The President and Mrs. Carter request the pleasure of your company at a reception to be held at The White House on Saturday afternoon, October 6, 1979, at two-thirty o'clock.

South Lawn

On the occasion of the visit of His Holiness John Paul II

Please respond to The Social Secretary The White House and include the name of your guest.

(202) 456-1300

NOT TRANSFERABLE
Dear Marc,

Thanks for your letter of December 3. I am pleased that you plan to join us and participate in January. Your presence will be appreciated.

Your continuing support and commitment to the President has, and will continue to be, very helpful, and very important to us all. Thanks for your help.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Anne Wexler
Assistant to the President

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
National Director
Interreligious Affairs
The American Jewish Committee
165 East 56 Street
New York, New York, 10022
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

August 4, 1978

To Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum

Thank you for sending me your book on Evangelicals and Jews in Conversation. I appreciate your inscription; I need your prayers in the search for peace. I am grateful for your contribution to the foreign aid meeting. I hope that this meeting can be the beginning of a fruitful dialogue.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
American Jewish Committee
165 East 56th Street
New York, N.Y. 10022
To Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum

I appreciated the opportunity to discuss foreign assistance issues with you on July 31. I believe we had a productive exchange of views at that meeting, and I am pleased my staff has been able to continue working closely with you and your representatives.

As you know, the bill passed by the House of Representatives earlier this week was a victory for those interested in a viable foreign assistance program. Your efforts were significant in ensuring an informed and educated consideration of these issues. We are now looking ahead to the Senate, where foreign aid will be considered in September.

Thank you again for your help.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
National Director
Interreligious Affairs
American Jewish Committee
165 East 56th Street
New York, New York 10022
Dear Hy,

Thank you very much for your help with the High Holy Day statement. Please tell Rabbi Tannenbaum he did an absolutely splendid job, one thoroughly in keeping with the occasion as well as the President's wishes. There were very few changes but I'm enclosing the revised text for your final o.k.

The firemen did get in the speech -- note the underlined enclosure. Don't feel bad -- Jerry Rafshoon missed it too.

Best,

CARYL CONNER
Speechwriter
to the President

Enclosures

Hyman Bookbinder
818 18th St., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006
JEWISH NEW YEAR GREETINGS

Rosalynn and I are confident we express the sentiments of millions of Americans in extending to our fellow citizens, the Jewish people of our nation, our deepest respects and heartfelt greetings on the eve of the Jewish Holy Days.

Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur are a supreme moment of moral and spiritual stock-taking in one's personal life as well as in evaluating our role in society. There are few more moving and ennobling utterances of the human spirit than that found in the Jewish High Holiday prayers: "May they all (all people) form one companionship to do Thy Will with a single heart."

That yearning for solidarity among all persons, which the Jewish people bequeathed to our nation and to humanity, has seldom been more compelling than it is today. Our nation and the human family have paid too great a price in human lives as a result of religious, racial, and ethnic prejudice and hostility. We thank God for keeping America free of the religious and racial wars that dominate other continents.

The theme of human solidarity is based on profound respect for the right of each group to be itself, and to be true to its own heritage and culture. This philosophy has been translated into unique reality in the religious pluralism and mutual caring which are distinctive features of American democracy.
In a world that continues to be threatened by ideological fanaticism, our 300 year American experience with unity in the midst of diversity may be the single most important cultural and spiritual example we have to offer the world. May the Jewish people, their fellow Americans, and the entire human family enjoy a good and, above all, a peaceful, New Year.
To Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum

No matter what else may be added to my life's work, I cannot imagine anything that will give me more happiness than the contribution I was able to make to help Prime Minister Begin and President Sadat achieve the historic breakthrough for peace. At the time of the negotiations at Camp David leading to this milestone, there was a great deal of discussion about the "political risk" involved in such a venture. It was an opportunity for peace, and I gave it the maximum effort. When the leaders of Israel, Egypt and the United States signed the Egyptian-Israeli treaty on the White House grounds, it provided the first real hope in a generation for Middle East peace. It was a moment none of us will forget. Our goal now must be to continue the Camp David process, something Prime Minister Begin assures me he wants with all of his heart.

That larger peace we seek will not be achieved by campaign rhetoric, although it is gratifying that all of the Presidential candidates are pledged to the continuation of the "special relationship" between America and Israel. My pledge has been backed up by Camp David, by unequaled economic and military assistance for Israel, by a strong anti-boycott law, by opposition to an independent Palestinian state, by refusal to recognize or negotiate with a PLO committed to the destruction of Israel. I see Israel not only as a close friend and partner but as an important strategic ally of the United States.

As a strong democracy in a troubled part of the world, Israel is a major strategic asset. A strong secure Israel is not just in Israel's interest. It is in the interest of the United States and in the interest of the entire free world.

I am grateful for the help my Administration has received from the Jewish community in these and other important national efforts. We shall need this support more than ever in the years ahead. I am concerned about the shrill voices that would end our struggle to achieve social justice, that would put a stop to our efforts on behalf of the poor and the victims of discrimination, and that would tear down the
wall that separates church from state. It is especially painful that much of this is promoted in the name of "morality." I ask you to help me resist this drive to right-wing extremism. You know that I am the candidate these forces are seeking to defeat.

I want to answer directly and personally a question that has been raised by some in our country who care deeply about Israel: "What about after the election? Isn't there a danger that President Carter might reverse United States policy and turn his back on Israel?" My answer is: "Never!"

My Administration will never reassess America's relationship with Israel as the previous administration did. At no time in the last four years did my Administration use economic or military aid to Israel as a lever against Israel, and I pledge that we shall not do this in the next four years.

I ask for your support in November. I ask you to consider which winner in November is more likely to work for the kind of country in which the pursuit of social justice will be strengthened, not diminished. I ask you to think who is more likely to appoint Supreme Court Justices and Cabinet members and White House aides who understand the challenges of our times. I ask you to remember which ticket includes Walter Mondale with his impeccable record of dedication to all that you hold dear. I pledge you a Carter/Mondale Administration that is not only committed to the security of Israel, but to the kind of United States that can make that commitment credible and enforceable in a fragile and dangerous world community.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Carter
TEXT OF PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER'S ADDRESS
TO COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
SONS AND DAUGHTERS MEETING
NEW YORK CITY
DECEMBER 17, 1981

With the possible exception of my two predecessors, I know better than anyone how complicated and intransigent are some of the foreign policy questions that confront a President. I also know from first hand experience about innate human fallibility, even among those of us who have served in the Oval Office.

In order to alleviate the problems of complex issues and potential error, to insure a unified America, and to gain broad support for the controversial decisions a President must make, our leaders have usually tried to follow one important principle -- bi-partisan continuity in foreign policy.

Continuity is naturally assumed when a Vice President becomes President, but because most of the same problems persist and the solutions to them are best evolved in a broad collegial forum, a consistent policy has usually resulted even when new leaders took office because of an election victory.

International problems often survive over long periods of time. Harry Truman is my favorite among the Presidents I remember, and I made a special study of the challenges he faced and his reaction to them. It was surprising how many of the same ones I inherited in some form or other, all the way from Israel to China, and including nuclear weapons, energy, Iran, and especially Human Rights.

American Foreign Policy has been most-successful when it enjoyed bi-partisan support, as was the case with the formation of NATO and the United Nations, the U.S.-Japanese Agreements after World War II, the Panama Canal Treaties, the Camp David Accords and normalization of relations with China. When such involvement and support is absent we suffer the consequences, as with the League of Nations, Vietnam, and our failure to implement all the terms of the SALT II Treaty.

(more)
I am a loyal Democrat, and it is not my nature to be patient or timid when innovations seem advisable. However, there is no way I could have concluded any successful effort in controversial foreign areas without bi-partisan help. For my own interests alone, we regularly briefed the former Presidents, and repeatedly asked President Ford, Senator Howard Baker, Secretary Henry Kissinger and other Republican leaders for their advice and support.

I tried to use boldness and persistence consonant with what had gone on before -- in Europe, Panama, China, The Middle East, in our relations with the Soviet Union, in negotiating a SALT Treaty, and to some degree even in Africa -- building upon the efforts of my predecessors and seeking their advice when new ideas were being pursued. I knew they had done the same.

It is particularly advisable to maintain a consistent approach when our decisions affect other nations and our national security -- perhaps even our very existence. Historically, our leaders have made a radical change in such plans only when necessary to pursue a completely different national objective or to meet an unanticipated new challenge.

Apparently, this policy of bi-partisan continuity has been abandoned.

Although many problems are of concern to us, we realize that only the Soviet Union has the capability to threaten our very existence, and for that reason alone the super-power relationship must always be foremost in the development of wise and consistent plans.

I am convinced that the Soviet leaders want to stay at peace with us. They suffered 20 million deaths in the Second World War, and their aging leaders remember vividly the agony of that conflict. At the same time, we know they will probe for every change to exert their influence, depending for their primary strength on great military power, the use of Cuban and Vietnamese surrogates, and the delivery of weapons to almost any willing recipient.

I studied very closely the policies of Presidents Nixon and Ford in defining the basis for Detente. Our commitment to this process cannot be lightly abandoned if the word means the easing of tension between our two nations. Both super-powers must exercise restraint in troubled areas and in troubled times, and must search for better understanding of one another.

(more)
The importance and complexity of Soviet-American affairs require that our national policy be thoroughly and frequently proclaimed to the public. Repeatedly, in news conferences and in major speeches we made clear our eagerness to cooperate with the Soviets whenever possible, but our willingness to compete with them when necessary.

A one-sided attitude of belligerence toward the Soviet Union may be politically attractive for a time, but it is not an adequate basis for American Policy because it precludes cooperation and generates fear among those who would avoid a super-power confrontation.

SALT negotiations have been the most notable example of an extended bi-partisan effort, extending throughout the last three Presidential terms. Even major differences were not permitted to interrupt this process. In May, 1972, after almost four years of talks, President Nixon was scheduled to go to Moscow to complete SALT I. Two weeks before the summit, he ordered the mining of Haiphong Harbor and the bombing of rail lines to impede the flow of supplies from China and the Soviet Union to North Vietnam. Nevertheless, Nixon and Brezhnev met and signed the agreement.

The SALT II Treaty was negotiated for almost seven years under three Presidents, also under most difficult conditions. Just during the final year we concluded the Middle East Peace Treaty without Soviet participation, normalized diplomatic relations with China contrary to Soviet desires, weathered the Iranian Revolution, and condemned the Soviet Union for its involvement in military operations in Ethiopia -- but we still proceeded to Vienna to conclude the agreement and lay the groundwork for much deeper nuclear arms reductions under SALT III.

This SALT process had been pursued not just to reduce the nuclear threat and alleviate tension between the preeminent leaders of the East and West, but also to convince our allies and other Nations that we seek peace and are committed to the process of nuclear arms control.

Now we have seen a radical American departure from this long-prevailing policy. From my successors there have been mixed signals, at best, even involving the acceptability of limited nuclear wars and demonstration nuclear warning shots. These have aroused consternation here and in Europe, and have dealt the unity of NATO a most damaging blow.

(more)
When I visited England, Germany, France and Italy we had reports about smoldering embers of pacifism and the anti-nuclear movement, but we never saw demonstrations or other evidence of this sentiment. Now these embers have been fanned into flames. It may well be that an aroused public on both sides of the Iron Curtain will serve to hasten the day of general nuclear arms reductions, but it is troubling that most of the hundreds of thousands are demonstrating against us, and not against the much more culpable leader of the Warsaw Pact.

The recent offer by the President not to deploy future medium-range weapons in Europe if the Soviets remove their existing ones was a step in the right direction. Although I have never found the Soviet leaders willing to consider either unilateral dismantling of their medium-range missiles or on-site inspections, nor inclined to ignore French and British weapons when the balancing tallies are made, maybe we will now see a new day. It is certain that something must be done to reduce this immediate and growing threat to European, American and Soviet citizens. I pray that the present talks might soon bring this new day.

But after a year it is important to ask: what is our policy concerning strategic nuclear arms limitations or reductions? Neither SALT I nor SALT II now have the force of law, and there have been no clear public statements either from Washington or Moscow about these possibly moribund agreements. What modifications to the existing treaties would make them acceptable to this Administration? What about SALT III or other subsequent negotiations? After more than 25 years, have we abandoned this crucial effort? If so, this is a development of the most serious consequence to our country and to the world.

There was one nuclear issue on which President Brezhnev and I found no significant area of disagreement -- nuclear non-proliferation. We both strongly opposed the spreading of nuclear explosives to additional Nations.

With full bi-partisan support, and in conformity with campaign commitments made by me and President Ford, we moved aggressively to strengthen America's non-proliferation policy. In 1977 I signed into law a far-reaching bill designed to restrain the trade in atomic fuels and waste reprocessing plants without strict international
controls, and we implemented this policy even though it sometimes aroused the displeasure of friends like Germany, France, Japan and Switzerland.

Within the last year this non-proliferation policy has been almost wiped out completely, through announcements and actions here and among others who are eager to benefit financially from the lucrative trafficking in nuclear materials. Nations like India, Brazil, Argentina, South Africa, Iraq, Pakistan and Libya are watching with intense interest what the free world's leading nation will do, knowing that without the United States in the forefront of this effort there can be no substantial restraints. So far, we have smiled and nodded, or looked the other way. Unfortunately, the trade and the danger are growing.

Under Presidents Nixon and Ford the Middle East problems were addressed at the highest levels of our government. We all remember the 'shuttle diplomacy' of their Administrations as we injected a strong American voice into this troubled region. As you know, I continued this policy, with top-level officials specifically directed to speak for me in seeking peace. When necessary, I did the negotiating myself.

The Middle East is still a tinderbox, and the only foundation in sight for a comprehensive peace is the consummation of the Camp David Accords. In April, Egypt and Israel can prove to the world that negotiations in good faith will pay rich dividends to both sides. Israel will gain peace and normal relations with her most powerful Arab neighbor, and Egypt will also have peace plus the return of her occupied territories. The Camp David framework provides for the continued security of Israel, the withdrawal of her armed forces to security posts, the termination of military rule and full autonomy for the Palestinians. It is all there in the agreement -- promises waiting to be fulfilled. This is no time to be slack or equivocal in our support for the existing accords. This would be a tragic mistake for Egypt, Israel and for the United States.

I can certainly understand why any President does not personally join the discussions, but it is almost inconceivable that neither the Secretary of State nor any other high-level negotiator has been assigned to help implement the Camp David Agreement. The prospective alternatives as proposed by the Saudis, the European community and the United Nations are ill-advised as long as there is an ongoing peace process under American
leadership -- but we are bordering on default.

I have been listening with great personal concern to the confusing statements from Washington. We are a signatory of the Camp David Accords. Have we abandoned this commitment? If not, do we only have a casual interest in the ongoing peace talks? Do we recognize the catastrophic consequences of a failure? Is this another abrupt change from more than a decade of bi-partisan commitment? These questions cry out for answers.

Perhaps the most memorable accomplishment of the Nixon Administration was his visit to China and the signing of the Shanghai Communique. President Ford endorsed this action, and visited China to demonstrate his commitment to further Sino-American relations. Our normalizing relations with China was another major step toward a better life for both our peoples and a more stable and peaceful Far East. Commercial trade, scientific and technological agreements, tourism, and the exchange of scholars have all burgeoned. In the process, the people of Taiwan have reaped similar benefits.

Now again, through public statements and impending action there are clear indications that our country might revert to a Two-China Policy. In September, I had extensive discussions with China's leaders, Premier Zhao Ziyang, Chairman Hu Yaobang, and Vice Premier Deng Xiaoping. I can tell you that American sales of anything other than strictly defensive weapons to Taiwan will endanger the progress we have made with China. Another bi-partisan accomplishment of the greatest value is being threatened.

The imposition of a new economic and political philosophy and the resulting economic problems here at home are affecting military, political and diplomatic decisions. Excessive tax reductions have substantially removed the flexibility needed to make such judgements in the future. We face soaring deficits during this and the next three years, and the number of unemployed Americans now exceeds that of any time since the 1930's. Protectionism resulting from high unemployment is a serious and growing source of friction with our European trading partners, and threats or verbal attacks on Japan are becoming commonplace.

President Ford was the first American President to visit Japan, and I have been there several times. It has been gratifying to witness their remarkable economic achievements, and to realize how staunch and valuable a friend they have become. During recent years the Japanese have played an increasingly beneficial role in regional and world-wide affairs. It would be a mistake to underestimate
the importance of our bi-partisan policy of cooperation with Japan on matters of common interest.

Although it is possible for the Japanese to do more in their own defense, we should not be abrasive in our efforts to influence this decision. It is best to honor their peaceful nature and the constitutional limits on their military role. This would be a good time to explore other ways of contributing to our joint security, perhaps by helping to stabilize the Middle East with some Japanese economic contributions to Egypt and the Sudan.

Japan is very sensitive to American desires, but in my recent talks with their business and political leaders they made it plain -- in a typically polite way -- that there is a limit to how many verbal gaffes, naval incidents, public demands and export restraints the traffic can bear.

Southern Africa is another area where long-standing policies are being reversed. Shortly before I became President, our country proposed a substantial American contribution toward resolving the Rhodesian question. I saw this as important, and through our leaders in the State Department and the United Nations, and with my personal intervention at times, we greatly increased American involvement in African affairs. Our clear policy was to condemn racism, to work for majority rule, and to extend a hand of friendship to black African people, with special attention to influential nations like Zimbabwe and Nigeria. This was sometimes very controversial policy invoking clashes with the more right-wing members of Congress, but the results were highly gratifying. Combined with the Panama Canal treaties and diplomatic recognition of China, this African policy gave us a strong new status among the emerging nations of the world. This relationship is now in danger.

The strongest weapons in the American arsenal are our ethical and moral values based upon the fair treatment of human beings, here and abroad. In Asia, Latin America, Eastern Europe and in many other regions, our protection of Human Rights has been a good foundation for democracy, freedom, and the enhancement of American influence. I raised this banner as high as possible, as had many of my predecessors in the White House.

This is what Harry Truman had to say:

"The attainment of worldwide respect for essential Human Rights is synonymous with the attainment of world peace." He added, "On us as a nation rests the
responsibility of taking a position of leadership in the struggle for human rights. We cannot turn aside from the task if we wish to remain true to the vision of our forefathers and the ideals that have made our history what it is."

Some have said I was too enthusiastic with this policy, and these criticisms now make me doubly proud. I can remember with a twinge of regret only the times when we might have been a little bolder. Being a champion of Human Rights is a natural and historic American trait and also a valuable tool for building our own spirit and meeting the totalitarian challenge among millions of people in other nations who hunger for liberty and justice.

What is our American policy on oppression? On racial equality? On democracy? On freedom? There can really be only one answer to these questions, but the answer needs to be loud and clear — not muted or wavering or off key as during the past eleven months. Nowadays concerning freedom and Human Rights the American trumpet gives an uncertain sound and, as the Bible says, "who shall prepare himself for the battle?"

I am deeply concerned about these and other radical changes in foreign policy, and the apparent abandonment of efforts to build bi-partisan cohesion and let the world see a unified and consistent America.

Where will we go from here? It is time for our leaders to clarify where we stand on such basic issues as SALT, Human Rights, nuclear proliferation, China, protectionism, our relations with the emerging Nations, and the Middle East peace process. We are the natural leaders of the free world, and we need to provide adequate ground for foreign and domestic support for our policies — policies based on bi-partisan continuity, broad-ranging consultation and clarity of purpose.
September 27, 1979

President Jimmy Carter  
The White House  
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President,

It was my very genuine privilege to be with you during the recent luncheon of Camp David alumni to discuss the follow-up on the energy and conservation program.

I am deeply grateful for your kind invitation to be present at the forthcoming reception for His Holiness Pope John Paul II at the White House on October 6th. Regrettably, that time falls both on the Jewish Sabbath and on the first day of Sukkot, the Jewish Festival of Tabernacles, and it will therefore not be possible for me to be present. Fortunately, thanks to the thoughtfulness of Cardinal Cooke, I will be present at several of the meetings and receptions for the Pope in New York City on October 2nd and 3rd.

I am also grateful for your kind invitation to attend the recent reception in honor of my beloved friend and long-time colleague, His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos. While I was not able to be present for that I did spend an hour with the Archbishop taping a television program for CBS-TV on the discussions with you and had an opportunity to express my deep love and respect for him at that time. Incidentally, I had suggested that CBS invite you to be the center of that discussion but apparently your schedule did not allow for that. The program will be shown on Sunday, September 30th, at 10:30 in the morning and will be entitled, "The Invisible Threat," a phrase which was taken from your excellent July 15th address.

My major purpose in writing to you now is to bring to your attention an article by Mr. Leonard C. Yaseen, the chairman emeritus of Fantus Corporation, one of the major plant relocation firms in the United States. Mr. Yaseen has set forth some ideas about a conservation program that I believe is not only imaginative but is realistic and could advance the goal of conservation in a major way.
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I hope that copies of this article - which is a condensation of a longer article which he has written - could be made available to those in charge of organizing the voluntary sector in advancing the cause of conservation in this country.

I plan to send copies of this article around to thousands of key national civic and religious leaders with a view toward urging them to begin undertaking some of the programs suggested by Mr. Yaseen at the earliest possible date. This program, I believe, could go a long way toward helping us achieve significant conservation and contribute to a goal of energy self-reliance.

I have just seen your statement disavowing that American Jewish leadership put pressure on you to cause the resignation of my good friend, Ambassador Andy Young. We plan to give considerable attention to this statement which is very much needed because a large number of people in the black community believe that "the Jews" are responsible for Andy's resignation and the resentment has become widespread. So I am grateful that you have cleared the air on this issue.

I do hope that we can bring together a White House Conference of Religious Leaders to concentrate on the issue of conservation with a view toward mobilizing massive public support behind this central issue.

With warmest personal good wishes, I am,

Respectfully yours,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
National Director
Interreligious Affairs

MHT:RPR

CC: Mr. Leonard C. Yaseen

Enclosure

bc: Bert Gold
 Selma Hirsh
  Joel Gallob
  Mort. Yarmon
Drive, But Save

By Leonard C. Yaseen

This country can save 500,000 barrels of oil a day if employers and workers make a serious commitment to sharing rides. Such a move would involve no legislation or drastic Government action — simply the willingness of people across the country to slightly alter their commuting habits.

While a program of increased public transit is essential for compact, high-population-density areas, the fact is that most people in urban areas must continue to drive to work. Compared to the New York metropolitan area encompassing 1,100 square miles where mass transit is possible, Phoenix covers 9,000 square miles, Dallas-Fort Worth over 8,000, Houston almost 7,000, St. Louis 5,000, and Los Angeles, Atlanta, San Diego, Denver, Seattle, Detroit and Chicago approximately 4,000 square miles each.

In 1978, highway fuel consumption totaled 7.10 million barrels per day and commuters accounted for 2.37 barrels of that amount. Of our 86 million people in the nonagricultural workforce, 89 percent use cars — many commuting from the same neighborhoods, to and from the same work areas at about the same time.

To date, comparatively few employers have initiated or encouraged any form of car pooling. The number of commuter occupants per car now averages 1.15. If this could be raised to 1.5 per car, 26 million automobiles would be removed from the highways and some 500,000 barrels of oil could be saved each day.

America is irrevocably committed to decentralization of industrial and other facilities. Nearly 40 years ago, at the onset of World War II, the Government decreed that no new plants were to be constructed in or near vulnerable, highly industrialized metropolitan areas. Light-manufacturing, textile and shoe plants had sought to escape strong Northern union pressures several decades earlier. Heavy industry soon found that decentralization, in rural and semi-rural areas, could help them undercut competition in traditional manufacturing centers by as much as 10 percent to 15 percent.

This exodus of manufacturing jobs generated the relocation of warehousing, corporate headquarters, retailing centers, campuses — and people. People moved to the suburbs and relocated in the Sun Belt. This new, and still emerging, geography of industry has completely transformed driving patterns. Public transportation has deteriorated, and the car has become the only way to reach many isolated facilities. This is an established fact of our society, and gasoline shortages pose new challenges to industry and workers alike — pool cars or vans as a permanent way of life.

In addition to saving gasoline, large employers such as I.B.M., A.T.&T., and the T.V.A., which have initiated extensive car-pooling and van-sharing programs, have found that results are constructive both for the company and for the employees. Absenteeism and tardiness have dropped, efficiency and productivity have improved. Workers have found that riding with a group of fellow employees or neighbors is sociable, enables them to leave their cars at home for family use, and provides assurance of getting to and from work at lower cost. For a 40-mile round trip, considering all ownership and operating costs, these savings are estimated at $1,400 per person annually in a four-person shared driving pool.

Specifically, companies can do the following:
1. Appoint a transportation coordinator.
2. Supply the workers with maps and with names of fellow workers in their same residential areas.
3. Map out the best routes to and from the facility.
4. Guarantee supplies of gasoline, either at the plant or through an arrangement with a nearby station.
5. Provide preferred parking near the facility.
6. Provide vans or other multi-passenger vehicles on some basis satisfactory to the company and the employees.

Such a program could have a material impact on the nation's energy problem, could demonstrate strong initiative and responsibility on the part of citizens and companies, and take off some pressure on Government to over-bureaucratize the solution to the energy crisis.

Leonard C. Yaseen is retired chairman of an economic-consulting firm that specializes in industrial location.
August 15, 1979

TO: Marc Tenenbaum

FROM: Miles Zitmore

RE: Carter's Missionizing to Koreans

With everyone's attention riveted to Andrew Young, another incident has just about slipped by. Is it true that the President of the U.S., on an official visit to Korea, evangelized to President Chung Hee Park or any other Korean official? If this story is correct, has AJC or any other group questioned its propriety?

I have received several queries from members of my board who asked me to check the accuracy of the story and if AJC has responded.

Mz;ez
August 7, 1979

President Jimmy Carter
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

My dear Mr. President,

It was most gracious of you to take the time and trouble to write to me about my participation with other religious leaders in the Camp David seminar with you.

I found it a most creative and stimulating discussion, and was deeply moved by how much all of us shared your perceptions on the moral and psychological condition of the American people.

On returning, I have just written to Cardinal Cooke, Claire Randall and others proposing that we arrange to meet together shortly in order to mobilize systematic support in every major city in our country behind your energy and conservation proposals.

I am genuinely persuaded that Christian and Jewish leaders collaborating closely together can literally help turn America around on this issue, as we have done on the Indochinese refugees, world hunger, foreign aid, human rights, et cetera.

It will be a privilege to be associated with you in this massive challenge to our nation and our people. I hope you realize that my organization and I personally are available to be of every possible assistance in this vital area.

With warmest personal good wishes and my prayers for God's richest blessings over you, Rosalyn, and your lovely family, I am,

Respectfully,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
National Director
Interreligious Affairs
THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON  
August 21, 1978  

Dear Rabbi Tanenbaum:  

I thought you might want to have this photograph which was taken at your meeting with the President on July 31. I know the President appreciated your attendance at the meeting and your work on behalf of foreign assistance undoubtedly contributed to our success in the House of Representatives.

Thank you for sending me a copy of your radio commentary on foreign aid. It is a moving statement, and I'm sure that it played a role in our success.

We intend to continue our dialogue with you and other religious leaders on a wide range of issues.

I look forward to seeing you soon.

Sincerely,

Anne Wexler  
Assistant to the President

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum  
National Director, Interreligious Affairs  
American Jewish Committee  
165 East 56th Street  
New York, New York 10022
Dear Rabbi Tanenbaum:

Thank you for your letter of August 4 and the copy of your radio script on foreign aid. I welcomed the recent opportunity to meet with you and other religious leaders at the White House, and deeply appreciate your efforts to promote understanding of the importance of foreign assistance. Radio messages of the type you sent me play a vital role in expanding the American peoples' awareness of the contributions our foreign aid programs make to the needy peoples in the developing world.

Let me again thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

C. Fred Bergsten
Assistant Secretary for International Affairs

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
National Director
Interreligious Affairs
The American Jewish Committee
165 East 56 Street
New York, NY 10022
30 churchmen meet Mr. Carter

Religious leaders backs foreign aid

WASHINGTON (NC) — An interfaith coalition of almost 30 religious leaders discussed foreign aid with President Jimmy Carter and then asked Congress to pass the President's endangered foreign aid bill.

The religious leaders met with Carter on the eve of a key House vote on the foreign aid appropriations bill. The $7.3 billion appropriations bill faces a series of amendments to cut its funds.

A spokesman for the group, Fr. J. Bryan Hehir, associate secretary for international justice and peace for the U.S. Catholic Conference, said the religious leaders at the meeting have already supported the bill and that the meeting with Mr. Carter was "not a one shot deal."

Father Hehir said the religious leaders were concerned with the bill for two main reasons.

First, he said, "We believe this legislation is aimed at meeting the needs of the poorest people in the world. It is not a perfect program, but we believe it is worth our support, as well as our attempts to reform it."

"Secondly, the arguments being made in the Congress are that the American people will not support this kind of legislation because of inflation, unemployment and the debate about taxation in the United States."

"It is our conviction," he said, "...that in the ministry we perform with people, preaching and work we do with them, we do not believe they would not support the kind of foreign assistance that is, being proposed in the House for the poorest people in the world."

Religious leaders meeting with Carter

included Bishop Thomas Kelly, USCC general secretary; Bishop Edwin Broderick, executive director of Catholic Relief Services; Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America; Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum of the American Jewish Committee; the Rev. Jimmy Allen, president of the Southern Baptist Convention.

The foreign aid bill contains $11.16 billion for U.S. "Country-to-country" aid, primarily through the Agency for International Development; $2.63 billion for international banks which lend money to developing nations; $2.17 billion for security and military assistance mostly to the Middle East; and $260 million for development programs.
GOVERNMENT PRINTER REFUSES TO PRINT GUYANA CATHOLIC WEEKLY (420)

GEORGETOWN, Guyana (NC) — When the editor of the Catholic Standard met with a government-controlled publishing concern on its failure to print the paper for the second consecutive week, he was told to look for another printer.

In a mimeographed edition the editor, Jesuit Father Andrew Morrison, attributed the troubles to the Standard's opposition to a referendum July 10 giving the socialist government of Premier Forbes Burnham more control of Parliament to write a new constitution. The Standard is the only Catholic newspaper in Guyana and one of the few independent voices among the country's media.

"It is still our conviction that the disappearance of copy (at the printer's the previous week) and stoppage of work on our paper was deliberate," said the priest in the July 16 mimeographed edition. The weekly had been published by the Guyana National Newspapers Ltd. In the weeks before the referendum the paper strongly opposed the referendum, issued warnings of fraud and urged a referendum boycott. Its July 16 edition reported heavily on allegations of fraud and charged that government figures on the electoral turnout had been grossly inflated.

"During the past few weeks many Guyanese were required to participate actively in fraud, or to condone such behavior by their silence," the Standard said in an editorial. "We refer to such activities as one person voting many times, the government creating fictitious votes, publishing false or distorted information, denying others the right to express their opinions in the media and public meetings."

The Standard challenged government assertions that 98 percent of those who voted backed its proposal to adopt a socialist charter and go away with future referenda.

It reported that "boycott of the fraud was highly successful," and published figures given by the Committee in Defense of Democracy showing turnouts at voting places ranging from six percent to 20 percent of registered voters in Georgetown, and even lower in rural areas. The government's figures of more than 400,000 votes cast had indicated a much higher voter turnout — 69 percent of all eligible voters.

The independent daily, The Mirror, declared that only 10 percent of the electorate had voted, and it reported numerous cases in which government-announced ballot totals were several times the number of voters counted by observers at the polls. Concerning mail ballots, The Mirror reported that "the dead voted heavily," citing case-by-case examples to back the charge.

The mimeographed edition of the Standard also reported several instances of violence by government agents against labor and student leaders and members of the opposition party.

RELIGIOUS LEADERS MEET WITH PRESIDENT, ASK CONGRESS TO BACK HIS FOREIGN AID BILL (350 — With NC Photo to come).

By Jim Castelli

WASHINGTON (NC) — An interfaith coalition of almost 30 religious leaders discussed foreign aid with President Jimmy Carter and then asked Congress to pass the president's endangered foreign aid bill.

The religious leaders met with Carter on the eve of a key House vote on the foreign aid appropriations bill. The $7.3 billion appropriations bill faces a series of amendments to cut its funds.

A spokesman for the group, Father J. Bryan Hehir, associate secretary for international justice and peace for the U.S. Catholic Conference, said the religious leaders at the meeting have already supported the bill and that the meeting with Carter was "not a one shot deal."
NC NEWS SERVICE

Father Hehir said the religious leaders were concerned with the bill for two main reasons. First, he said, "We believe this legislation is aimed at meeting the needs of the poorest people in the world. It is not a perfect program, but we believe it is worth our support, as well as our attempts to reform it."

"Secondly, the arguments being made in the congress are that the American people will not support this kind of legislation because of inflation, unemployment and the debate about taxation in the United States. "It is our conviction," he said, "that in the ministry we perform with people, preaching and work we do with them, we do not believe they would not support the kind of foreign assistance that is being proposed in the House for the poorest people in the world."

In addition, Father Hehir said, "We certainly don't believe they would retaliate against congressional people who would vote for this legislation."

Religious leaders meeting with Carter included Bishop Thomas Kelly, USCC general secretary; Bishop Edwin Broderick, executive director of Catholic Relief Services; Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America; Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum of the American Jewish Committee; the Rev. Jimmy Allen, president of the Southern Baptist Convention; Dr. Eugene Stockwell of the National Council of Churches and William Ladd of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Mormons).

(MORE TO COME)

1-8-1-78
FATHER KUNG TO PARTICIPATE IN ECUMENICAL CONVOCATION ON PREACHING (100)

NEW YORK (NC) — Father Hans Kung and civil rights leader Benjamin Hooks will be among those addressing the topic "How Can We Talk About God Today?" at the Fosdick Ecumenical Convocation on Preaching in America, scheduled for Oct. 16-19 at The Riverside Church in New York.

The convocation is cosponsored by the host church; Union Theological Seminary; the American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A.; the United Church of Christ; the United Methodist Church; the Progressive National Baptist Convention; the Episcopal Church; the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.; Trinity Institute, New York; and Colgate University.

2-8-1-78
ADD (170)

To 10-7-31, WINONA, Minn. — Divine justice calls... ADD the following:

Later in the institute, Bishop Dozier and other speakers and participants signed a resolution encouraging parish concern for prisoners and prison conditions. The resolution had been introduced by Sister of St. Joseph Dorothy Donnelly, director of spirituality at the Pacific School of Theology in Berkeley, Calif., as part of her presentation at the institute.

"We as members of the institute on Justice in Management and Leadership ask, then, (in order to do justice) for citizen access to our prisons, accountability from our prisons, investigation of the economic basis and functioning of our prisons and concern, presence and care for prisoners from each U.S. parish," the resolution said: "We ask this because justice must be the gospel concern of each parish."

In addition to Sister Donnelly and Bishop Dozier, the resolution was signed by Franciscan Sister M. Joyce Rowland, president of the College of St. Teresa; Dominican Sister Kathleen Short, director of in-service at the National Catholic Educational Association; and 11 other participants in the institute.
3-8-1-78

PENNSYLVANIA PRO-LIFE CONVENTION SCHEDULED FOR NOVEMBER (80)

WHITE HAVEN, Pa. (NC) – Workshops on politics, myths, the woman's viewpoints, the media, adoption procedures, euthanasia and other topics will be featured at the Pennsylvania Pro-Life Convention '78, to be held Nov. 3-5 in White Haven, Pa.

Dr. Mildred Jefferson, immediate past president of the National Right to Life Committee, will be the keynote speaker at an evening banquet Nov. 4. The convention will also include an ecumenical prayer service and a meeting of the Pennsylvania Pro-Life Federation.

---

4-8-1-78

PAPER NOTIFIES READERS THAT INSURANCE TRUST HAS NO CATHOLIC SANCTION (400)

By NC News Service

The Catholic Standard and Times, newspaper of the Philadelphia archdiocese, has notified its readers that the United Catholic Group Insurance Trust, an organization advertising in the paper, has no "formal or informal" affiliation with the Roman Catholic Church.

But the marketing director for the company which administers the trust says the trust has never claimed to be associated with the Catholic Church, and that the notice results from a misunderstanding of what a trust is.

According to Michael Wert, director of marketing for Union Fidelity Corporation in Trevose, Pa., the United Catholic Group Insurance Trust was formed to provide insurance programs for Catholics at reduced rates. Advertisements about the insurance program have appeared in "virtually every" Catholic newspaper in the country, he said.

The Catholic Standard and Times carried an advertisement for the trust's hospitalization program March 9. But a notice in the paper July 29 read in part: "Please be advised that this company has no affiliation, approval or endorsement, formal or informal, with or by any ecclesiastical authority of the Roman Catholic Church, either in this archdiocese or in the United States of America." It was signed by Msgr. Francis J. Statkus, archdiocesan chancellor.

At issue is the requirement that those enrolling in the hospitalization plan sign a statement which reads: "I certify that I am a member of the Roman Catholic Church." Some believe that implies a church connection, but Wert said it is necessary only because a trust is limited to a select group, in this case Catholics.

"There are a lot of misconceptions about what a trust is," said Wert. The United Catholic Group Insurance Trust, underwritten and administered by Union Fidelity, was established after a Catholic named John Deegan approached the company to ask if a reduced rate program could be set up, he said. The trust was filed in Missouri, with Deegan as a representative member of the group the trust was meant to benefit.

Trusts have advantages over group insurance plans established through Catholic or other organizations, Wert said, because "there are no kickbacks. When an association sponsors an insurance program, it receives part of the premium, which comes out of the insured's pocket."

Msgr. John F. Foley, editor of The Catholic Standard and Times, said the paper would be willing to run advertisements about the trust's insurance programs if implications of an official Catholic affiliation were removed.
The lawyers said in a statement at the end of July that these persons were detained by security forces during the purge of alleged leftists between 1973 and March of 1978.

"The interior ministry has in its power the necessary information to carry the proper investigation," they said in a document released to the media and to human rights groups.

Interior Minister Sergio Fernandez said in June that the government has no record of the missing persons and that they might well have joined clandestine groups — with the risk of being killed — or left the country under assumed names. This was a disappointment to relatives and church mediators after his earlier statement that his office would supply information on a case-by-case basis.

On the strength of that promise Cardinal Raul Silva of Santiago, one of the mediators, asked the relatives and sympathizers on a long hunger strike in May and June to suspend their fast.

Documentation on the missing was gathered and published by the Santiago Vicariate for Solidarity in May. In recent weeks relatives of more than 150 missing prisoners entered with the government their own records, and Cardinal Silva pleaded with Fernandez to process their request for information.

By mid-July the pro-government press was publishing personal attacks on the vicariate's director, Father Cristian Precht, who countered with a lawsuit.

11-8-31-78

ADD (430)

To 21-7-31-78, WASHINGTON — RELIGIOUS LEADERS MEET...add the following:

The foreign aid bill contains $1.16 billion for U.S. country-to-country aid, primarily through the Agency for International Development; $2.63 billion for international banks which lend money to developing nations; $2.17 billion for security and military assistance, mostly to the Middle East and $260 million for development programs operated by the United Nations and the Organization of American States.

Father Hehir said funds for the International Development Association, which provides interest-free loans to countries with per capita annual income of $300 or less, were cut sharply in committee and face further cuts on the House floor.

He said the people served by the IDA "live at a level of poverty that goes beyond what most of us can even imagine."

Father Hehir said the White House had not asked the religious leaders to make a statement. He said the leaders had drawn up a statement before the meeting because "this kind of legislation produces, as it ought to, an automatic consensus within the religious community."

The statement, signed by 26 religious leaders, was hand delivered to every member of Congress before the aid bill vote.

Father Hehir said Carter "indicated that he and the administration had done all that he felt they could do from a political point of view."

"He felt that the value of having the religious community assembled in this way was that it would add another voice from another perspective."

Father Hehir said, "We think the problem is that the case for the poor of the world has not been adequately put to the American people so that a fair decision can be made."

"As religious leaders, we take responsibility for not adequately putting the case thus far, but we certainly feel, seeing the state of the legislation, that it requires a kind of voice on behalf of the poorest people of the world and the religious leaders that were here today tried to form themselves into a committee to be that voice."

Carter, in his opening remarks to the religious leaders, said foreign aid helps the United States in its "competition" with "totalitarian and atheistic forces."
He said the United States cannot send troops or surrogates to fight those forces and that foreign aid allows the United States to develop a "sense of sisterhood and brotherhood" with the world's poor.

He urged the religious leaders "to let the world know what the American people stand for."

EDITORS: We will keep you posted on the House vote on the aid bill expected today or tomorrow and send a full story as soon as possible.

12-8-1-78

AFRICAN BISHOPS CALL AFRICA A WORLD BATTLEFIELD, PLEAD FOR PEACE (1,000)

NAIROBI, Kenya (NC) — Leaders of the Catholic bishops throughout Africa declared (July 29) that foreign powers are turning Africa into a world battleground, that liberation wars in southern Africa and factional divisions elsewhere on the continent are creating continent-wide political instability and millions of refugees, and that "fanatical" religious persecution and suppression of human rights in some countries are destroying human dignity.

In a plea for peace and political order based on justice, they denounced crimes committed in the name of state security and political systems built on bribery, lying, torture and political murder.

They called for liberation of the "whole man," which they said "means decolonization, development, social justice, respect for (each person's) inalienable rights and fundamental liberties."

The declaration was issued at the end of a week-long plenary meeting in Nairobi (July 24-30) of SECAM — the Symposium of Episcopal Conferences of Africa and Madagascar, which consists of representatives from all of Africa's national and regional bishops' conferences.

The bishops praised the efforts of many African people and leaders "to promote or rehabilitate fundamental African values" and said they were "particularly happy about the recognition given to the fundamental rights of the human persons in the constitutions of our various countries."

But they said that Africa also has "injustice and persecution perpetrated by certain dictatorial and police-state regimes," that this problem is compounded by the increase in armed conflicts within or between countries, and that now "a more serious situation has been created."

"Foreign powers," they said, "are no longer content to just provide money, arms and logistic support to the warring factions on the continent. Now, taking advantage of ideological differences and alliances as well as border disputes, they are turning Africa into their battlefield."

In southern Africa they cited the fight against apartheid and the escalating war of liberation. "If a solution is not found in good time...it will end in a terrible bloodbath," they said.

Across the continent political systems based on partisan interest have created "an ever growing political instability," they said. "Since 1960, Africa has witnessed 43 coups d'etat, 10 of which have involved the assassination of heads of state.

"Finally," they continued, "in certain countries there is a fanatical proselytism or a veritable religious persecution often disguised under political and ideological motives. Certain governments have even gone so far as to ban Catholic and other forms of worship."

The bishops did not name countries, but they almost certainly had at the top of their minds Equatorial Guinea, whose President-for-life Francisco Macias Nguema has expelled practically all priests, turned churches into warehouses, imprisoned priests and others for practicing their religion, and hindered or suppressed Catholic activity in numerous other ways.

Among other countries they may have had in mind are:
26 RELIGIOUS LEADERS VISIT CARTER, BACK U.S. AID TO WORLD NEEDY

By Religious News Service (7-31-78)

WASHINGTON, D.C. (RNS) -- Twenty-six religious leaders met with President Carter and other Administration officials at the White House to express their support for U.S. development aid for the poor around the world.

Meeting with the President at his invitation on the eve of a House of Representatives vote on foreign-assistance legislation, they declared that "it is of the essence of the Biblical faith which we share that the religious community stand with those who are the poorest and most vulnerable members of society."

In a joint statement, the religious leaders said that "we have both pressing needs and poor people here in our own society, but the added burden of the global poor is that they have even less voice and visibility in our midst. Our purpose today is to call attention to the urgency of their needs and to reassert the moral responsibility we have as members of the international community to do our part on their behalf."

They commented that they did not believe, "even in the face of domestic problems of inflation, unemployment and debate over taxes, that the American public will refuse to contribute to the needs of the very poorest in the human family." Similarly, they said, they were "even less inclined to believe that they will retaliate against their elected representatives who vote for these programs."

During the meeting, President Carter told the religious leaders, "As a political leader myself and also a deeply religious person, I feel a special responsibility to share with you." He declared that "what we have to do is deal with our fellow human beings in the less developed world in such a way that they trust us."

Religious leaders who attended the meeting were Dr. Jimmy Allen, president, Southern Baptist Convention; Tart Bell, director, Washington Public Affairs Program, American Friends Service Committee; Dr. Keith Bridston, head of the U.S. Office for the World Council of Churches; Bishop Edwin Broderick, director of Catholic Relief Services; Dr. James Cogswell, director, Task Force on World Hunger, Presbyterian Church, U.S.;

Dr. George Chauncey, chairperson of Interreligious Task Force and director of Washington Office of Presbyterian Church, U.S.; Bernard Confer, executive director, Lutheran World Relief; Lamar Gibble, chairman, International Affairs Office of National Council of Churches; Dr. J. Harry Haines, general secretary, United Methodist Committee on Relief; Father J. Bryan Hehir, associate secretary for Office of Justice and Peace, U.S. Catholic Conference.

(more)
Archbishop Iakovos, Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America; Bishop Thomas Kelly, general secretary, U.S. Catholic Conference; Rabbi Benjamin Kreitman, executive vice-president, United Synagogue of America; William D. Ladd, personal representative of President Spencer W. Kimball of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon); Dr. Robert Marshall, president, Lutheran Church in America;

Bishop D. Ward Nichols, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Rabbi Eli Pilchik, president, Central Conference of American Rabbis; Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, president, Rabbinical Assembly; Rabbi Bernard Rosznweig, president, Rabbinical Council of America; Bishop Herbert Bell Shaw, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church; Rabbi Henry Siegman, president, Synagogue Council of America;

Ronald Stenning, national director, CROP (Church World Service); Dr. Eugene Stockwell, associate general secretary, National Council of Churches; Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, national director of interreligious affairs, American Jewish Committee; Dr. Robert A. Thomas, chairman of the board, National Council of Churches Division of Overseas Ministries; Dr. Foy Valentine, executive director, Christian Life Commission of Southern Baptist Convention.
STATEMENT OF PROTESTANT, CATHOLIC AND JEWISH LEADERS ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION

As representatives of the major religious communities in the United States we have come today to meet with President Carter and members of the Administration to offer our support for the development aid provisions of the Foreign Assistance legislation which will be voted on by the House of Representatives tomorrow. It is of the essence of the biblical faith which we share that the religious community stands with those who are the poorest and most vulnerable members of society. As the prophets spoke in behalf of the orphans and the widows, so we must address ourselves to the needs of those throughout the globe who live in conditions of absolute poverty; deprived of basic nutrition, without adequate shelter, education, health care or employment. We have both pressing needs and poor people here in our own society, but the added burden of the global poor is that they have even less voice and visibility in our midst. Our purpose today is to call attention to the urgency of their needs and to reassert the moral responsibility we have as members of the international community to do our part on their behalf.

The Foreign Assistance legislation now before the Congress has already been stringently reduced. Efforts will be made in the House to reduce it even more drastically. We urge members of the House to resist such cuts in U.S. foreign development assistance. We especially call attention to the U.S. role in supporting multilateral programs such as The International Development Association; this program is aimed at the absolutely poorest people in the world. It deserves both more support and a better hearing than it has received in this Congressional debate.

None of the foreign assistance programs are perfect; the real question is whether with all their shortcomings they still are worthy of support. We believe they are. Speaking from a faith perspective, we affirm that in spite of divisions of sovereignty, geography and culture, we exist in the world as a single human family.
The poorest members of that family lay a moral claim upon our conscience. We cannot wait for a perfect program before we address that claim on our conscience. The existing international development efforts -- both bilateral and multilateral -- have improved significantly in recent years. They merit our support, as well as our efforts to reform them.

Finally, we are not ready to believe, even in the face of domestic problems of inflation, unemployment and debate over taxes, that the American public will refuse to contribute to the needs of the very poorest in the human family. We are, therefore, even less inclined to believe that they will retaliate against their elected representatives who vote for these programs. Indeed, the basic problem is that the case for the global poor has not been adequately put to the public so that a careful decision can be made. As religious leaders we accept our share of responsibility for not making the case strongly enough. Even at this late date, however, we urge our Congressional representatives to support the Foreign Assistance legislation before them; we pledge in turn to advocate the wisdom of such a choice with our constituencies.
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MEETING WITH RELIGIOUS LEADERS
July 31, 1978

ALLEN, Dr. Jimmy
President, Southern Baptist Convention

BELL, Tart
Director, Washington Public Affairs Program
American Friends Service Committee

BRIDSTON, Dr. Keith
World Council of Churches

BRODERICK, Most Reverend Edwin
Executive Director of the Catholic Relief Services
New York Catholic Center

COGSWELL, Dr. James
Director, Task Force on World Hunger - Presbyterian Church, U. S.

CHAUNCEY, Dr. George
Chairperson, Interreligious Task Force
Director of Washington Office
Presbyterian Church of the U. S.

CONFER, Bernard
Executive Director
Lutheran World Relief

GIBBLE, Lamar
Chairman, International Affairs at NCC
Church of Brethren

HAINES, Dr. J. Harry
General Secretary
United Methodist Committee on Overseas Relief

HEHIR, Reverend J. Bryan
Associate Secretary for Office of International Justice and Peace

IAKOVOS, Archbishop
Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America

KELLY, Most Reverend Thomas
General Secretary of United States Catholic Conference

KREITMAN, Rabbi Benjamin
Executive Vice President
United Synagogue of America
LADD, William D.
Personal Representative of President Spencer Kimball
Member, Council of Twelve Apostles
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Mormons)

MARSHALL, Dr. Robert
President, Lutheran Church of America

NICHOLS, Bishop D. Ward
AME

PILCHIK, Rabbi Eli
President, Central Conference of American Rabbis

RABINOWICS, Rabbi Stanley
Rabbinical Assembly

ROSENSWEIG, Rabbi Bernard
President, Rabbinical Council of America

SHAW, Bishop Herbert Bell
AME-ZION

SIEGMANN, Rabbi Henry
President, Synagogue Council of America

STENNING, Ronald
National Director
CROP (Church World Services)

STOCKWELL, Dr. Eugene
Associate General Secretary
National Council of Churches
Director, Division of Overseas Ministries

TANNENBAUM, Rabbi Mark
American Jewish Committee

THOMAS, Dr. Robert A.
Chairman of the Board
National Council of Churches
Division of Overseas Ministries
Christian Disciples of Christ

VALENTINE, Dr. Foy
Executive Director
Christian Life Community of the Southern Baptist Convention
PRESIDENT JIMMY CARTER
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON, D.C.

JUNE 29, 1978

WE HAVE JUST RETURNED FROM MEETING WITH MORE THAN THIRTY SOVIET JEWS KNOWN AS REFUSENIKS AND ACTIVISTS IN MOSCOW, RIGA, VILNIUS AND LENINGRAD. WE MUST TELL YOU THAT THE NEXT TWO WEEKS ARE CRITICAL FOR THE FATE OF VLADIMIR AND MARIA SLEPAK, IDA NUDEN AND OTHERS FACING REPRISALS OF THE SOVIET STATE.

THE NATIONAL INTERRELIGIOUS TASK FORCE ON SOVIET JEWS, INCLUDING CATHOLICS, EVANGELICALS, PROTESTANTS, ORTHODOX AND JEWS, URGES YOU, MR. PRESIDENT, TO UNDERTAKE AT ONCE THOSE NECESSARY ACTIONS

AJR/es
IN RELATION TO THE SOVIET UNION THAT WILL LEAD IT TO SUSPEND THE
HARSH AND CRUEL SENTENCES THAT VIOLATE THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF
VLADIMIR SLEPAK, IDA NUDEL, AS WELL AS OTHERS FACING TRIALS AT
ANY MOMENT.

TO ALLOW THESE TWO WEEKS OF APPEAL TIME TO PASS WITHOUT
MEANINGFUL DIPLOMATIC AND OTHER INTERVENTIONS COULD IN FACT
IMPLICATE US AS ACCESSORIES TO THE VIOLATION OF BASIC HUMAN
DIGNITY AND RIGHTS. WE ARE JOINED IN THIS APPEAL BY THE
NATIONAL CO-LEADERS OF THE INTERRELIGIOUS TASK FORCE ON SOVIET
JEWRY: SISTER MARGARET ELLEN TRAXLER, DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE
OF WOMEN TODAY, PROFESSOR ANDRE LACOCQUE OF THE CHICAGO
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AND RABBI MARC TANENBAUM OF THE AMERICAN
AJR/es
WE ALSO WISH TO INFORM YOU THAT ON JULY SIXTH WE ARE CALLING A NATIONAL NEWS CONFERENCE TO SHARE WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE OUR FINDINGS REGARDING THE GROWING SYSTEMATIC EFFORT BY THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT TO UPROOT BOTH CHRISTIANS AND JEWS WHO SEEK THEIR FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN RIGHTS AND RELIGIOUS AND CIVIC LIBERTIES.

SISTER ANN GILLEN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL INTERRELIGIOUS TASK FORCE ON SOVIET JEWRY
SISTER GLORIA COLEMAN, CARDINAL'S COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONS AND PHILADELPHIA INTERRELIGIOUS TASK FORCE ON SOVIET JEWRY

AJR/es
May 2, 1978

Social Secretary
The White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Madam or Sir:

This letter acknowledges with pleasure the receipt of your gracious invitation to attend the reception in honor of Israel's Thirtieth Anniversary.

I deeply regret that a previous public speaking engagement prevented me from going to Washington on May 1st. I was honored to be invited and would appreciate your expressing my thanks to the President and Mrs. Carter for their kindness.

With all good wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

Rabbi A. James Rudin
Assistant Director
Interreligious Affairs

AJR:FM
RABBI ARNOLD JAMES RUDIN  
AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE 
165 E 56TH ST 
NEW YORK NY 10022

IN CONJUNCTION WITH PRESIDENT CARTER'S WHITE HOUSE RECEPTION FOR PRIME MINISTER BEGIN, 2 PM MONDAY, MAY 1ST, TO WHICH YOU HAVE BEEN INVITED, YOU ARE ALSO INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN A SPECIAL RELIGIOUS LEADERSHIP CONVOCATION IN CELEBRATION OF ISRAEL'S 30TH ANNIVERSARY WHICH WILL TAKE PLACE 10:30 A.M. THAT SAME MORNING AT THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL. IF YOU PLAN TO ATTEND, PLEASE RSVP 212-686-8670 SUNDAY, APRIL 30TH, BETWEEN 12 NOON AND 3 PM.

FOLLOWING THE WHITE HOUSE RECEPTION, WHICH WILL CONCLUDE 3 PM, YOU ARE ENCOURAGED TO MEET WITH YOUR SENATORS AND CONGRESSMAN TO DISCUSS WITH THEM YOUR CONCERNS ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATION'S MIDDLE EAST POLICY. WE SUGGEST YOU CALL THEM IMMEDIATELY TO ARRANGE APPOINTMENTS.

RABBI SAUL I. TEPLITZ, PRESIDENT, SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA

00:45 EST

MGMCOMP MGM
TO REPLY BY MAILGRAM, PHONE WESTERN UNION ANY TIME, DAY OR NIGHT:
FOR YOUR LOCAL NUMBER, SEE THE WHITE PAGES
OF YOUR TELEPHONE DIRECTORY
OR
DIAL (TOLL FREE) 800-257-2241
(EXCEPT IN NEW JERSEY 800-632-2271)

OR DIAL WESTERN UNION'S INFOMASTER SYSTEM DIRECTLY:
FROM TELEX ......................... 6161
FROM TWX ....................... 910 420 1212
ARNOLD J. RUDIN
165 E 56TH ST
NEW YORK NY 10022

"THE PRESIDENT AND MRS. CARTER INVITE YOU TO A RECEPTION ON MAY 1, 1978 AT 2:00 P.M. IN CELEBRATION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL. HONORED GUESTS - HIS EXCELLENCY THE PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL AND MRS. BEGIN.

PLEASE PRESENT THIS MESSAGE AT SOUTHWEST GATE,"

SOCIAL SECRETARY
THE WHITE HOUSE
00141 EST

TO REPLY BY MAILGRAM, SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR WESTERN UNION'S TOLL-FREE PHONE NUMBERS
On the eve of Rosh Hashonah and Yom Kippur, I want to extend to my fellow Americans of the Jewish faith my warm and heartfelt greetings. These High Holy Days, the most solemn and soul-searching in the Jewish tradition, symbolize the ancient commitment of the Jewish people to honor their God by honoring the human beings he created in his image. This is surely the finest of all the great Hebrew teachings that undergird the Judeo-Christian tradition.

From our earliest beginnings this country has sought to translate the same commitment into our national creed, and to make our society in which men and women of all faiths, races and nationalities can live together in dignity and mutual respect.

The Rosh Hashonah prayer for universal brotherhood resonates in the heart of every American who believes in peace, in freedom and in human rights for himself and for those around him. May I echo the hope—also familiar to the Jewish tradition—that this prayer may reach swiftly from your tongues to God's ear.
You may recall the important exchange of letters between President Carter and John Steinbruck in response to a news story last spring that the President had talked about Jews killing Jesus, and the trial.

According to Marc Tanenbaum, President Carter's letter is of historic importance (copy attached). John Steinbruck has had the original letter framed and is prepared to present it to AJC if we wish it. It would be appropriate for him to do so inasmuch as we were involved in the negotiations with the White House which led to the letter. What we would do with the letter is another matter—we could keep it or give it to the Jewish Historical Society.

However, if we are to accept Steinbruck's offer to present the letter to AJC, he and I both thought that you might want to do that at the next Annual Meeting at some appropriate session.

Regards,

[Signature]

BC:gvp
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THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
May 12, 1977

To Reverend John F. Steinbruck

Several weeks ago, I conducted a Bible study class during which the subject of the role of the Jewish people in the Crucifixion of Christ was discussed. A number of newspaper reports have appeared about my comments which have led to some questions about my views on this subject. I am glad to have this opportunity to set forth my personal position and to clarify any misunderstandings which may have resulted from these incomplete accounts of my convictions:

The Christian religion, according to my understanding, holds that Jesus of Nazareth, who was a Jew, gave His life to redeem the sins of humanity. The Gospels declare that His death was foreordained and without that death and the resurrection which followed it Christians would not be saved in Christ. Yet the Crucifixion required human instruments.

Among these were Judas, who was a Christian disciple, Caiaphas, who was a Jewish priest appointed by the Roman authorities, and Pilate, a gentile, who actually condemned Jesus to death.

In accordance with the Gospels, I know that Jesus forgave the human instruments of His death but I am also aware that the Jewish people were for many centuries falsely charged with collective responsibility for the death of Jesus, and were persecuted terribly for that unjust accusation which has been exploited as a basis and rationalization for anti-Semitism.
I know and am personally gratified by the fact that the highest authorities of the major Christian Churches, Protestant, Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox, have totally and decisively rejected the charge that the Jewish people as a whole were then or are now responsible for the death of Christ. My own denomination, the Southern Baptist Convention, adopted an official resolution on June 7, 1972, declaring "anti-Semitism as un-Christian" and as being opposed to any and all forms of it. Further, the Baptist Churches have resolved that "we covenant to work positively to replace all anti-Semitic bias in the Christian attitude and practices with love for Jews, who along with all other men, are equally beloved of God."

To that, I can only say "amen" with all my heart.

Reverend John F. Steinbruck
Luther Place Memorial Church
Fourteenth and N Streets, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005