion of human rights represents a central tenet of our foreign policy; we even believe that a passionate commitment to human rights is one of the special characteristics that helps to make America, America. And it is worth noting that

the American emphasis on human rights represents much more than merely a vague respect for human dignity. No, part of our heritage as Americans is a very specific and definite understanding of human rights -- a definition of human rights that we can assert to challenge ourselves and our own institutions, and that we can hold up as an example for all the world.

Ultimately, our view of human rights derives from our Judeo-Christian heritage and the view that each individual life is sacred. It takes more detailed form in the works of the French and English writers of the 18th-century Enlightenment. Government, they argued, should derive its mandate from the consent of the governed, this consent being expressed in free elections. And there you have the first human right, the right to have a voice in Government -- the right to vote.

Elected governments would reflect the will of the majority, but the Enlightenment writers and our own Founding Fathers gave the concept of human rights still more definite, specific form. For they held that each individual has certain rights that are so basic, so fundamental to his dignity as a human being, that no government -- however large the majority it represents -- no government may violate them.

Freedom of speech. Freedom of religion. Freedom of assembly. Freedom of the press.

These and other rights enshrined in our Constitution consist in severe limitations upon the power of Government. They are rights -- and this is another, basic point -- they are rights



that every citizen can call upon our independent court system to uphold. They proclaim the belief -- and represent a specific means of enforcing the belief -- that the individual comes first: That the Government is the servant of the people, and not the other way around.

That contrasts with those systems of government which provide no limit on the power of the government over its people.

Within the Soviet Union, decision-making is tightly concentrated at the top. The authority of the Communist Party is not determined by a document -- a Constitution, if you will -- but by the leadership who determine what is right for the people. Rights such as free speech, free press, and free assembly are granted if they are "in accordance with the interests of the people and in order to strengthen and develop the socialist system."

So there are contrasts between the United States and the Soviet Union. Our differing points of view concerning civil and political rights leave room for further discussion.

None of this is new, of course. And while it is always useful to remind ourselves of these basic distinctions between our two systems, today I have much more in mind. For in recent months, the Soviet Union has shown a willingness to respect at least some human rights. It is my belief that there is hope for further change, hope that in the days ahead the Soviets will grant further recognition to the fundamental civil and political rights of all.

But before discussing our hopes for the future, I'd like to turn for a moment to a subject that the Soviets themselves often raise.

The United States may recognize civil and political rights, but what of economic and social rights? The Soviets point out, for example, that while the United States has an unemployment problem, everyone in the Soviet Union is guaranteed a job. Or they point to the American problem of homelessness. Or to racial discrimination. Well, it deserves a full response.

To begin with, so-called economic and social "rights" -- it would probably be more fitting to use the term economic and social "conditions" -- belong to an essentially different category from civil and political rights. The economic and social conditions in any society are constantly changing -- new social groupings constantly taking shape; new markets forming as old markets disappear. Yet there is nothing shifting about civil and political rights like freedom of speech or worship: They are constant and immutable, forever basic to the dignity of each human being.

Yes, the United States has social and economic failings.

As a free people, we have created an economic expansion that over the past 5 years has created nearly 16 million jobs -- but we need to do more.

Homelessness is indeed a problem, an agonizing one. To some extent, we are bound in dealing with it by our very commitment to liberty: Laws have been passed in recent years that make it illegal to force those who live on our sidewalks into hospitals

or shelters unless they represent a threat to society or themselves. It is true that as a free people, we spend hundreds of millions of dollars a year through our Federal and State governments to care for the homeless. As a free people, our churches, synagogues, and a host of volunteer organizations do much to provide the homeless with food, clothing, and medicines. And yet -- there is no denying that the problem remains.

Racial discrimination -- our strides as a free people during just the past three decades have been dramatic. Yet the problem lingers, and we continue to battle bigotry and prejudice.

The problems, as I said, are serious -- no one would seek to deny that. Yet in freedom we are constantly confronting them, criticizing ourselves, seeking to do better... in full view for all to see.

Now consider, if you will, the economic conditions of the Soviet Union.

Now, I do not mean to suggest that the Soviet economy has made no progress. But the limited successes of the past arose largely from constant additions to the labor force and the availability of inexpensive resources. Now that these have been to a great extent depleted, the Soviet Union is no longer closing the gap between itself and the West. Indeed, given the enormous advances in Western technology, the gap is likely to widen.

I have no desire to berate the Soviet system. I mention it here because in recent months -- and this is a development of tremendous significance -- in recent months they have begun to mention it themselves -- just like Americans do about their

problems. Soviet economists have published articles about Soviet shortcomings -- one recent article dealt with the inadequacies of Soviet housing. The Soviet press now carries stories about the need for progress. And, of course, Soviet economic progress is one of Mr. Gorbachev's chief aims.

And this brings us back to the subject of the day, human rights. For I believe that the Soviets may be coming to understand something of the connection -- the necessary and inextricable connection -- between human rights and economic growth.

The connection between economic productivity and certain kinds of freedom is obvious. Private plots of land make up only 4 percent of the arable land in the Soviet Union but account for a quarter of the produce. The free flow information, to provide another example, will clearly prove vital for Soviet scientists to have hope of reaching new and higher standards.

And yet there is a still deeper connection.

For it is the individual who is always the source of economic creativity -- the trained mind that produces a technical breakthrough, the imagination that conceives of new products and markets. And in order for the individual to create, he must have a sense of just that -- his own individuality, his own self-worth. He must sense that others respect him -- and yes, that his nation respects him. Respects him enough to permit him his own opinions. Respects the relationship between the individual and his God enough to permit him to worship as he

chooses. Even respects him enough to permit him, if he chooses to do so, to leave.

The Soviets should recognize basic human rights because it is the right thing to do. And if they recognize human rights for other reasons -- because they seek economic growth, or because they want to enter into a more normal relationship with the United States and other nations -- well, I want to say here and now, that's fine by me.

The signs, as I've said, have been hopeful.

Over the past 3 years, some 300 political and religious prisoners have been released from labor camps. More recently, the incarceration of dissidents in mental hospitals has slowed. And while the press remains tightly controlled by the Party and state, we've seen the publication of stories on topics that used to be forbidden -- topics like crime, drug addictions, corruption, even police brutality.

These changes are limited, and the basic standards contained in the Helsinki Accords still are not being met. But we applaud the changes that have taken place -- and encourage the Soviets to go farther. We recognize changes occur slowly; but that is much better than no change at all. And if I may, I'd like now to share with you a brief summary of the human rights agenda that I'll be discussing in my meetings in Moscow. It has four aims.

First, freedom of religion. Despite the recent relaxation of some controls on the exercise of religion, it is still true that churches, synagogues, mosques, or other houses of worship may not exist without government permission. Many have been

imprisoned in the past for acts of worship. And yet -- to quote the Universal Declaration of Human Rights -- "everyone has a right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion." I know you agree: It's time for such government regulation of religion to end. And General Secretary Gorbachev has indicated a willingness to consider "a new law" on the freedom of conscience.

Second, freedom of speech. There are still many serving long prison sentences for offenses that involve only the spoken or written word. Yet the clear, internationally-recognized standard, as defined, once again, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is that -- and I quote -- "everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression." And today, there is more such freedom in the Soviet Union than two years ago. Many persons imprisoned for expressing dissenting views have been released from the prison. The Soviet Union should put this issue behind it by granting full recognition to this basic human right. And I know you join me in urging the freeing of every last person imprisoned for nothing more than the expression of his views.

Emigration, third, has long represented a matter of great concern to us. The Universal Declaration states that, quote, "everyone has a right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country." It is true that during the past 12 months, more people have been permitted to leave the Soviet Union than during the preceding 6 years. And it is true as well that the numbers of those permitted to leave for short trips -- often family visits -- has gone up. We're heartened by this

progress. Our hope is that the Soviets grant all their peoples full and complete freedom of movement.

And one point in particular. The Soviets refuse many the right to leave on the grounds that they possess secret information -- even though they had ended their secret work many years before, and whatever information they had has become public or obsolete. I hope such cases will be rationally reviewed -- and the decision will be made to free these people and their families.

This brings me now to the fourth and final area I want to discuss, the institutionalization of progress.

As I've said a number of times now, we welcome the human rights progress that the Soviets have made -- and believe there is good reason to hope for still more. Yet it is only being realistic to point out that we have seen progress in the Soviet Union before. Khrushchev permitted relatively wide freedoms, particularly freedom of speech. The intellectual and cultural life of the Soviet Union underwent a kind of thaw, a kind of springtime.

But it was a springtime followed by winter -- for Khrushchev's relaxations were reversed. And for the nearly three decades until our own day, oppression and stagnation once again became the determining characteristics of Soviet life.

And that is why those of us in the West both publicly and in direct conversation with the Soviets must continue to make candor and realism the basis of our bilateral relationship. My Chief of Staff Howard Baker told me recently of an old Tennessee saying,

"Plain talk -- easy understood." Exactly. And just as previous hopeful moments in Soviet history ended all too soon, so, too, "perestroika" -- today's new openness will succeed if the Soviets take steps to make it permanent, to institutionalize it.

Of course, none of this can be accomplished quickly. But there is one specific reform the Soviets can make, one that in itself would do much to ratify their progress and hearten many peoples.

Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom to emigrate -- and the willingness to make new freedoms permanent: These are our hopes -- these are our prayers -- for the future of human rights in the Soviet Union, in the world, in our own country.

In granting greater liberty, I am confident, the Soviets will discover that they have made possible economic growth. But even more important, this recognition of human rights will advance the cause of peace. For in the words of Andrei Sakharov -- a man who suffered much under the Soviet system, but who has also experienced the benefits of "glasnost": "Human rights, peace, and security are indivisible." Thank you all, and God bless you.

And now I'd be happy to answer your questions.



(Robinson/Griscom)

May 2, 1988

2:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1988

Thank you, Morry, and thank you all. It's a pleasure to be in Chicago -- Chicago always has been my kind of town -- and an honor to be able to speak to you, the members of the National Strategy Forum. I'll keep my remarks brief today so that we'll have ample time for questions. I can't help but reflect here at the opening that it can be pretty tough in this State for a Chief Executive. In fact, let me tell you what The Illinois State Register had to say about the occupant of the White House. They said, and I quote, "the craftiest and most dishonest politician that ever disgraced an office in America." Of course, that wasn't me they were writing about, that was Abraham Lincoln.

It may have been that kind of treatment in the press that led Lincoln to answer this way when he was asked what it felt like to be President.

"You've heard," Lincoln is supposed to have said, "about the man who was tarred and feathered, and ridden out of town on a rail? A man in the crowd asked him how he liked it, and his reply was that, if it wasn't for the honor of the thing, he would rather walk." Come to think of it, I must be doing something right.

As you know, our agenda for U.S.-Soviet relations has four main parts -- regional conflicts, bilateral exchanges, arms reductions, and human rights. I've spoken elsewhere at some

length about the first three. Today, I'd like to take a moment to discuss with you the subject of human rights.

We Americans, of course, often speak about human rights, individual liberties, and fundamental freedoms. We know that the promotion of human rights represents a central tenet of our foreign policy; we even believe that a passionate commitment to human rights is one of the special characteristics that helps to make America, America. It was Lincoln himself who said that the Declaration of Independence granted liberty not to our Nation alone, but "gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men...." And it is important to note that this American emphasis on human rights represents much more than merely a vague respect for human dignity. No, part of our heritage as Americans is a very specific and definite understanding of human rights -- a definition of human rights that we can assert to challenge ourselves and our own institutions, and that we can hold up as an example for all the world.

Ultimately, our view of human rights derives from our Judeo-Christian heritage and the view that each individual life is sacred. It takes more detailed form in the works of the French and English writers of the 18th-century Enlightenment. It is the notion that government should derive its mandate from the consent of the governed, this consent being expressed in free, contested, regular elections. And there you have a first human right, the right to have a voice in government -- the right to vote.

Elected governments would reflect the will of the majority, but the Enlightenment writers and our own Founding Fathers gave the concept of human rights still more definite, specific form. For they held that each individual has certain rights that are so basic, so fundamental to his dignity as a human being, that no government -- however large the majority it represents -- no government may violate them.

Freedom of speech. Freedom of religion. Freedom of assembly. Freedom of the press.

These and other rights enshrined in our Constitution and Bill of Rights consist in severe limitations upon the power of Government. They are rights -- and this is another basic point -- they are rights that every citizen can call upon our independent court system to uphold. They proclaim the belief -- and represent a specific means of enforcing the belief -- that the individual comes first: That the Government is the servant of the people, and not the other way around.

That contrasts with those systems of government that provide no limit on the power of the government over its people.

Within the Soviet Union, decision-making is tightly concentrated at the top. The authority of the Communist Party is not determined by a document -- a Constitution, if you will -- but by the leadership who determine what is right for the people. Rights such as free speech, free press, and free assembly are granted if they are "in accordance with the interests of the people and in order to strengthen and develop the socialist system."

I have in the past stressed these contrasts between the United States and the Soviet Union -- the fundamental and profound differences between our philosophies of government and ways of life. And I have always said that our negotiations must be undertaken with precisely this sort of realism, this sort of candor. And yet while establishing this context is essential and reminding ourselves of these basic distinctions always useful, today I have something additional in mind. For in recent months, the Soviet Union has shown a willingness to respect at least some human rights. It is my belief that there is hope for further change, hope that in the days ahead the Soviets will grant further recognition to the fundamental civil and political rights of all.

But before discussing our hopes for the future, I'd like to turn for a moment to a subject that the Soviets themselves often raise.

The United States may recognize civil and political rights, but what of economic and social rights? The Soviets point out, for example, that the United States has an unemployment problem. Or they point to the American problem of homelessness. Or to racial discrimination. Well, it deserves a full response.

To begin with, so-called economic and social "rights" -- it would probably be more fitting to use the term economic and social "conditions" -- belong to an essentially different category from civil and political rights. The economic and social conditions in any society are constantly changing -- new social groupings constantly taking shape; new markets forming as

old markets disappear. Yet there is nothing shifting about civil and political rights like freedom of speech or worship: They are constant and immutable, forever basic to the dignity of each human being. They are fundamental -- fundamental to everything.

Yes, the United States has social and economic shortcomings.

Unemployment, for one. As a free people, we have created an economic expansion that over the past 5 years has created nearly 16 million jobs -- but we need to do more.

Homelessness is indeed a problem, an agonizing one. To some extent, we are bound in dealing with it by our very commitment to liberty; for we are restrained in our ability to coerce those homeless individuals who choose to reject our help. It is true that, as a free people, we spend hundreds of millions of dollars a year through our Federal, State, and local governments to care for the homeless. As a free people, our churches, synagogues, and a host of volunteer organizations do much to provide the homeless with food, clothing, and medicines. And yet -- there is no denying that a problem remains.

Racial discrimination -- our strides as a free people during just the past three decades have been dramatic. Yet the problem lingers, and we continue to battle bigotry and prejudice.

The problems, as I said, are serious -- no one would seek to deny that. Yet in freedom we are constantly confronting them, criticizing ourselves, seeking to do better... in full view for all to see.

But consider, if you will, the economic conditions of the Soviet Union.

Now, I do not mean to suggest that the Soviet economy has made no progress. But the limited successes of the past arose largely from constant additions to the labor force and the availability of inexpensive resources. Now that these have been to a great extent depleted, there remains a gap between the Soviet Union and the West. Indeed, given the enormous advances in Western technology, the gap is likely to widen.

I do not bring this up simply for the sake of sounding critical. I mention it here because in recent months -- and this is a development of tremendous significance -- in recent months they have begun to mention it themselves -- just like Americans do about their problems. Soviet economists have published articles about Soviet shortages -- one recent article dealt with the inadequacies of Soviet housing. The Soviet press now carries stories about the need for progress. And, of course, Soviet economic progress is one of Mr. Gorbachev's chief aims.

And this brings us back to the subject of the day, human rights. For I believe that the Soviets may be coming to understand something of the connection -- the necessary and inextricable connection -- between human rights and economic growth.

The connection between economic productivity and certain kinds of freedom is obvious. Private plots of land make up only 3 percent of the arable land in the Soviet Union but account for a quarter of the produce. The free flow of information, to provide another example, will clearly prove vital for Soviet

science and technology to have hope of reaching new and higher standards.

And yet there is a still deeper connection.

For it is the individual who is always the source of economic creativity -- the inquiring mind that produces a technical breakthrough, the imagination that conceives of new products and markets. And in order for the individual to create, he must have a sense of just that -- his own individuality, his own self-worth. He must sense that others respect him -- and yes, that his nation respects him. Respects him enough to permit him his own opinions. Respects the relationship between the individual and his God enough to permit him to worship as he chooses. Even respects him enough to permit him, if he chooses to do so, to leave.

The Soviets should recognize basic human rights because it is the right thing to do. They should recognize human rights because they have accepted international obligations to do so, particularly in the Helsinki Final Act. But, if they recognize human rights for reasons of their own -- because they seek economic growth, or because they want to enter into a more normal relationship with the United States and other nations -- well, I want to say here and now, that's fine by me.

The signs, as I've said, have been hopeful.

Over the past 3 years, some 300 political and religious prisoners have been released from labor camps. More recently, the incarceration of dissidents in mental hospitals and prisons has slowed and, some cases stopped completely. And while the

press remains tightly controlled by the Party and state, we've seen the publication of stories on topics that used to be forbidden -- topics like crime, drug addictions, corruption, even police brutality.

These changes are limited, and the basic standards contained in the Helsinki Accords still are not being met. But we applaud the changes that have taken place -- and encourage the Soviets to go farther. We recognize that changes occur slowly; but that is better than no change at all. And if I may, I'd like now to share with you a brief summary of the human rights agenda that I'll be discussing in my meetings in Moscow. It has four aims.

First, freedom of religion. Despite the recent relaxation of some controls on the exercise of religion, it is still true that churches, synagogues, mosques, or other houses of worship may not exist without government permission. Many have been imprisoned in the past for acts of worship. And yet -- to quote the Universal Declaration of Human Rights -- "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion." And General Secretary Gorbachev has indicated a willingness to consider "a new law" on the freedom of conscience.

Second, freedom of speech. There are still many serving long prison sentences for offenses that involve only the spoken or written word. Yet the clear, internationally recognized standard, as defined, once again, in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is that -- and I quote -- "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression." And today, there is more such freedom in the Soviet Union than 2 years ago. Many persons



imprisoned for expressing dissenting views have been released from prison. This issue can be removed by granting full recognition to this basic human right. And I know you join me in urging the freeing of people imprisoned for nothing more than the expression of their views.

Emigration, third, has long represented a matter of great concern to us. The Universal Declaration states that, quote, "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country." It is true that during the past 12 months, the rate of people permitted to leave the Soviet Union has been significantly higher than during the preceding 6 years. And it is true, as well, that the number of those permitted to leave for short trips -- often family visits -- has gone up. We're heartened by this progress. Our hope is that the Soviets grant all their peoples full and complete freedom of movement.

And one point in particular. The Soviets refuse many the right to leave on the grounds that they possess secret information -- even though they had ended their secret work many years before, and whatever information they had has become public or obsolete. I hope such cases will be rationally reviewed -- and the decision will be made to free these people and their families.

This brings me now to the fourth and final area I want to discuss, making the progress more permanent.

As I've said a number of times now, we welcome the human rights progress that the Soviets have made -- and believe there is good reason to hope for still more. Yet it is only being

realistic to point out that we have seen progress in the Soviet Union before. Khrushchev loosened things up a bit. The intellectual and cultural life of the Soviet Union underwent a kind of thaw, a kind of springtime.

But it was a springtime followed by winter -- for Khrushchev's relaxations were reversed. And for the nearly three decades until our own day, oppression and stagnation once again became the determining characteristics of Soviet life.

And that is why those of us in the West both publicly and in direct conversation with the Soviets must continue to make candor and realism the basis of our bilateral relationship. My Chief of Staff Howard Baker told me recently of an old Tennessee saying, "Plain talk -- easy understood." Exactly. And just as previous hopeful moments in Soviet history ended all too soon, so, too, "glasnost" -- today's new candor -- will succeed if the Soviets take steps to make it permanent, to institutionalize it.

Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom to emigrate -- and the willingness to make new freedoms permanent: These are our hopes -- these are our prayers -- for the future of human rights in the Soviet Union, in the world, in our own country.

In granting greater liberty, I am confident that the Soviets will discover that they have made possible economic growth. But even more important, this recognition of human rights will advance the cause of peace. For in the words of Andrei Sakharov -- a man who suffered much under the Soviet system, but who has also experienced the benefits of "glasnost": "...I am

convinced that international confidence, mutual understanding, disarmament, and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish, and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live.... Peace, progress, and human rights -- these three goals are insolubly linked...." Thank you all, and God bless you.

And now I'd be happy to answer your questions.

3-

- Richard Johnson

647-9370

State

*Arthur  
Schiscom*

(Robinson/ARD)

May 2, 1988

10:30 a.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1988

Thank you, Morris, and thank you all. It's a pleasure to be back in Chicago -- Chicago always has been my kind of town -- and an honor to be able to speak to you, the members of the National Strategy Forum. I'll keep my remarks brief today so that we'll have ample time for questions. But I can't help but reflect here at the opening that it can be pretty tough in this State for a Chief Executive. In fact, let me tell you what The Illinois State Register had to say about the occupant of the White House. They said, and I quote, "the craftiest and most dishonest politician that ever disgraced an office in America." Can you believe that? Of course that wasn't me they were writing about, that was Abraham Lincoln. Come to think of it, I must be doing something right.

As you know, our agenda for U.S.-Soviet relations has four main parts -- regional conflicts, bilateral exchanges, arms reductions, and human rights. I've spoken elsewhere at some length about the first three. Today I'd like to take a moment to discuss with you the subject dealt with in the story I just told -- the subject of human rights.

We Americans of course use the phrase "human rights" often. We know that the promotion of human rights represents a central tenet of our foreign policy; we even believe that a passionate commitment to human rights is one of the special characteristics that helps to make America, America. And it is worth noting that

the American emphasis on human rights represents much more than merely a vague respect for human dignity. No, part of our heritage as Americans is a very specific and definite understanding of human rights -- a definition of human rights that we can assert to challenge ourselves and our own institutions, and that we can hold up as a standard for all the world.

Ultimately, our view of human rights derives from our Judeo-Christian heritage and the view that each individual life is sacred. It takes more detailed form in the works of the French and English writers of the 18th-century Enlightenment. Government, they argued, should derive its mandate from the consent of the governed, this consent being expressed in free elections. And there you have the first human right, the right to have a voice in Government -- the right to vote.

Elected governments would reflect the will of the majority, but the Enlightenment writers and our own Founding Fathers gave the concept of human rights still more definite, specific form. For they held that each individual has certain rights that are so basic, so fundamental to his dignity as a human being, that no government -- however large the majority it represents -- no government may violate them.

Freedom of speech. Freedom of religion. Freedom of assembly. Freedom of the press.

These and other rights enshrined in our Constitution consist in severe limitations upon the power of Government. They are rights -- and this is another, basic point -- they are rights

that every citizen can call upon our independent court system to uphold. They proclaim the belief -- and represent a specific means of enforcing the belief -- that the individual comes first: That the Government is the servant of the people, and not the other way around. That is a basic difference in our view and the Soviet view of government. For in a Leninist state, there are, by definition, no limits to the power of government.

For many decades, the most serious threat to human integrity and human dignity has come from states which claim the right to control both body and soul of every citizen. Lenin -- if you will, the Founding Father of the Soviet state -- stated in a report to the Soviet Communist Party: "[W]e constitute the single legal party in Russia.... We have taken away political freedom from our opponents...."

Within the Party itself, Lenin asserted that decision-making was to be tightly concentrated at the top. Law is made and altered at will by this leadership. The powers of the leadership cannot be limited by a document -- a Constitution. Nor can an individual stand in the way of the leadership's decision of what is right for the people.

It is against this background that the Soviets Constitution exists. Rights such as free speech, free press, free assembly are guaranteed in the Soviet Union if they are, "In accordance with the interests of the people and in order to strengthen and develop the socialist system."

And who makes that decision: The Communist Party.

In the Soviet Union, then, it is not the individual and it is not even the State that comes first. It is the Communist Party -- and leadership. Human rights as we understand them -- the civil and political rights of every human being -- do not have the same standing there.

None of this is new, of course. And while it is always useful to remind ourselves of these basic distinctions between our two systems, today I have much more in mind. For in recent months, the Soviet Union has shown a willingness to respect at least some human rights. It is my belief that there is hope for further change, hope that in the days ahead the Soviets will grant further recognition to the fundamental civil and political rights of all.

But before discussing our hopes for the future, I'd like to turn for a moment to a subject that the Soviets themselves often raise.

The United States may recognize civil and political rights, but what of economic and social rights? The Soviets point out, for example, that while the United States has an unemployment problem, everyone in the Soviet Union is guaranteed a job. Or they point to the American problem of homelessness. Or to racial discrimination. Well, it deserves a full response.

To begin with, so-called economic and social "rights" -- it would probably be more fitting to use the term economic and social "conditions" -- belong to an essentially different category from civil and political rights. The economic and social conditions in any society are constantly changing -- new



social groupings constantly taking shape; new markets forming as old markets disappear. Yet there is nothing shifting about civil and political rights like freedom of speech or worship: They are constant and immutable, forever basic to the dignity of each human being.

Yes, the United States has social and economic failings.

As a free people, we have created an economic expansion that over the past 5 years has created nearly 16 million jobs -- but we need to do more.

Homelessness is indeed a problem, an agonizing one. To some extent, we are bound in dealing with it by our very commitment to liberty: Laws have been passed in recent years that make it illegal to force those who live on our sidewalks into hospitals or shelters unless they represent a threat to society or themselves. It is true that as a free people, we spend hundreds of millions of dollars a year through our Federal and State governments to care for the homeless. As a free people, our churches, synagogues, and a host of volunteer organizations do much to provide the homeless with food, clothing, and medicines. And yet -- there is no denying that the problem remains.

Racial discrimination -- our strides as a free people during just the past three decades have been dramatic. Yet the problem lingers, and we continue to battle bigotry and prejudice.

The problems, as I said, are serious -- no one would seek to deny that. Yet in freedom we are constantly confronting them, criticizing ourselves, seeking to do better... in full view for all to see.

Now consider, if you will, the economic conditions of the Soviet Union.

Now, I do not mean to suggest that the Soviet economy has made no progress. But the limited successes of the past arose largely from constant additions to the labor force and the availability of inexpensive resources. Now that these have been to a great extent depleted, the Soviet Union is no longer closing the gap between itself and the West. Indeed, given the enormous advances in Western technology, the gap is likely to widen.

I have no desire to berate the Soviet system. I mention it here because in recent months -- and this is a development of tremendous significance -- in recent months they have begun to mention it themselves -- just like Americans do about their problems. Soviet economists have published articles about Soviet shortcomings -- one recent article dealt with the inadequacies of Soviet housing. The Soviet press now carries stories about the need for progress. And, of course, Soviet economic progress is one of Mr. Gorbachev's chief aims.

And this brings us back to the subject of the day, human rights. For I believe that the Soviets may be coming to understand something of the connection -- the necessary and inextricable connection -- between human rights and economic growth.

The connection between economic productivity and certain kinds of freedom is obvious. Private plots of land make up only 4 percent of the arable land in the Soviet Union but account for a quarter of the produce. The free flow information, to provide

another example, will clearly prove vital for Soviet scientists to have hope of reaching new and higher standards.

And yet there is a still deeper connection.

For it is the individual who is always the source of economic creativity -- the trained mind that produces a technical breakthrough, the imagination that conceives of new products and markets. And in order for the individual to create, he must have a sense of just that -- his own individuality, his own self-worth. He must sense that others respect him -- and yes, that his nation respects him. Respects him enough to permit him his own opinions. Respects the relationship between the individual and his God enough to permit him to worship as he chooses. Even respects him enough to permit him, if he chooses to do so, to leave.

The Soviets should recognize basic human rights because it is the right thing to do. And if they recognize human rights for other reasons -- because they seek economic growth, or because they want to enter into a more normal relationship with the United States and other nations -- well, I want to say here and now, that's fine by me.

The signs, as I've said, have been hopeful.

Over the past 3 years, some 300 political and religious prisoners have been released from labor camps. More recently, the incarceration of dissidents in mental hospitals has slowed. During the past 20 months, no one has been sent to prison under Article 70 of the Soviet Constitution, the article the Soviets had previously used as their umbrella law for imprisoning

dissidents. And while the press remains tightly controlled by the Party and state, we've seen the publication of stories on topics that used to be forbidden -- topics like crime, drug addictions, corruption, even police brutality.

These changes are limited, and the basic standards contained in the Helsinki Accords still are not being met. But we applaud the changes that have taken place -- and encourage the Soviets to go farther. We recognize changes occur slowly; but that is much better than no change at all. And if I may, I'd like now to share with you a brief summary of the human rights agenda that I'll be discussing in my meetings in Moscow. It has four aims.

First, freedom of religion. Despite the recent relaxation of some controls on the exercise of religion, it is still true that churches, synagogues, mosques, or other houses of worship may not exist without government permission. Large numbers of the faithful suffer -- the entire Ukrainian Catholic Church, for example, has been declared illegal. Many have been imprisoned in the past for acts of worship. And yet -- to quote the Universal Declaration of Human Rights -- "everyone has a right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion." I know you agree: It's time for such government regulation of religion to end. And General Secretary Gorbachev has indicated a willingness to consider "a new law" on the freedom of conscience.

Second, freedom of speech. There are still many serving long prison sentences for offenses that involve only the spoken or written word. Yet the clear, internationally-recognized standard, as defined, once again, in the Universal Declaration of

Human Rights, is that -- and I quote -- "everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression." And today, there is more such freedom in the Soviet Union than two years ago. Many persons imprisoned for expressing dissenting views have been released from the prison. The Soviet Union should put this issue behind it by granting full recognition to this basic human right. And I know you join me in urging the freeing of every last person imprisoned for nothing more than the expression of his views.

Emigration, third, has long represented a matter of great concern to us. The Universal Declaration states that, quote, "everyone has a right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country." It is true that during the past 12 months, more people have been permitted to leave the Soviet Union than during the preceding 6 years. And it is true as well that the numbers of those permitted to leave for short trips -- often family visits -- has gone up. We're heartened by this progress. Our hope it that the Soviets grant all their peoples full and complete freedom of movement.

And one point in particular. The Soviets refuse many the right to leave on the grounds that they possess secret information -- even though they had ended their secret work many years before, and whatever information they had has become public or obsolete. I hope such cases will be rationally reviewed -- and the decision will be made to free these people and their families.

This brings me now to the fourth and final area I want to discuss, the institutionalization of progress.

As I've said a number of times now, we welcome the human rights progress that the Soviets have made -- and believe there is good reason to hope for still more. Yet it is only being realistic to point out that we have seen progress in the Soviet Union before. Khrushchev permitted relatively wide freedoms, particularly freedom of speech. The intellectual and cultural life of the Soviet Union underwent a kind of thaw, a kind of springtime.

But it was a springtime followed by winter -- for Khrushchev's relaxations were fiercely reversed. And for the nearly three decades until our own day, oppression and stagnation -- and, yes, fear -- once again became the determining characteristics of Soviet life.

And that is why those of us in the West both publicly and in direct conversation with the Soviets must continue to make candor and realism the basis of our bilateral relationship. My Chief of Staff Howard Baker told me recently of an old Tennessee saying, "Plain talk -- easy understood." Exactly. And just as previous hopeful moments in Soviet history ended all too soon, so, too, "perestroika" -- today's new openness will succeed if the Soviets take steps to make it permanent, to institutionalize it.

Of course, none of this can be accomplished quickly. But there is one specific reform the Soviets can make, one that in itself would do much to ratify their progress and hearten many peoples. I mentioned that for some 20 months now, no one has been sent to prison under Article 70, what is in effect an

anti-dissident article. Hopefully, the time has come for Article 70 to be rewritten.

Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom to emigrate -- and the willingness to make new freedoms permanent: These are our hopes -- these are our prayers -- for the future of human rights in the Soviet Union, in the world, in our own country.

In granting greater liberty, I am confident, the Soviets will discover that they have made possible economic growth. But even more important, this recognition of human rights will advance the cause of peace. For in the words of Andrei Sakharov -- a man who suffered much under the Soviet system, but who has also experienced the benefits of "glasnost": "Human rights, peace, and security are indivisible." Thank you all, and God bless you.

And now I'd be happy to answer your questions.

4-28-88

MEMORANDUM FOR PETER

FROM: BARBARA

SUBJECT: PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO CHICAGO TO ADDRESS NATIONAL  
STRATEGY FORUM

The President will address a group of about 800 members and guests of the Nat'l Strategy Forum, a non-partisan group, started by a group of civic and business leaders concerned about foreign policy issues. The Forum includes academicians, business leaders and civic leaders. The President's remarks should be 15-20 minutes in length. The speech takes place in the Palmer House Hotel in downtown Chicago.

The Chairman of NSF is Morris Leibman, who received the Medal of Freedom from the President

Prior to the President's remarks to NSF, he will take part in a political fundraiser for the Illinois GOP. He will leave the GOP event, have lunch with the NSF members, and then hear a brief introduction about the group and will then be introduced by Mr. Leibman. After his remarks, the President will answer questions from the group.



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

May 2, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.  
KENNETH DUBERSTEIN  
GARY BAUER  
A.B. CULVAHOUSE  
RHETT DAWSON  
ANTHONY DOLAN  
FRANK DONATELLI  
MARLIN FITZWATER  
THOMAS GRISCOM  
CHARLES HOBBS  
ALAN KRANOWITZ  
COLIN POWELL

NANCY RISQUE  
FRED RYAN  
JACK COURTEMANCHE  
JAMES F. KUHN  
JAMES MCKINNEY  
REBECCA RANGE  
JOHN TUCK  
ALAN RAUL  
MARK WEINBERG  
BILLY DALE  
PHOTO OFFICE  
USSS OPERATIONS

FROM: JAMES L. HOOLEY *APP for*

SUBJECT: THE TRIP OF THE PRESIDENT TO CHICAGO, ILLINOIS,  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1988

Attached is a draft outline schedule for your planning purposes.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1988

- 9:55 a.m. MARINE ONE departs the South Lawn.
- 10:05 a.m. MARINE ONE arrives Andrews Air Force Base.
- 10:10 a.m. AIR FORCE ONE departs Andrews Air Force Base en route  
EDT O'Hare Airport, Chicago, Illinois.
- Flight Time: 1 hr. 40 mins.  
Time Change: -1 hr.  
Food Service: TBD
- 10:50 a.m. AIR FORCE ONE arrives O'Hare Airport, Chicago,  
CDT Illinois.
- 10:55 a.m. MARINE ONE departs O'Hare Airport en route Meigs Field.
- 11:10 a.m. MARINE ONE arrives Meigs Field.
- 11:15 a.m. Depart Meigs Field en route Palmer House Hotel.
- 11:25 a.m. Arrive Palmer House Hotel.
- \* Photo reception with Illinois State GOP Major Donors - OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHER
  - \* Lunch with National Strategy Forum - OPEN PRESS
  - \* Address National Strategy Forum - OPEN PRESS
  - \* Question and Answer Session with National Strategy Forum (20 mins.) - OPEN PRESS

5/2/88 9:00 a.m.

1:50 p.m. Depart Palmer House Hotel en route Meigs Field.  
2:00 p.m. Arrive Meigs Field.  
2:05 p.m. MARINE ONE departs Meigs Field en route O'Hare Airport.  
2:20 p.m. MARINE ONE arrives O'Hare Airport.  
2:25 p.m. AIR FORCE ONE departs Chicago, Illinois en route  
CDT Andrews Air Force Base.

Flight Time: 1 hr. 30 mins.  
Time Change: + 1 hr.  
Food Service: TBD

4:55 p.m. AIR FORCE ONE arrives Andrews Air Force Base.  
EDT  
5:00 p.m. MARINE ONE departs Andrews Air Force Base en route The  
White House.  
5:10 p.m. MARINE ONE arrives the South Lawn.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

April 28, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR. *HHS*  
THROUGH: THOMAS C. GRISCOM *3*  
FROM: JAMES L. HOOLEY *JLH (FLA)*  
SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL TRIP TO CHICAGO, ILLINOIS ON WEDNESDAY,  
MAY 4, 1988

Attached is a proposed draft summary schedule.

Event Concept

On Wednesday, May 4, 1988, the President will travel to Chicago, Illinois to address the National Strategy Forum at the Palmer House Hotel, and to participate in an Illinois State GOP Fundraiser. Upon arrival at the Palmer House, the President will participate in a photo reception with approximately 40 of the Illinois Forum major donors and their spouses. Following the photo reception, the President will make remarks to about 200 gathered for a State GOP Fundraising Luncheon.

At the conclusion of his remarks to the Illinois GOP, the President will proceed to the Grand/State Ballroom of the hotel where he will lunch with, and address, the National Strategy Forum. Following his remarks, the President will participate in a question and answer session for approximately 20 minutes.

Organized in 1983, the NSF is a nonpartisan group of Chicago area civic leaders who believe it critical that community leaders be accurately informed about the rapidly changing issues affecting our national security. The NSF provides an opportunity for individuals interested in these important matters to learn from experts who analyze and formulate American national security strategy in a balanced exchange of ideas. Former speakers include Admiral Carlisle Trost, Chief of Naval Operations, and Amb. Max Kampelman, Chief U.S. Arms Negotiator.

This memorandum is being forwarded to Rhett Dawson for submission to the President unless otherwise instructed.

cc: K. Duberstein                      J. Courtemanche  
R. Dawson                              T. Dolan  
F. Donatelli                            A. Kranowitz  
M. Fitzwater                           J. Kuhn  
C. Powell                               R. Range  
N. Risque                               J. Tuck  
F. Ryan                                  M. Weinberg

4/28/88 10:00 a.m.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

---

PROPOSED DRAFT SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF THE PRESIDENT

---

THE PRESIDENT proceeds to Marine One for boarding.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

9:45 a.m. MARINE ONE departs the South Lawn en route Andrews Air Force Base.

Flight Time: 10 mins.

9:55 a.m. MARINE ONE arrives Andrews Air Force Base.

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds on board Air Force One.

10:00 a.m. AIR FORCE ONE departs Andrews Air Force Base en route Chicago, Illinois.

Flight Time: 1 hr. 40 mins.

Time Change: -1 hr.

Food Service: TBD

10:40 a.m. AIR FORCE ONE arrives O'Hare Airport, Chicago,  
CDT Illinois.

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds on board Marine One.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

CLOSED ARRIVAL/DEPARTURE

10:45 a.m. MARINE ONE departs O'Hare Airport en route Meigs Field  
CDT landing zone.

Flight Time: 15 mins.

11:00 a.m. MARINE ONE arrives Meigs Field landing zone.  
CDT

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds to motorcade for boarding.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

4/28/88 10:00 a.m.

11:05 a.m. THE PRESIDENT departs Meigs Field landing zone en route  
CDT Palmer House Hotel via motorcade.

Drive Time: 10 mins.

11:15 a.m. THE PRESIDENT arrives Palmer House Hotel and proceeds  
CDT inside to holding room.

THE PRESIDENT arrives holding room.

Met by:

TBD

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHER ONLY

11:20 a.m. THE PRESIDENT departs holding room en route Room TBD.  
CDT

11:25 a.m. THE PRESIDENT arrives Room TBD and participates in  
CDT photo reception with Illinois State GOP Major Donors.

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHER ONLY

11:45 a.m. THE PRESIDENT concludes photo reception and departs  
CDT Room TBD en route Room TBD for GOP Luncheon.

THE PRESIDENT arrives Room TBD and makes remarks to  
Illinois Stage GOP Fundraising Luncheon.

11:55 a.m. THE PRESIDENT concludes remarks and departs Room TBD en  
CDT route Grand/ State Ballroom off-stage announcement  
area.

THE PRESIDENT arrives Grand/State Ballroom off-stage  
announcement area.

Ruffles and Flourishes  
Announcement (off-stage)  
"Hail to the Chief"

12:00 noon THE PRESIDENT proceeds on-stage and takes seat for  
CDT lunch.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

12:05 p.m. Lunch begins.  
CDT

12:55 p.m. Lunch concludes.  
CDT

TBD makes brief remarks and introduces THE PRESIDENT.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

1:00 p.m. THE PRESIDENT proceeds to podium and makes remarks.  
CDT

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

1:20 p.m. THE PRESIDENT concludes remarks and begins question and  
CDT answer session.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

1:40 p.m. THE PRESIDENT concludes question and answer session  
CDT and departs dais en route holding room.

THE PRESIDENT arrives holding room.

1:45 p.m. THE PRESIDENT departs holding room en route motorcade  
CDT for boarding.

1:50 p.m. THE PRESIDENT departs Palmer House Hotel en route Meigs  
CDT Field via motorcade.

Drive Time: 10 mins.

2:00 p.m. THE PRESIDENT arrives Meigs Field and proceeds on board  
CDT Marine One.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

2:05 p.m. MARINE ONE departs Meigs Field en route O'Hare Airport.  
CDT

Flight Time: 15 mins.

2:20 p.m. MARINE ONE arrives O'Hare Airport.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE  
CLOSED ARRIVAL/DEPARTURE

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds on board Air Force One.

2:25 p.m. AIR FORCE ONE departs Chicago, Illinois en route  
CDT Andrews Air Force Base.

Flight Time: 1 hr. 30 mins.  
Time Change: +1 hr.  
Food Service: TBD

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1988

PAGE 4

4:55 p.m. AIR FORCE ONE arrives Andrews Air Force Base.

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds on board Marine One.

5:00 p.m. MARINE ONE departs Andrews Air Force Base en route The White House.

Flight Time: 10 mins.

5:10 p.m. MARINE ONE arrives the South Lawn.

OPEN PRESS COVERAGE

THE PRESIDENT deplanes and proceeds inside.

4/28/88 10:00 a.m.

## U.S.-Soviet Quality of Life: A Comparison

by Richard Schifter

*Address before the Human Rights Experts' Meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in Ottawa, Canada, on May 22, 1985. Ambassador Schifter is head of the U.S. delegation to the CSCE.*

Ever since this conference began, we have returned, from time to time, to a discussion of what is perceived to be the distinction between political and civil rights on one hand and economic and social rights on the other hand. I shall, therefore, at the outset of this statement, set forth the thoughts of the U.S. delegation on this issue.

### Rights of the Individual

Those of us who trace our views of government to the writings of the English and French thinkers of the 18th-century Enlightenment subscribe to the proposition that government derives its mandate from the consent of the governed, such consent being expressed in free elections. The government, thus, reflects the will of the majority. In this context of majority rule, the philosophers on the subject defined certain rights of the individual which are so basic that no government may deprive him of them, irrespective of the size of the popular majority by which it was installed in office. These rights of the individual are what we understand principally under the term "human rights." They define and clarify the fundamental relationship between the individual and his government, and they consist, essentially, of limitations on the powers of government. Like the biblical "Thou shall not," the beginning phrase of the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the beginning phrase of our Bill of Rights, is "Congress shall make no law"—a phrase followed by the subjects on which Congress shall make no law, such as abridgment of freedom of speech or the press.

When we use the term "right," we think of a claim which can be enforced in the courts. The rights guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution, which in CSCE terminology are referred to as political and civil rights, are rights which every citizen can call upon the courts to protect.

We view what are here referred to as economic and social rights as belonging in an essentially different category.

They are, as we see it, the goals of government policy in domestic affairs. Government, as we see it, should foster policies which will have the effect of encouraging economic development so as to provide jobs under decent working conditions for all those who want to work at income levels which allow for an adequate standard of living. These goals should be attained in a setting which allows freedom of choice of his work to everyone. For those who are unable to find jobs we provide unemployment compensation and, if that is unavailable, other forms of social assistance. The economic system which is now in place in our country is fully in keeping with the relevant articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The U.S. delegation, in selecting issues for discussion at this conference, decided deliberately to limit itself to problems which, though of great concern to the American public, would not require systemic changes in the Soviet Union to effect correction. Every one of the problems we have raised so far about conditions in countries which describe themselves as Marxist-Leninist could be eliminated while staying within the system.

It so happens, therefore, that the Soviet human rights problems of greatest concern to the American public are the problems which could be most easily solved by the Soviet Union. They concern, as we have pointed out, the incarceration of persons guilty only of giving expression to their thoughts, the persecution of religious believers, the commitment of sane persons to institutions for the mentally ill, cultural repression, and discrimination against certain people on the grounds of ancestry. The Soviet State could, as I have said, correct these problems without effecting fundamental structural change.

We had not intended to engage in discussions of economic and social conditions in the Soviet Union, both because the American public is not as deeply aware of or concerned about them and because correction of any shortcomings which we would have to point out would, indeed, require systemic change in the Soviet Union. We see such changes occurring gradually in some other countries which had initially adopted the Soviet economic model. However, we did not think this meeting to be an appropriate forum for a discussion of such issues. Nevertheless, as the Soviet delegation has clearly insisted that we engage in a discussion of social and

economic issues, let me say that we are prepared to join in that debate. To begin with, I shall respond in detail to the concerns expressed by the Soviet delegation as to social and economic problems in the United States.

### U.S. Social and Economic Problems

**Unemployment.** First of all, let me discuss the problem of unemployment in the United States. Our present unemployment rate is 7.3%. It reached a peak of 10.5% in 1982 and has declined significantly since then. Millions of new jobs have been created in recent years, offering new opportunities to the unemployed as well as to persons newly entering the job market. While we agree that an unemployment rate of 7.3% is still too high and further efforts need to be made to reduce the unemployment level, we believe that any person analyzing our unemployment rate should note the following:

- About two percentage points are attributable to so-called frictional unemployment, i.e., persons in transit from one job to another.

- A significant number of the job opportunities which are available in the United States at any one time go unfilled because no one in the locality in which the jobs are available is interested in doing the kind of work available at the wages which are being offered; as we don't have a system under which people can be compelled to work, unfilled jobs thus exist side by side with unemployment.

- We do not have an anti-parasitism law; some persons prefer to draw unemployment insurance payments or welfare benefits rather than take jobs which they deem unsuitable.

- The percentage of our adult population looking for work in the productive sector of the economy is enlarged by the fact that we have significantly fewer people than the Soviet Union in our military forces, in our police forces, and, for that matter, in prison or performing forced labor; specifically, though the Soviet population is only 12% greater than that of the United States, its military forces are almost 200% greater, its police forces more than 100% greater, and its prison population, including forced labor, over 1,100% greater than the corresponding figures in the United States.

I have made these points only to explain what the 7.3% figure means, not to suggest that it can and should be ignored. Our government is committed to the proposition that everyone who wants



to work should have an opportunity to do so. Government policy is dedicated to the stimulation of economic growth, to the creation of more jobs, to the raising of standards of living, to the reduction of poverty. In a country such as ours, there is often disagreement as to what might be the best policy to effect economic growth. Different political groupings advocate different solutions to the problems we face. But there is an overwhelming consensus that unemployment must be reduced and that it should be reduced within our present economic framework.

When we compare our economic model to alternate approaches, we must note that, to some extent, unemployment in our country is a consequence of our ideas of individual freedom. We do not assign people to jobs or prosecute them for parasitism if they fail to take an available job. As I have noted, there are people in our country who pass up job opportunities because they don't like the jobs that are being offered or consider the wage offers too low. There are others who are unemployed and might be able to get a job of their liking and at a satisfactory wage at a substantial distance from their home, but they are loathe to move.

Much of the latter kind of unemployment is created by the fact that the economy adapts itself to market conditions. Uneconomic enterprises are thus compelled to close, sometimes causing serious dislocation in the communities dependent on them. In the long run, such adjustments enable the economy to adapt itself to change and to increase its overall productivity. But in the short run, it creates serious hardships for the people directly and adversely affected. To deal with these hardships and to bridge the periods of difficulty is a continuing challenge to our Federal, State, and local governments. We recognize it for the problem it is and seek to deal with it. For reasons which I shall state later, the overwhelming majority of our people are not at all attracted to the solution to this problem which the Soviet Union offers.

There is one other point that needs to be made with regard to the issue of employment. We need to emphasize the role which a free labor movement has played in the United States in strengthening the role of the worker, achieving increases in wages and improvements in working conditions. The existence of a free labor movement, accountable only to its members and not under the control of employers or governments, is, we believe, essential to the protection of the

interests of working people. It has succeeded in the United States in setting standards not only for its own members but for unorganized workers as well. As I noted yesterday, workers in certain states which profess to have been founded for the benefit of the working people are deprived of the ability to assert their interests through the operation of free and independent labor unions.

**Homelessness.** The distinguished Soviet representative has raised the issue of homelessness in the United States. We recognize the existence of homelessness in our society. This is a complex and difficult problem for us, in large part because in recent years our laws have not allowed us to incarcerate or commit to mental institutions persons who insist on living on the sidewalks of our cities as long as they are not threats to themselves or society. Many of these people refuse to make use of the wide range of accommodations available to them. In some societies they would be charged with vagrancy, parasitism, or forced into mental institutions. In our cities they remain on the streets, quite understandably causing many visitors to wonder whether there is, in fact, no housing available for them.

The fact is that our Federal Government and our State governments have spent and continue to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to provide shelter for the homeless. Those who cannot be self-sufficient, such as the elderly, are given priority in assistance programs. Furthermore, the tradition of voluntarism in the United States has resulted in the creation of a great number of nonprofit groups which have specialized in helping those in need of what our laws call safe and sanitary housing. Particular efforts have been made to assist the elderly.

I should also make it clear that there are quite a number of people in our country who live in housing which we deem substandard. We are interested in improving such housing, though we know that what is substandard in the United States may be standard in countries which are among our severest critics.

**Discrimination.** We readily concede that persons were for a long time discriminated against in our country on the grounds of their ancestry, and we recognize that government at all levels shares culpability with regard to this problem. However, beginning 40 years ago, policies on the subject of race began to change in our country and have changed at an ever-accelerating pace. Over this period the Federal Government as well

as State and local governments have succeeded in stamping out all officially sanctioned forms of discrimination based on ancestry. Beyond that, laws have been enacted that require the private sector to conform to fundamental principles of nondiscrimination.

What I have just said does not mean that we can overnight overcome the results of generations of discrimination and disadvantage. I have not carefully checked all the statistics which our distinguished Soviet colleague has recited, but they may very well be correct. What is important to note is the change in the figures in recent years, as groups of our population which were previously discriminated against have seen the barriers fall and have used the opportunities which have been afforded them.

Nothing that I have said is designed to suggest that we have eliminated racial and ethnic antagonisms within our population. They do exist, and government is not able to change that fact. But here, too, we have witnessed change. Through the activities of various institutions—including, particularly, religious organizations—younger people have increasingly been imbued with a commitment to human brotherhood. We, therefore, have reason to believe that over time these antagonisms will continue to diminish.

My remarks about nondiscrimination generally apply to Indians as well. But our Indian people have a special problem, which they share with indigenous peoples elsewhere in the world—indigenous peoples whose culture and economies differ markedly from those of the surrounding society. Many of our Indian reservation residents are only a few generations removed from a hunting and fishing culture. They have found it much more difficult to fit into industrial society than do the descendants of families engaged in agriculture.

The unusually large unemployment rate on Indian reservations is related to this problem. It is, let me emphasize, the unemployment rate not of Indian people but for Indian reservations. Indian people who have decided to leave the reservations can find and have found jobs elsewhere in the country. But there is no doubt that Indian reservations have found it difficult to attract industry and thereby create job opportunities for Indian people at reasonable wage levels in their home communities. It happens to be a problem with which our government has concerned itself and continues to concern itself. I readily concede that the problem has not been solved. In fact, I have personally worked and written on this subject.

I shall complete this discussion of discrimination by noting again that the United States has served as a magnet for immigrants of all races to achieve a higher standard of life for themselves and for their children. The fact that a majority of recent immigrants to the United States are nonwhites from non-European areas and that they have integrated into our society at a truly amazing speed is clear evidence of the strength of the well-recognized American acceptance of a variety of ethnic groups into our social and economic system.

**The Role of Women.** Much has also been said here as to the role of women in the United States. As to the point made concerning the Equal Rights Amendment, let me note again that the courts of the United States have construed the 5th and 14th amendments to the U.S. Constitution so as to require legal equality between the sexes.

Admittedly, what is required by law takes time to be translated into reality in day-to-day life. The entry of women into our economic life on a basis of parity occurred only quite recently, after 1970. It has, however, progressed at amazing speed. To cite one item of statistics that comes to mind, in 1970, 2% of all law school students were women. Today they are 50%.

But new entries do not come in at the very top. That is why we find average women's wages to be below the average earned by men. It was 60% in 1980; it is 64% today and is expected to continue to rise as the years go by. Here, too, we do not suggest that we have reached our goal of full actual rather than purely legal equality, but we are clearly on our way toward that goal.

## Soviet Economic Progress Since the October Revolution

As I said earlier, we had not intended to engage here in a debate on the respective advantages of the U.S. and Soviet models, but as the Soviet Union has initiated this discussion, we want to make it clear that we are not inclined to shrink from it. Let me say also that we recognize that the Soviet Union started to industrialize later than we did and that the Soviet Union suffered devastation during World Wars I and II. But let us also remember that we recalled earlier in this session that the war in Europe ended 40 years ago. How far has the Soviet Union been able to travel in this period on the way to its economic goals?

In the early 1960s, Nikita Khrushchev predicted that the Soviet Union would surpass the United States in living standards by 1980. Yet studies of comparative per capita consumption conducted by University of Virginia professor Gertrude Schroeder and others show that today, 25 years after Khrushchev spoke and 67 years after the October Revolution, the Soviet standard of living remains barely one-third of the U.S. level. These same studies show that Soviet living standards are much lower than in any developed Western country.

The average Soviet citizen, in fact, lives less well than someone living at the official U.S. poverty line. An American family living at that level, for example, lives on an income which is 41% of the U.S. average. About 15.2% of our population lives at or below that level. By comparison, as indicated, the average Soviet citizen lives at about one-third of the U.S. average, which gives us some idea of the percentage of the Soviet population which lives below the U.S. poverty line. As suggested earlier by our distinguished Spanish colleague, equally dramatic comparisons can be made between the average Soviet citizen and the average unemployed worker in the West. In the recession year of 1982, for example—the worst since World War II—the median per capita income for unemployed workers in the United States was about \$5,000. The average income of a family with an unemployed worker was \$20,000. We do not deny that such an income in many cases reflected a substantial decline in living standards. But a Soviet family living on the equivalent of \$20,000 a year would be quite well off, even after we have adjusted for differences in the cost of basic needs.

In making these comparisons, I do not mean to suggest that the Soviet Union has made no economic progress since the October Revolution. But the limited success the Soviet economy has enjoyed in the past was dependent on constant additions to the labor force and on the availability of plentiful and inexpensive resources. Now that the Soviet Union has used up its surplus labor pool and its resources are more costly, its growth rates have plummeted. The Soviet Union, in fact, is no longer closing the gap between itself and the developed West. The per capita consumption comparisons I cited earlier have remained constant over the last decade. Given low Soviet labor productivity, the gap can reasonably be expected to widen in the future.

## Shortcomings of the Soviet Economic System

**Consumer Shortages and Corruption.** The Soviet economy today is characterized by pervasive shortages of consumer goods and the widespread corruption these shortages generate. These features, moreover, are not temporary problems which will solve themselves through continued progress over time. Rather, they are problems endemic to the Soviet system of centralized economic planning. This system, based on the notion that a small group of planners can efficiently allocate resources for an entire economy, has created instead an economy of bottlenecks, shortages, and waste.

In the Soviet Union, unlike anywhere in the developed West, the most basic consumer goods are in continuous short supply and rationing remains a common fact of Soviet life. The situation has been so bad in some localities in recent years that food riots have reportedly occurred. In 1981, *Izvestia* reported the introduction of rationing in 12 major Soviet cities, including Irkutsk, Kazan, Tbilisi, Vologda, and Naberezhnye Chelny (now called Brezhnev). We have learned that meat and butter have both been formally rationed in the closed city of Sverdlovsk and its surrounding villages for several years. Presumably, the same is true of many other areas closed to foreign visitors.

The long lines of people lining up for scarce items on Soviet city streets have become famous throughout the world. The production and distribution system is so capricious that it is impossible to tell what will be available from one day to the next. This is why Soviet housewives frequently join lines without inquiring what is for sale. They simply assume they had better get whatever it is while it's available. This is also one important cause of Soviet productivity problems, since working people are typically obliged to take unauthorized absences from their jobs to chase after scarce necessities. These endless shortages force the average Soviet family to spend 2 hours shopping every day just to obtain the basic necessities of life.

The endless waiting is bad enough, but the Soviet consumer often finds that the product waiting for him at the front of the line is hardly worth the wait. The quality, variety, and design of the consumer goods available in the Soviet Union are, in fact, notoriously poor by both Western and East European standards, and retail trade and personal service facilities are scarce, primitive, and inefficient.

As one might expect, the chronic shortage of basic consumer goods has fostered the creation of an enormous black market in scarce items. This, in turn, has led to widespread official corruption as persons with administrative control over scarce commodities divert them for personal gain. Corruption exists in all societies, but in the Soviet Union it is a pervasive and normal part of life. Stealing from the state is so common that the Soviet people have come to take it for granted. Anecdotes about corruption and bribery have become a staple of Soviet humor.

The leaders of the Soviet Union are aware of the problem, of course. It has been frequently raised at party plenums, and the Soviet media are replete with stories of corruption, bribery, and the executions of those unfortunate enough to be selected as examples of equal justice under law. What the Soviet leadership seemingly fails to realize or simply will not face is that an economy of shortages inevitably breeds corruption. Some estimate that as much as 25% of the Soviet gross national product (GNP) is diverted to the black market every year.

It must be emphasized once again that the chronic shortages and widespread corruption which characterize contemporary Soviet life are fundamental features of the Soviet economic system. They reflect the systemic inflexibility of a centralized economic planning system which breeds bottlenecks and inefficiencies.

The Soviet consumer is further disadvantaged by the Soviet preference for spending on defense and heavy industry at the expense of the consumer sector. Soviet per capita spending for defense, for example, is, in relative terms, at least twice as high as in any developed Western country. Though we have heard a great many reminders from some of our colleagues here of the importance of the right to life and appeals for an end to the arms race, let us remember that in the 1970s the Soviet Union was the only runner in that arms race, continuing its buildup while the United States was, in effect, engaging in unilateral arms reduction. Today, the Soviet Union spends at least 14% of its GNP on defense, compared to only 7% for the United States. Given the Soviet Union's systemic economic problems and its emphasis on heavy industry and weapons procurement, it is little wonder that Soviet authorities and press commentators chronically complain about the evils of "consumerism" and against the excessive accumulation of material goods.

**Effects of Agricultural Collectivization** The Soviet system of collectivized agriculture also contributes to the harshness of Soviet life. Much of the problem in food supply stems from the collectivized nature of Soviet agriculture. As is well known, the forced collectivization of agriculture in the early 1930s divested Soviet farmers of their land. What is not so well known is that the forcible confiscation of grain supplies that accompanied it resulted in a widespread famine that killed as many as 6 million in the Ukraine alone. Collectivization not only killed 6 million people but it permanently crippled Soviet agriculture.

The Soviet Union—in prerevolutionary days the world's largest grain exporter—is now the world's largest grain importer. Twenty percent of the Soviet work force works in agriculture, compared to 3% in the United States. Yet the Soviet Union often has had to import up to 25% of its grain. American farmers, who own their own land, are 10 times more productive than their Soviet counterparts. Each year, approximately 20% of the grain, fruit, and vegetable harvest and as much as 50% of the Soviet potato crop perishes because of the poor storage, transportation, and distribution system.

Soviet farmers have not lost their ability to grow crops. They just lack the incentive to do so on a *kolkhoz* [collective farm]. By contrast, even though private plots, which are farmed by individuals in the early morning and late evening hours, occupy only 4% of the Soviet Union's arable land, they produce 25% of the Soviet Union's total crop output.

**Housing Shortages and Deficiencies.** Housing in the Soviet Union is in as short supply as most consumer goods. At least 20% of all urban families must share kitchen and toilet facilities with other families. Another 5% live in factory dormitories. Young married couples are typically forced to live with their parents and must wait years for housing of their own.

The housing that does exist is extremely cramped, more so than in any other developed country in the world. The average Soviet citizen has 14 square meters of living space, for example, compared to the 49 square meters available to the average American. This means that there are approximately two people for every room in the Soviet Union, compared with two rooms for every person in the United States. Soviet statistics reveal that in 1983, 32% of all urban housing had no hot water, 23% was without gas, 19% without indoor baths, 12% without central heating,

11% without sewage facilities, and 9% without water.

The housing situation is much worse in the countryside and contains many features reminiscent of the 19th century—or even the 18th. There, for the most part, heating is with fireplaces, food is cooked on wood stoves, out-houses provide the toilet facilities, and water frequently is from a well.

Although there has been much new housing built in the Soviet Union in recent years, almost all of it consists of poorly constructed high-rise apartment buildings, which are even more poorly maintained. At the current rate of construction, the per capita space available to Soviet citizens will begin to approach the Western standard in approximately 150 years. Soviet housing woes should come as no surprise, given the fact that the Soviet Union spends less than one-fifth as much on housing as the United States and well under half of what is spent in Spain and Japan.

**Status of Soviet Women.** Women in the Soviet Union usually occupy the lowest status and lowest paying jobs in Soviet society. One-third of all working Soviet women, for example, are employed as agricultural laborers. By contrast, only 1.5% of American women are so employed.

Soviet authorities often point to the liberal maternity benefits accorded to Soviet women. Yet the Soviet Union is currently suffering from a severe labor shortage brought on by declining birth rates. This reduction in birth rates, in turn, is due to the extraordinarily high abortion rate. Many women have a history of five or more abortions. The fact is that the low Soviet standard of living compels women to work to supplement the family income. Maternity benefits, with extra mouths to feed and bodies to clothe, are, in many instances, simply not enough to encourage a family to let a child be born.

Unlike Soviet men, the working day of a Soviet woman does not end as she leaves the field or the factory. Soviet women are expected to do the cooking and the housework and the waiting in line.

In the West, women have effectively banded together to fight discrimination and sexism, but Soviet women have no access to effective political power. In its entire history, only one woman has ever served on the Politburo; none serves there now. Fewer than 5% of Central Committee members are female. Interestingly, only one-fourth of Communist Party members are female.

**Medical Care and Health Problems.** Soviet authorities are often fond of pointing out that health care in the Soviet Union is free. As with so much that is free or subsidized in the Soviet Union, however, you often get what you pay for. Although there are plenty of beds in Soviet hospitals, the people who lie in them frequently receive substandard care. **One-third of them, for example, develop postoperative infections due to unsanitary conditions.** Most of the doctors who care for them, moreover, are poorly trained by Western standards. Medicine is not a high-prestige occupation in the Soviet Union, and doctors are among the lowest paid workers in Soviet society. Significantly, 70% of these low-paid physicians are women.

Soviet medicine is not immune to the same shortages that afflict the rest of Soviet society. Medical equipment and many medicines are in extremely short supply. One-third of all Soviet hospitals, for example, do not have adequate facilities for blood transfusions. Basic items such as bandages, aspirin, and syringes are often difficult to find. Food rations are so small that patients must supplement their diet with food from home. In Novosibirsk, for example, which is home to many leading Soviet academic institutes and where one would expect supplies to be significantly better than normal, only 11% of the 216 standard drugs to be prescribed for specific illnesses are actually available. These shortages are not surprising in light of the fact that Soviet per capita expenditures on health care are less than one-third the U.S. level.

Although the problems in the Soviet health care delivery system are serious, they are not the most serious medical problem facing the Soviet Union today. Dramatically, over the course of the past two decades a significant deterioration has occurred in the overall health status of the Soviet population. Recent studies show that there has been an increase in Soviet death and morbidity rates over the past 20 years. The life expectancy of Soviet males has decreased during that period by a little over 4 years, from 66 in the mid-1960s to just under 62 years today. In the United States during the same period, male life expectancy increased from 66 to 71 years. Infant mortality in the Soviet Union has increased from 26.2 per 1,000 live births in 1971 to about 40 per 1,000 today. U.S. infant mortality during the same period has decreased from 24.7 per 1,000 to 10.7.

The Soviet figure for infant mortality is necessarily an estimate since Soviet authorities stopped publishing infant mortality statistics after 1973 when the rate had risen to 31.9 per 1,000. This rate was already much higher than in any developed Western country. The Soviet Union also has stopped publishing life expectancy figures. The reason why this has been done is obvious enough. The decrease in male life expectancy and the increase in infant mortality in the Soviet Union are historic events. Never before has a developed, industrialized nation suffered a decline in these demographic indicators in time of peace.

The reasons for this decline are even more disturbing for anyone tempted to look to the Soviet Union as a model for social and economic development. Factors such as poor health care, increased smoking, and frequently unregulated industrial pollution are important, but perhaps the most important contributor is alcohol. This would appear to be the view of Soviet authorities themselves.

The Soviet Union leads the world in the per capita consumption of hard liquor. Much of it is consumed in the form of home-brewed moonshine known as *samogon*. Alcohol consumption in the Soviet Union has more than doubled over the past 25 years. The death rate from alcohol poisoning in the Soviet Union is 88 times the U.S. rate, and alcohol and its effects may be the leading cause of death among Soviet males.

Alcohol abuse in the Soviet Union is not simply a male problem. Alcohol abuse is the third leading cause of illness among Soviet women and is a key factor in both the alarming rise in birth defects and the increased infant mortality rate. By 1980 the net social cost of alcohol abuse in decreased labor productivity in the Soviet Union amounted to a staggering 8%-9% of the total national income.

Much of the heavy drinking in the Soviet Union occurs in the work place. Professor R. Lirmyan of the Soviet Academy of the U.S.S.R. Ministry of Internal Affairs, writing in a 1982 issue of *Molodoy Kommunist*, reported that 37% of the male work force is chronically drunk. Not surprisingly, drunkenness is the leading cause of industrial accidents.

A poll cited in a March 1984 edition of a Soviet journal, *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, revealed that half the Soviet population regards drunkenness as the number one social problem in the Soviet Union. Seventy-four percent said they were alarmed over the extent of public drunkenness. These statistics make clear that the Soviet Union now suffers from an

alcohol abuse problem of epidemic proportions, serious enough to cause a significant rise in the national death rate.

As I remarked earlier, even the Soviet leadership concurs with this assessment. Vitaliy Fedorchuk, the Soviet Minister for Internal Affairs, interviewed in the August 29, 1984, issue of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, candidly acknowledged that Soviet mortality and sickness rates have been on the increase, and he specifically cited alcohol abuse as the cause.

We note with interest that the Soviet authorities only last week announced yet another campaign against the abuse of alcohol. Production is to be cut back, the drinking age raised, and penalties against the manufacture of home brew increased. While it is possible that these measures may meet with some limited success, we note that similar campaigns have always failed in the past. Our suspicion is that alcohol abuse in the Soviet Union will remain an alarmingly serious problem until the Soviet leadership begins to come to grips with the profound social malaise that gave rise to the problem in the first place. In saying this, I do not mean to deny that there are drug and alcohol abuse problems in the United States and in other countries which deserve our serious attention. But I am suggesting that in the Soviet Union we are dealing with a problem of an entirely different order of magnitude.

## Egalitarianism in the Soviet Union

I have been talking at length here about some serious difficulties in the Soviet social and economic system. But there is one more problem I would like to discuss. As we know, Marxist-Leninist ideology claims to be based on the notion of egalitarianism. This, we are told, is what the great October Revolution was all about. One would, therefore, expect that whatever problems the Soviet Union might have, the Soviet authorities would ensure that no class or group or individuals would ever be accorded privileges not available to other members of Soviet society.

But the truth is that certain groups in Soviet society (the party, the military officer corps, the diplomatic corps, the scientific-technical intelligentsia, the cultural and sports establishments) have deliberately shielded themselves from the social and economic hardships faced by the rest of the population. A privileged 5% of the Soviet population,

## Maintaining Momentum in the Middle East Peace Process

by Richard W. Murphy

*Address before the American Council of Young Political Leaders on June 27, 1985. Ambassador Murphy is Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs.*

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss our policy in the Middle East. The current terrorist hijacking of TWA Flight #847 reminds us that peace in the Middle East has enemies. Extremists and terrorists seek to undermine the forces of moderation in the region. The tragic violence in Lebanon highlights and makes more urgent the need for a negotiated peace settlement in the region. That key—to the stability and security of the Middle East—is the peace process.

The United States has been actively involved for more than two decades in the search for peace in the Middle East. We have had some success, but there is still a difficult road ahead to reach our goal of direct negotiations and peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors. There has recently been positive movement in this direction, much of it due to King Hussein's courageous initiatives.

### The Movement Toward Negotiations

Let me share with you some ideas on where we are in the peace process and where we are likely to be going in the months ahead. The two key themes which are at the heart of our efforts are pragmatism and process. We are now seeing concrete proposals from both sides which address the problem of getting negotiations started rather than focusing on a desired outcome. We now see a willingness to face the hard, practical steps that lie ahead. I would like to explore with you how these concepts relate to recent developments and our expectations for the future.

A new momentum began to develop late last year. At that time, and for the first few months of this year, the key parties in the region seemed content for us to step back a bit and let them work out some of their immediate problems. On the Israeli side, this was largely a result of domestic political considerations. The results of the last election in Israel were inconclusive in many respects and led to a unique experiment in power-sharing between Likud and Labor.

known as the *Nomenklatura*, has access to special "closed" stores that are specially stocked with foreign goods not available in regular stores, as well as bountiful supplies of Soviet goods that are in short supply elsewhere. The average Soviet citizen is forbidden from entering these stores, which are unmarked and have opaque windows to prevent the curious from looking in. Housing space is allocated by state authorities on the basis of social status. Many leading Soviet organizations have their own housing facilities, which are of good standard and centrally located.

The Fourth Directorate of the Ministry of Health runs a closed system of hospitals, clinics, and dispensaries for the *Nomenklatura*, providing far better services than those available to the general population. The Soviet ruling oligarchy also has access to such special benefits as foreign travel, automobiles, admission to the best schools, country houses, access to cultural events, and paid vacations in choice resorts, which are not available to the average citizen. Even the center lanes of certain roads are closed off for their exclusive personal use. To quote from George Orwell's *Animal Farm*: "All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others."

### Conclusion

In an earlier intervention, the distinguished Soviet representative suggested that we were reluctant to discuss social and economic issues in this forum. I hope I have succeeded in dispelling this impression. Despite our many problems, we believe that we in the West, with our pluralistic, mixed-market economies, have gone further toward meeting basic human social and economic aspirations than has the system now in place in the Soviet Union.

More than 35 years ago, there was published a collection of essays authored by prominent former communists or fellow travelers, including Ignazio Silone, Andre Gide, Richard Wright, and Arthur Koestler. The book was entitled *The God That Failed*. Each of these prominent writers explained in his own words why he had concluded that the price in terms of personal freedom was not worth paying to attain the promised goal of a future paradise. The decades that passed have demonstrated that the image of paradise off in the distance was only a mirage. ■

For the new Israeli Government, getting Israeli forces out of Lebanon was a primary consideration across clearly during the election. It was one of the issues on which there was consensus within Israel.

The second priority for the electorate was the need to stabilize the economy. Inflation rates had reached, in the month of October, an annual rate of 1,200%. Although the Israelis have taken several steps, they still have further to go to achieve a comprehensive economic reform plan. This may seem a separate question and unrelated to the peace process, but it demands immediate attention of Israel. It reduces their ability to deal with other problems.

The Arab states, particularly Syria, cited the Israeli military presence in Lebanon as one of the reasons for their movement on negotiating a "cold peace" between Egypt and Israel. Other issues noted by the Syrians inhibiting progress were the status of Taba, a small piece of property on the border, and the Syrian desire to focus greater attention on the quality of life of the Palestinian inhabitants of the occupied territories. There has been some discussion on these issues, too. The Israelis have resumed discussion of the status of Taba, and the Egyptian government has been taking steps toward ameliorating the lives of residents of the West Bank. Improvement in this relationship is important for the psychological climate that would have on the climate of the region.

On the Arab side, there is some very encouraging developments. A new sense of pragmatism has opened up unique possibilities for movement. These developments began last October with Jordan's resumption of formal diplomatic relations with Egypt. In November, the proposed Palestine National Council meeting was held in Amman. The prospects for cooperation between Jordan and the PLO [Palestine Liberation Organization] are bright. King Hussein, addressing the PNC, called on them to join him in seeking a negotiated settlement based on UN Security Council Resolution 242. The PLO has responded to King Hussein's call out of hand.

Richard Schifter

Current  
Policy  
No. 994

# The Soviet Constitution: Myth and Reality



United States Department of State  
Bureau of Public Affairs  
Washington, D.C.

*Following is an address by Richard Schifter, Assistant Secretary for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, before the American Bar Association (ABA), San Francisco, California, August 10, 1987.*

If we were asked to identify the passage or passages in the Constitution of the United States that best characterize the nature of our government, I would assume that a good many of us would point to the Bill of Rights, particularly the First and Fifth Amendments. If the same question were asked with regard to the Soviet Constitution, I, for one, would select four key provisions.

First and foremost, I would direct attention to Article 6, which states:

The leading and guiding force of Soviet society and the nucleus of its political system, of all state organizations and public organizations, is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. . . . The Communist Party . . . determines . . . the course of the domestic and foreign policy of the U.S.S.R., directs the great constructive work of the Soviet people, and imparts a planned, systematic and theoretically substantiated character to their struggle for the victory of communism.

I would then move back to Article 3 and note the following words:

The Soviet state is organized and functions on the principle of democratic centralism. . . . Democratic centralism combines central leadership with local initiative and creative activity. . . .

Next, I would drop down to Article 39, which states:

Enjoyment by citizens of their rights and freedoms must not be to the detriment of the interest of society or the state. . . .

I would round out these quotations from the Soviet Constitution with Article 59, which reads as follows:

Citizens' exercise of their rights and freedoms is inseparable from the performance of their duties and obligations.

Citizens of the U.S.S.R. are obliged to observe the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. and Soviet laws, comply with the standards of socialist conduct, and uphold the honor and dignity of Soviet citizenship.

## The Role of Lenin

The Soviet Constitution is a lengthy document, containing altogether 174 articles. A number of them would, at first blush, remind us of guarantees of individual freedom which are the hallmark of basic charters in true democracies. To understand their meaning and significance in the Soviet setting, we need to comprehend fully just what the role of a constitution is in the U.S.S.R. and how constitutional provisions must be read in the context of the Soviet Union's basic notions of the relationship between the governing and the governed.

In seeking to construe our own Constitution, we often refer to the *Federalist Papers* and other writings of the Founding Fathers. Similarly, the Soviet Constitution should be inter-

preted in light of the writings of the Soviet Union's Founding Father. That person is, of course, Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, whom the world has come to know as Lenin.

In using the term Marxism-Leninism, we often lose sight of the individuals to whose teachings we thus refer. They were, in fact, persons who differed markedly from each other. Karl Marx was a theoretician, who proclaimed to the world his purportedly scientific analyses of economics and history and who predicted future historic trends on the basis of his analyses.

Lenin, by contrast, was an activist. His writings are free of abstruse theory. They are how-to-do-it kits on seizing and holding power. To be sure, these writings were not entirely original. Their basic theses can be found in Machiavelli's *The Prince*, written close to 400 years before Lenin put pen to paper.

After having become familiar with Marx's writings, Lenin committed himself to helping history along by seeking to establish first in Russia and then throughout the world his own notion of Marx's vision of an ideal society. With single-minded devotion to his cause, he applied himself to the goal of taking power in Russia, a goal which he reached in the fall of 1917.

Lenin, we must note, had competition among the revolutionaries who, like he, tried to depose the czar and Russia's ruling aristocracy. His competitors included advocates of capitalist

democracy as well as leftwing revolutionaries, some of them fellow Marxists. What distinguished most of them from Lenin was that, in one way or the other, they subscribed to the ideas of the role of government and of the dignity of the individual which were the essence of the teachings of the Enlightenment. These teachings, let us recall, are, indeed, the teachings to which our Founding Fathers subscribed and which provided the ideological base on which our system of government is built.

Lenin rejected these teachings, derisively referring to them as "bourgeois liberalism." His basic precepts were that the power of the state must be seized and held by an elite group, which he viewed as "the vanguard of the revolution." That vanguard was the Bolshevik faction of the Russian Social Democratic Party, which later renamed itself the Communist Party. Not long after the Bolsheviks had taken power, one of Lenin's disciples and a principal leader of the new Soviet state, Grigory Zinoviev, had this to say in his report to the 11th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party:

[W]e constitute the single legal party in Russia; . . . we maintain a so-called monopoly on legality. We have taken away political freedom from our opponents; we do not permit the legal existence of those who strive to compete with us. We have clamped a lock on the lips of the Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries. We could not have acted otherwise, I think. The dictatorship of the proletariat, Comrade Lenin says, is a very terrible undertaking. It is not possible to insure the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat without breaking the backbone of all opponents of the dictatorship. No one can appoint the time when we shall be able to revise our attitude on this question.

Within the party, decisionmaking, according to Lenin, was to be concentrated at the very top. As semantic games are often played by the Soviets and as the term "democracy" is assigned an important role in that context, let me share with you the following quotation from Lenin:

Soviet socialist democracy is not in the least incompatible with individual rule and dictatorship. . . . What is necessary is individual rule, the recognition of the dictatorial powers of one man. . . . All phrases about equal rights are nonsense.

It is against this background that we must read the term "democratic centralism," as it appears in Article 3 of the Soviet Constitution. It means that the people in the central position call the shots. Lenin made no bones about his intention to establish a dictatorship.

### The Soviet Constitution as an Educational and Propaganda Instrument

We must understand, therefore, that the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. is not, like our Constitution, a document that spells out the powers and form of government as well as its limits and the inalienable rights of the individual. In a Leninist state there are, by definition, no limits to the power of government. There are no inalienable rights of the individual. Law is made and altered at will by the leadership. The powers of the leadership cannot be limited by an overarching document that would deprive a leadership group of its freedom to act as it sees fit. Nor can the assertion of the right of an individual stand in the way of the leadership's determination of what is good for society.

The Constitution of the U.S.S.R. is, therefore, an educational and propaganda instrument. Any provisions contained in the Constitution which might facially suggest that freedom of the kind that we know exists are effectively modified by the key phrases in Articles 3, 6, 39, and 59 to which I referred earlier.

Let me offer an illustration of what I mean. The equivalent of our First Amendment is contained in Article 50 of the Soviet Constitution, which reads as follows:

In accordance with the interests of the people and in order to strengthen and develop the socialist system, citizens of the U.S.S.R. are guaranteed freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly, meetings, street processions and of demonstration.

Starting from our notions of civil liberties, we might read this article to mean that citizens of the U.S.S.R. are guaranteed freedom of expression and that that grant of freedom accords with the interest of the people and strengthens the Soviet Union's system of government. But that is not the way Article 50 is understood in the Soviet Union. The way Article 50 is applied, freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly is granted *only if it accords with the interest of the people and if it strengthens and develops the socialist system*. And who is to decide what is in the interest of the people and what strengthens and develops the socialist system? The answer is, of course, found in Articles 3 and 6 of the Constitution. What is in the interest of the people is decided by the Communist Party and ultimately by the central leadership, the Politburo. That is why a law that makes defamation of the socialist system a crime is constitutional. Defamation,

which in Soviet practice means speaking unpleasant truths, is presumed not to strengthen the socialist system.

Let us take a look at another constitutional provision dealing with civil liberties. Article 52 reads as follows:

Citizens of the U.S.S.R. are guaranteed freedom of conscience, that is, the right to profess or not to profess any religion, and to conduct religious worship or atheistic propaganda.

Indeed, in the Soviet Union today, anyone may profess a religion. But nothing in the Constitution prohibits the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from banning anyone who professes religion from its membership and, therefore, from advancement to any position of leadership and responsibility in Soviet society. Furthermore, while the right to conduct religious worship is guaranteed, this phrase has not been construed to mean that any group of citizens may conduct religious worship at any time in any place of their choosing. Laws have been promulgated which allow religious associations to form and register with the authorities of the state. If they are registered and if they do receive permission to use a house of worship, worship in that place at times authorized therefor is permitted. Any group which worships without appropriate authority can be and often is punished severely.

How does all of that comport with the constitutionally guaranteed right "to conduct religious worship"? The Soviet answer would be that the right to conduct religious worship exists. The Constitution, they will say, does not guarantee a right to *unregulated* religious worship.

To understand how religion may be practiced in the Soviet Union, we, as American lawyers, should think of the way the securities industry functions in the United States. Just as you may practice religion in the Soviet Union, you may engage in the securities business in the United States. But to engage in the securities business in our country, you must operate within the regulations issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission. If you act outside the regulations, you may, indeed, be punished. That is the way it is with the practice of religion in the Soviet Union. If you act within the regulations laid down by the Religious Affairs Commission, you will not run into any problems. If you act outside these regulations, you violate Article 227 of the criminal code of the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic or the corresponding code sections in the criminal codes of the other republics. Article 227

makes it a crime to participate in a group which "under the guise of preaching religious doctrines and performing religious rituals is connected with . . . inciting citizens to refuse to do social activity or to fulfill obligations. . . ." The penalty imposed upon violators is customarily 3 years of deprivation of freedom. For leaders of such a group, it is 5 years.

### Gorbachev and *Glasnost*

In light of the news that has come out of the Soviet Union within the last 8 months or so, you might ask whether we cannot expect some fundamental changes in the roles of the party and the state under Mikhail Gorbachev and *glasnost*. My answer to this question would be "no." Gorbachev is deeply committed to carry on in the spirit of Lenin and, as I noted at the outset, dominance of the state by a single party, control of the party by a self-perpetuating leadership group, and subordination of the individual to the interests of the state, as defined by the leadership, are the essential elements of the teachings of Lenin. In fact, Gorbachev made precisely that point in his statement to the Communist Party's Central Committee Plenum in January of this year when he emphasized that "the principle of the Party rules under which the decisions of higher bodies are binding on all lower Party committees . . . remains unshakeable."

What Gorbachev and his friends are attempting to strip from the operations of the Soviet system, in the name of *glasnost*, are the features of oriental despotism initially imbedded in the Leninist construct by Joseph Stalin. These include severe punishment for the mere expression of dissenting opinions, rigid limitations upon allowed literary expression, state control over all other forms of artistic endeavor, punishment for criticism of any state official or any official action, etc. Under *glasnost* all of these Stalinist controls

are to be relaxed. The petty tyrannies of local officials are to be ended, as efforts are made to have the lower levels of the bureaucracy operate under the rule of law. But, and this is a point that must be kept in mind, there are to be limits to the relaxation. Nothing is or will be allowed that might threaten the control of the state by the party, as guaranteed by Article 6 of the Constitution. Gorbachev and his colleagues reject, as did Lenin before them, "bourgeois democracy." Their goal is to return to the practices of the Soviet system in the early 1920s, in the time of Lenin and the years immediately after his death. Their notion is to live by Lenin's precepts, not to abandon them.

It is important to note in this context that Stalinism is now being stripped from the Soviet system for the second time. It was initially exorcised by Nikita Khrushchev, back in the 1950s. It evidently sprouted again after Khrushchev's removal, even though not driven by paranoia of the same intensity as under Stalin. What the Soviets really should ask themselves is whether a Leninist system, without any checks and balances, will inevitably, over time, develop Stalinist features and whether, therefore, in the absence of fundamental change, Gorbachev's *glasnost* is not likely to go the way of Khrushchev's thaw, with the country returning to another form of despotic rule.

As I have noted, the Soviet governmental system is characterized by an absence of checks and balances, by an absence of a constitutional framework which guarantees individual rights against the highest state authority. It is for that reason that the operation of the entire system is so critically dependent on the outlook and attitude of the person or persons who at any one time control the principal levers of power in the Soviet Union. As Dr. Koryagin—the Soviet psychiatrist who has recently been released from prison—has had occasion to observe, the somewhat

greater freedom of expression now allowed in the Soviet Union is not *guaranteed*, it is *permitted*, and permission can at any time be withdrawn.

Though the Soviet leadership does not appear to have any present intention of abandoning the basic precepts on which its system of government rests, that does not mean that no change will ever occur. Having gotten in recent months at least a whiff of greater freedom, some Soviet citizens might be willing to learn how other societies go about the task of assuring respect for individual rights. And who would be better equipped to talk to them about this subject than those whose professional responsibility it is in a democratic country to see that the rights of the individual are protected?

It is for that reason that I want to end my remarks with an appeal to you. If the ABA/Association of Soviet Lawyers agreement is renewed, I sincerely hope that American participants will try to learn how the Soviet system works, will learn to understand the facade which the Soviet Constitution presents, a facade behind which any Politburo directive can supersede any alleged constitutional guarantee. I hope that American participants will not be shy about explaining to the Soviet lawyers they meet the difference between a constitution which a country's political leadership can manipulate at will and one which with the help of an independent judiciary can, indeed, shield the individual citizen against oppressive government. In responding to you, a good many of your interlocutors will parrot the party line, but deep down they will understand what you are talking about. ■

Published by the United States Department of State • Bureau of Public Affairs  
Office of Public Communication • Editorial Division • Washington, D.C. • August 1987  
Editor: Colleen Sussman • This material is in the public domain and may be reproduced without permission; citation of this source is appreciated.



---

*Bureau of Public Affairs*  
United States Department of State  
Washington, D.C. 20520

---

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

If address is incorrect  
please indicate change.  
Do not cover or destroy  
this address label. Mail  
change of address to  
PA/OAP, Rm 5815A. ▶

<p>BULK RATE POSTAGE &amp; FEES PAID U.S. Department of State Permit No. G-130</p>
--