

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

HEARING BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS FIRST SESSION

THE NEW AND IMPROVED SUPREME SOVIET AND THE
INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS REFORM

NOVEMBER 28, 1989

Printed for the use of the
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
[CSCE 101-1-11]



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

26-611

WASHINGTON : 1990

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

DENNIS DeCONCINI, Arizona, *Chairman*
STENY H. HOYER, Maryland, *Cochairman*

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida	FRANK LAUTENBERG, New Jersey
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts	TIMOTHY WIRTH, Colorado
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico	WYCHE FOWLER, Georgia
EDWARD FEIGHAN, Ohio	HARRY REID, Nevada
DON RITTER, Pennsylvania	ALFONSE M. D'AMATO, New York
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey	JOHN HEINZ, Pennsylvania
JOHN EDWARD PORTER, Illinois	JAMES McCLURE, Idaho
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia	MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

HON. RICHARD SCHIFTER, *Department of State*
STEPHEN J. HADLEY, *Department of Defense*
WILLIAM D. FRITTS, JR., *Department of Commerce*

SAMUEL G. WISE, *Staff Director*
MARY SUE HAFNER, *Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel*
JANE S. FISHER, *Deputy Staff Director*
MIKE AMITAY, *Staff Assistant*
ANN W. BANCHOFF, *Staff Assistant*
OREST DEYCHAKIWSKY, *Staff Assistant*
RICK FERRILL, *CONSULTANT*
JOHN FINERTY, *Staff Assistant*
ROBERT HAND, *Staff Assistant*
GINA M. HARNER, *Administrative Assistant*
JUDITH INGRAM, *Staff Assistant*
JESSE JACOBS, *Staff Assistant*
RONALD McNAMARA, *Staff Assistant*
MICHAEL OCHS, *Staff Assistant*
SPENCER OLIVER, *Consultant*
MARK RAMEE, *Senior Advisor for Soviet & East European Affairs*
BETH RITCHIE, *Press Officer*
ERIKA SCHLAGER, *Staff Assistant*
TOM WARNER, *Printing Clerk*

CONTENTS

	Page
Mr. Fyodor Burlatskiy, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Humanitarian, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation of the International Affairs Committee of the Supreme Soviet.....	6
Dr. Louise Shelley, Chairperson of the American University Department of Justice, Law and Society, Professor at the School of International Service and Consultant to Helsinki Watch.....	11
Mr. Aleksei Ridiger, member of the Supreme Soviet Metropolit of Leningrad and President of Church Association in Europe.....	18

(III)

**PUBLIC HEARING ON THE NEW AND IMPROVED
SUPREME SOVIET
AND THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF HUMAN
RIGHTS REFORM**

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1989

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE
Washington, DC

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, in room 138, Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 10:20 a.m., Senator Dennis DeConcini, Chairman, and Representative Steny H. Hoyer Cochairman, presiding.

In attendance: Representatives and Commissioners Christopher H. Smith, John Edward Porter, Frank R. Wolf and Hon. Richard Schifter from the Department of State.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN DENNIS DeCONCINI

Chairman DeConcini. The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe of the Congress of the United States will come to order.

I'd like to welcome our guest from the Soviet Union today. This marks the first Helsinki Commission hearing at which Soviet officials will testify and it is a measure of the progress we are making in our relations.

As we know, representatives of the Soviet Union, the United States and 33 other nations, signed the Helsinki Accord in 1975. The Helsinki Commission was established by Congress in 1976 to monitor the compliance with the Accord, particularly in the area of human rights and humanitarian affairs.

In the past, the Commission has been very critical of the Soviet Government for violations of the Helsinki Accord. The Soviet Government, for its part, has criticized the Commission for allegedly interfering in internal affairs and undermining bilateral relations between our two countries.

Today, not only has the tone changed, the record shows that many of these violations have been rectified. To give one brief example, when the Vienna Follow-up Meeting of the Helsinki Accord opened on November 4, 1986, there were approximately 40 Soviet Helsinki monitors in labor camps or exile at that time. Now, there are none. Although real concerns still remain, this positive pattern has also been generally followed in such areas as emigration, human contacts, religious liberties and freedom of speech.

The Soviet Government says that the changes occurring in the Soviet Union are the result of internal demands rather than external pressures. Perhaps this is the case. At any rate, we are glad that they are occurring and hope that progress will continue.

Today, we will look to the role of the Supreme Soviet in promulgating and institutionalizing human rights in the Soviet Union. Our Soviet guest today is Mr. Fyodor Burlatskiy. Mr. Burlatskiy is the primary political commentator for the widely read Literary Gazette. He has also written many background and research papers that are used by President Gorbachev and others. He was elected to the Supreme Soviet earlier this year and is presently the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Humanitarian, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation of the International Affairs Committee of the Supreme Soviet.

Mr. Burlatskiy has stated that among the goals of the International Affairs Committee is to draft laws on human rights that conform to the provisions of the Vienna Concluding Document. We look forward to his insiders view on how this work is proceeding.

Testifying with Mr. Burlatskiy is Louise Shelley, Chairperson of the American University Department of Justice, Law and Society, and professor at the School of International Service. She is consultant to the Helsinki Watch on issues of Soviet law and has published widely on the Soviet justice system and legal reforms. Dr. Shelley will present us her outside view of the progress being made under the Soviet laws and in human rights.

I'd like to mention that this hearing is part of the Supreme Soviet's delegation visit to the United States, sponsored by the Helsinki Commission to discuss issues of human rights and humanitarian affairs. It is a follow-up to our talks in Moscow in November of 1988. We feel our visit to Moscow a year ago was very productive and we hope that this visit will be equally productive for both sides.

I'd like the record to show, before I yield to Cochairman Hoyer, the interpreting will be simultaneous from English to Russian and interpreting will be consecutive for Russian to English. Those are just some of the rules here.

I will now yield to my Cochairman, Congressman Hoyer.

STATEMENT OF COCHAIRMAN STENY H. HOYER

Cochairman HOYER. I thank the Chairman for yielding.

Let me say this is a unique hearing and it is not a traditional hearing. We have invited our guests, members of the Supreme Soviet and accompanying officials of the Government of the Soviet Union, to address a meeting of the Commission. This is the first time that this has happened, as I understand it, and to that extent is a historic event.

I would like to join Chairman DeConcini in welcoming our witnesses to this Helsinki Commission hearing, an event I think that symbolizes the stunning pace of change in the Soviet Union and indeed in Eastern Europe as well. Events move so quickly these days that we often don't even have the time to catch our breath.

Someone spoke to us the other day and said, "I'm out of touch. I haven't listened to the radio for the last 2 hours." I think there's much truth in that. But it is worth standing back for a moment

and trying to gain a certain perspective, I think. Not so long ago, the Soviet Union used to respond, as Mr. Burlatskiy knows, to Western inquiries about human rights by saying that we should not interfere in their internal affairs. Today, it is hard to imagine, for example, that before last November, the Soviet authorities would not allow the Helsinki Commission to visit the Soviet Union as a Commission. Yet this same Helsinki Commission hearing has as its guest witness a very distinguished Soviet parliamentarian, Fyodor Burlatskiy, who chairs a subcommittee, as the Chairman has pointed out, on humanitarian affairs in the Supreme Soviet.

Last year at this time, when we met with him in Moscow, he was not a parliamentarian and, in fact, has said that perhaps our meeting had some effect on his election to the Supreme Soviet. Now he is leading the return visit in what we hope will be a continuum of exchanges between parliamentarians of the Soviet Union and the United States. This marks, as I've said, a first time that a representative of one of the branches of the Soviet Government has addressed our Commission.

The creation of Mr. Burlatskiy's subcommittee in the Supreme Soviet, the country's new standing legislature, represents the recognition by the Soviet leadership of the importance of human rights. Mr. Burlatskiy's appearance testifies to the new Soviet acknowledgement of the validity of our interest in human rights issues in the Soviet Union. They also, of course, have a legitimate interest in the human rights in the United States. It is a new stage in the ongoing transformation of our relationship from confrontation to what we hope will be cooperation.

The Supreme Soviet has been in operation only since June of this year, yet its members have already displayed their resolve to act independently. The Helsinki Commission is particularly interested in learning what the Supreme Soviet Subcommittee on Humanitarian Affairs sees as its goals and what it has accomplished so far.

As there are various commissions and committees in the Supreme Soviet that are involved in drafting laws on human rights issues, we would welcome an explanation of the interrelationship between the Burlatskiy Subcommittee and these other bodies. We would like to know what role the Subcommittee played in shaping the draft law on exit and entry and we will want to discuss its prospects for passage during the question and answer period.

We are also, of course, very curious to know how the Subcommittee has interacted with ministries and agencies of the Soviet Government. After all, U.S. congressmen also have some experience in trying to reach and understanding with the Executive Branch of government. We might be able to offer our Soviet colleagues a couple of tips that might come in handy.

Much of what we will hear today will be novel, so I'm eager, as I know every member of the Commission is, to hear Chairman Burlatskiy and Dr. Shelley discuss the role of human rights in the Supreme Soviet. I know that all of us are very much looking forward to their statements and to the ensuing discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to Chairman Burlatskiy's testimony, and Dr. Shelley's, and congratulate you, sir, for the leadership you have shown in creating this environment in which we can dis-

cuss views and that can be done with the greatest degree of *glasnost*.

Chairman DECONCINI. Thank you, Chairman Hoyer.

I will now yield to outstanding member of the Commission, Representative Smith from New Jersey.

BRIEF COMMENT FROM REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Representative SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I, like my other colleagues, will be brief so that we can hear from our distinguished visitors, and Mr. Burlatskiy, in particular, who has come a long way to speak to us.

This truly is an historic meeting of the Helsinki Commission, to hear from a man who has been a champion of human rights and a voice in an area of Soviet policies about which many of us have been very critical over the years. Mr. Burlatskiy has been responsive. He has, I think, earned the respect certainly of members of this Commission and respect throughout the world for speaking out boldly, both within the Supreme Soviet—within the Kremlin walls, with regards to freedom of emigration, freedom of conscience, and religious freedom.

Mr. Burlatskiy, when Mr. Wolf and I first made your acquaintance in Holland at a human rights conference, I was very impressed with your responsiveness to the cases that we raised at that particular time. There was action. There was not just talk, there were deeds to follow that talk.

So, I'm very pleased that you are here and, like my colleagues, very pleased that you are in the position that you are in, in the Soviet Union. So, I look forward to your testimony.

Chairman DECONCINI. Thank you.

I now yield to Mr. John Porter of Illinois. He is also the Cochairman, I believe, of the Human Rights Caucus for the House of Representatives.

Congressman Porter?

BRIEF COMMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN EDWARD PORTER FROM ILLINOIS

Representative PORTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me apologize for not being able to be with you yesterday, but we're so very glad to welcome our Soviet colleagues here today. Who would have imagined this historic meeting when the Congressional Human Rights Caucus was formed in 1982 after a trip to the Soviet Union? We've seen amazing change in a very short time. I think it is very, very important and productive that we continue the dialogue between our Soviet colleagues and members of the United States Congress. It can only lead to a greater understanding of one another in greater progress on human rights.

Mr. Chairman, we look forward to hearing the testimony of Mr. Burlatskiy and Dr. Shelley.

Chairman DECONCINI. Thank you, Congressman Porter.

I now yield to one of the new members of the Commission, but has been very active in human rights, Congressman Wolf of Virginia.

BRIEF COMMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANK R. WOLF FROM VIRGINIA

Representative WOLF. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I also want to second what my colleague said and welcome Mr. Burlatskiy and his colleagues to the Committee and really want to thank him for the cooperation he has given us in the past. I look forward to hearing what he has to say and working with him many years to come.

Thank you.

Chairman DECONCINI. Thank you, Congressman Wolf.

Now we will yield to Assistant Secretary Richard Schifter, who is a part of the Helsinki Commission and heads up the State Department's Office of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs.

BRIEF COMMENT BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY RICHARD SCHIFTER FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Secretary SCHIFTER. Let me, on behalf of the Executive Branch, also extend my welcome to Mr. Burlatskiy and the members of the Supreme Soviet.

In the United States we generally think that there's an abundance of lawyers. In the Soviet Union they say there is a shortage and I would like to point out that one of the truly outstanding Soviet lawyers who is in the room today is Mr. Yakovlev of the Institute of State and Law.

Chairman DECONCINI. Thank you. Welcome.

I now would like to yield for any comments that former member of the Commission and the Department of Commerce, Assistant Secretary Laun, who joined us in our last visit to the Soviet Union. We are very pleased to have him here.

Mr. Secretary?

BRIEF COMMENT FROM FORMER MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION LOUIS LAUN FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Secretary LAUN. I'm very pleased to be back as an alumnus of this distinguished organization. We had a marvelous trip to the Soviet Union last November. There were many interesting words spoken, but the most impressive thing that I have seen is a letter we received after we came back from Senator DeConcini and Representative Hoyer which detailed what had happened since that meeting. We had 599 people on our list who we wanted to get out. Only 31 of those are still open cases. All the rest have come out.

Similar things have happened on the release of prisoners. We're very, very grateful to Mr. Burlatskiy and to the people who we talked to for their responsiveness and we encourage a continuation of this.

Thank you very much.

Chairman DECONCINI. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, we appreciate it.

I also want to pay public thanks to the Helsinki Commission staff and its staff director, Mr. Wise, Ambassador Wise, and others who have worked so hard to put together this week's events with our guests.

Mr. Burlatskiy, Mr. Chairman, we are pleased to have you here and you may proceed in any fashion that you so care to.

STATEMENT OF MR. FYODOR BURLATSKIY, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMANITARIAN, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL COOPERATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET

Mr. BURLATSKIY. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman DeConcini, Mr. Cochairman Hoyer, ladies and gentlemen. First of all, I would like to thank you very much for your invitation to be here, for a brilliant opportunity to change our views, our experience and study especially the experience of your Commission.

Now, if you allow me, I will use my Russian language because I'm afraid that somebody will not understand my terrible English.

I would also like to welcome my old colleagues whom I've met many times before, Mr. Smith, Mr. Wolf and Mr. Porter. I hope we will be able to find a common trunk with those who are meeting here now, Mr. Laun, Mr. Porter, with other representatives in your Committee which is well known around the world and well respected.

I hope you won't hold it against me if I make a small remark, critical remark from the very beginning. All our history was characterized by closing the gap with the United States. Now I'm forced to do the same. Two cochairmen face me, but I am alone. Next time, on the basis of the development of pluralism in our country, I'll bring a few cochairmen with me to help me.

I have often had to make statements in other countries, including the United States, and I usually was asked one and the same question, where your country is heading, can it be understood? It's a difficult question for us ourselves. I'd say we are heading from state society to a civil society. From a closed society, at one time closed by an Iron Curtain, now is just a wooden stockade, but still it remains, to open society. From an authoritarian political regime to a democratic one. From a unilaterally organized political system to a plural one. From a society which never in its history, and I'm not taking the Soviet's period only, for all of its history, has never known liberal traditions, never knew such a thing as inalienable human rights.

How are we proceeding? With great difficulties. With great difficulties because we are undergoing a reconstruction period. You might remember how the New Deal started in the United States. I think our difficulties are ten times as great. You might remember the period of difficulties experienced during reconstruction in such countries as Brazil, Argentina, Spain. Our difficulties are no less than theirs were.

Many of us on the Supreme Soviet speak of a crisis, of an economic crisis, of an ecological crisis, even about a political crisis. But I personally consider that if we have not yet surmounting the process, we are in the process of surmounting it.

There are, to my mind, two main achievements of the last years. The first is well known to you, is *glasnost*, is freedom of expression. The second achievement is the first in the Russian history, a par-

liament which was freely elected, though there were some manipulations in the course of the elections. We're just taking the first steps. But as John Kennedy said during the Caribbean Crisis, the first step is the most difficult one because it paves the road for all the other ones.

I must say that there are two groups of problems which form the center of interest for the Supreme Soviet. The first is deep rooted economic reforms, structural reforms. And the second group are political problems which include the general process of democratization and human rights. The core of both groups of problems is the issue of liberty, freedom, freedom of economic activity, freedom to form the Government not only in the central part but in localities on a local level in republics, and of course personal freedom.

You have probably heard in our press and even on a political level such characteristics which would have been unimaginable, unheard of even a year ago: priority of human values in the sphere of democracy and human rights, the main importance of civil and political rights, a state ruled by law when law is above the authorities and not the other way around, and complete parallel with the laws on human rights which are being now adopted to the international obligations which we have, the Human Rights Declaration of 1948, the Pact of 1966, the Final Helsinki Act, and specifically and most of all the Vienna Agreement.

On the 27th of September, we had a special meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the subject of which was how our obligations in that field being fulfilled on the Vienna Agreement.

This is some sort of pluralism between the speaker and the interpreter. Maybe he has his own opinion.

Cochairman HOYER. Well, perhaps we'll question him as well as you.

Mr. BURLATSKIY. We've invited representatives of the Government and more than 20 organizations dedicated to the protection of human rights. We have a lot of ministries. Yesterday we visited the Attorney General and saw that he alone has the functions of four of our ministries. We hope it will give us an impetus to raise the issue of lowering the number of ministries which we have, so simplifying their activity.

On our meeting on the 27th of September, we raised the issue on speeding up all the drafting of laws on human rights. We have underlined that we were not satisfied with the way how these laws were being prepared. And finally, we took the matter of preparing or drafting such laws in our own hands, in the hands of our Committee on Legislation and other committees of the Supreme Soviet.

I can tell you about our first achievements in that field. We have prepared a law which has a somewhat boring name, title, a Law on Exit From and Entry To the Soviet Union. Actually, it's freedom of movement. I had the task, together with the representatives who prepared it, to tell the Supreme Soviet during its session of that law. I brought a video recording of that session and the members of the Committee might find it interesting to see with their own eyes how the discussion proceeded in the Supreme Soviet. I had to answer more than 20 questions asked by the deputies, the members of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. All the questions were asked in a democratic spirit.

I can give your Committee the initial draft of the law, of the bill, and also all the changes which were introduced into it on the basis of our discussion. That law was considered approved in the first reading. We thought that it would be finally approved during this week, but unfortunately such a great amount of new bills was collected, especially in the field of economics. At most, probably the law will be passed in January next year.

I would like to underline two or three elements of the law because they concern those questions which were raised by our American colleagues during their visit to the Soviet Union.

The first rule that was introduced was that a person can leave the country for permanent residence abroad or some time without any invitation, any time he decides to do it.

Every citizen of the Soviet Union will receive a foreign passport valid for 5 years and automatically the validation will then be extended which will give him a possibility to leave the country on demand.

Every person will have the right to leave the country for some time without any restrictions whenever he wants, including any restrictions of the time spent abroad.

Fourth, that any citizen of the Soviet Union has the right to return to the Soviet Union without any conditions.

The gravest dispute is raised by questions of secrecy. As you know, the question was decided by different ministries, such as Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Internal Affairs, other organizations, KGB. They were the ones who decided if a person could go abroad. Now, the secrecy clause can mean a maximum of 5 years. That term can be extended by a decision of a special committee of the Supreme Soviet in the most special cases only.

The main thing which our Committee managed to include in that bill is a possibility to, of course, appeal against a decision of absolutely any level of authority.

And another problem which interested us greatly during the discussion was the problem of mechanism in which the law would work, a problem of guarantees, a problem of foreign currency exchange, transportation, documentation, and other problems. We asked the Council of Ministers to give for consideration the draft to our Committee and it is probable that we will be considering that bill during a session.

I personally think that the law will become a giant step forward on the road of forming an open society in our country. Though a struggle is still in front of us and great pressure will have to be exerted by the Supreme Soviet, a lot of work will be required to destroy the stereotypes which form during dozens of years in our bureaucracy.

Two other draft bills have been prepared of great importance, a bill of freedom of conscience and the activity of religious organizations, the subject which was most actively discussed with Messrs. Smith and Wolf in Holland and that conference helps us raise the issue in front of our government of liberating from prison all the persons who were imprisoned for their religious so-called crimes, for which we do thank our colleagues.

A bill has been drafted on press and mass media activities. If, in my view, the law on freedom of conscience does come up to interna-

tional standards, the bill on mass media will require a lot of work, will require some struggle in achieving such standards. You know that during our history the press was under the control of the Party and the Party finds it difficult to break the habit. And there was discussion in which I participated before leaving for America which was centered on that issue and that precisely was the problem which led to the discussion.

A bill is also being prepared on public organizations, public societies, those which will deal with informal organizations in our country and help develop political pluralism in our country. Actually, the political pluralism has become a fact in our life. It has also become fact in the life of the Party itself, where you can find those who still retain their faith in Stalinism and those who are just as hotly opposed to it, those who are for Bukharin and those who are against him, those who are for radical reform and those who are for some slight cosmetic changes only and so on.

There also have come into being more than 60,000 informal organizations outside the Party limits. Among them there are very large movements including many people such as peoples front in the Baltic Republics and in the Belorussia. I cannot say that all of them are progressive to the same degree. There are such societies as Memory Pamyat which is a nationalistic movement and some other also exist. That is why the issue of drafting a law on public organizations is precisely the question that raises the greatest difficulties.

I think you will have some questions, so I will not go into greater detail on these bills and my colleague, who probably knows it much better than I do and can commence on it.

There are also two very important areas which are connected with human rights. That is problem of court protection of human rights. Previously, we did not accept the theory of distribution of government. We did remember Montesque, of course. We knew the American Constitution and of other countries. But in theory and in practice, we did not accept the theory of separation of not only government, but of authority. The situation has changed and is continuing to change now.

During the last session, about a week ago, we accepted a draft law on the basis for formation of courts.

Dr. SHELLEY. Judicial organizations.

Mr. BURLATSKIY. And the discussion was extremely characteristic. Our Committee insisted on inclusion into the draft of three very important democratic principles: on a trial by jury; of participation of a lawyer on the earliest stages of investigation; and on creation of condition for actual independence of the court from both the State and Party apparatus. The representatives of courts were against it and even the Minister of Justice, you probably remember him, he also had his doubts.

It is all the more interesting that the Supreme Soviet was all for these proposals. There were no votes against us, zero vote against it. It does go to show the evolution of our parliament. It is growing up and becoming an adult one quite quickly.

Very important amendments were introduced and accepted on the possibility of appeal against the decisions by authorities. And our Committee intends to have a special session on questions of

psychiatry, to ensure factual and basic guarantees against the possibility of misuse which existed previously.

Just a few words concerning the human rights in the area of economics. It is basically the key issue of all our new laws in the field. A law on property has been prepared, drafted, land, on leasing, development of cooperatives, and a number of others. The main issue which is being discussed is the property, personal property issue because for ideological reasons they are afraid to say private property. These are the most difficult questions of economic reform which are being discussed in the Supreme Soviet currently.

I, as a member of the Commission on preparation of the new constitution, introduced a proposal that the central part of the constitution be formed by articles on human rights. In many constitutions which were adopted during the Second World War in Europe and in other countries, the constitutions start with human rights declarations or sections.

A lot of disagreement is evident in the area of discussion of the multi-party system. They were sharply discussed during last session. There is a large group of deputies who insist that the current constitution should not contain the Article 6 which deals with the leading role of the Party in the society. I think that the question should be decided in preparing a new constitution. It should not become an issue under struggle, under debate currently because it could lead to unpredictable results.

We are looking with great interest into the experience of Hungary, of Poland and now we can even say of German Democratic Republic. You know that the changes have received an impetus through the activity of Mikhail Gorbachev who initiated the changes in our country which has played an important role in stimulating the changes in Eastern Europe, as an example.

What I wanted to say in conclusion, I would like if our colleagues, like the American public opinion, would better understand not only our achievements, but the gravest difficulties which still remain. It is not a discussion only within the Parliament. It is not a discussion only within the scientific and technical elite of the society. It is a problem of the level of culture, political culture.

We saw what an important role these facts are playing in aggravating the nationalities conflicts in our country. There is no other question which is as difficult and as sharply discussed in the Supreme Soviet as issues concerning the relations between nationalities, between the union and the republics. It creates difficulties for us and solution of those difficulties requires time.

Once I wrote an article on Khrushchev because I was his counselor and accompanied him on his visits abroad. The article concluded with the following:

Once Winston Churchill expressed his opinion on Khrushchev's reforms. It was in 1956. He said that Mr. Khrushchev was starting very deep reforms, but he must remember that you cannot jump over a canyon in two jumps, you can fall into it.

There are problems which can be solved today and now and which must be solved today and now by us. There are also problems which require patience and time. We are currently trying to develop a program of transitional period, to achieve success as ef-

ficiently as possible in the restructuring of our society, to minimize the difficulties and problems.

Esteemed members of the Committee, during 70 years we've strived to teach others how to live and what system to build. Now we have managed to understand that there are things we must learn ourselves. And not only in the field of modern technology and ecology, but also in the field of democracy and human rights. Our main aim in coming here is to study your experience, to colate your experience and our experience, and to find new forms of our business-like and reality cooperation.

First, our meetings have shown us that you create the most favorable conditions for that. Thank you very much. I thank you for it and I would like to express our hope that our cooperation here will be successful. And forgive me for speaking for such a long time. I warned you that the main problem for our deputies is to stop.

Chairman DECONCINI. Chairman Burlatskiy, thank you very much. I think you are learning very well how we operate here in the Senate. But seriously, I want to thank you for your candid remarks, for your frankness and your forthrightness in discussing the changes in the Soviet Union and particularly the area of human rights.

We will now ask for Dr. Shelley to give her statement, please.

Dr. SHELLEY. Thank you.

Chairman DECONCINI. Can you pull that microphone down a little bit, Dr. Shelley?

Dr. SHELLEY. Certainly.

Chairman DECONCINI. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DR. LOUISE SHELLEY, CHAIRPERSON OF THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, LAW AND SOCIETY, PROFESSOR AT THE SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL SERVICE AND CONSULTANT TO HELSINKI WATCH

Dr. SHELLEY. It is a great honor for me to be here on this momentous occasion and to be testifying here with Dr. Burlatskiy. It is especially notable for me because for many years I have sharply criticized Soviet human rights policy. But as I am participating in this discussion here, I hear many of the criticisms that I would make already coming out of the mouth of Dr. Burlatskiy.

I am going to be brief, even though that's sometimes supposedly difficult for American academics, not only because I want to allow time for questions, but because many of the things that I have written in my testimony have already been pointed out by Dr. Burlatskiy. There are, however, a few points that I think, from a Western perspective, should be made and that place some of his arguments in a slightly different focus.

I would start by saying that neither I nor most Soviet citizens had much expectation for the new Supreme Soviet that was formed without any established legal procedures from the larger Congress of Peoples Deputies. Yet the newly constituted body has shown itself to be very different from its rubber stamp predecessor. It is a contentious body that is rapidly learning the process of democracy. But as Dr. Burlatskiy has pointed out, it is a difficult moment and

once you put the legislation that is being considered before the legislature, you can no longer guarantee what the results are going to be. So that once when you had a commitment to human rights and you put legislation before the old rubber stamp body, you knew what the results were going to be. Now, the results are not certain.

But there does seem to be a strong commitment among many of the deputies in the Supreme Soviet towards improvement of the human rights agenda. One of the clearest evidences of this was the recent law that was passed on judicial organization.

I want to reiterate the point that Dr. Burlatskiy made about the difficulties in which the legislature is working. The domestic tensions are extremely difficult. The economy and the nationalities problems place such strains on the society. These needs come first in the eyes of many before the human rights agenda, even though there is a great commitment to these concerns on the part not only of this group of legislators but many people in national policymaking. They are not able to bring these questions to the fore as early as some of the questions on economic rights.

The process of lawmaking is not yet routinized. There are no established legal procedures by which to formulate laws. You've heard today a discussion of the different commissions that are working on the lawmaking process. As was mentioned to you, there are certain laws that the human rights commission have taken and worked on because there is not an equal commitment to human rights among the different commissions that are working with the Supreme Soviet.

For example, the organization on law enforcement, on judicial reform that Dr. Yakovlev, who is here, in which he has been so instrumental, is staffed by reformers, by individuals really committed to issues of human rights. While the commission that has worked on freedom of conscience and the commissions, there are several, that have worked on the law of the press, are less devoted to questions of human rights. In fact, some of these have been staffed by some of the old hard liners. It is the reason that this group that is advocates of human rights have taken and worked with this program.

One must understand the great difficulties that they are facing in drafting and putting through this legislation. Members of Congress often complain about how many lawyers you have, how you have to deal with such large staff. But if you didn't have these staffs, if you didn't have so many people trained in lawmaking and aware of the subtleties of the law, it would be much more difficult. As was mentioned, the problems of instituting a system of checks and balances, of introducing laws that are sure, that have certain guarantees and protections on them, are something that we take for granted, that years of legal education, of honing legal skills have trained you to do this almost automatically. But in the Soviet legal body, there are very few people who are lawyers. There are very few people who have staff who are lawyers and it all makes the process more complicated and less assured, even though the intent and the willingness may be there.

As the society seeks to redo Soviet society to establish this law-based state that was referred to, to establish legal foundations, one needs to rewrite the whole legal basis of Soviet society, which

means that there are literally dozens of laws being prepared within the commissions that need to be considered by the Supreme Soviet.

And then there's the question of priorities, there's the question of how much time can be devoted to this, how much discussion can be done. And with the problems of economic difficulties, of the problems of feeding the population, of consumer shortages that may be so threatening to the problems of *perestroika*, these questions on economic rights are coming first. Even legislation that is being emphasized for international reasons, like a new law on emigration, may not be considered until January because the incentive is there but the problems of speeding the process are very complex.

I would, however, mention that things that seem like gross abuses of human rights are rectified, that they are not postponed until January. For example, last time that I testified here, there was a very heated discussion on the new law on anti-state crime, Article 11-1, that Congressman Ritter had paid much attention to as an abuse of human rights. I would point out, however, that foreign pressure was not the only force that resulted in the elimination of this law very early on by the Supreme Soviet. There was tremendous domestic pressure as well. When there are such violations of individual rights, these are not being put off to the future, but are being dealt with automatically. I think this shows in a very significant way how the process of democratization is being learned by the Supreme Soviet.

I would also say that the new legislation on judicial reforms points to the commitment that the whole Supreme Soviet is showing in the face of pressure from the bureaucracy to establish an autonomous judiciary and to establish greater rights for the defendant.

I would, however, point out, as Dr. Burlatskiy did, that the reason that this law was received so strongly, so favorably, by the Supreme Soviet is that it is clearly a continuation of the strong anti-Stalinist sentiment that is currently surfacing in the Soviet Union. Laws and movements that can be most closely associated with anti-Stalinism receive much more favorable treatment than the law on the press or the law on public organizations that relinquish some of the Party control over the society.

It is important to understand that domestic pressure is presently more important than external pressure. But the movement from the population is not as large as what you are observing in Eastern Europe at the present time. There is not a mass movement from below in the society. The initiative for this change is coming primarily from these forward looking deputies that you meet and there is popular support behind them, but it isn't going to result in hundreds of thousands of people demonstrating in the streets throughout the country, as we are seeing in Eastern Europe, the last few weeks.

So, what you have is a party that is in some ways reluctant to give up the control that it has enjoyed, which makes it more difficult to push through reforms in some areas than others.

There are a few other points that I would like to make and then I will conclude. One is that the law on freedom of religion or freedom of conscience has had a very difficult path. I'm very pleased to hear that the Commission, this group, has taken it as an issue. But

in the draft that has come through the Supreme Soviet, there were still problems. The law on the press also has problems as it has not resolved the question on censorship, on the fact that the Government cannot have a monopoly on the rights to publication. The question of cooperatives and whether they should also have the right to publish materials has been problematic. These questions are not questions that I have just raised. They have been raised very prominently in recent weeks in the Soviet press as well.

One must remember that the situation in the Soviet Union is very volatile. The whole process of learning democracy is very difficult in a society that has not had an established legal tradition. It is not a problem of just 70 years of Soviet rule, but a problem of a whole czarist legacy. As the Soviet Union is dealing with problems of strikes that were never known, of nationality disturbances, the question remains of whether there will be efforts to curtail individual rights if these developments are seen as a threat to *perestroika*.

We have seen in the last few months, quite to everybody's surprise, significant progress in the Supreme Soviet on the human rights agenda. But will this be able to be sustained if there are increased problems of social disorder?

I would say that the answer in the Soviet Union is not an easy one. I am not a pessimist, as some of the reports that have recently appeared in America press are. But I would say that our role in this situation, our path is much clearer than the Soviets who have a very hard road ahead of them as they try to incorporate and learn a whole legal tradition.

For us, we must express our commitment to human rights, to praise this increasing compliance with international agreements and the progress that has been made, as we have been doing today. We must also voice our concern at clear violations which, as we have seen, are things that are really appreciated by these internal fighters for human rights who are pressing for these changes in their internal agenda.

Thank you.

Chairman DECONCINI. Dr. Shelley, thank you very much. That's very helpful.

We do have some questions, Dr. Burlatskiy and Dr. Shelley.

First, just to you, Dr. Shelley. Have you had a chance to read the draft of the new law that Dr. Burlatskiy has referred to of exit and entry?

Dr. SHELLEY. I haven't read the whole law. I have seen some comments on it in the press that look like it is a significant improvement in all respects. The one question that I have is this question on secrecy and whether there are still going to be problems in administering this that could lead to questions of arbitrary administration.

Chairman DECONCINI. Thank you for raising that because that's the question I wanted to address to you, Mr. Burlatskiy. The draft that we have seen is very encouraging. It does make reference to a secrecy status as criteria for one of the reasons to deny a visa or a passport. It specifically, I believe, sets forth a 5-year period of time. My question to you is when does the clock start running? Is this retroactive? Will the 5 years be as of the effective date of the final legislation which is passed How will it apply to those who have

been denied exit visas for 15 or 20 years? Will they still have to wait an additional 5 years?

Mr. BURLATSKIY. I think the law will have retroactive force.

Chairman DECONCINI. Which means the 5 years would count—the years they have already been denied would count toward that 5 years?

Mr. BURLATSKIY. Yes.

Chairman DECONCINI. And just for clarification, in your best judgment, and I realize it's impossible to predict accurately, but your best judgment is that this will be presented to the Supreme Soviet for a final draft and final vote sometime early next year?

Mr. BURLATSKIY. Yes. I think it will be in January, at the very latest February, during the next session. The time of the next session has not yet been set, but it will probably take place in January or February.

I would also like to draw your attention not only to the draft text, but to the amendments in the text which is included there. There is a very important article on possibility of appealing in court any decision by any authority, including the problem of secrets.

Chairman DECONCINI. Of secrecy?

Mr. BURLATSKIY. Yes.

Chairman DECONCINI. Thank you very much.

Mr. Burlatskiy, I have a number of individual cases that I'm going to hold off discussing with you and our colleagues until our working session because I think it's more appropriate there and other members here do want to ask some questions regarding the changes. So, I'll yield to the Cochairman, Mr. Hoyer.

Cochairman HOYER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think it ought to be pointed that tomorrow there is scheduled a 3-hour working session at which we will be discussing individual cases and individual questions that our colleagues from the Supreme Soviet may have of us and that we have of them.

Doctor, first of all, let me thank you for what was an excellent statement given from a depth of experience over the last 30 years from one who has been in the leadership and committed to reform in the Soviet Union.

When we visited the Soviet Union in November 1988, we had the opportunity to visit with you. But the opening plenary statement was given by Mr. Zagladin. Those of us who heard that statement perceived it to be an extraordinary one, a statement that heightened criticism and self-criticism about *perestroika* and *glasnost*, and went far beyond what any of us from the American delegation expected. Your discussions have continued that process of enlightening us as to your analysis of the problems and your steps towards their solution.

We are, of course, on the eve of a very significant, perhaps historic meeting between President Gorbachev and President Bush. It is my understanding this is one of the first summits that you will have missed in many decades. I would very much like to have your observations on what you think will be and what ought to be on the agenda of President Bush and President Gorbachev as it relates to human rights as they meet in Malta. Specifically, I ask that

question in the context of the U.S.-Soviet continuing dialogue has as one of its four agenda items, the issue of human rights.

Mr. BURLATSKIY. First of all, thank you very much. I prefer to ask the same question to you, but I will try to explain my own impression.

Maybe the problem of emigration and the freedom of movement which usually are very important and became now some new aspects, not only from Soviet side but from American side too because during this year, it will be at the end of this year, 200,000 people who will emigrate from Soviet Union, Mostly of them prefer United States. We predicted during the next year maybe there will be 500,000 or 700,000 emigrants.

That is a problem for us, from our side, because there's the problem of money, what kind of money to give them. But maybe there is some problem from American side. There must be some agreement between us about this subject.

The second very important question is freedom of consciousness. I know that the Americans worried very much about this problem. We understand this. But believe me, we are worried too now about this problem in our country because it is a very important part of freedom and human rights. The possibility for everybody believe and which we prefer, not only in the Communist ideology or Christianity, Muslim and others, Judaism and others. Maybe it is the subject which must be discussed and maybe we can find some new way of cooperation this way.

The thought which is spreading from my point of view is the problem of information, cooperation and information. I mean TV cooperation, press cooperation, the possibility for every country to buy their newspapers in Soviet Union, in our country, to create their culture centers in Soviet Union, in United States. We need it. We need it as a part of educating our society. We need it as a part of bettering our relations with the United States. Maybe the Presidents will discuss their problem of Jackson-Vanik because it is up to you. But it is a very important part for our economical and technological cooperation and may be one of a symbol of a new style of relations between us.

Maybe I'm wrong, but from my point of view, these questions are very important. I'm going to defer, however, to our other members before I ask additional questions, with this simple observation. You mentioned Jackson-Vanik in the most favored nation status, which has both substance to it, but as you point out correctly, significant symbolism.

It has, I think, been the position of myself and Chairman DeConcini, as you may know, that the performance, as Majority Leader Mitchell mentioned earlier this morning at our breakfast, has been such that very serious consideration of the Jackson-Vanik waiver seems to me—and I speak only for myself at this point in time—is justified.

However, I and other members have been very interested and very hopeful that the legislation of which you spoke which will guarantee under law the right to leave and the right to return so that some arbitrary change might not be made very quickly would be established and passed contemporaneously with the Jackson-

Vanik waiver, both for its symbolism and for its substance. I'm hopeful that that will happen.

Mr. BURLATSKIY. Usually, you ask us to go faster. Maybe we can ask you to go a little bit faster too.

Cochairman HOYER. That's a fair comment.

Chairman DECONCINI. Thank you, Chairman Hoyer.

Representative SMITH?

Representative SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank both of our panelists for their excellent testimony.

Mr. Burlatskiy, I do want to thank you publicly for your support and very strong letter that you sent to the Presidium asking for a release of all religiously incarcerated prisoners during the millennium celebration. That was timely. Many of those who were, we feel, unjustly incarcerated were released. And I want you to know that you are held in very high esteem by many Members of Congress, because not only do you speak about reform, you act upon it. You do match your words with deeds and we deeply appreciate that.

Let me raise briefly here, and I will go into much greater detail tomorrow during our working session, but I would like to publicly raise our very deep concern regarding the Christian Seminar in Moscow. In August, Mr. Wolf and I, joined by other members of our delegation, including Steve Snyder of the Christian Solidarity International, met with Alexander Ogorodnikov. We have since learned that on November 7, as you may be aware, his editorial office was ransacked. Father Gregoriev was severely hurt by suspected KGB agents, and many of the printing materials, the computer, the printing press were taken.

I would like to ask that your Commission not only investigate this, and perhaps the appropriate members of the Supreme Soviet, but in the spirit of the law on conscience, the draft law in *glasnost* and *perestroika*, that you do everything that is humanly possible to protect the Christian Seminar and other like-minded organizations and groups that are meeting, both Christian and Jewish and others. And I would like to make that appeal to you publicly.

If I could ask a question on the law on freedom of conscience, I've read the second and third drafts. We had a very vigorous discussion in August with members of the Council on Religious Affairs about many of its aspects. I am particularly concerned about the right of parents to teach their children about God, grandparents, uncles, aunts, and to have that unfettered freedom to pass on to succeeding generations religiously oriented material and to do it without any fear of repercussion, whether it be job loss or whatever. And I would like you if you could to spend some time on that draft as it's making its way through the Supreme Soviet.

When do you think such a draft may come to fruition in terms of an actual law? Will it be before the 1991 Conference? The importation of religious material, Bibles and other religiously-oriented materials, will that be unfettered and allowed and permitted? And if you could, Mr. Burlatskiy, perhaps touch on how many churches are being constructed or rebuilt, and synagogues—we were led to believe that in 1989 there would be minimally 1,000 Christian churches reconstituted and rebuilt—and whether or not that is

coming along? And I would ask you, if you would, to touch on some of those subjects.

Mr. BURLATSKIY. As far as your first question, we will—I promise you that our Committee will take the matter under our observation. We shall invite people from the Ministry of Internal Affairs to our Committee to receive their explanation and we will inform you on the results of the investigation.

And as far as the second question is concerned, the latest draft, though it is not the last draft of that law, includes, incorporates an article giving permission to parents to indulge in religious education of their children.

As far as the third question is concerned, I'd like to ask the Metropolitan Aleksei to answer that question. He is much better informed on the subject.

Cochairman HOYER. Doctor, the Metropolitan can have a seat.

Chairman DECONCINI. There's another seat right here, and a microphone.

This is Metropolitan Aleksei Ridiger.

We welcome you, a member of the Supreme Soviet, Metropolitan of Leningrad.

Mr. BURLATSKIY. And President of Church Association in Europe.

TESTAMONY OF MR. ALEKSEI RIDIGER, A MEMBER OF THE SUPREME SOVIET, METROPOLITAN AND PRESIDENT OF CHURCH ASSOCIATION IN EUROPE

Mr. RIDIGER. Permit me to answer the question on building and opening up of churches.

We have started counting time from the date of the meeting of the Patriarch with the permanent members of the Synod with Mikhail Gorbachev on 29th April, 1988. That meeting held place before the celebration of the millennium of Christianity in Russia. And the meeting had to do not only with that question, the millennium, but also with the life and activity of churches and religious organizations in our country. Also, the issue was raised on registration and creation of religious communities where the parish asks for it.

During the 1½ years that elapsed, more than 3,000 Orthodox Churches have been opened up. The process has also included all other churches and religious organization of our country, not only the Orthodox Church. And the process is speeding up. Registration procedure has been simplified for opening up of churches. The procedure of returning buildings which were churches previously to religious communities has been facilitated. Monasteries and spiritual academies are also being opened. But I am not sure that—I don't think that it is part of the answer I was asked to give.

Representative SMITH. Mr. Burlatskiy, if I could follow-up, in light of the Pope's meeting with Secretary General Gorbachev in just a couple of days, do you anticipate that the Ukrainian Orthodox Church will be legalized?

Mr. RIDIGER. First, please permit me to read the item of Article 3 on the rights of parents.

The parents have the right to insure religious and moral upbringing of their children in accordance with their private convic-

tions. The same right is given to people who are acting as parents under the legally-envisioned regulations. They have the same right.

Representative SMITH. That's very encouraging, Mr. Burlatskiy. How does that affect the teaching of other children? Say, if I wished to teach someone else's children, is that also permitted under the draft law?

Mr. BURLATSKIY. I'm not sure about all the articles. I don't know them exactly. But I think there are some possibilities of religious upbringing of children.

Mr. RIDIGER. The draft of the law now incorporates the right of parents for religious upbringing of the children. That includes the possibility of religious upbringing at home, personally, or for groups or in religious organizations in parishes.

Mr. BURLATSKIY. Article 6, the citizens may teach and be taught religion through private means, whether individually or in groups with others, at home or at religious organizations in the language of their choice.

The issue of the Uniatic Church on the Ukraine is one of the difficult questions of the relationship between the Orthodox and the Catholic Church. We as a legislative organization consider the following: we help the establishment and conducting of direct dialogue between the representatives of the churches; and we include in the law the possibility of the recognition of every church, including the Uniate. I think that the issue will be viewed in the same light during the meeting of Mikhail Gorbachev with the Pope.

Representative SMITH. I have several questions, but I'll only restrict it to one final question.

Mr. Burlatskiy, you pointed out that there are five subcommittees, and one deals with the labor camps in an attempt to de-Stalinize those camps.

Representative Wolf, who was with us earlier, and I went to Perm 35, 1,000 miles outside of Moscow, spent the better part of a day there, and interviewed 23 separate prisoners. I would ask you and your Commission to look very carefully at each of those cases and hopefully, as a humanitarian gesture—because we believe the evidence suggests that some are political prisoners—arrange for or work towards their very quick release. As well, I encourage you to reform the standards and the practices that are in force at Perm 35 and Chistopol and some of the other camps.

Mr. BURLATSKIY. Within the framework of a public committee, there is a subcommittee which deals with the problems of prisons. But it is not within the Supreme Soviet Committee. They have visited many prison camps, and they are discussing the problem of restructuring the system.

I have my personal opinion on the subject. I am against prison camps. I would be for incarceration in prisons when it is necessary, because the system of camps has become a system of recreation of crime. And though the changes since Stalin's times and even Brezhnev's times have been great, the problem of incarceration, of the way people are imprisoned, of course, still remains.

And as far as specific cases are concerned, all the documents we've received from our Western colleagues are looked into within the framework of the Public Committee, are investigated with great attention. We ask the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Minis-

try of Justice, KGB, for explanation of each case. And then we have informed our Western colleagues on these cases.

There are some problems left. We shall continue to pay the most serious attention to those problems within both the framework of our Public Commission and within our Committee. At one time, our great poet Pushkin said that traditions are the soul of a nation. Traditions are very hard to break, but we're trying to do it.

Chairman DECONCINI. Thank you, Mr. Burlatskiy.

Gentlemen, I'm going to yield to Congressman Porter. The Soviet delegates have to leave in about 8 or 9 minutes, so I regret the time restraints.

Congressman PORTER?

Representative PORTER. Chairman Burlatskiy, I have really just two questions I want to ask in that short time frame.

One is, your title is Chairman of the Subcommittee on Humanitarian, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation of the International Affairs Committee of the Supreme Soviet. Why are matters like press laws, judicial procedures, human rights legislation, why do they come under the jurisdiction of a subcommittee of the International Affairs Committee, and why are they also combined with other matters like scientific and cultural cooperation?

Mr. BURLATSKIY. The laws on human rights are prepared not by one committee, but by a number of committees. Our Committee was especially responsible and we were considered the central committee in preparation of the exit from and entry to law, though other committees participated in that preparatory work, the Committee on Legislation and the Committee on People's Demands.

The law on the press and media, on freedom of conscience, on information are being prepared by two other committees, the Committee on Openness and Committee on Legislation. We are coworkers, coparticipants. Our role is in overseeing that they are compatible with our obligations under the Vienna agreements and other international obligations of the country. But we do abuse our power sometimes, and do introduce amendments to other laws, proposals, on the basis of international law, norms, and regulations.

As far as unification of three problems within one committee, we have special committees that deal with the problems of science and with the problems of culture. Those are large committees. Our Subcommittee deals only with the problems of cooperation in those fields. The International Committee has three subcommittees, Political Relations, Economic Cooperation, and the third is ours. When we attain your levels, we will probably have, instead of 15 committees and 7 commissions, at least 100.

Representative PORTER. The difficulty is obvious. As soon as you have any measure of democracy, you have multiple jurisdiction and multiple committees, which is a big problem of the Congress. We can see you have the same problem already.

Let me ask the second question. You've described laws that are being prepared or passed on emigration, press rights, religious freedom, trial by jury, lawyer participation, and others. This hearing today is on institutionalization of human rights, and our own experience in the formation of rights under our constitution and laws is that when you have rights that come from the state—and it seems to me the implication of laws is that the rights are given by the

state to the individual—what the state gives at one point in time, the state can take away in another point in time.

And so it seems to me that it would be important—and you mentioned theory—but it would be terribly important at this point in time in the Soviet Union to be talking about the institutionalization of human rights in the context of the relation of the individual to the state, and whether those rights don't exist beyond law, but rather exist as basic to human beings and never given to the state for the state to deal with in one way or the other.

In other words, if the power of all power exists in the people, then in the contemplation of our constitution certain powers are given to government, but others are retained by the people. And government has no right to deal with them.

So my question is, are you considering—and I realize you have to walk before you can run—but are you also considering national debate on the relationship between the individual and the state and incorporating the ideas of human rights in such a way under your system that the majority can't withdraw those rights or the state can't withdraw those rights at some time in the future?

Mr. BURLATSKIY. Mr. Porter, I have not only read Jean-Jacques Rousseau, I even wrote about him. So I know something about natural and inalienable rights of humans. That is a basic problem of formation of a political culture in our country.

We did have, though, a few, but some democratic traditions. But we had no liberal traditions at all. That is the inalienableness of rights and the unpermissiveness of the state's infringing on such rights.

The first task in educating a civil society is to change the laws.

And the second much more difficult task is educating a consciousness and creating public institutions which will form the guarantee of inalienableness of those rights. So we are trying to help the development of different movements for the protection of human rights.

So we would be glad to be able to invite you and give you a possibility to speak in front of our deputies and explain to them how such problems are solved in the United States.

Representative PORTER. Could I ask one follow-up, and that is—

Chairman DECONCINI. We're running out of time, John.

Representative PORTER. All right. I'll ask later.

Chairman DECONCINI. I'm awful sorry. I do want to yield to Secretary for a quick question if he has one. I appreciate him being with us today.

Secretary SCHIFTER. I've just one question that we can pursue tomorrow. You made reference to the nationalities issue, to the serious problem of relations between the Soviet Union on the one hand and the republics on the other.

While we do not have quite the same situation in the United States, we do have a federal structure here. And the issue of the relationship between the states on the one hand and Federal government is one that we have for many decades, centuries, worked on. I would suggest that if we exchange ideas on American federalism, some of these ideas might be useful for the Soviet Union in dealing with this very critical question of the nationalities issue.

Chairman DECONCINI. Mr. Burlatskiy, thank you.

Mr. BURLATSKIY. Thank you very much.

Mr. Schifter, that's a very good idea. It is in our mind and we will thank you for some explanation.

Chairman DECONCINI. Mr. Burlatskiy, I want to thank you very much for your candidness and your participation today, and also for your invitation for some of us to appear before your subcommittee and other committees. Believe me, if that invitation is extended, I think you will find a very welcome reception.

This has been a remarkable hearing and I am most indebted to you, Mr. Burlatskiy, Ms. Shelley, Metropolitan Ridiger, for your participation, and your colleagues for being with us today.

Thank you.

Mr. BURLATSKIY. Thank you. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 12:23 p.m., the above entitled matter was concluded.]

○