



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Preserving American Jewish History

MS-603: Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum Collection, 1945-1992.

Series A: Writings and Addresses. 1947-1991

Box 4, Folder 28, Action for International Religious Freedom,
Spring 1985.



EDITORIAL BOARD

Evron M. Kirkpatrick
Editor and Chairman
Walter E. Beach
Penn Kemble
Jeane J. Kirkpatrick
Charles Lichenstein

Joshua Muravchik
Howard Penniman
Don Piper
Austin Ranney
Joyce I. Horn
Managing Editor

CONSULTING EDITORS

Walker Connor
Belmont, VT
Cecil V. Crabb, Jr.
Louisiana State University
Harold E. Davis
The American University
Roderic Davison
The George Washington University
William A. Douglas
*American Institute for Free Labor
Development*
Allan E. Goodman
Clark University
Jerome J. Hanus
The American University
Stephen Horn
California State University, Long Beach
Joyce K. Kallgren
University of California, Davis
Terry L. McCoy
Ohio State University

Joseph L. Nogee
University of Houston
William V. O'Brien
Georgetown University
Neil R. Richardson
University of Wisconsin—Madison
Richard M. Scammon
Elections Research Center
Ronald M. Schneider
Queens College, CUNY
Justus M. van der Kroef
University of Bridgeport
James B. Whisker
West Virginia University
David Wilkinson
University of California, Los Angeles
I. William Zartman
The Johns Hopkins University

WORLD AFFAIRS

A QUARTERLY REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

Volume 147

Number 4

Spring 1985

CONTENTS

- 235 **International Conference on Religious Liberty**
- 236 Welcoming Remarks
George Schultz
- 237 The State of Religious Freedom
Peter L. Berger, Firuz Kazemzadeh, Michael Bourdeaux
- 252 Religious Freedom in the Third World
*Richard John Neuhaus, Abdurrachman Wahid, Nico Smith,
Saneh Chamarik, Joaquin Bernas, Michael Delgado*
- 267 Support of Religious Witness in Eastern Europe
*J.A. Hebly, Peter Reddaway, Martin Gilbert,
Bohdan Bociurkiw*
- 286 Action for International Religious Freedom
*Marc Tannenbaum, David Jessup, Arthur E. Gay, Jr., Martin
A. Cohen, Ralph McNerny*
- 303 Address
Ronald Reagan
- 315 **The Public Philosophy**
- 315 The Malady of Democratic States
- 322 The Derangement of Powers
- 330 The Public Interest
- 333 The Two Functions
Walter Lippmann
- 341 **Annual Index**

by their concern for religious freedom but only by greed, egotism, or some other base inspiration; not that their "extremist" activities were "in fact" serving foreign propaganda, subversion, and espionage organs. For the same purpose, Kuroedov and other Soviet spokesmen have been "quoting" and misquoting visiting representatives of Western churches and ecumenical organizations to create the unreal impression of "religious freedom," "full satisfaction of religious needs," "absence of religious persecution" for the benefit of Western public opinion. Similar, though much less extreme, steps have been taken by other communist regimes (except "officially" atheist Albania) to conceal the actual position of religion in their respective countries.

To sum up, we really must realize that religion is not a private matter in the communist systems, that the moment it is openly professed and acted upon, it generates, from the viewpoint of the ruling communist parties, political consequences which the former try to manipulate by extending their political controls to the internal affairs of the church. Widely different treatment is accorded by communist states to individual religious groups depending on the given church's willingness and capacity to submit to state control, its compatibility with the regime's political objectives, and its usefulness for promoting the regime's foreign policy and propaganda. It is within the broad spectrum of attitudes to the regime—from complete submission to complete defiance, between sometimes well rewarded servitude to the atheist state and martyrdom—that one finds the religious institutions and organizations within the USSR and Eastern Europe. Such, in brief, is the political context of religious rights and religious witness in communist countries today.

ACTION FOR INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Remarks by Rabbi Marc Tannenbaum

We spent much of yesterday looking at the data of the contemporary human condition in terms of human rights, religious liberty, freedom of conscience in many parts of the world. We have had occasion to reflect on that condition and to seek understanding of some of the ideological, theological, and philosophical currents which affect the lives of so many millions of our brothers and sisters in so many parts of the world. Our purpose today is to focus on the challenges and the problems, the profound anxieties that affect so many millions of human beings where their human rights are denied in many parts of the world. It is also to ask ourselves, "What are we to do about it?" "What can we do about it?" "What contribution can we make to the alleviation of the straitened condition of so many millions of human beings throughout the world?"

Before introducing our three guest speakers I would like to make the observation that this is a symbolic moment of surpassing importance. The year 1985 marks the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II and the defeat of Nazism. At the core of Nazi ideology was religious and racial hatred, anti-Semitism, and racism. From their inception, the Nazis began a calculated and systematic exploitation of religious liberty and freedom of conscience. Anyone who has studied the ideological sources of Nazism must become aware of how central a role in the early emergence of Nazism the issue of religious freedom and the suppression of freedom of conscience played in the unfolding of that demonic ideology.

We also meet in 1985 on another anniversary. This is the 20th anniversary of the close of Vatican Council II, which became a landmark in the relationship between the Catholic Church and other Christians, Moslems, and, particularly, the Jewish people. 1985 marks the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Vatican declaration on Catholic-Jewish relationships—*Nostra Actate*—which literally marked a turning point in the nineteen hundred years encounter between the Catholic Church and the Jewish people. The Vatican Council II also became a watershed in its adoption of the Vatican Declarations on Religious Liberty, Ecumenism, and the Church and the Modern World.

If there is faintness of heart as we face the magnitude of the challenges that are before us, it is profitable to look at what happened at Vatican Council I at the end of the 19th century and the extraordinary progress made as a result of Vatican Council II. Literally, light years were covered during that period of time.

I would like to say to all of you that from the point of view of the American people and the American religious community, it is important to keep in mind that the very founding of the American republic took its primary impetus from a determined search for religious liberty by the founders of this nation by our Puritan forebears. In many ways American history has been one long adventure in the pursuit of a more adequate and viable set of relationships between church and state, between religion and society, than had existed anywhere else or at any time before the American experiment was launched. Religious liberty was central in the motivations of the founding of America. Freedom of conscience is the parent liberty from which all other liberties derive: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and the right to privacy. As Leo Pfeffer has written in his book *Freedom and Separation: America's Contribution to Civilization*, "In the American system religious freedom is the progenitor of practically all other freedoms."

Consider freedom of speech. Today it is generally thought of in terms of political speech—the right to attack the government and condemn its

policies. Historically, however, freedom of political speech came late onto the scene. It came after freedom of religious speech had been won. The struggle for freedom of speech in England, from which we inherited our tradition, was initially a struggle for freedom to speak religiously. With that consciousness of the centrality of religious liberty in mind, it is now my privilege to call on three panelist to speak on the issue of how to mobilize our resources, moral, intellectual, spiritual, human, to uphold religious liberty in all of its manifestations throughout the human family.

Remarks by David Jessup

This conference provides us with an historic opportunity for advancing religious freedom in a world threatened by totalitarianism. The sponsorship is itself unique. Never before has this constellation of organizations, with so much potential, come together to discuss this issue.

The conference comes at a time when the entire range of United States-Soviet issues are being reexamined and renegotiated by high government officials. For this reason I will deal primarily with religious freedom in the Soviet bloc, while remembering that any projects emerging from this conference must necessarily deal with religious freedom worldwide.

On April 11 the *New York Times* carried a story detailing preparations for United States-Soviet negotiations, which will go on for months, even years. The article mentioned several items to be included on the agenda: trade, armaments, Afghanistan, cultural exchanges, landing rights for Aeroflot, and Soviet treatment of dissidents. But will the agenda include the fate of people like Gleb Yakunin and the status of Jewish refused-niks? Will it include questions about the autonomy of churches in the Soviet bloc? The answer may partly depend on what comes out of this conference.

In order to take full advantage of this opportunity, we must deal with four problems or factors. The first is our failure to give adequate emphasis to one particular form of denial of religious freedom; namely, the appropriation of religion to serve the political ends of the totalitarian state.

When most people think about denial of religious freedom, they think of overt repression, jailing, and torture. The otherwise excellent report on religious intolerance by Amnesty International is limited to these familiar outrages. Similarly, although it is a giant step forward, the recent U.N. document on religious freedom does not adequately deal with government efforts to transform religious bodies into instruments of the state. Yet consider what an affront to God, what a great sin it is, to ap-

propriate His instrument, the church, by means of the coercive powers of the modern state, to expand the temporal political power of that state.

In the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe we have the familiar examples of groups like the Christian Peace Conference, which promote Soviet foreign policy goals.

In the Western Hemisphere, dating approximately from Fidel Castro's famous appeal for a "strategic alliance" between religion and revolution in 1972, the trend has been away from overt repression, although that still goes on, toward greater emphasis on appropriation. Thus there have emerged in Cuba several churches whose favorable treatment by the regime rises in direct proportion to their willingness to serve the state's promotional needs.

In Nicaragua, the most advanced experimentation with this new method of dealing with religion has produced something unique in the Marxist world: a communist revolution cloaked in the symbols of Christianity. There, religious repression takes the form of state intervention for the purpose of shifting control of religious organizations into the hands of supporters of the revolution. Such intervention included various rewards and punishments, but does not yet involve the full fury of totalitarian control. We are left with a temporary facade of pluralism, which, unfortunately, some people mistake for the real thing.

The point is that our treatment of religious repression must keep pace with its newer, more sophisticated varieties. Otherwise, the issue may be defined away, at least in part.

The reason is that the more successful the state's strategy to appropriate the church, the more likely that its outward manifestations will be interpreted not as repression but as its opposite. In Orwellian fashion, repression becomes freedom.

A recent example may be found in Cuba. For more than a decade the Castro regime has cultivated several Protestant church organizations which, however few their adherents within Cuba, have the virtue of giving unstinting support to the government. On June 27, 1984, Castro himself signaled the success of this strategy by gracing the pulpit of a particularly cooperative Methodist pastor with his presence, accompanied by Jesse Jackson.

A high ranking United Methodist official in New York rejoiced that Castro's historic visit "publicly legitimized the Church" by reassuring Cubans that it would not be considered unpatriotic to be a Christian. He did not bother to add that this might apply only to certain kinds of Christians joining certain approved churches.

Other examples abound in Nicaragua. The appointment of priests to the government and the favorable treatment of pro-Sandinista religious