

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: [Undated] Moscow - Catch-All (2)
Box: 385

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/>

PRESIDENT'S SPEECH -
VISIT TO DANILOV MONASTERY

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to meet with you today, especially because we are able to do so in this important religious shrine - a shrine which has only recently been returned to the Church. I only wish I were able to visit other important religious and historical sites, such as Zagorsk and Kiev.

I welcome the opportunity to speak with you in this, the millennial year of Christianity in Kievan Rus. The Millennium is being celebrated throughout the world. In my own country, the celebrations have already begun. The tone of the celebrations is one of hope. Hope that the second millenium in your country will herald a new era of religious freedom.

The American people hope that in this new era all faiths will be allowed to practice freely in the Soviet Union. This includes, of course, religious communities which have been prevented from registering or have been banned altogether, such as the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox Churches. My people hope that religious instruction will be permitted, including instruction to children outside the home. And they hope that many more houses of worship, such as the one we are in now, will be returned to the control of believers.

So, just as we are celebrating 1,000 years of Christianity in Kievan Rus, we are praying for the coming 1,000 years to be marked by expanded freedoms for believers.

You are the leaders and future leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Soviet Union. Your commitment to giving life to that hope is critical.

I join you in celebrating this joyous occasion, and I commit myself and my government to freedom of religion for all peoples and all religious communities everywhere.

Drafted:EUR/SOV/SOBI:DGrossman *OG*

5/9/88 0024S 7-8670

Cleared:EUR/SOV/SOBI:JRPurne *JRP JME*

EUR/SOV:MRParris

(0025S)

PRESIDENT'S SPEECH -
MEETING WITH DISSIDENTS

I am delighted to have this opportunity to meet with you. I have heard much about all of you, and I told my staff that I wanted to meet with some of the people who are trying to implement the most significant form of perestroyka -- perestroyka in the area of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Our foreign policy is rooted in the belief that peace and human liberty go hand in hand. Without freedom, there can be no true peace. A democracy such as ours finds it difficult to establish a firm relationship--marked by trust and confidence--with a government that does not respect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of its own people. This principle lies at the heart of the Helsinki Final Act. The United States Government views it as fundamental to our relationship with the Soviet Union.

Human rights is one of four pillars on which that relationship rests. We have consistently stressed that respect for the rights of Soviet citizens is essential for a significant improvement in our bilateral relationship.

We have noticed some changes in the past two years - a growing respect for freedom of expression, assembly and movement. We welcome this change, but it is only a beginning. This improvement does not meet standards established in the Helsinki Final Act. More important, little of this improvement has been institutionalized by being incorporated into the laws and practices of the land.

After all, what is the significance of the release of some political prisoners, when others convicted on similar charges and for similar reasons still languish in prison? And even if they too are released, what are the prospects for the future if the political articles of the Criminal Code are not repealed?

These and many other questions still concern us. We have pressed the Soviet government to review these concerns carefully. Our commitment remains firm on this issue. There can be no compromise on full respect for human rights.

Drafted: EUR/SOV/SOBI: DGrossman

5/9/88 0025S 7-8670

Cleared: EUR/SOV/SOBI: JRPurnell

EUR/SOV: MRParris

Handwritten notes:
308
for JME

REMARKS FOR POSSIBLE SIGNING CEREMONY
TO BE PROVIDED

President's Meeting with Refuseniks

We Americans feel a special sympathy toward those of you who have sacrificed so much in order to exercise an important human right -- freedom of movement. Except for native Americans, the United States is a country of immigrants. Many of us have heard first-hand from a parent or grandparent about what it means to leave the country of your birth in search of a new life. Millions of American citizens were themselves born in other countries.

Some of you have another compelling reason to emigrate: you wish to join close family members who are already living abroad. To be separated in this way from loved ones is contrary to the deepest and most basic human emotions. It is also contrary to the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act, to which the Soviet Union is a signatory.

As important as family ties are, however, emigration should not be limited to those who have close relatives living abroad. The Soviet Union has agreed to act in conformity with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which states that, "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own." The U.S. objects to the provision in the Soviet law which states that applicants must have an invitation from a close relative. We also object to the requirement that

adult applicants to have their parents' permission. Another very serious barrier to emigration is the arbitrary use of "state security" as a pretext to deny permission to leave.

In my meetings with Soviet officials, I have urged that these barriers to freedom of movement be removed, and that families be allowed to be together in the country of their choice. You can be confident that the United States will keep on stressing these rights in the future, since we understand so well their importance to human beings everywhere in the world.

Drafted:EUR/SOV/SOBI:KCLang

05/09/88 x78670 Wang 0029S

Cleared:EUR/SOV/SOBI:IMSilins

EUR/SOV:MRParris

President's Toast at Soviet Official Dinner

Moscow, May 30, 1988

Mr. General Secretary, honored guests:

Over the next three days, General Secretary Gorbachev and I will review what has been accomplished over the past three years, and what our two nations might accomplish together in the months to come. We have a great deal to discuss on both accounts.

What we have achieved is a good beginning.

We have taken the first steps toward deep reductions of nuclear arsenals.

We have taken the first steps toward resolution of regional conflicts.

We have taken the first steps to deal with the reality that much of the tension and mistrust between our two countries arises from our very different concepts of the fundamental rights and role of the individual in society.

We have taken the first steps to build that network of personal relationships and understanding between societies -- between people -- that are crucial to dispelling dangerous misconceptions and stereotypes.

These are good first steps, Mr. General Secretary. We both can take pride in them. But, as I said, they are just a start. Nuclear arsenals remain too large. The fighting continues needlessly, tragically, in too many regions of the globe. The vision of freedom and cooperation enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act remains unrealized. The American and Soviet people are getting to know each other better, but not well enough.

Mr. General Secretary, you and I are meeting now for the fourth time in three years -- a good deal more often than our predecessors. This has allowed our relationship to differ from theirs in more than a quantitative sense. We have established the kind of working relationship I think we both had in mind when we first met in Geneva. We have been candid about our differences, but sincere in sharing a common objective and working hard together to draw closer to it. It is easy to disagree and much harder to find areas where we can agree. We and our two governments have both gotten into the habit of looking for those areas. We have found more than many expected.

I intend to pursue the search for common ground during the months left to me as President. When I pass the job on to my successor, I intend to tell him it is a search that must be continued. Based on the achievements of the last few years, I will also tell him it is a search that can succeed.

Mr. General Secretary, allow me to raise a glass to the work that has been done, to the work that remains to be done, and to the commitment of our two peoples to build a more stable, productive and open relationship between our two countries.

Drafted: EUR/SOV: RJohnson
0019S 5/6/88 x79370
Cleared: EUR/SOV: BBurton
EUR/SOV: MRParris
EUR: TSimons, Jr.

REMARKS FOR CULTURAL LEADERS

AT HOUSE OF WRITERS

As a representative of the New World, I am honored to address you, the heirs of one of the oldest and richest cultural histories in the world. As one who has spent most of his working life in the arts, and not in politics, I feel an affinity for what you do; and I have a deep respect for the work of your masters over the ages.

You know better than I the wealth of culture created in this country over the centuries. But as an American, I think I can say to you that the effect of Russian culture, of the works of your masters over the ages, has had a profound impact on the way we Americans view your country and your peoples. Many of those masters have visited the United States and have had a direct effect on our people. And, as you know, some have come and stayed. But most importantly, whether directly or through their works, your cultural masters have shaped the way we Americans see our own lives, understand our own history, as well as how we perceive the great moral questions of love and hate, war and peace, sin and innocence, life and death.

We are watching with great interest the developments underway in your society that fall under the heading of

"glasnost." I know that most of you in this room are intimately involved in the question of what glasnost' means for you, for your art, and for your society. There are probably few societies in the world where art and politics have historically been as intertwined as in Russia, where artists have played the kind of political role that they have here. Well, as an actor-turned-politician, believe me, I welcome that kind of involvement. While I have been a critic of your political system, I have admired from afar the courage of Soviet artists who, over the years, often at great personal risk to themselves, have not flinched from remaining true to their art, to use their God-given talent to deliver their message to the people, thereby enriching the culture not only of their own country, but of the entire world. The world is indebted to them.

As we approach the twenty-first century, it is clear to me that, whatever challenges we face, technological change has already dictated that the entire world will face them together. None of us will be able to live in isolation from the cultures of even those people living at the opposite end of the globe from us. We will all be neighbors. Information and culture will take on an even greater international flavor than it has today.

In this respect, we have already seen the beginnings of wonderful new opportunities in the creation of art together. Soviet and American artists regularly visit each other, have workshops together, and as we see increasingly, are even performing together. It was only a few months ago that we had a stirring example of this when Soviets and Americans came together in Boston for a month of making music together, to the enthusiasm of Americans throughout our northeastern states. And in a few days the New York Philharmonic will be here, and performing under a Soviet baton.

I know that New York and Moscow are usually considered the cultural capitals of our two respective societies. Well, as much as I respect those cities, I don't think cultural exchanges should be limited to our big cities. Both of our societies are spread across continents, with peoples of different nationalities, different regional histories, and of course different cultural traditions. I hope that more and more of our energies will be devoted to bring our cultural people together from all regions, from all walks of life, the young and inexperienced, as well as the older, established artists.

There is still much both of our societies can learn about the cultural life we each enjoy, and I hope that we will continue to expand our knowledge of each other. You, as the creators of much of modern Soviet culture, will be instrumental, I hope, in that cause. I can assure you that you will have the assistance of your colleagues in the American cultural world to make that our hope a reality.

SUGGESTED REMARKS FOR
RECIPROCAL DINNER

Mr. General Secretary, Mrs. Gorbachev, distinguished guests and friends.

It is truly a pleasure to host all of you here tonight. Nancy and I have been looking forward to this trip for quite some time. While the General Secretary and I have had the opportunity to meet three times up to now, all of those earlier meetings were in the fall, with the days getting shorter, and the weather ever grayer and colder. It is a wonderful change to be with you here at Spaso House at the high point of the Moscow spring, with the days ever longer and the city in full bloom.

And it is especially gratifying to be able to have you all here at Spaso House, the residence of our Ambassadors to the Soviet Union. Those of you who have been involved in the conduct of US-Soviet affairs over the years know better than I that through all the ups and downs in the relationship over the past fifty-five years, Spaso House has been the venue of many of the diplomatic, and social contacts, we have had with the people of the Soviet Union. Through thick and thin, good times and bad.

And there have been some wonderful times in this house. I understand that Prokof'yev once performed his "Love for Three Oranges" in this very room, and that our first Ambassador used

to have some of the top leaders of the Soviet leadership here for gala parties, staying up with them until the early morning debating the differences between our two societies. As wartime allies we met regularly and frequently under this roof. And in recent times Ambassador Hartman and Ambassador Matlock and their wives have made this house a centerpiece for American culture, a place to receive and talk not only with Soviet officials, but also with people from all walks of life in the Soviet Union.

But there have also been quiet times in this house, unnaturally quiet times, when our contacts with Soviet society were minimal, where official dialogue was all but non-existent. This is a majestic house, laid out as it is in the center of a bustling, busy city. But despite all the activity around it, I understand that when the house is empty of guests, when there's no movement afoot, the silence is overwhelming, so much so that you can hear ever so faintly the Moscow Metro, deep down, far below the house.

We have different societies, different histories, different systems. And I am sure, on many issues, we will continue to have serious differences of opinion. But the General Secretary and I have met now four times, more times than any previous President and General Secretary. We have had long discussions, some of them contentious, some of them friendly. But I can say for myself, and I hope it's true for Mr. Gorbachev, that I understand you, Mr. Gorbachev, and your country better as a result of our dialogue. We still often disagree, but the dialogue has been crucial. Silence, as has sometimes existed between our two countries, is simply not acceptable between great societies.

This evening space house is filled as it was intended to be, by Soviets and Americans, breaking bread together, talking to one another and learning more about each other, about our homes, our families, our work. Not only about our differences, but how in many ways we are alike. This is how it should be. It is also an experience which more and more of our people must have if we are to build true mutual understanding between our societies.

With that in mind, let me raise a toast to the growth in contacts and dialogue between our peoples, such that the silence that has at times weighed heavily on our relationship in the past will be no more.

PRESIDENT'S PRESS STATEMENT

June 1, 1988

I want to thank General Secretary Gorbachev and Mrs. Gorbacheva, and above all the people of Moscow, for the warm welcome and gracious hospitality we have received here.

When I go home in a few days, I will gladly report to the American people that I found in Moscow a deep desire among the Soviet people for peace and friendship.

I came here to continue the mission of strengthening peace by seeking ways to overcome the divisions between East and West. This has been a productive meeting, in the tradition of our earlier meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik and Washington. We haven't settled all the issues between our countries. That was never the intent, nor was it within the reach of a single meeting. But we have agreed to carry on with a process that will address the serious differences that remain.

The next steps in that process are outlined in the Joint Statement which the General Secretary and I have issued today. They encompass potential progress in all four areas of our agenda -- arms control, human rights, regional affairs, bilateral relations. General Secretary Gorbachev and I also delivered a joint report to the American and Soviet peoples on one crucial aspect of our relations, the effort to achieve a Treaty implementing our agreement to reduce the U.S. and Soviet strategic offensive arsenals by half.

As in the past, the General Secretary and I have spoken to each other with candor and with the conviction that, if we work hard and are realistic about both the problems and the possibilities for progress, we can change things for the better. The record of achievement over the last few years shows that to be true. One purpose of our meeting was to celebrate those accomplishments -- the INF Treaty, progress in other arms control areas, the spirited dialogue we have developed in such difficult matters as human rights and regional issues, the great expansion in opportunities for American and Soviet citizens to know and learn from each other.

I have had the great privilege here in Moscow of talking with a wide range of Soviet citizens -- from the students and faculty at Moscow State University, to the monks of the Danilov monastery, to Soviet citizens who are struggling to exercise

their basic human rights. I have found these events deeply moving, and a vivid reminder of the real goal of the effort to improve relations between governments. And that is to shape circumstances which assure the peace and sanctity and freedom of the individual.

I am convinced that a key to building these circumstances is openness. Openness to new ideas and different views. Openness to the free flow of people and information. Openness to the possibility that old problems can be solved, and new ones prevented from arising.

Removing the sources of tension and mistrust in American-Soviet relations will take hard work and a constructive spirit. I found plenty of evidence of both during the discussions here.

President's June 1 Press Statement

Drafted by: EUR/SOV:BBurton

5/9/88 (0023S) ext. 79806

Cleared by: EUR:TWSimons

EUR/SOV:MParris

PA:

The President's Meeting with Embassy Personnel

George Shultz has often remarked on what a tremendous job you do here at the Embassy. I've never doubted that, but there's nothing like being here to help a person appreciate the kind of challenges you people face every day.

Your efforts over the past months have been truly outstanding. And I don't mean just in terms of providing support for my visit -- as good as that support has been.

You are the U.S. Government's eyes and ears in the Soviet Union, and reporting from Moscow and Leningrad has been consistently excellent. You have provided the first-hand information and on-the-scene analysis vital to the sound management of our day-to-day relations with the Soviet Union. And we are looking forward to expanding that reporting effort from our U.S. consulate in Kiev by the end of the year.

What you have accomplished is no small achievement even under the best of circumstances. Doing it from the center of a closed society that does not share your values and mistrusts your motives is nothing short of remarkable.

The success of this summit, like the success of our overall policy toward the Soviet Union, has been due in no small part to your efforts. Everyone in Washington is proud of the work you are doing here. You, too, should be proud.

Thank you very much.

Response to General Secretary's Farewell
at St. George's Hall, Kremlin Palace

Mr. General Secretary, Mrs. Gorbachev, this is an emotional moment for Mrs. Reagan and me. We have been truly moved by the warmth and the generous hospitality we have received from all of our Soviet hosts during this brief visit -- but most especially, from the two of you.

During this meeting as in all of our previous meetings I appreciated and valued our frank exchanges of views, and the long hours of hard work we and our experts put in to make progress on the difficult issues we face.

But this meeting has added something else for Mrs. Reagan and me. Our time here has allowed us to know -- if only briefly -- your art treasures, your monasteries, your Russian countryside, and, above all, your people: artists, writers, people from all walks of life. People who were willing to share with us their experiences, their hopes, their fears.

Mr. General Secretary, it is fitting that we are ending our meeting, as we began it, in this hall - named for St. George, whose victory over the evil dragon is celebrated to this day. I would like to think that our efforts during these past few days have advanced the struggle against the evils that threaten humankind -- threats to peace and to liberty. And I would like to hope that like St. George, with God's help, we, too, will prevail.

Thank you.

Drafted: EUR/SOV: EBSutter 0080S 5/10/88
Cleared: EUR/SOV: MRParris
PA: POakley

President Reagan's Suggested Remarks
Official Departure Ceremony
Moscow/Vnukovo Airport, with Chairman Gromyko

As we leave the Soviet Union, Mrs. Reagan and I would like to express our gratitude to all of our Soviet hosts.

Our official hosts, those in government, have been generous in sharing their thoughts with us, and in working with us through long hours to narrow our differences, to record the progress we have made, and to reach agreements that would benefit both the American and the Soviet peoples. During this week we have advanced the process of building a more stable relationship.

But this visit has given us much more than the satisfaction of good, hard work. Our meetings with the Soviet people -- with religious leaders, with writers, artists, students, political thinkers, people from all walks of life -- have shown us that the American and Soviet people share many characteristics: talent, creativity, a sense of humor, and -- above all -- a desire for peace.

You have opened your homes and your hearts to us, you have shown us your cultural treasures, we have broken bread together. As we leave, we thank you most sincerely, and we wish you, in the words of the old song: "BOOD-tee zda-RO-vwee, zhee-VEE-tee bo-GA-to!" "Be healthy, live richly! We are leaving for home, ..." but we will never forget you.

Drafted: EUR/SOV: EBSutter 0089S 5/12/88 x6735
Cleared: EUR/SOV: JMEvans
PA: POakley

Suggested Presidential Arrival Statement, London

I am happy to be back in the United Kingdom after an absence of some five years for my third visit to England during my presidency. I look forward to my stay here, particularly the opportunity to be received by Her Majesty the Queen.

The discussions I will have with the Prime Minister will, as always, be useful, informative and beneficial. We will of course discuss my recently concluded meetings with General Secretary Gorbachev, as well as many of the other interests which the United States and the United Kingdom share. I am confident the "special relationship" remains strong and close.

Suggested Presidential Remarks to Embassy London Staff

Nancy and I want to thank Ambassador Price and all of you, the members of the Embassy, for the your extraordinary efforts to assure the success of this visit. I know how much time and hard work must be devoted to a Presidential visit. I am also well aware of the particular burden placed on the Embassy's resources by the large number of government officials and media representatives who come to London and need your help. Embassy London has always responded magnificently and has once again done a stellar job.

I am also aware that a visit like this is an exceptional event -- one that takes you away from the day-to-day business of conducting America's foreign affairs. It is equally important to express my appreciation for the work you do every day to represent U.S. interests in the United Kingdom. All too often Americans think a diplomat's job consists mainly of attending receptions and dinners. I know that is not the case -- that you spend long hours working to meet the foreign policy objectives of our country, to strengthen our economy, to enhance our national security and to protect U.S. citizens overseas. Your work here in London has proven invaluable in assuring that the special relationship we enjoy with Great Britain continues to bear fruit.

Once again, Nancy and I wish to thank all the men and women of Embassy London, not just the American employees, but also the Foreign Service Nationals, without whose hard work and support this visit and the execution of our foreign policy would not be possible.

Suggested Presidential Departure Statement, London

After nearly eight years in office, I have visited many corners of the world -- including Great Britain on two previous occasions. This visit to your wonderful country will hold a very special place in my memories as President. As I returned from Moscow, my first stop was in the United Kingdom, the nation with which the United States shares so many common ties. As is always the case when we meet, I found my discussions with the Prime Minister a very useful and enjoyable exchange with a close friend. We discussed many topics of mutual interest, but concentrated primarily on my recent trip to Moscow.

We in the United States are frequently told of the hospitality shown to American visitors to Great Britain. Nancy and I know from personal experience just how warm British hospitality can be. I want to thank you all for the reception we have received here and to tell you how deeply we value the closeness of our two nations and the continued health of our special relationship.

5/10/88 x78027 0987a

EUR/NE:FCooper
EUR/NE:RJohnson
EUR/NE:HPerlow
EUR/PA:TSwitzer
PA:POakley

(0096S)

ARRIVAL AT ANDREWS AFB

It has been said that, "to travel hopefully is a better thing than to arrive." We've certainly travelled hopefully but I've just been to three countries in 10 days and I must say it's good to be home.

Meetings like the ones we've just had in Moscow are important milestones in our relations with the Soviet Union; and they are closely watched all around the world. I imagine political observers are already analyzing this trip, inspecting each event and turn of phrase, and trying to decide what it all means. Before they get too far along, I'd like to offer some of my own thoughts about where we are and what we've accomplished.

I've had occasion recently to think back to the first meeting Mr. Gorbachev and I had in Geneva in 1985; they called that the "fireside summit," and I think some believed it was a bit long on public relations and short on substance. But looking back now, it is clear that we set in train a process that has made a big difference in U.S.-Soviet relations.

Before, high-level meetings between us were infrequent and our relations blew hot and cold, depending on the prevailing direction of the political winds. Now we have had four summits, our foreign ministers have met over 26 times, and scores of officials of our respective governments are in regular contact on subjects ranging from reactor safety to transportation cooperation.

This doesn't mean that our relations with the Soviet Union have entered a new era. We still have different values and beliefs and on many issues the distance between us is as wide as it ever was. But I am convinced that it is in the interest of both our countries, who between us have the power to destroy the world many times over, to find ways to control their competition. I believed we could engage the Soviet Union in such an endeavor if we pursued a consistent policy based on strength, realism and dialogue; and I outlined such a policy in a speech at the beginning of our second term.

This visit to the Soviet Union has convinced me not only that this approach was correct, but that we have made truly impressive strides in carrying it out. I had five meetings with General Secretary Gorbachev and we found areas where we could agree. What is equally impressive is that we were again able to speak frankly about those areas where we do not agree.

It is a sign of our maturing relationship that we can maintain a consistent, realistic dialogue. We speak our minds, we agree where we can, and where a solution is not immediately possible, we keep working at the problem.

I must admit I was as intrigued as anyone to see whether the reports of "new thinking" and "restructuring" in the Soviet Union were true. I don't want to read too much into one four-day trip, but I think some winds of change are blowing. Other presidents have visited the Soviet Union before me, but I don't think they had the opportunity for outreach that I had. I met with dissidents, religious believers and the clergy, artists and writers. I am sure this sort of contact would not have been tolerated even a short time ago; and it convinced me of the worth of our efforts to stabilize the U.S.-Soviet relationship and bring our peoples closer together.

Yet history teaches us that reform can be a fragile flower. It never proceeds without opposition and it can be reversed. We can applaud efforts to liberalize Soviet emigration laws, release prisoners of conscience, and tolerate greater dissent. But the Soviet Union has a long way to go before we can say that glasnost and perestroika have really taken hold.

As I return from this final summit of my administration, I am content that we are on the right track in our dealings with the Soviet Union. We have not accomplished all we wanted to, but the results of our policy are clear, concrete, and impressive in their own right. Equally important, I believe we have established a process that can be sustained over the long term. There is a lot more yet to do but we now have the means to do the job. We need not worry over historic opportunities missed; we have only to roll up our sleeves and continue the work.

I believe this summit has showed that our relationship with the Soviet Union has matured. We have put it on a stable basis that we can sustain for years to come. The framework we have put in place will help the next administration, and the one after that, to control and moderate the superpower rivalry. It is the kind of legacy I am pleased and proud to pass on to my successors and the American people.

Summit Public Statement: Arrival At Andrews AFB

Drafted:EUR/SOV:WMenold

5/12/88 (Wang 6765M) x76736

Cleared:EUR/SOV:JEvans

PA:

MEMORANDUM TO TONY DOLAN
SPEECHWRITERS
RESEARCHERS

Barbara

From: Tom Griscom



Re: Travel Dates

Date: April 20, 1988

There are two new travel dates on President Reagan's schedule pre-summit:
May 4 and May 18.

MAY 4: this speech use use human rights as a main theme. we should reference Helsinki, the president's full agenda, the need to move forward on human rights. there should be some comparison to the way we deal with "human rights" in this country; this will take away the soviet line about oppression of the poor in the U.S.; i would hope the message is one of making progress, similar to progress being made in arms reduction and regional issues; that there have been limited successes, but much more can occur.

May 18: this speech will be at the Coast Guard Academy graduation. There should be a two-part message: drugs and summit.

On drugs, we should talk about progress being made, (I might have some additional initiatives we can use here), the role of the coast guard; i feel we should point out that it is time for bipartisan approach to this problem; note that many in congress talk about cuts in coast guard budget for this area but it was congress last year that re-ordered the priorities and took funds from coast guard for mass transit; President had a great line in the Q & A at Springfield, Mass., on Thursday on drugs and how to deal with them. Please get a copy of that as an approach to be used.

On summit, I would hope that you can trace the president's philosophy as it relates to dealing with the soviets. this is not just to hit one piece of the agenda or another, but to talk about the whoel relationship; how he feels ; how things have developed, etc.

→ Lisa Jameson
Peter Rodman

Research - F.Y.I.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 13, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR TONY DOLAN
SPEECHWRITERS

FROM:

TOM GRISCOM *3*

SUBJECT:

OUTLINE FOR PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS

Attached is a good outline that I strongly suggest you follow. We must be sensitive to how we position the Millennium when we prepare the President's remarks in Moscow.

Barb

→ Call me about this

Aw

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

2740

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

April 12, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR THOMAS GRISCOM

FROM: COLIN L. POWELL 

SUBJECT: Pre-Summit Events Relating to the Millennium of Christianity in Kiev Rus'

There are a number of currently-scheduled and projected pre-Summit events relating to the Millennium of Christianity in Kiev Rus':

Two weeks ago, the President videotaped a three-minute message for use by domestic groups celebrating the Millennium. The message, prepared by NSC, is attached at Tab A. It lays forth the ecumenical line that must be taken about the Millennium, especially because of the controversy inside and outside the USSR about who may lay claim to this momentous occasion -- the Russians or the Ukrainians. (Actually, it is a commemoration for the Russians, Ukrainians, and Belorussians, too).

On April 25, the President will meet briefly with George Weigel, President of the James Madison Foundation, and three religious leaders representing Ukrainians, Russians, and Jews. The James Madison Foundation has collected more than five-hundred signatures of prominent citizens on a petition to General Secretary Gorbachev calling for religious freedom. A copy of the petition is attached at Tab B. Weigel and the other April 25 guests will present a copy of the petition to the President.

On May 3, the White House will hold a Seminar on Religious Rights in the USSR. Although the seminar will address the rights of all believers in the Soviet Union, from Baptists to Buddhists, there will be a major focus on the Millennium. The President will speak at the Seminar.

The events described above are directly related to the Millennium, but other activities will undoubtedly touch on the subject: the meeting with Congressional leaders on human rights (May 13); the human rights event on May 17 (religious freedom will be discussed among other issues); and the meeting with experts on the USSR (date not yet scheduled). In addition, the

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
DECLASSIFY ON: OADR

DECLASSIFIED
White House Guidelines, August 28, 1997
By WJD NARA, Date 6/21/06

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

2

President will need to make an appropriately tailored reference to the Millennium in his remarks at the Danilov Monastery during the Moscow Summit.

Attachments

Tab A Presidential Taping on Millenium
Tab B Petition to General Secretary Gorbachev

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



(Dolan edit)
March 29, 1988
2:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL TAPING: MILLENNIUM OF CHRISTIANITY IN KIEV RUS'
THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1988

The short span of our lifetimes permit few of us to experience the passage of a millennium. This year, our generation is privileged to mark a momentous 1,000 year anniversary -- the Millennium of Christianity in Kiev Rus'.

The Millennium is an event of great importance to all Christians, but, most especially, to the spiritual descendants of Kiev Rus'. ~~_____~~ I join all of you in celebrating the invigorating spirit of renewal that the Millennium brings us, and in its irrevocable message of hope: that despite decades of persecution, especially in this century, faith remains imperishable.

Americans are unswervingly dedicated to supporting freedom of conscience, religion, and belief for all people, and this commitment underlies our continuing emphasis on human rights performance in our relations with the Soviet Union. We have made clear to the Soviet leadership that other aspects of our relationship cannot prosper if the U.S.S.R. continues to abuse the fundamental human rights of its citizens. The Soviet Union signed the 1975 Helsinki Act that provides, among other things, that governments "respect the freedom of an individual to profess and practice, alone or in community with others, religion or belief in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience." We will always insist that the Soviet government upholds this obligation to its own people.

For 70 years, Soviet rulers have systematically tried to replace the people's deep religious faith with the new creed of communism. At the time of the Revolution in 1917, for example, there were more than 80,000 Orthodox churches in Tsarist Russia. Today, according to the Soviet government head of the Council on Religion, there are fewer than 7,000. In Ukraine, whose capital city, Kiev, witnessed St. Vladimir's conversion ten centuries ago, Soviet authorities outlawed the Ukrainian Catholic Church and forcibly subjugated Ukrainian Orthodoxy to state control. Appeals by the Uniate Church for official registration have gone unheeded. All Soviet believers -- Christian, Moslem, and Jewish alike -- are deprived of elementary freedoms to publish spiritual literature, preach ethics and doctrines, and instruct their children in the teachings of the faith. With few exceptions, churches are still prevented from engaging in charitable activities, even though citizens in Poland, and even Bulgaria and Romania, are not denied this right.

Yet, the church has survived in suffering, and Christianity within the U.S.S.R. is experiencing an unprecedented spiritual revival. Decades of militant state atheism could not extinguish the yearning of people for God and church. And like the martyrs of ancient Rome, Soviet Christians kept the light shining in darkness -- the light of faith, fidelity, and freedom.

The Christian Millennium in Kiev Rus' is a sign of that light to all who live under oppression. It is a promise of the triumph of the spirit over materialism and of life over death. With God's help, the Millennial message will spread to every

corner of the Earth. I join with you in recalling Jesus' words in the Gospel of John: "In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; for I have overcome the world."

Warmest greetings to all of you on this great occasion. God bless you.

B

MEMORANDUM TO TONY DOLAN
SPEECHWRITERS
RESEARCHERS *J Barbara*

From: Tom Griscom

Re: Moscow Summit *TG*

Date: April 19, 1988

Here are some additional thoughts on the religious event:

- 1) mention the right to teach all religious views
- 2) talk about moral restructuring (as Gorbachev does) and how it is rooted in traditional values (a Reagan theme); then relate how traditional values are rooted in religion
- 3) as another point on this, note that there is talk about return to traditional discipline in the Soviet Union; why not return to traditional values
- 4) as we look ahead, talk about hope for expanded opportunity in the next millenium; talk about being active in the third millenium for all Christianity
- 5) talk about concern for today; concern for the hopes of tomorrow
- 6) note that it is not right to expect government to solve all problem; much of the decision process is based in religious values and community decisions

These remarks need to make sure that there is a clear distinction in the millenium being observed; that there needs to be further change; and once the millenium is over, will the movement in the religious area continue or return as it was; are the steps taken irreversible.

Attached is also a document with some general information on the Soviet Union.

James H. Billington
The Library of Congress
March 31, 1988
Washington, D. C.

THE FACES OF RUSSIAN CULTURE

Broadly speaking Russian culture moved from 1,000 years of a primarily rural, Orthodox, Christian identity (10th to early 20th centuries) to a new and increasing urban industrial, Communist identity after three revolutions (1905, two in 1917) that led to the Soviet regime. Kiev was "the mother of Russian cities" and the great trade center on the steppe that became the original center of Orthodox Christianity among the Eastern Slavs when Prince Vladimir was baptized just 1,000 years ago in 988. The main center of this civilization moved north into the more protected forested regions in the mid-thirteenth century after the Mongols sacked Kiev. Moscow was built out of the forests to become capital of medieval, "Muscovite" Russia (13th-17th centuries); Leningrad (Petersburg) was built out of a swamp to become the capital of the most Westward-looking, multi-national empire of the Romanov Tsars, who ruled until the Revolution of February, 1917. After the Bolsheviks overthrew the provisional, democratic government in October, 1917, the capital was returned to Moscow. Both cities have since grown enormously and are now Soviet showcases, though the central, imperial city of Leningrad is virtually intact as is the older inner Kremlin and Red Square complex of Moscow.

Kiev became the center of a distinctive Ukrainian culture that was partly under Polish cultural influence, after it became part of the Moscow-centered Russian empire in the late 17th century. The Baroque extension of Santa Sophia Cathedral conceals a great Byzantine-type basilica of the earlier Kievan period. Nearby is the Monastery of the Caves, a catacomb with many preserved bodies of saints that the Orthodox Church is anxious to have returned for the Millennium celebrations this year. The Ukraine is the largest ethnic minority in the USSR.

Russian history can be understood in terms of five different forms of art in which Russians have achieved greatness. There have been only about 15 years in all Russian history in which there was a legal political opposition and freedom from censorship. So art has historically expressed both the deeper religious-philosophical concerns of the Russian people and their social-political aspirations.

Painting was the first art medium to achieve greatness on Russian soil. The Eastern Slavs chose Orthodox Christianity as their religion in the late 10th century because of the beauty of its worship. The Russians translated the mosaic and fresco art of the Eastern Mediterranean into icon painting on wood in the forested world of the Russian north. Russia developed "theology in pictures" at the time the Western Middle Ages produced "theology in words".

Icons provided cosmic consolation during the long Mongol occupation (early 13th to late 15th century). The most beautiful icons that you will see (Russian Museum Leningrad, and the Tretyakov Moscow), were painted for "meditation in color." As life became brutalized in Russia, saints on the icons became more ethereal, even abstract. Yet all icons represent only those

gifts of God that were mediated directly to the eyes of men. (There are no icons of God the Father, whom no man saw; and icons of mysteries like the Holy Trinity are represented -- as in famous Icon by Rublev in the Tretyakov museum -- in the forms of its Old Testament anticipation; the appearance of the three angels to Sarah and Abraham).

The icons are mute witnesses to the two great accomplishments of Russian culture from the 9th to the 16th century: the conquest of the frozen northern forest by these rugged pioneers and the survival and revival of their Christian civilization. The icon screen you will see in churches provides an image of order and hierarchy that was mirrored in the hierarchical, secular society as well. The rich colors and bold lines of the compositions inspired the great pioneers of modern art: Kandinsky, Chagall, etc., whose works, alas are largely relegated to the "reserve" collections of Soviet museums, which still favor the official, cheerleader style of "socialist realism."

Architecture, the second artistic medium to achieve world greatness on Russian soil, illustrates the conflict in Russian history between West and East; the palatial architectural style of Leningrad (formerly Petersburg), built out of the swamps in the 18th century as a "window to the West" and the more exotic, semi-oriental style of Moscow (preserved in the Kremlin and around Red Square).

St. Basil's Cathedral shows the characteristic Muscovite tent roofs and onion domes, translation from wood into stone and brick as Moscow became the center of expansion East. St. Basil's was seen as the "candle" before the "icon" of the New Jerusalem: the Kremlin (whose 12 gates were thought to replicate those of the city described in the Book of Revelation).

The city of Leningrad was itself Russia's first "crash program" to duplicate and surpass the West. The geometrically designed city built by Peter and Catherine the Great illustrates the attempt to introduce Western "rationality" into the exotic world typified by St. Basil's. The contrast between the Winter Palace (now part of the Hermitage Museum) and the Kremlin provides a cameo of the conflict between the westward-looking, French-speaking aristocratic world of Imperial Russia (whose capital was Petersburg-Leningrad) and the more Eastern-looking Moscow which was the medieval capital and has become the capital again in Soviet times. Moscow is on an upper tributary of the Volga, which flows into the Caspian sea, whereas Leningrad faces the Baltic sea and links Russia with Northern and Western Europe.

Most of Moscow and the outer parts of Leningrad are now, of course, dominated by the characteristic, mass reproduced Soviet style of architecture which tends to borrow motifs from the Leningrad school (spires) but also quasi-religious themes from the Muscovite school (subway mosaics, mummified saints such as the Lenin Mausoleum, etc.)

Literature came late to Russia, exploding after long silence in the 19th century, expressing the socio-political and philosophical-religious concerns of the people awakening to imperial greatness after defeating Napoleon -- yet uncertain of themselves culturally.

Petersburg, a ceremonial city built for parades not for people, became the "stage" for a literature (and a political unrest) that slowly turned the main preoccupation of Russian culture from religion to revolution. Russians idealize their poetry beginning with the aristocratic Pushkin; and still produce vast audiences for public poetry readings); they created a great stage tradition of "laughter through tears" (Gogol to Chekhov), but their greatest literary vehicle was the ideologically-charged novels of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy.

With the outlawing of political opposition and reinstatement of censorship by the Communist regime after a brief period of liberty in the early 20th century, Russian literature once again assumed the burden of a kind of surrogate political opposition and moral conscience (Pasternak's Doctor Zhivago; finally now being published in the USSR) -- as well as a valued form of entertainment in an often harsh and dull environment.

Music did not attain independent greatness in Russia until the Russian national school of Tchaikovsky, Borodin and Mussorgsky burst on the scene in the 1860's. The sung liturgy of the Orthodox Church accorded great prominence to the base voice of the priest and the large, unaccompanied chorus. Not surprisingly, the greatest Russian operas (Mussorgsky's Boris Godunov, for example) have bass rather than tenor heroes and a particularly rich chorus. Instrumental accompaniment (even organs) were considered decadent, Western intrusions into the sung liturgy; and orchestration developed latest of all musical skills in Russia. The more Westernized Rimsky-Korsakov often had to orchestrate Mussorgsky's operas; and Russia's great violin virtuosi of the 20th century have come in disproportionate numbers from the Jewish population of the cosmopolitan port city of Odessa.

Because, perhaps, music had historically been essentially a supporting medium for the ornate, dramatic worship service of the Orthodox Church, modern Russian music has also tended either to carry a message or to be linked to the stage.

Much of Tchaikovsky's (and Stravinsky's and Prokofiev's) best music was written for operas or (even better) ballets. The latter have, in the last century, provided a kind of enchanted world of fairy tale fantasy and sentimentalized heroes and heroines not only as a non-threatening form of establishment entertainment, but also more popularly for children (who are loved and indulged in Russia) and, indeed, for adults -- as a kind of idealized escape from an often harsh daily routine and an otherwise graceless official culture. The puppet theater, circus, etc. are other forms of "children's entertainment" that are also often preferred by adults to the tractors-into-the-sunset dramas of official "socialist realism."

Cinema is the last -- and the only purely Soviet -- art medium to attain greatness in Russia. Lenin thought it would be the ideal medium for indoctrinating the ideals of the new society; and the films of the great Sergei Eisenstein (Potemkin, October) did indeed codify the picture most people now have of the revolutionary struggle that led to the "storming of the winter Palace" and the establishment of Communist power.

With the coming of sound, the movies became a medium of reuniting all the arts as they had been in the liturgy of the Church (and as a late imperial composer like Scriabin had tried to do with his "symphony of sounds, sights, and smells"). In Alexander Nevsky, Eisenstein used his training as an architect, a literary epic, an original score by Prokofiev, and iconographic camera work to create a historical drama that helped inspire the resistance to Hitler.

The cinema in the post-war era has been a remarkable field or cultural ferment (Eisenstein ran afoul of Stalin by depicting the psychotic qualities of Ivan the Terrible in his last great film). Tarkovsky's film on the life of the great icon painter, Andrei Rublev, provided a spur to the greatly revived interest in old Russian religious culture. The works of the great Armenian film maker Parajanov (jailed until recently with his latest film condemned) are the best of a host of films by smaller national minority cultures in the USSR. The Georgians have often been in the lead; and cinema -- through heavily censored -- has become genuinely multi-national art form for which many of the best writers are now working. The cinema has been perhaps the most lively art medium in the Gorbachev era. Particularly remarkable is Tenghiz Abuladze's Repentance: a brilliant if surrealistic anti-totalitarian film rich in Christian symbolism.

Richard Schifter

Current
Policy
No. 994

The Soviet Constitution: Myth and Reality



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Role of Lenin

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Soviet Constitution as an Educational and Propaganda Instrument

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Gorbachev and *Glasnost*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



CHRISTIANIZATION OF THE PEOPLE
OF THE
U K R A I N E

988 - 1988

Heaven on Earth for a Millennium:
A Spiritual Legacy



Presented on this Day of Our Lord,

June 14, 1987

St. John the Baptist Ukrainian Catholic
Church
Northampton, Pa.

by Andrew M. Batcho, Acting Principal & Religious Coordinator

Pastor: Rev. Monsignor Constantine Berdar

These words are humbly dedicated to the children of St. John's --
The Children of the Second Millennium

"You, too, must come to know who you are. You must know the family you came from with all its history. And how little we really know about the Ukrainian nation." Fr. Maloney, Society of Jesus

"Study well, my brothers ...
Do not fool yourself in vain!
Read, study and discern,
And from the foreigner learn,
But do not your own disdain.
For whoever his mother forgets
Him God will castigate,
He'll be barred at the cottage gate,
By his children he'll be shunned.
By strangers he'll be driven away
And such an evil one
Will never find a joyful home
On earth beneath the sun" Taras Shevchenko

The latter verses you may be most familiar with ... they are verses of exhortation ... a mindful plea by our Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko to study -- indeed, to know -- one's Ukrainian homeland. Uniquely Ukrainian is the metaphor of the homeland, the very earth, to one's mother. The former quotation, perhaps less familiar, are the words of Father George Maloney, a Jesuit father, spoken before a predominantly Ukrainian audience more than fifteen years ago. We preface this afternoon's paper with the reflective advice of these two men -- men of different centuries, of different backgrounds, of different motivations -- for reasons that shall become apparent as we attempt to offer the meaning of the Millennium of Official Acceptance of Christianity among the Ukrainian people and the relevance and meaning to us today -- one thousand years following the baptism of our forefathers in the year 988 A.D.

SLAVA ISUSU CHRISTU!

Any paper of this brevity cannot hope to achieve a comprehensive treatise on a subject of such a magnitude as the Millennium of the Ukrainian people. We shall seek, instead, with the humble uplifting of our hearts to our Savior, to focus upon the spiritual legacy of the Ukrainian Catholic Church as it gives meaning -- both at the time of Olha and Volodymyr and now upon the ushering in of the second millennium -- to the Ukrainian people. We present this in a threefold manner: first, what is the Millennium of the Ukrainian Christianization; second, the bonding of Heaven and Earth as a uniquely Ukrainian attitude of spirituality; and, third, the relevance of this observance as we witness the second millennium among our youth.

+ + +

Before Grand Prince Volodymyr the Great had accepted officially the Christian Way of Life as his people's religious conversion in an act of a nation's baptism en masse, this particular Way of Life -- simply yet dramatically recorded in the Scripture writings of the early Christians -- had taken root in the daily lives of the Ukrainian peoples. The seeds of this religious tradition, harvested years earlier by Princess and Saint Olha and her people, had continued to spread and to grow preparing the hearts and souls of the Ukrainian people for the official recognition given by Volodymyr upon the Baptism of his Nation in the year 988 A.D. Those influences from the Christian East, with its spirituality, found a most receptive people in the communities of the Kievan Ukraine who were responding to their Master's call to: "Come, follow Me."

Please note now and throughout this paper that we stress the Eastern Christian's Way of Life, rather than religion, because it shall aid one's understand-

ing of the underlying history, psyche, and soul of the Ukrainian people and of the Ukrainian Catholic Church through a thousand years of invasions, wars, political strife, suffering, and isolation -- and nevertheless a constant Faithfulness to the Way of Christ! Rather than attempting a lengthy explanation of the Eastern-Ukrainian Spirituality, we ask each of us to follow the advice of the poets and religious students: study the meaning of obozheniye, deification; reflect upon the Ukrainian's attitude toward creation, zemlya -- heaven and earth, nebo i zemlya. The Ukrainian people already, at and before the time of Olha or Volodymyr, had had a close relationship with God's creation, nature, and his mother: the earth. The humble Ukrainian was particularly receptive to lifting himself out of an embattled existence ... Christ's Way of Life enters the homelands, and the remainder becomes the history of the Ukrainian people and of the Ukrainian Catholic Church there and throughout the world.

+ + +

The acceptance of Christianity was not quite as passive as some would have us believe today in 1987. The memoirs of the pilgrim monk, Dan'ylo, Daniel, makes early reference (the years 1106 - 1108 A.D.) to his journeys to the Holy Lands. Within himself and within his prayers were those of his people. Daniel requested on one Good and Great Friday of the King Baldujyn to:

"... I beg of you in the name of God and all Ukrainian Princes to allow me to place a lamp over the Lord's grave for all our Princes and for our Christian lands."

Daniel was one of thousands after him to heed the call of Christ and follow Him. The princes and the people had built their houses of worship almost at once. As early as the year following the official baptism of his nation, Volodymyr began the construction of a church in Kiev dedicated to the Dormition

of the Mother of God, the Bohorodytse. Fittingly enough, this Kievan church was placed beneath the protection of the Mother of God -- for down through the centuries the Ukrainian people have requested her protection and have honored her through devotional prayer-services as the protective Birthgiver to God. It is and has been an important aspect of Ukrainian spirituality -- this bond between the Ukrainian Catholic Church and Mary in her role as Theotokos.

The construction of the houses of worship continued and prospered down through the martyrdom of Volodymyr's sons, Boris and Hlib -- early witnesses to the Christian Way of Life among the Ukrainian people. Yaroslav the Wise, 1019 - 1054, continued the physical building spurred on by the religious life of his people. Among other edifices, Yaroslav was responsible for the Church of Hagia Sophia and the monasteries of St. George and of St. Irene. He shares recognition for founding the Kievan Caves Monasteries and called for a gathering of native bishops in the year, 1051.

The Great Schism of 1054 between the Heads of the Eastern and Western Churches had created turmoil and factions of many diverse natures. The purpose of this afternoon's observance is not to enter a discussion on "straightening" out historical events. Suffice it to mention that during the Great Schism the Ukrainian people in their worship and Christian Way of Life remained ever-faithful to the Presence of Christ and His Teachings.

The Ukrainian Catholic has had a "tough go of it" from these early days in her Church's history. Take one hour of your time to scan the pages of Ihor Romanovych's "Condensed Course on the History of the Ukraine" to acquaint yourself with the struggles of our people and our Church against the odds of

periods of Western Latinization, Eastern Russification, Ethnic Political Power-struggles, and Forced Assimilations.

Even the re-affirmation of the bond between the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the Bishop of Rome of the Western Church that had taken place in the year 1596 at Brest-Litovsk was unable to be a smooth event. It found instead that man permits his human will to stifle the will of God. The Ukrainian Catholic remained an integral, living part of the suffering Church of Christ. It is little wonder that the Church's Akathist Service to the Passion of Christ becomes an identifying mark of the faithful.

Adding to the woes of the Ukrainian people and their Church, the mid-1600's found the new-strength of the separate Muscovite peoples forcing control of the Kievan neighbors. Again, we shall note this aspect of the Ukrainian Catholic's history without entering into the political events and ramifications. Let it be sufficient to remark that from that time-period to present the calendar years of the Ukrainian people were marked with the struggle of survival: both of her people and of her beloved Catholic Church. Before closing this part of this afternoon's paper on the Meaning of the First Thousand Years, allow me to add that during this century, the Ukrainian Church has seen itself scattered across the many countries and continents of the earth. Amid a desperate fight for survival in her own homeland, the Church abroad takes upon herself the simultaneous entrance into the second millennium.

+ + +

H E A V E N O N E A R T H

We hope to offer one aspect of the Ukrainian Catholic's spirituality both as it has been passed on through the generations from Olha's era even now within our own generation. We are not theologians nor offer this as a definitive report on Ukrainian Spirituality; rather, accept it as an educative tool with which to refresh our youngest generation who need the perspective of their heritage in order to carry their Christian Way of Life into their children's lifetimes.

The Christianization of the Kievan lands during the tenth century effected a change among the people which was most receptive to their own mentality. This change, a spiritual one, characterized their mode of thought as well as their spiritual behavior, that is, their particular expression of the Christian Way of Life. They had "discovered" the religious way of life from Constantinople through the travels of Prince Volodymyr's ambassadors. This "Eastern" way both penetrated and was assimilated by the Ukrainian people. The end-result, over a period of time, was the integration of Christianity with their own Slavic outlook on the world. This blend did bring about a particular accentuation of Christianity -- essentially, the truths remained the same universal teachings accepted in East and West; however, their outlook towards life stressed a different aspect of Christianity.

One of the several themes which had determined their thought and action was that of heaven on earth. As legend relates, Volodymyr's ambassadors had entered the church of 'Aghia Sophia during one of the liturgical services. There, they were overwhelmed by the impressive beauty which had encircled them.

With the total enrapturing of their senses, they are said to have exclaimed: "... this must be heaven on earth ... where surely God abides."

These words were prophetic of the lasting role which this concept would have in the lives of their people shortly thereafter: That heaven was to begin here on earth through uniting oneself to God in Christ with a sincere awareness of His presence in the Church and Her Mysteries.

Their lives, then and now, were channelled constantly into the concept of deification -- obozhenie -- union with God, sons of God. Naturally, this union is basic to all of Christianity; however, these Slavic people did emphasize the concept -- and wholly incorporated it into their everyday life whether at home or at worship: That union with God is not some type of standing apart from God and somehow "observing" Him, but actually participating in the divine life through His Grace. This process begins in a real way here on earth -- earth was, and is, considered to be the entrance into the new life inaugurated through the Christian's baptism.

Life was marked, not so much in an expectancy or longing for final union as much as they lived in a living awareness of Christ's presence on earth in every place and in every activity. Life was being lived in the presence of Christ. A holy fear or loving respect, together with a constant expression of praise, indicated their inner attitude on life. The Earthly life becomes heaven ... and Christ's presence sensed ... in many ways. The Church's sacramental Mysteries become the chief means of entering the divine life -- Christ-God is encountered in the real presence of God in the Eucharist; the presence of the Holy Spirit in Chrismation; the presence of the Trinity in Baptism.

This presence of the divine and man's entrance into divine life was found to permeate their iconography: The very particles of the earth itself and relics of the saints were utilized in the creation of an ikon -- an eikon: not a depiction of the earthly person, but rather, a window on heaven -- the presence of the saints -- the presence of God and the Bohorodytse. The spirituality of the people transformed not only the image but the church itself into a place worthy to be called heaven on earth. Everything within the church holds a meaning that contributes to giving the awesome effect of heaven: from the Holy Table, the Vestings, the Ikons, the Vocal Singing,

The profuse usage of incense adds to the effect: The Ukrainian seeks heaven and reaches for God through all of his senses: the scent of incense clouds lifts his heart to God just as the pressing of his lips to the ikons and relics brings him into the Presence of God. This is intimately tied in with his spirituality: He finds the Creator through all of creation for everything is sacred and holy coming from the Hands of the Creator Who made all things Good. The Ukrainian's very self, his culture, is tied in so closely with nature and with the earth that this same attitude is employed to bring him to the divine life.

A closing remark at this point of the paper, allow me to quote from the work of George Fedotov speaking of the mind of the Slavic people:

"... there is a world of higher emotions tied up with this bodily adoration: awe, contrition, tenderness, gratitude, joy, the consciousness of one's unworthiness, and the unmerited grace of God."

The extravagant use of icons, burning of incense, intricate vocal singing, elaborate liturgical services: These to the Ukrainian then and now are

not empty externals to be used or not used. They are rather an indicator of his spiritual heritage: Each fulfills a place in making his heaven here on earth. It is one approach, one emphasis, of the Ukrainian Spiritual Heritage that has been carried down for over a thousand years. Now it remains for the elders to pass it on to the youth who enter the second millennium.

+ + +

Finally, the relevance of the Millennium for us today as we embark on the next one thousand years of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. The historical existence of Christianity within the life of the Ukrainian people for over a thousand years carries that heritage into a world milieu with a more intricate countenance than that which was recorded in Kiev in 988 A.D. Today, the Christian Heritage lives in varying levels of awareness both within the borders of the Ukrainian homelands and also within the practices of the descendants who thrive in countries across the globe. Within the homeland, the countenance is one of repression and persecution: an all-out attempt to deny the existence of the Ukrainian Catholic and his Church. It is the image of the suffering Church. In South America, the countenance bears the heavy weight of poverty, survival, and a whole-hearted attempt at revival that hearkens to the aid of Ukrainian kindred spirits from the North and from across the oceans. On the North American continent we are more acquainted with the Ukrainian communities and churches residing within the Canadian borders and scattered in varying degrees of population in the cities and towns of these United States.

Time prohibits, of course, the exposition of the history of the several immigrations and their histories of our Ukrainian Catholic Church in America. For such accounts, there are several good books available for the student. Suffice it to mention that the awareness, study, and the understanding of this history is an important -- if not the foundation -- aspect of the meaning for our Millennium observance. It is common Wisdom that a person loves that which one knows -- love, continuation of life, and in this instance, the life of our Ukrainian Catholic Church must be reinforced with the knowledge of our people, our liturgical traditions, our historical evolution and progression. We do not dismiss the cultural customs and traditions, but rather, emphasize that these continue to have meaning in the degree of their relationship to the spiritual life of our people: It is the spiritual life of our communities -- bishops, priestly orders, religious houses, and the laity -- that offers the witnessing of the Second Millennium of Ukrainian Christianity into which we have already entered.

This aspect of the Millennium's meaning and relevance, as we approach the year 2000 A.D. is most important for it builds upon knowledge and requires both active and passive witnessing -- to our own and to whomever God sends to us! Passive testimony is, of course, our being or becoming who we know we are: acknowledging and living the spiritual heritage that has come down to us since the days of Olha and Volodymyr. Active witness, depending upon the individual's calling, involves the actual passing on of our heritage to those already in the Second Millennium: the youth of our parish communities. Whether we happen to be in the church hierarchy or the laity, we have the responsibility to teach our children and to pass on the spiritual heritage.

We would like to interject at this point that a second aspect of active witnessing becomes most apparent upon the ushering in of the Second Millennium: This is the testimony we must offer to those not of the Ukrainian Tradition, perhaps not even of the Catholic Tradition. The words of our Savior were to Go and Teach All Nations. These words of instruction to his followers were not restricted to any particular rite: Rather His instruction to go out into the world and spread the Good News. This is a real meaning of the Second Millennium: Not only to our own must we pass on our spiritual tradition, but also to those of other faiths, other persuasions. Perhaps, the time has come upon us to reverse the trend of our own adapting from others; perhaps, the time has come for our spiritual heritage to be exposed for others to come to Christ by another road: the road of our Ukrainian Spiritual Traditions.

Our spiritual legacy remains eternal as long as the youth --- once it has become an integral part of their lives -- have received it from their elders. They, the children of the SEcond Millennium, can only pass on to their future offspring that which we have carefully nurtured inside of their minds, hearts, and souls. All other customs and traditions can pass away for a time and return through special interest groups and study; however, the spiritual heritage is a continuum. If an entire generation of children are not the recipients of this spiritual heritage, then we at this time, can not make a declaration. We can merely ask the question: Who, if the spiritual heritage is not transferred to the young generation, shall revive it one or two generations from now? Many things can be researched and dusted off from library bookshelves. Spirituality, though written and expounded upon, springs not from books but from the very life-blood of a people in close union with the Creator-God. We welcome each of us to the Millennium observance ... how shall each of us bear witness actively to the Second?

Thank You ... Slava Isusu Christu!

Andrew M. Batcho
June 12, 1987



MEMORANDUM TO TONY DOLAN
SPEECHWRITERS
RESEARCHERS *J Agnes*

From: Tom Griscom

Re: Moscow Summit *7*

Date: April 19, 1988

Here are some additional thoughts on the religious event:

- 1) mention the right to teach all religious views
- 2) talk about moral restructuring (as Gorbachev does) and how it is rooted in traditional values (a Reagan theme); then relate how traditional values are rooted in religion
- 3) as another point on this, note that there is talk about return to traditional discipline in the Soviet Union; why not return to traditional values
- 4) as we look ahead, talk about hope for expanded opportunity in the next millenium; talk about being active in the third millenium for all Christianity
- 5) talk about concern for today; concern for the hopes of tomorrow
- 6) note that it is not right to expect government to solve all problem; much of the decision process is based in religious values and community decisions

These remarks need to make sure that there is a clear distinction in the millenium being observed; that there needs to be further change; and once the millenium is over, will the movement in the religious area continue or return as it was; are the steps taken irreversible.

Attached is also a document with some general information on the Soviet Union.

James H. Billington
The Library of Congress
March 31, 1988
Washington, D. C.

THE FACES OF RUSSIAN CULTURE

Broadly speaking Russian culture moved from 1,000 years of a primarily rural, Orthodox, Christian identity (10th to early 20th centuries) to a new and increasing urban industrial, Communist identity after three revolutions (1905, two in 1917) that led to the Soviet regime. Kiev was "the mother of Russian cities" and the great trade center on the steppe that became the original center of Orthodox Christianity among the Eastern Slavs when Prince Vladimir was baptized just 1,000 years ago in 988. The main center of this civilization moved north into the more protected forested regions in the mid-thirteenth century after the Mongols sacked Kiev. Moscow was built out of the forests to become capital of medieval, "Muscovite" Russia (13th-17th centuries); Leningrad (Petersburg) was built out of a swamp to become the capital of the most Westward-looking, multi-national empire of the Romanov Tsars, who ruled until the Revolution of February, 1917. After the Bolsheviks overthrew the provisional, democratic government in October, 1917, the capital was returned to Moscow. Both cities have since grown enormously and are now Soviet showcases, though the central, imperial city of Leningrad is virtually intact as is the older inner Kremlin and Red Square complex of Moscow.

Kiev became the center of a distinctive Ukrainian culture that was partly under Polish cultural influence, after it became part of the Moscow-centered Russian empire in the late 17th century. The Baroque extension of Santa Sophia Cathedral conceals a great Byzantine-type basilica of the earlier Kievan period. Nearby is the Monastery of the Caves, a catacomb with many preserved bodies of saints that the Orthodox Church is anxious to have returned for the Millennium celebrations this year. The Ukraine is the largest ethnic minority in the USSR.

Russian history can be understood in terms of five different forms of art in which Russians have achieved greatness. There have been only about 15 years in all Russian history in which there was a legal political opposition and freedom from censorship. So art has historically expressed both the deeper religious-philosophical concerns of the Russian people and their social-political aspirations.

Painting was the first art medium to achieve greatness on Russian soil. The Eastern Slavs chose Orthodox Christianity as their religion in the late 10th century because of the beauty of its worship. The Russians translated the mosaic and fresco art of the Eastern Mediterranean into icon painting on wood in the forested world of the Russian north. Russia developed "theology in pictures" at the time the Western Middle Ages produced "theology in words".

Icons provided cosmic consolation during the long Mongol occupation (early 13th to late 15th century). The most beautiful icons that you will see (Russian Museum Leningrad, and the Tretyakov Moscow), were painted for "meditation in color." As life became brutalized in Russia, saints on the icons became more ethereal, even abstract. Yet all icons represent only those

gifts of God that were mediated directly to the eyes of men. (There are no icons of God the Father, whom no man saw; and icons of mysteries like the Holy Trinity are represented -- as in famous Icon by Rublev in the Tretyakov museum -- in the forms of its Old Testament anticipation; the appearance of the three angels to Sarah and Abraham).

The icons are mute witnesses to the two great accomplishments of Russian culture from the 9th to the 16th century: the conquest of the frozen northern forest by these rugged pioneers and the survival and revival of their Christian civilization. The icon screen you will see in churches provides an image of order and hierarchy that was mirrored in the hierarchical, secular society as well. The rich colors and bold lines of the compositions inspired the great pioneers of modern art: Kandinsky, Chagall, etc., whose works, alas are largely relegated to the "reserve" collections of Soviet museums, which still favor the official, cheerleader style of "socialist realism."

Architecture, the second artistic medium to achieve world greatness on Russian soil, illustrates the conflict in Russian history between West and East; the palatial architectural style of Leningrad (formerly Petersburg), built out of the swamps in the 18th century as a "window to the West" and the more exotic, semi-oriental style of Moscow (preserved in the Kremlin and around Red Square).

St. Basil's Cathedral shows the characteristic Muscovite tent roofs and onion domes, translation from wood into stone and brick as Moscow became the center of expansion East. St. Basil's was seen as the "candle" before the "icon" of the New Jerusalem: the Kremlin (whose 12 gates were thought to replicate those of the city described in the Book of Revelation).

The city of Leningrad was itself Russia's first "crash program" to duplicate and surpass the West. The geometrically designed city built by Peter and Catherine the Great illustrates the attempt to introduce Western "rationality" into the exotic world typified by St. Basil's. The contrast between the Winter Palace (now part of the Hermitage Museum) and the Kremlin provides a cameo of the conflict between the westward-looking, French-speaking aristocratic world of Imperial Russia (whose capital was Petersburg-Leningrad) and the more Eastern-looking Moscow which was the medieval capital and has become the capital again in Soviet times. Moscow is on an upper tributary of the Volga, which flows into the Caspian sea, whereas Leningrad faces the Baltic sea and links Russia with Northern and Western Europe.

Most of Moscow and the outer parts of Leningrad are now, of course, dominated by the characteristic, mass reproduced Soviet style of architecture which tends to borrow motifs from the Leningrad school (spires) but also quasi-religious themes from the Muscovite school (subway mosaics, mummified saints such as the Lenin Mausoleum, etc.)

Literature came late to Russia, exploding after long silence in the 19th century, expressing the socio-political and philosophical-religious concerns of the people awakening to imperial greatness after defeating Napoleon -- yet uncertain of themselves culturally.

Petersburg, a ceremonial city built for parades not for people, became the "stage" for a literature (and a political unrest) that slowly turned the main preoccupation of Russian culture from religion to revolution. Russians idealize their poetry beginning with the aristocratic Pushkin; and still produce vast audiences for public poetry readings); they created a great stage tradition of "laughter through tears" (Gogol to Chekhov), but their greatest literary vehicle was the ideologically-charged novels of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy.

With the outlawing of political opposition and reinstatement of censorship by the Communist regime after a brief period of liberty in the early 20th century, Russian literature once again assumed the burden of a kind of surrogate political opposition and moral conscience (Pasternak's Doctor Zhivago; finally now being published in the USSR) -- as well as a valued form of entertainment in an often harsh and dull environment.

Music did not attain independent greatness in Russia until the Russian national school of Tchaikovsky, Borodin and Mussorgsky burst on the scene in the 1860's. The sung liturgy of the Orthodox Church accorded great prominence to the base voice of the priest and the large, unaccompanied chorus. Not surprisingly, the greatest Russian operas (Mussorgsky's Boris Godunov, for example) have bass rather than tenor heroes and a particularly rich chorus. Instrumental accompaniment (even organs) were considered decadent, Western intrusions into the sung liturgy; and orchestration developed latest of all musical skills in Russia. The more Westernized Rimsky-Korsakov often had to orchestrate Mussorgsky's operas; and Russia's great violin virtuosi of the 20th century have come in disproportionate numbers from the Jewish population of the cosmopolitan port city of Odessa.

Because, perhaps, music had historically been essentially a supporting medium for the ornate, dramatic worship service of the Orthodox Church, modern Russian music has also tended either to carry a message or to be linked to the stage.

Much of Tchaikovsky's (and Stravinsky's and Prokofiev's) best music was written for operas or (even better) ballets. The latter have, in the last century, provided a kind of enchanted world of fairy tale fantasy and sentimentalized heroes and heroines not only as a non-threatening form of establishment entertainment, but also more popularly for children (who are loved and indulged in Russia) and, indeed, for adults -- as a kind of idealized escape from an often harsh daily routine and an otherwise graceless official culture. The puppet theater, circus, etc. are other forms of "children's entertainment" that are also often preferred by adults to the tractors-into-the-sunset dramas of official "socialist realism."

Cinema is the last -- and the only purely Soviet -- art medium to attain greatness in Russia. Lenin thought it would be the ideal medium for indoctrinating the ideals of the new society; and the films of the great Sergei Eisenstein (Potemkin, October) did indeed codify the picture most people now have of the revolutionary struggle that led to the "storming of the winter Palace" and the establishment of Communist power.

With the coming of sound, the movies became a medium of reuniting all the arts as they had been in the liturgy of the Church (and as a late imperial composer like Scriabin had tried to do with his "symphony of sounds, sights, and smells"). In Alexander Nevsky, Eisenstein used his training as an architect, a literary epic, an original score by Prokofiev, and iconographic camera work to create a historical drama that helped inspire the resistance to Hitler.

The cinema in the post-war era has been a remarkable field or cultural ferment (Eisenstein ran afoul of Stalin by depicting the psychotic qualities of Ivan the Terrible in his last great film). Tarkovsky's film on the life of the great icon painter, Andrei Rublev, provided a spur to the greatly revived interest in old Russian religious culture. The works of the great Armenian film maker Parajanov (jailed until recently with his latest film condemned) are the best of a host of films by smaller national minority cultures in the USSR. The Georgians have often been in the lead; and cinema -- through heavily censored -- has become genuinely multi-national art form for which many of the best writers are now working. The cinema has been perhaps the most lively art medium in the Gorbachev era. Particularly remarkable is Tenghiz Abuladze's Repentance: a brilliant if surrealistic anti-totalitarian film rich in Christian symbolism.