

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) (2)

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

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

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

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

Rhett Dawson

DATE: 4/29/88

ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:

2:00 pm 5/2/88

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOBBS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOOLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KRANOWITZ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MILLER - OMB	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	POWELL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAUER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RANGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIBB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RISQUE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIPPEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CULVAHOUSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DAWSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DONATELLI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DOLAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRISCOM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide any comments directly to Tony Dolan by 2:00 pm Monday, May 2nd with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

RESPONSE:

see edits/changes/comments
Additional edits from
Griscome - marked in yellow -
on pages with corners
folded down -

*TD*Rhett Dawson
Ext. 2702*marked in blue - -*
at K... in file

(Robinson/ARD)
April 29, 1988
2:30 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. 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.

No Soviet jokes!

~~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. These stories are a testimony to the resilience and goodness of the Russian people. And by the way, Mr. Gorbachev has a good sense of humor himself and has told me a few good tales. Anyway, 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, with Reagan!' and nothing would happen to me." And, yes, tell that to Mr. Gorbachev. And yes he laughed. Boy, was I glad he laughed.

"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."

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 ~~an example~~ ^{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} ~~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. *That is a basic difference in our view and the Soviet view of government.*

~~In the Soviet Union, the contrast could hardly be more pronounced. Yes, certain articles in the Soviet constitution~~

For in a Leninist state, there are, by definition, no limits to the power of government.

~~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...."

the not accurate for me. I read over Lenin did not say this

Within the Party itself, Lenin asserted that decision-making was to be tightly concentrated at the top. ~~By the way, you might altered at will by this leadership. The power of the leadership cannot be limited by a document -- a Constitution. Nor can socialist democracy is not in the least incompatible with an individual stand in the way of the leadership's individual rule and dictatorship.... what is necessary is decision of what is right for the people. 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 ~~exists. Rights such as free speech, free press, their Constitution. Consider, for example, Article 50: 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, ~~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?~~

For many decades, the most serious threat to human integrity & human dignity has come from states that wield chain the right to control both body

And who makes that decision: the Communist Party. [⊙]

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

In the Soviet Union, then, it is not the individual ~~who~~
~~comes first~~ ^{and} / It is not even the State that comes first. It is
the Communist Party -- and ^{its} ~~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 -- ^{do not have the same standing there. ⊙}
~~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 ~~more~~ 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. ^{well,} ~~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... *in full view for all to see*
Now consider, if you will, the ~~social and economic failings~~ *Conditions* 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.

out "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 ~~advances in~~ ^{new creativity of} Western technology, the gap is likely to widen.

I have no desire ~~to~~ ^{System} berate the Soviets. I mention ~~it here~~ ^{their backwardness} 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 ~~begun to publish~~ ^{ed} articles about Soviet ~~shortcomings~~ ^{shortages} -- one recent article dealt ~~frankly and in detail~~ with the inadequacies of Soviet housing. The Soviet press ~~is filled with~~ ^{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 ~~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 ^(of land make) 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.~~ ^(The free flow) Freedom of information, to provide another example, will clearly prove vital ^{for} Soviet scientists ~~and~~ to have ~~any~~ hope of reaching ~~new~~ ^{newer 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} ~~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, and prisons the incarceration of dissidents in mental hospitals and some cases, stopped completely ~~During the past 10 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 encourage 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 discussing in my meetings in Moscow 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 ~~a~~ church, synagogue, mosque, or other house of worship may not exist ~~unless the government has granted it permission.~~ without ~~the~~ numbers of the faithful suffer ~~the entire Ukrainian Catholic Church, for example, has been declared illegal.~~ have been imprisoned in the past ~~prison~~ for acts of worship. And yet -- to quote the Universal

we recognize changes occur slowly; but that is much better than no change at all

Gorbachev

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~~ ^{for such} government regulation of religion to ~~an end.~~ And ~~the~~ General Secretary has indicated a willingness to consider "a new law" on the freedom of conscience.

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." ^(should put this issue behind) The Soviet Union ~~must~~

^{by granting} grant full recognition to this basic human right. And I know you join me in urging ~~them to begin freeing~~ ^{the} ~~right now~~ ^{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~~ ^{But we cannot be satisfied until} the Soviets grant all their peoples ^{full and} complete freedom of movement.

~~And in the meantime, I will raise~~ one point in particular ~~with Mr. Gorbachev. You see,~~ the Soviets refuse many the right to

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 prison.

leave on the grounds that they possess secret information -- 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~~ ^{hope such cases will be rationally reviewed} ^(the decision will be made) -- 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 ~~reversed~~ ^{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 ~~may not prosper~~

will succeed if

~~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 ^{many} ~~their~~ peoples.

~~I mentioned that for some 30 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 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} ~~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" ~~And 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.

- Reflects NSC changes -
as of 5/2/88

3:00 pm

per T. Guscom & Amb. Negroponte

(Robinson/ARD)

May 2, 1988

3:00 p.m.

10:

~~Robinson~~
Dowson
Powell

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

Barb

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". 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

often speak about

in individual
liberties &
fundamental
freedom

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.

It is the notion that
Government, ~~they argued,~~ should derive its mandate from the consent of the governed, this consent being expressed in free, *contested,*
regular 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

+ Bill of 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. *They are Fundamental -- Fundamental to everything ©*

Yes, the United States has social and economic *failings* ^{*shortcomings*}.

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~~ ^{there remains a} ~~the gap between itself and the West.~~ ^{the Soviet Union} Indeed, given the enormous advances in Western technology, the gap is likely to widen.

OK 5/1 I have no desire to ~~berate the Soviet system.~~ ^{question its existence} 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~~ ^{science + 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 ~~trained~~ ^{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. 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.~~ Can be removed And I know you join me in urging the freeing of ~~every last person~~ people 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, ~~the rate of~~ the rate of ~~people have been~~ has been significantly higher 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} ~~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~~ ^{making the} ~~more permanent~~ ^{more permanent} (C)

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} ~~permitted relatively wide freedoms, particularly freedom of speech~~ (C). 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}~~perestroika~~" -- today's new ^{candor}~~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.

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 4/29/88

ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2:00 pm 5/2/88

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOBBS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOOLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KRANOWITZ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MILLER - OMB	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	POWELL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAUER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RANGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIBB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RISQUE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIPPEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CULVAHOUSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DAWSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DONATELLI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DOLAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRISCOM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide any comments directly to Tony Dolan by 2:00 pm Monday, May 2nd with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

RESPONSE:

see edits/changes/comments

RG

Rhett Dawson
Ext. 2702

(Robinson/ARD)
April 29, 1988
2:30 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. 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.

No Soviet jokes!

~~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. These stories are a testimony to the resilience and goodness of the Russian people. And by the way, Mr. Gorbachev has a good sense of humor himself and has told me a few good tales. Anyway, 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." And, yes. I did tell that to Mr. Gorbachev. And yes he laughed. Boy, was I glad he laughed.

"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."

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 ^{our} ~~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. *That is a basic difference in our view and the Soviet view of government.*

~~In the Soviet Union, the contrast could hardly be more pronounced. Yes, certain articles in the Soviet constitution~~

For in a Leninist state, there are, by definition, no limits to the power of government.

the not accurate
quote from
material
I read
over
which
leaving
did not
say
this.

For many decades, the most serious threat to human integrity & human dignity has come from states, that would claim the right to control both body

"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?~~

And who makes that decision: the Communist Party. (C)

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

In the Soviet Union, then, it is not the individual ~~who~~
~~comes first~~ ^{and} / It is not even the State that comes first. It is
the Communist Party -- and ^{its} ~~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 -- ^{do not have the same standing there} (C)
~~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 ~~more~~ further change, hope
that in the days ahead the Soviets will grant further recognition
to the fundamental civil and political rights of all ~~people~~.

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. ^{well,} ~~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...

^{Now} ~~But~~ consider, if you will, the ~~social and economic failings~~ ^{in full view for all to see} ~~of the Soviet Union itself.~~ ^{Conditions}

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.

out | "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 ~~advances in~~ ^{new creativity of} Western technology, the gap is likely to widen.

I have no desire ~~now~~ to berate the Soviets. ^{System} I mention ~~their backwardness~~ ^{it here} because in recent months -- and this is a development of tremendous significance -- ~~in recent months~~ ^{-- just like Americans do about their problems} they have begun to mention it themselves. Soviet economists have ~~begun to~~ ^{ad} publish articles about Soviet ~~shortcomings~~ ^{shortages} -- one recent article dealt ~~frankly and in detail~~ with the inadequacies of Soviet housing. The Soviet press ~~is filled with~~ ^{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 ~~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 ^{(of land) make} 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 these plots are free to keep the rewards of their own labor.~~ ^{The free flow} Freedom of information, to provide another example, will clearly prove vital ^{for} Soviet scientists ~~are~~ to have ~~any~~ hope of reaching ~~new~~ ^{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} ~~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 encourage ~~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 ~~discussing~~ ^{discussing} in my meetings ~~with Mr. Gorbachev~~ ^{in Moscow}. It has four ~~aims~~ aims.

First, freedom of religion. Despite the recent relaxation of some controls on the exercise of religion, it is still true that ~~a~~ church, synagogue, mosque, or other house of worship may not exist ~~unless the government has granted it~~ ^{without} permission. Large numbers of the faithful suffer -- the entire Ukrainian Catholic Church, for example, has been declared illegal. Many ~~are in~~ ^{have been imprisoned} ~~in the past~~ ^{prison} for acts of worship. And yet -- to quote the Universal

we recognize changes occur slowly; but that is much better than no change at all

Gorbachev

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~~ ^{for such} government regulation of religion to ~~an end.~~ And ~~the~~ General Secretary has indicated a willingness to consider "a new law" on the freedom of conscience.

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." ^(Should put this issue behind it) The Soviet Union ~~must~~ ^{by granting} grant full recognition to this basic human right. And I know you join me in urging ~~them to begin freeing~~ ^{the} ~~right now~~ ^{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~~ ^{But we cannot be satisfied until} the Soviets grant all their peoples ^{full and} complete freedom of movement.

~~And in the meantime, I will raise~~ one point in particular, with ~~Mr. Gorbachev. You see,~~ the Soviets refuse many the right to

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 prison.

leave on the grounds that they possess secret information -- even though they had ended their ^{as-called} secret work many years before, and whatever information they had has become public or obsolete. I

~~will urge Mr. Gorbachev to review these cases~~ ^{hope such cases will be rationally reviewed} ^{the decision will be made} -- 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.

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 ~~may not prosper~~

will succeed if

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~~ ^{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. ~~I would suggest -- and indeed, in Moscow~~ ^{Hopefully, the time has come} ~~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 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} ~~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" ~~As 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.

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

Barb

DATE: 4/29/88

ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:

2:00 pm 5/2/88

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOBBS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOOLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KRANOWITZ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MILLER - OMB	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	POWELL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAUER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RANGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIBB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RISQUE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIPPEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CULVAHOUSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DAWSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DONATELLI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DOLAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRISCOM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

Please provide any comments directly to Tony Dolan by 2:00 pm Monday, May 2nd with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

RESPONSE:

Should consider insert, 1st HP on former Sen. Charles Percy - newly-appointed Chairman of Int'l Cultural + Trade Comm. (?) which met in OEOB last Friday - he will be in audience

DLG/CES

Rhett Dawson
Ext. 2702

Dan L. Crippen 5-2-88

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

3291

May 3, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR COLIN L. POWELL

FROM: PAUL SCHOTT STEVENS *PS*
SUBJECT: National Strategy Forum Speech

Lynn Pascoe just called with State's comments on tomorrow's speech. They have no problems, but do suggest that we "toughen it up" in one respect. (Yes, that's right - toughen it up.) In the first paragraph on page 7 they would make the changes noted below (indicated by underlining).

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. [And] But, if they recognize human rights for [other] 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.

If you concur, I can propose this change through Rhett Dawson. Alternatively, you might wish to raise it with Tom Griscom directly. Please let me know which, if either.

Attachment
National Strategy Forum Speech

Bow

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

3291
Advance
Speechwriters

DATE: 4/29/88 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2:00 pm 5/2/88

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOBBS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HOOLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KRANOWITZ	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MILLER - OMB	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	POWELL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAUER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RANGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIBB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RISQUE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CRIPPEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	RYAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CULVAHOUSE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	SPRINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DAWSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TUTTLE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DONATELLI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DOLAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRISCOM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

→

REMARKS:

Please provide any comments directly to Tony Dolan by 2:00 pm Monday, May 2nd with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

RESPONSE:

May 2, 1988

TO: Tony Dolan

NSC concurs in the speech with the changes marked.

Paul Schott Stevens
Executive Secretary

Rhett Dawson
Ext. 2702

cc: Rhett Dawson

(Robinson/ARD)
April 29, 1988
2:30 p.m.

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

*Is this
okay by
Robinson, by
any chance?*

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.

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. These stories are a testimony to the
resilience and goodness of the Russian people. And by the way,
Mr. Gorbachev has a good sense of humor himself and has told me a
few good tales. Anyway, 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." And, yes, I did tell that to Mr. Gorbachev. And yes he laughed. Boy, was I glad he laughed.

"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 ^{often speak about} ~~use the phrase~~ "human rights," ^{individual liberties, and} ~~often~~ ^{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. 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, ^{a standard that is, indeed, a universal} ~~and that we can hold up as a~~ standard for all the world.

stress here
and on next
page that
our standard
is the universal
standard, not culture-bound
- morally equivalent to
their "standard."

wish you
could
find a
new
joke!

our point
is to
promote
a subject
in this
direction.
The real
issue is
political
liberty.

The civilized world today has a very clear idea of the notion of political liberty. It happens to draw on traditions of Western civilization. ~~Ultimately, our view of human rights derives from our -- the Greeks and Romans, the Judeo-Christian tradition, Magna Carta, Judeo-Christian heritage and the view that each individual life in 18th Century Enlightenment -- but today it is the heritage of is sacred. It takes more detailed form in the works of the every continent, from Costa Rica to Botswana to India to the Philippines. French and English writers of the 18th-century Enlightenment.~~

Key point
It is the notion that

Government ~~they argued~~, should derive its mandate from the consent of the governed, this consent being expressed in free, ^{contested, regular} 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.

Bill of Rights
These and other rights enshrined in ^{our} the ^{and Bill of Rights} 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.

one own
In spite of all the reforms we are hearing about -- and even those in the Soviet Union, the contrast could hardly be more pronounced -- that is not yet how things are in the Soviet Union. Yes, certain articles in the Soviet Constitution

resemble those of other countries' constitutions 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~~ ^{in the Soviet Constitution,} ~~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?

condense
or
tone
down.

Drop
one or
both of
these
quotes

You can
leave it
a rhetorical
question.

~~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~~ ^{Security of the citizen against the political} ~~dignity of every human~~
^{authorities} ~~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.~~

^Q For In recent months, the Soviet Union has shown a ^{degree of flexibility in relieving hardship} ~~willingness -- albeit a very~~ ^{cases, in allowing a slight increase in emigration, and indeed in loosening up the} ~~limited willingness~~ ^{to respect at least some human rights. It} ~~constraints on intellectual, cultural, and religious activity. 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.

I should
if this
my back.
would not
cede
that there
are equal
weight on
our
agenda

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, fundamental to the solution to these problems.*

~~(But to proceed to the substance of the Soviet charges)~~ Yes, the United States has social and economic ^{shortcomings,} ~~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.)~~

Too defensive. skip all this

~~(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.)~~ ^{with} Yet in freedom we are constantly confronting them, criticizing ourselves, always seeking to do better. It is the self-correcting resilience of a free society that affords the best hope solution to such ~~problems. But consider, if you will, the social and economic failings~~

~~of the Soviet Union itself.~~

The most telling reply, therefore, to the Soviet criticism of our system is that the Soviet system itself has done so poorly between the various peoples of the Soviet Union -- the issue is in dealing with this economic and social dimension of so sensitive, indeed, that I will do no more than mention it in passing. How ironic that a system that prides itself on scientific understanding of the material factors and economic ~~is there homelessness in the Soviet Union? Not exactly; laws in human affairs has failed so badly in delivering those on the streets are often picked up on charges of vagrancy or parasitism.~~

There's no need to dwell on the statistics here -- the ~~But housing in the Soviet Union is more cramped than that in inadequate housing, the infant mortality, the food shortages, any other developed country in the world. The figures indicate the nationalities problems, the governmental corruption and that there are approximately 2 people for every room in the juvenile delinquency.~~

~~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

indense all this.
Don't get into a big debate over this when we really don't want it to have equal weight in the agenda

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 ^{pursue such a debate.} ~~berate the Soviets~~ I mention ^{these Soviet problems} ~~their backwardness~~ because in recent months -- and this is a development of tremendous significance -- in recent months they have begun to mention ^{them} ~~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 ^{science and technology} ~~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 ^{inquiring} ~~trained~~ mind that produces a technical breakthrough, the imagination that conceives of new products and markets, ^{the energy and initiative that turns an idea into a change in people's lives.} 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

Not
doctrination!

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 ^{Russian criminal code,} ~~Soviet Constitution~~ ^{on so-called anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda} the article, the Soviets ^{which} 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

Not
inhibition,
at
SFSR
criminal
code

Declaration of Human Rights -- "everyone has a right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion." ~~(I knew you agree: It's time for the Soviets to bring government regulation of religion to an end)~~

Make
less
ecturing
&
hectoring

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, ^{the rate of} ~~more~~ people ~~have been~~ permitted to leave the Soviet Union ^{has been significantly higher} 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 ^{still urge} ~~cannot be satisfied until~~ the Soviets ^{to} grant all their peoples complete freedom of movement.

Correction

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, ^{making the} ~~the institutionalization of~~ ^{more permanent,} 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 ^{loosened things up a bit,} ~~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, ^{"glasnost"} ~~Perestroika~~ -- today's new ^{candor} ~~openness~~ -- may not prosper --

Wrong!
Perestroika
means
"restructuring"

unless the Soviets take steps to make it permanent, to institutionalize it. ^{Structural and institutional safeguards} ~~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.

see
resident's
NGA
speeches
in 1985
in 1987

URGENT

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL EXECUTIVE SECRETARY REFERRAL

TIME STAMP

88 APR 29 P 4:06

SYSTEM I LOG NUMBER: 3291☐ (FIRST DRAFT OF REMARKS)ACTION OFFICER: ~~P. [redacted]~~DUE: 1:00, 2 MAY

- ☐ Prepare Memo Stevens to Dawson
☒ Prepare Memo Stevens to Dolan WCC to Dawson
☐ Prepare Memo Stevens to _____
☐ Prepare Memo _____ to _____

*** PUT RESPECTIVE STAFF OFFICER'S NAME IN MARGIN BESIDE CHANGES.

CONCURRENCES/COMMENTS*

DUE: 0900, 2 MAY*PHONE to action officer at ext. 3110

FYI

- ☒ Batjer
☐ Bemis
☐ Brooks
☐ Burns
☐ Childress
☐ Cobb
☐ Cockell
☐ Cohen
☐ Collins
☒ Danzansky chairs
☐ Dean
☐ Dekok
☐ Donley
☐ Douglass
☐ Ermarth
☐ Farrar
☐ Flower
☐ Fortier
☐ Frazier
☐ Grimes

FYI

- ☐ Heiser
☐ Henhoeffer
☐ Herbst
☐ Howard
☐ Howland
☒ Jameson chairs
☐ Jenkins
☐ Kelly, B.
☐ Kelly, J.
☐ Kimberling
☐ Kissell
☒ Ledsky chairs
☐ Lewis
☐ Linhard
☐ Mahley
☐ Matthews
☐ McNamara
☐ Melby
☐ Miskel
☐ Oakley

FYI

- ☐ Paal
☐ Perina
☐ Porter
☐ Reger
☐ Rodman
☐ Rosenberg
☐ Ross
☒ Rostow
☐ Saunders
☐ Scharfen
☐ Snider
☐ Sorzano
☐ Steiner
☐ Tahir-Kheli
☐ Tarbell
☐ Tice
☐ Tillman
☐ Tobey
☒ Popaduk
☒ Curtin chairs

INFORMATION

- ☒ Stevens
☒ Powell (advance)

- ☒ Courtney PERITO
☒ Negroponte (advance)

- ☒ Exec. Sec. Desk
☒ Secretariat CEW 2777

Logged By CDM

Return to Secretariat

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

BS

May 2, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR TONY DOLAN

FROM: FRANK DONATELLI (FJD)
RE: NATIONAL STRATEGY FORUM

My general comment is that I think we are a bit too defensive about our problems at home. The section on homelessness perhaps should be shortened or eliminated.

Specific comments include:

Page one, first paragraph, change Morris to Morry and add the following to the end of the first sentence: Mike Gavin and all of you who participate in the National Strategy Forum.

Mike Gavin is the President of the National Strategy Forum.

Page 6, last paragraph, line 7 add local, so that it reads, Federal, state and local government.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

BS

May 2, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR ANTHONY R. DOLAN
DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND
DIRECTOR OF SPEECHWRITING

FROM: ARTHUR B. CULVAHOUSE, JR.
COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT



SUBJECT: Presidential Address: National Strategy Forum

Counsel's office has reviewed the above-referenced Presidential address, and we have the following comments:

1. At page 3, paragraph 4, we suggest substituting the word "constitute" for the phrase "consist in."
2. At page 4, paragraph 5, we agree that it is important to highlight the fact that the Soviet Constitution includes guarantees similar to our own but that human rights are not, in fact, afforded the same protection. It is our understanding, however, that the language of the Soviet Constitution -- and not simply its application -- provides for this distinction. For example, Article 39 of the Soviet Constitution provides that "enjoyment by citizens of their rights and freedoms must not be to the detriment of the interest of society or the state. . . ." (Emphasis added) We suggest that this paragraph be revised to make it clear that the Soviet Constitution assures the preeminent role of the State and the Communist Party.
3. At page 5, paragraph 3, we do not believe it is accurate to state that the Soviet Union "respects at least some human rights." In our view, respect requires continuous practice over time. The Soviet Union's recent statements and actions do not meet this standard. Therefore, we suggest substituting the word "consider" for "respect." Along these same lines, we also suggest substituting the word "recognize" for the phrase "grant further recognition to."

4. At page 7, we suggest deleting paragraph 4 unless we are prepared to make it clear why the Soviet Union practices internal racial discrimination. We do not believe it is appropriate to state that this issue is so sensitive that the President will not comment further.
5. At page 8, paragraph 3, we suggest deleting the phrase "in recent months" one of the two places it is used in the second sentence.
6. At the bottom of page 11 and the top of page 12, we do not believe it is appropriate for the President to accept the Soviet premise that they are legitimately restricting emigration because of their citizens access to secret information. We suggest revising the last clause to read as follows: "-- even though they had ended their "so-called" secret work many years before, and whatever information they may have had has become public or obsolete."
7. At page 13, continuation paragraph, we recommend deleting the last two sentences because revising laws and the role of the courts in the Soviet Union would not represent true institutional change so long as the Communist Party is in control.

Thank you for submitting this Presidential address for our review.

cc: Rhett B. Dawson