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Paul Oetken

11/29/2000 03:10:13 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Amanda C. Hanlin/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: Meredith E. Cabe/WHO/EOP@EOP

Subject: Re; Follow Up

Amanda: Sorry, I was supposed to get back to you on this. I think our preference on this one would be no response, because the (rather delicate) strategy on this bill has been general avoidance. If you all think there is a need for a response to the Oregon Governor (and maybe the others), I think the way you've drafted it is fine, with the possible change from "we will examine..." to "we will continue to examine..."
The truth is that we have been looking at the bill, and we allowed a letter from Justice to go out in October 1999 expressing "concerns" with it.

Thanks.

Paul
66297

Meredith E. Cabe

Meredith E. Cabe

11/29/2000 02:55:29 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Paul Oetken/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: 

Subject: Follow Up

I think I gave you this pain stuff? Ignore the Garza part -- I'll call her:

----------------------------- Forwarded by Meredith E. Cabe/WHO/EOP on 11/29/2000 02:55 PM -----------------------------

Amanda C. Hanlin

11/29/2000 02:51:56 PM

Record Type: Record
Can the sentence, "I find the issue of assisted suicide to be deeply troubling" stay in?? I would venture that we should send some sort of response to the Governor but can avoid responding to the others. However, it is your final call and Chris Jennings' office has said that they would not respond to this one. What do you think is best? Thanks!
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March 5, 1993

His Eminence
Anthony Cardinal Bevilacqua
Archbishop of Philadelphia
222 North 17th Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-1299

Dear Cardinal Bevilacqua:

Thank you for your letter. I've been touched by the letters I've received from people who care deeply about the future of our nation and who are troubled by my position on the issue of reproductive rights.

I believe that personal privacy is a fundamental liberty protected by our Bill of Rights. The right to privacy includes the right to make difficult and intensely personal decisions regarding abortion. The government should not stand between a woman and her doctor or prevent her from obtaining information about all her options. In practice, the Title X "Gag Rule" was directed almost entirely toward low-income Americans who utilize federally funded clinics, effectively denying access to information solely on the basis of income.

The anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision, January 22, was understandably chosen for the March for Life demonstration because of its historic and symbolic importance. It is an appropriate occasion for other significant actions regarding abortion.

Though we disagree on this issue, I'm grateful for your candor and your prayers.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Note: The president supports parental notification with appropriate safeguards and alternatives. He believes in teaching about abstinence and sex education in schools and vigorous efforts to reduce teen pregnancies. He supports the concept of women deciding their own destiny within the law, not government interference in private matters. He believes in condemning the conduct of women and their doctors in the case unprotected by Roe v. Wade.]

[Signature]
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**WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** 8/25/94  
**ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:**

**SUBJECT:** RESPONSE TO ARCHBISHOP KEELER, CARDINAL MAHONY, AND BISHOP RICARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION FYI</th>
<th>ACTION FYI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VICE PRESIDENT</td>
<td>McGINTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PANETTA (angell)</td>
<td>MYERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLARTY</td>
<td>QUINN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADER</td>
<td>RASCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICKES</td>
<td>RUBIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVLIN</td>
<td>SEGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAGGETT</td>
<td>SEIDMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUTLER</td>
<td>STEPHANOPoulos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMANUEL</td>
<td>TYSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEARAN</td>
<td>VARNEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERGEN</td>
<td>WILLIAMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBBONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERMAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDSEY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REMARKS:** Do you concur with this response?

_Paul R. x62702_

**RESPONSE:**

To: Paul R.

Fri. Caret S.

Isn't it better to repeat our position on abortion rather than surrender their questions?

JOHN D. PODESTA
Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary
THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

September 14, 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR GREG LAWLER

FROM:  JAMES DORSKIND  
Special Assistant to the President  
Director of Correspondence and  
Presidential Messages

SUBJECT:  LETTER TO ARCHBISHOP KEELER, ET AL.

George Stephanopoulos and John Angell believe (and Paul Richard and I agree) that the response to the attached letter should address the Administration's position on abortion in health care reform. My department did not include any such language, because Jennifer Klein instructed my writers otherwise, which is consistent with the past approach to this issue.

As you know, I have tried for some time to get some approved language to respond to the heavy volume of letters that we have received on this issue. I am hopeful that this letter will provide the vehicle for developing that language.

The letter is already quite late for reasons that I intend to identify, but which include a three week delay in the West Wing. Accordingly, anything you can do to expedite this would be appreciated. I attach some proposed language that you may wish to consider. It is derived from a letter written by a Democratic Senator supportive of the inclusion of coverage for reproductive services.

I look forward to hearing from you soon. Thanks.
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 14, 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR GREG LAWLER

FROM: JAMES DORSKIND
Special Assistant to the President
Director of Correspondence and
Presidential Messages

SUBJECT: LETTER TO ARCHBISHOP KEELER, ET AL.

George Stephanopoulos and John Angell believe (and Paul Richard and I agree) that the response to the attached letter should address the Administration's position on abortion in health care reform. My department did not include any such language, because Jennifer Klein instructed my writers otherwise, which is consistent with the past approach to this issue.

As you know, I have tried for some time to get some approved language to respond to the heavy volume of letters that we have received on this issue. I am hopeful that this letter will provide the vehicle for developing that language.

The letter is already quite late for reasons that I intend to identify, but which include a three week delay in the West Wing. Accordingly, anything you can do to expedite this would be appreciated. I attach some proposed language that you may wish to consider. It is derived from a letter written by a Democratic Senator supportive of the inclusion of coverage for reproductive services.

I look forward to hearing from you soon. Thanks.
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Landmines
Bishop McCann

- May self-destructive mines.
- Ottawa process not universal.
- Gip not issued first - Ottawa process much faster.
- Renewing when we are.
- Ottawa - early September - Oslo.

> Next several weeks - will come to grips.

Middle East

President urges both sides. Questions commitment of both sides.
Palestinians and Israelis not overreact.
> Condemn terrorism.

Rel. between Vatican and State of Israel.
Agreement made, but not kept.
- Get more information on
- Reductions on Hebron/Palestine.
- Churches.

Lebanon - travel restrictions - Thanks.
Religious Freedom

China question: - Opposed MFN. Strengthened hands of foreign policy agents of govt. President of China coming - be as good as you were with Yeltsin! Miland will write a letter.

Jiang
SPD: He will raise!

Some conflicting information.
Normalisation of relations with Vatican.

Cuba: Had trouble with the Embassy. Seemed humanitarian assistance.

SPD: Looking at that now.
Holy Father's visit.

Bosnia: Do more for Bosnian refugees.

Finally: We could stop in.
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Proposals for Freedom from Religious Persecution Act

(References are to Smith substitute for H.R. 2431 as reported by Subcomm. on IO and Human Rights, 9-18-97)

1. **Section 3(8)(B). Sales/financing under Arms Export Control Act**

Retain sections that would end military aid, financing, and sales to the sanctioned country.

2. **Section 7(c)(1) and (2). Development aid exemption for Multilateral aid**

Replace current language in parens with the following:

"(other than for humanitarian assistance, or for concessional development assistance which addresses basic human needs of the people of the recipient country)"

**Rationale:**
This language refers to IDA and other multilateral development assistance through the word "concessional" but only includes that portion of concessional development aid that goes for poverty reduction -- through the words "basic human needs." It eliminates the confusing clause "benefits the poor in the poorest countries" which brings up questions like who are the poor, which are the poorest countries, what are the cutoff points? Yet it still identifies the beneficiaries as the people rather than the government of the country.

3. **Section 8(a). Waiver authority.**

ADD: Section 8(a)(2): “determines that a waiver is necessary to meet the purposes of this Act.”

**Rationale:**
This expansion of the waiver is designed not to let the president off the hook, but to recognize that, in some cases, it might be clear that sanctions would not be helpful and even might make the situation worse.
4. **Section 9. Immigration/ Asylum provisions**

Recognizing that the Judiciary Committee has primary jurisdiction over this bill, several specific changes in the immigration section would strengthen the asylum process (see detailed proposal). The bill is helpful in that it would restore vital procedural safeguards for persons applying for asylum on the grounds of religious persecution. In our view, these safeguards should also be restored for all five categories of persons claiming persecution and we will continue to pursue this objective.

5. **Point of clarification re: Sec. 3(8)(a)(vii). Exemption from sanctions of humanitarian/ development/ rule of law/ civil society aid.**

Expanding the exemption to include development aid run through nongovernmental organizations is helpful and appears to meet our concerns. We have been unable to clarify, however, what specific programs are covered under chapters (1) and (10) of the Act.

6. **Public input into process**

We recognize the problems with formal public review of proposed findings, but would welcome consideration of less formal mechanisms that would allow maximum public input into the determinations that religious persecution exists. Such input could reinforce findings of religious persecution and contribute to the process of judging the efficacy of imposing the types of sanctions contemplated by the bill, as well as stronger measures that might be necessary in a particular case.
Drew's a nice guy and would welcome the opportunity to meet with you. I told him I'd see what I could do. A meeting would have to be sooner rather than later because he's going to Jerusalem in early October.

US Catholic Conference concerned about W-S, as suspected -- particularly sanctions part. He's seen a copy of what the NCC has in the works and likes parts of it (including tone) and knows of similar legislative stabs at a draft by Hamilton, Clements (?) and Helsinki Committee. Prefers a sanctions provision that offers a flexible array of options (ala Helsinki). His preference is that sanctions not be made mandatory. At the same time, a Presidential waiver merely due to national security or the national interest may be too narrow. It's not his org's policy to tell the gov. how to structure itself, ergo his org. has no opinion about where the Office of Religious Persecution Monitoring is located. Personally, he favors that it be located in the State Dept.

He didn't ask if the administration has something in the works but he intimated that the NCC version had the imprint of the State Dept.

He senses that his organization will compromise its own effectiveness. Some stalwarts within USCC's ranks refuse to retreat from a broadsweeping immigration and asylum stance (apparently, members of his group are still angry about recent restrictions in immigration law). In defending that position, Drew says any USCC draft will sound its own deathknell. Absent its own ability to shape policy, USCC will likely stitch together bits and pieces of other drafts (liberal asylum policy for persecutees, flexible sanctions, broader defn. of religious persecution). He agrees that Evangelicals should be credited -- not for writing a good bill -- but for starting the debate.
INTRODUCTORY POINTS

- Honor to meet you - Clinton Administration is fortunate to have a person of your vision and commitment advising the Church on international affairs issues.

- Very grateful for your support of so many of our initiatives - from Bosnia, to Indochinese boat people, to religious freedom, to immigration.

- You have many friends and admirers in the White House.

- I'm eager to obtain your perspectives on the issues we confront.

POINTS FOR ISSUES ARCHBISHOP MAY RAISE

LANDMINES

- President committed to a worldwide, comprehensive ban.

- We've supported the Convention on Disarmament (CD) process because we believe a global approach to banning landmine use offers best prospect of making a real difference.

- But welcome Ottawa process as providing momentum and have met with Canadians to see if we could narrow our differences.

- Now that first six months of this year's CD session have concluded, we are taking stock of overall progress in both the CD and Ottawa.

- We want to ensure we remain on the most effective path.

[If Leahy legislation on post-2000 U.S. moratorium on use is raised:]

- We are concerned that the Leahy bill requires us to give up our use of landmines unilaterally without a mechanism for ensuring that the problem states give theirs up as well. That is why we are pursuing a negotiated international agreement.
Religious Freedom

- Thoroughness of recent State Department report on religious freedom reflects our seriousness of purpose on this issue.

- As you know, we are the leading voice internationally on these issues -- pressing the case in international fora like the UN and in our bilateral relations.

- We will continue these efforts and value your contributions.

[If coercive family planning in China is raised:]

- President has taken action to ensure protection for asylum applicants fleeing coercive family planning in China, first administratively and then through his support for legislation that was enacted.

Bosnia

- Rather than focus on endgame, need to occupy ourselves with hard work that needs to be done on civilian implementation.

- As President Clinton has said, those who fail to cooperate with the Dayton Agreement will not have full access to economic or other assistance.

[If war crimes is raised:]

- Remain deeply concerned with the presence of war criminals and we will not be satisfied until all indicted war criminals stand trial.

- The recent action by SFOR is an important step toward justice in Bosnia, a key ingredient to long-term peace. But it is the Parties who bear the responsibility.

Israel and the Middle East Peace Process

- Deeply concerned by current impasse.

- Bombing in Jerusalem will make it harder for two sides to resume vital work.

- President is determined to get Palestinians and Israelis moving forward, and we've been in intensive contact with two sides and other regional parties.
• Close to proposing a path forward for them to follow.

[If Christian concerns in Israel are raised:]

• U.S. policy on Jerusalem is long-standing and well-known.

• Israel and Palestinians have wisely decided to put off resolution of this most sensitive issue until their permanent status negotiations.

• We are determined that neither the U.S. nor either of the parties should take actions that tend to pre-judge the final status.

[If asked about proposed legislation in the Knesset that would outlaw Christian missionary activity in Israel:]

• We are watching this closely, and we welcome Prime Minister Netanyahu’s strong opposition to the legislation.

[If asked about problems faced by Christian communities in obtaining housing and water supplies:]

• We will look into it.
Lead in coalition - Vietnam Vet
TV campaign
Anne Wharton = lead staffer
met with Carroll before an hour minus 12 hours
Amin has told Tony
we're sensitive
have some secret issues
working with Putin
went to break then began
looking for another

Rel. Freedom
chairing a meeting
heavily involved

H2PP
see selves as a resource in H2PP
would like to be involved
virtually no engagement w/BNet-Jew
fired Jewish leaders - meeting test "will" hope to express view
view on the status of Jerusalem
frustration that as a Jew not a part of process
have a voice - not being heard
Sandy - be sensitive to their role
speaking on behalf of the Lebanon
should know looking for comfort, connecting
have an ally

we have used the 6th Ch as part
of Benic Pece, Pope
sensitive + Pepe response
Can be a valuable resource
get out ways can be

abortion + welfare. Domestic issues

status of Liddy Boggs
have id, but not sent her name up
former cong. Louisanas
6th of long-standing
nomination to replace Flynn as kitten
ambassador
not official

he should connect e. defec to big
have been heard + can come back
informed channel exit or found
breakfast
Thelma 62-721

dif of emphasis maybe a Jerusalem

3 Timor
done touch w/ Rebo
not a big got w/ Admi
not ret for migration

new as chairmen
can thru some of the agenda
just to make a decision
Admi not supporting strongly

common ground - N Ireland
economic work / efforts interfil
pleased w/th. Very constructive

CMC conv
common ground
motilize Cath community
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE</th>
<th>SUBJECT/TITLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001. email</td>
<td>Jennifer L Klein to Carol H Rasco, Jeremy D Benami, and Deborah L Fine at 11:52:12.94. Subject: Meeting on HR 1833 (1 page)</td>
<td>04/29/1996</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002. email</td>
<td>Audrey T Haynes to Sarah A Bianchi at 16:15:10.00. Subject: Re: VP and Catholic Newspaper (1 page)</td>
<td>09/02/1998</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLECTION:**
Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System (Email)
OPD ([Catholics, Bishops, Abortion])
OA/Box Number: 250000

**FOLDER TITLE:**
[09/11/1995 - 04/15/2000]

**RESTRICTION CODES**

**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**
- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
- PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
- RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

**Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]**
- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(5) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(5) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
TEXT:
On Friday, Leon held a meeting on H.R. 1833, The "Partial Birth Abortion" Ban Act to discuss our strategy for dealing with ongoing attacks from the Catholic community. The group agreed to do three things:

1. Leon will meet (very quietly) with Kerrey and Durbin -- who we believe are working on a bill that includes a health exception that the President could support. Betsy Myers argued that the women's community will be very upset if the President introduces new legislation. The group thought that working with Kerrey and Durbin instead of on our own bill may address some of these concerns.

2. The letter to Catholics that the President requested (drafted by Todd Stern and Elena Kagan) will be sent in response to a request by a non-Catholic religious leader for clarification of the President's position.

3. Marilyn Yager will continue to look for support from doctors at academic health centers.

In addition, several related issues came up.

1. Nancy Ann Min and White House Counsel are preparing a memo on assisted suicide for the President.

2. We will seriously consider an invitation for the President to meet with the Catholic Press Association.

3. The President will meet with other Catholic groups.

I think that's it. Call if you have any questions.
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SUBJECT: Re: VP and Catholic Newspaper

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sara A. Bianchi/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Gore is great on abortion. However, early in his political career, I believe he was more conservative on this. thanks
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A. Catholic Press
   1. POTUS interview - roundtable
   2. Administration officials' interviews - profiles
      a. Ray Flynn
      b. Leon Panetta
      c. Mark Gearan
      d. Alexis Herman
      e. Possibilities
         i. Gil Casellas
         ii. Henry Cisneros
   f. Others
   3. Conference calls on issues of concern to Catholics
   4. Briefings for Catholic press
B. Non-Catholic (and Catholic) press
   1. Op-ed pieces by Administration officials
   2. Use non-Administration surrogates to add credibility
   3. Project images that better reflect reality
      a. POTUS regularly attends church
      b. POTUS attended a Jesuit college
      c. POTUS regularly meets w/religious leaders

III. UPCOMING RELIGIOUS EVENTS
   A. POTUS address to National Baptist Convention - Sep. 9
   B. Pope's arrival in New York - Oct. 20

IV. CATHOLIC PRESS INFORMATION
   A. Catholic News Service
   B. National Catholic Reporter
   C. Others (listed in Media Affairs notebook)

================== END ATTACHMENT 1 ===================
I followed up with John Hart this morning. He said that the request for the President to meet with leadership of the Catholic Bishops was pulled. He said that due to the Bishop's focus on abortion, it wasn't a good time to meet. Apparently, he spoke to Lee about having the request pulled.
As most of you probably know, the President's pastor wrote to him on November 16 of last year about the partial-birth abortion ban issue. I prepared a response for POTUS' signature based on a SAP that OMB issued, McCurry's statements, and guidance from Jeremy Ben-Ami. We all knew that, no matter what was put on azure, POTUS would probably not like and want to rewrite himself. This proved true and Carol Cleveland was instructed to collect some background material on the subject for POTUS' review. This is the last any of us saw or heard of the original letter. Everybody involved has searched and searched for the missing letter to no avail. In passing, Barbara Woolley in Women's Outreach/OPL mentioned to me that she understood POTUS had actually called Rev. Horne about this. She thought Stephanopoulos was the one who said that, so I contacted him. He could not recall any such conversation. Bottom line, unless any one of you knows any differently, there has been no answer thus far to Rev. Horne's original letter. ORM has confirmed that no written communication has been sent. Therefore, it is Jim's recommendation that, since I have a copy of the backup including a copy of the original letter, we re-submit on azure my language for POTUS' signature or for any action he would rather take. It is important that we know how he wants to respond to this letter because now there are letters pending from Cardinals Hickey and Law and from Anthony Pilla of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops that should be answered in roughly the same way. Please let Jim and me know how you want to handle this. Thanks,
Kyle
TEXT:
John Hart and I discussed doing a Catholic press conference call as the best way to handle this. John and Paggy both feel that the Catholics are the only religious group with which we need to be proactive.
John suggests having Leon do the call because Leon can talk about POUTS' personal struggle with the decision and because he is Catholic. He also suggested having Jack Quinn and Elena Kagan on the call to answer substantive questions.
I am coming up with a list of press to put on the call based on the Catholic Roundtable list from last fall. Please let me know if this is the best way to proceed.
This is a heads-up on a complicated case.

We have had a POTUS letter to Cardinal Law in the works since November. The Cardinal wrote on November 7 to congratulate the Pres. and to discuss several issues, including education, immigration, welfare reform, and abortion. The (BC Sig) response went through several edits and re-writes, mostly because of the sensitivity of the abortion language. Jim had a Jan. 16 version ready for Todd & Phil with what we thought was our best and most recent late-term abortion language.

Then we received a Jan. 16 letter from the Cardinal on a different letterhead -- that of the US Conference of Catholic Bishops' "Right-to-Life Secretariat." The new letter deals entirely with late-term abortion. When Jim saw this one, he asked me to get in touch with John Hart and see how John would suggest we handle the new letter. (If John said we should answer the new letter, that meant we could go back and delete the abortion language entirely from the 1st letter and send it on out.) John answered my inquiry this afternoon: He does want us to answer the new letter, so Kyle is now working on a POTUS reply (to the 2nd letter). Should I now send the 1st letter back to support to be redone on azure without the abortion language, in case you can get it out tomorrow? (I assume it won't be a BC Sig, since the incoming was Nov. 7.) Or would you rather the whole thing wait for Jim's return? Thanks --
wait for jim. thanks.

Reuben L. Musgrave Jr.

This is a heads-up on a complicated case.

We have had a POTUS letter to Cardinal Law in the works since November. The Cardinal wrote on November 7 to congratulate the Pres. and to discuss several issues, including education, immigration, welfare reform, and abortion. The (BC Sig) response went through several edits and re-writes, mostly because of the sensitivity of the abortion language. Jim had a Jan. 16 version ready for Todd & Phil with what we thought was our best and most recent late-term abortion language.

Then we received a Jan. 16 letter from the Cardinal on a different letterhead -- that of the US Conference of Catholic Bishops' "Right-to-Life Secretariat." The new letter deals entirely with late-term abortion. When Jim saw this one, he asked me to get in touch with John Hart and see how John would suggest we handle the new letter. (If John said we should answer the new letter, that meant we could go back and delete the abortion language entirely from the 1st letter and send it on out.) John answered my inquiry this afternoon: He does want us to answer the new letter, so Kyle is now working on a POTUS reply (to the 2nd letter). Should I now send the 1st letter back to support to be redone on azure without the abortion language, in case you can get it out tomorrow? (I assume it won't be a BC Sig, since the incoming was Nov. 7.) Or would you rather the whole thing wait for Jim's return? Thanks --
John-
Here is the final draft of the Cardinal Law letter. I incorporated the changes we discussed last week and Bill Marshall’s suggestions he and I talked about this morning. Please let me know your final thoughts.

I want to thank you for your letter of January 16 and your comments about the so-called "partial-birth abortion ban." I share your belief that people from all sides of the debate must engage in a constructive dialogue on this most sensitive issue so that the realities of the discussion are not lost among the shouting.

I agree that definitions of the "health" of women seeking third-term abortions can be too loosely interpreted. That is why I pleaded with Congress to submit highly restrictive language on this procedure. I wanted Congress to make it clear that the health problem for the woman had to involve serious, adverse health consequences -- for example, the inability to have more children. But Congress failed to do so. If they will work with me in good faith, I will certainly sign such a bill.

I welcome the opportunity to work with your offices on this issue, and I have directed John Hart, my liaison to the Catholic community, to follow up on your desire to discuss it further. I understand that he has been in contact with Gail Quinn of your staff, and I hope that it will be possible for them to arrange for a serious exchange of ideas.

There are few more urgent issues must be addressed, and I look forward to your counsel during the coming weeks and months.
Hate to bother you twice in a day, but I have a letter from Bishop Pilla on late-term abortion that I need to get squared away. The background is that the letter came in June 25 and, after consulting with Elena Kagen, Jim and I worked on a draft that she cleared on 8/4. By this time, Jim was holding all BC Sig letters on this until we heard back on the McSorley and Stephen Carter letters. Well, since POTUS signed these on 10/11, and since he already vetoed the bill, Jim said to go ahead and put through the letters we had been holding (Arthur Anderson among them which you may remember). But the problem with this one is that it deals with an issue that was big then but is moot now, ie the AMA endorsement of 1122. Pilla has already gotten several versions of our language, however, and Elena and Jim decided we should answer specifically about AMA and just re-re-reiterate our stance on the legislation. So the dilemma now is that the AMA endorsement is long gone and it seems to me we will look silly if we try to answer the letter now.

Please let me know how you would like it handled, or let me know who you think would be the best person to consult.

Kyle
I am sorry but I need a little more time on the Catholic Bishop. The Bishop that was suggested has a problem with the whole abortion clinic thing so we are coming up with another. I am trying to resolve this by the end of the afternoon.

Thank you for your understanding.

Christine
ARMS Email System
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TEXT:
---------------------- Forwarded by Audrey T. Haynes/WHO/EOP on 10/22/97 05:29 PM ----------------------

Maureen and I had a discussion about this. Finally she told me why it's not a good idea to have this group. It is ok with me.......I completely understand

Maureen T. Shea
10/22/97 04:19:00 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Audrey T. Haynes
cc:
Subject: Catholics/Hate Crimes

Message Creation Date was at 22-OCT-1997 16:19:00

I'm sorry to do this through e-mail but I have to leave momentarily. Anyway, I suggest you check with Melanne, now our resident Catholic expert, on inviting Francis Kissling. My fear, which may be unfounded but I think I should raise it, is that if there is only one "official" of the Catholic Church and Francis Kissling, it will look like an abortion stand-off and not convey Catholic involvement in other hate crimes - especially in light of their recent statement on homosexuality. As you know, sensitivities with the Catholic Church over late term and vouchers are already quite high and if possible, I think, we should try to avoid exacerbating them. I assume that there are representatives from NARAL and Planned Parenthood so that the abortion clinics will be adequately represented with or without Francis.

Marsha, as to who to invite among Catholics, depending upon your geographic needs, I would suggest either Cardinal Mahoney of LA or Bishop McKerrick of Newark.
FYI - I have been getting some entreaties from the Catholic community, which I assume would be supported by others who share their position, about the way the Administration will handle the Roe v. Wade anniversary. While they recognize that there will be no agreement on the issue, it is very disturbing to them when any who oppose abortion are labeled either extremists or anti-child. They would like recognition that there are those of good faith who disagree on this issue. The way Mrs. Clinton handles it is very comfortable for them. I think their concerns are fair and have communicated this to Audrey and Susan as well. Many thanks.
Earlier this week, Chuck Ruff, Elena and I met with representatives of DOJ and ED on the issue of Title IX regulations and abortion. One of the most difficult issues concerns the application of Title IX to teaching hospitals, including those affiliated with the Catholic Church. Elena says that you have a good relationship with that community. We would like your help in getting their views on various regulatory approaches. I will be happy to send you a memo that explains the issues. Please give me a call when you can -- 62024 -- and, if I'm not there, please leave your fax number. Thanks.
got it. How about, instead of the last sentence in para. #3, we say:

I am grateful for Catholic Family Radio's efforts to promote a culture of values in our country.

how's that?

Thanks,

John

Maureen T. Shea
04/25/2000 01:29:27 PM
Record Type: Record

To: John H. Corcoran III/WHO/EOP
cc: 
bcc: 
Subject: Re: Catholic Family Radio letter

My suggestions in bold - I agree, this is a hard one.
it's on its way... here's the draft

Thank you for your letter regarding partial-birth and physician-assisted suicide. I appreciate your sending me a copy of the Catholic Family Radio Petition for Life.

I understand your serious concerns about these difficult issues. I have always expressed, and continue to do so, my strong opposition to physician-assisted suicide, but I stand firmly in my resolve to protect a women's right to privacy and her right to choose what happens to her body.

I also firmly believe that we will be an infinitely better, stronger nation if our decisions are informed by, driven by, and advanced by people of faith and the values we share. Be assured that my Administration stands with you and Catholic Family Radio in your efforts to promote a culture of values in our country. (I think it is hard to say we stand with you when there is such fundamental disagreement on late term abortion. I would delete that sentence.)

Once again, I appreciate hearing your views, and I am grateful that you took the time to write.

John H. Corcoran III

04/25/2000 12:31:54 PM
Thank you for your letter regarding partial-birth abortion and physician-assisted suicide. I appreciate your sending me a copy of the Catholic Family Radio Petition for Life.

I understand your serious concerns about these difficult issues. I have always expressed my strong opposition to physician-assisted suicide, but I stand firmly in my resolve to protect a woman's right to privacy and her right to choose what happens to her body.

I also firmly believe that we will be an infinitely better, stronger nation if our decisions are informed by, driven by, and advanced by people of faith. Be assured that my Administration stands with you and Catholic Family Radio in your efforts to promote a culture of values in our country.

Once again, I appreciate hearing your views, and I am grateful that you took the time to write.
To: John H. Corcoran III/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc:
Subject: Re: Catholic Family Radio letter

John - I'd totally forgotten - but I never got the fax - pls. send again,
sorry - 66218,
Thank you for your letter regarding partial-birth abortion and physician-assisted suicide. I appreciate your sending me a copy of the Catholic Family Radio Petition for Life.

I understand your serious concerns about these difficult issues. I have always expressed my strong opposition to physician-assisted suicide, but I stand firmly in my resolve to protect a woman's right to privacy and her right to choose what happens to her body.

I also firmly believe that we will be an infinitely better, stronger nation if our decisions are informed by, driven by, and advanced by people of faith. Be assured that my Administration stands with you and Catholic Family Radio in your efforts to promote a culture of values in our country.

Once again, I appreciate hearing your views, and I am grateful that you took the time to write.
Maureen T. Shea

04/25/2000 12:20:28 PM

Record Type: Record

To: John H. Corcoran III/WHO/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: Re: Catholic Family Radio letter

John - I'd totally forgotten - but I never got the fax - pls. send again, sorry - 66218,
I see. How about then, we move the 2nd sentence down to replace that sentence. So it looks like this: (let me know what you think. Thanks, Maureen!)

Thank you for your letter regarding partial-birth abortion and physician-assisted suicide.

I understand your serious concerns about these difficult issues. I have always expressed my strong opposition to physician-assisted suicide, and I will continue to do so, but I stand firmly in my resolve to protect a women's right to privacy and her right to choose what happens to her body.

I also firmly believe that we will be an infinitely better, stronger nation if our decisions are informed by, driven by, and advanced by people of faith and the values we share. I appreciate your sending me a copy of the Catholic Family Radio Petition for Life, which I have shared with members of my staff.

Once again, I appreciate hearing your views, and I am grateful that you took the time to write.
Maureen T. Shea  
04/25/2000 05:14:32 PM  
Record Type: Record  

To: John H. Corcoran III/WHO/EOP@EOP  
cc:  
bcc:  

Subject: Re: Catholic Family Radio letter

I am reluctant to say we're grateful for the efforts of a group with which we so firmly disagree (and for all we know, may well lambast us on a regular basis!).

John H. Corcoran III  
04/25/2000 04:33:07 PM  
Record Type: Record  

To: Maureen T. Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP  
cc:  
bcc:  

Subject: Re: Catholic Family Radio letter

got it. How about, instead of the last sentence in para. #3, we say:
I am grateful for Catholic Family Radio's efforts to promote a culture of values in our country.

how's that?
Thanks,
John

Maureen T. Shea
04/25/2000 01:29:27 PM
Record Type: Record

To: John H. Corcoran III/WHO/EOP/EOP
cc:
bcc:
Subject: Re: Catholic Family Radio letter

My suggestions in bold - I agree, this is a hard one.

it's on its way... here's the draft

Thank you for your letter regarding partial-birth and physician-assisted suicide. I appreciate your sending me a copy of the Catholic Family Radio Petition for Life.

I understand your serious concerns about these difficult issues. I have
always expressed, and continue to do so, my strong opposition to physician-assisted suicide, but I stand firmly in my resolve to protect a women's right to privacy and her right to choose what happens to her body.

I also firmly believe that we will be an infinitely better, stronger nation if our decisions are informed by, driven by, and advanced by people of faith and the values we share. Be assured that my Administration stands with you and Catholic Family Radio in your efforts to promote a culture of values in our country. (I think it is hard to say we stand with you when there is such fundamental disagreement on late term abortion. I would delete that sentence.)

Once again, I appreciate hearing your views, and I am grateful that you took the time to write.

John H. Corcoran III
04/25/2000 12:31:54 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Maureen T. Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc:
bcc:
Subject: Re: Catholic Family Radio letter

it's on its way... here's the draft

Thank you for your letter regarding partial-birth abortion and physician-assisted suicide. I appreciate your sending me a copy of the
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Bethany Little (CN=Bethany Little/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 15-SEP-2000 12:01:02.00

SUBJECT: Re: my apologies

TO: Maureen T. Shea (CN=Maureen T. Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
It might indeed. Just so you know, the current position of the Department of Education is that they would not be eligible for this money. It is not my intention to tell them that, but instead to allow them to make their case. Do you have any thoughts on this?

Maureen T. Shea
09/15/2000 11:58:56 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Bethany Little/OPD/EOP@EOP
cc:
bbc:
Subject: Re: my apologies

In general the U.S. Catholic Conference and we work very well on a broad range of issues (the obvious exception being abortion and vouchers).

They met with your predecessor and I'm looking for my notes, but their particular concern on this is the legislation now pending for a grant in loan program for school construction. I believe there is a similar program (energy related?) where federal money can go to Catholic schools. They want to be sure that they would be eligible for this money as well, fearing that if it is not in the first legislation, it will be impossible to add it later.

Would it help if I try to dig up my notes from the last meeting?

Bethany Little
09/15/2000 11:32:08 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Maureen T. Shea/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc:
bbc:
Subject: Re: my apologies

Then my office should be fine. Thanks very much for setting this up.

P.S. Is there anything I should know about this group or these folks?
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Maureen T. Shea (CN=Maureen T. Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 15-SEP-2000 11:59:07.00

SUBJECT: Re: my apologies

TO: Bethany Little (CN=Bethany Little/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

In general the U.S. Catholic Conference and we work very well on a broad range of issues (the obvious exception being abortion and vouchers).

They met with your predecessor and I'm looking for my notes, but their particular concern on this is the legislation now pending for a grant in loan program for school construction. I believe there is a similar program (energy related?) where federal money can go to Catholic schools. They want to be sure that they would be eligible for this money as well, fearing that if it is not in the first legislation, it will be impossible to add it later.

Would it help if I try to dig up my notes from the last meeting?

Bethany Little
09/15/2000 11:32:08 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Maureen T. Shea/WH/EOP
cc:

Subject: Re: my apologies

Then my office should be fine. Thanks very much for setting this up.

P.S. Is there anything I should know about this group or these folks?

Maureen T. Shea
09/15/2000 11:26:28 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Bethany Little/OPD/EOP
cc:

Subject: Re: my apologies

Only two: Pat Canan who is their lobbyist on education issues and a Father Davis from their education office.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE</th>
<th>SUBJECT/TITLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001. email</td>
<td>Marilyn DiGiacobbe to Barbara D Woolley at 11:07:51:00. Subject: Archbishop McCarrick (1 page)</td>
<td>07/31/1997</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002. email</td>
<td>Marilyn DiGiacobbe to Marjorie Tarmey at 09:57:48:00. Subject: Archbishop McCarrick (1 page)</td>
<td>07/31/1997</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003. email</td>
<td>Maureen T Shea to Lindsey E Huff, Steven J Naplan, and Matt Gobush at 15:28:06:00. Subject: Kosovo (10 pages)</td>
<td>05/12/1999</td>
<td>P2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004. email</td>
<td>Eugenie Bisulco to Betty W Currie and Nancy V Hernreich at 13:13:38:00. (1 page)</td>
<td>12/21/1999</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005. email</td>
<td>Maureen T Shea to Heather F Hurlburt at 14:40:34:00. Subject: I attach some talking points for McCarrick tomorrow. Hope they are helpful. [partial] (1 page)</td>
<td>12/05/2000</td>
<td>P6/b(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COFFLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
WHO ([Catholics Bishops Bosnia...])
OA/Box Number: 500000

FOLDER TITLE:
[09/06/1995-12/05/2000]
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL  (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Marilyn DiGiacobbe (CN=Marilyn DiGiacobbe/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 31-JUL-1997 11:07:51.00

SUBJECT: Archbishop McCarrick

TO: Barbara D. Woolley (CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP @EOP [WHO])

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
FYI, thanks!
---------------------------------------------------------- Forwarded by Marilyn DiGiacobbe/WHO/EOP on 07/31/97 11:07 AM -----------------------------------

Marilyn DiGiacobbe
07/31/97 09:57:35 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Marjorie Tarmey/WHO/EOP
cc:
Subject: Archbishop McCarrick

Sandy Berger's meeting with Archbishop McCarrick has been moved to this afternoon at 3:00 p.m. in Sandy Berger's office. I'm not sure if Bill Marshall needs to be there. I think it's much more appropriate to have a representative of the Office of Public Liaison attend. The meeting will be focused on the International concerns of the Catholic Church, mainly landmines, Bosnia and Religious Freedom abroad particularly as it pertains to China. For the sake of our relationship with Archbishop McCarrick, I thought it would be valuable for Maria to make that contact.

I think OPL should be at the meeting. I think Barbara Woolley would make alot of sense since she has been our lead on landmines and has also worked on the Bosnia issue with me.
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Marilyn DiGiacobbe (CN=Marilyn DiGiacobbe/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 31-JUL-1997 09:57:48.00

SUBJECT: Archbishop McCarrick

TO: Marjorie Tarmey (CN=Marjorie Tarmey/OU=WHO/O=EOP @EOP [WHO])

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
Sandy Berger's meeting with Archbishop McCarrick has been moved to this afternoon at 3:00 p.m. in Sandy Berger's office. I'm not sure if Bill Marshall needs to be there. I think it's much more appropriate to have a representative of the Office of Public Liaison attend. The meeting will be focused on the International concerns of the Catholic Church, mainly landmines, Bosnia and Religious Freedom abroad particularly as it pertains to China. For the sake of our relationship with Archbishop McCarrick, I thought it would be valuable for Maria to make that contact.

I think OPL should be at the meeting. I think Barbara Woolley would make a lot of sense since she has been our lead on landmines and has also worked on the Bosnia issue with me.
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Maureen T. Shea (CN=Maureen T. Shea/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 12-MAY-1999 15:28:06.00

SUBJECT: Kosovo

TO: Lindsey E. Huff (CN=Lindsey E. Huff/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Steven J. Naplan (CN=Steven J. Naplan/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ: UNKNOWN

TO: Matt Gobush (CN=Matt Gobush/OU=NSC/O=EOP [NSC])
READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
The following is a lengthy article which will appear in a Jesuit publication. The author concludes:

To summarize: The cause is just; force is necessary; it must be kept limited; it is desirable but not likely that a ground war be avoided; it is crucial to win but only within limits; the future in Serbia and Kosovo will not be a return to the past. The design for the future will ultimately pass to the diplomats, for war is not an end in itself; but Kosovo is a case where war must play its role so diplomacy can follow.

He is a very well respected Catholic voice and acting dean of the Harvard Divinity School - if you want a group of supporters, I would suggest including him - one caveat, this was clearly written before the Chinese embassy mistake.

---------------------- Forwarded by Maureen T. Shea/WHO/EOP on 05/12/99 03:25 PM ----------------------

"Jack Cullinan S.J." <JCullinan@nccbuscc.org>
05/12/99 09:14:15 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Maureen T. Shea/WHO/EOP
cc: 
Subject: Kosovo

Maureen,

I'm forwarding a copy of Fr. Bryan Hehir's article on Kosovo that will appear in this week's issue of the Jesuit weekly America. Bryan, as you know, is the principal author of the 1983 peace pastoral and one of the church's top thinkers on international issues.

Thanks for the offer to put me on your mailing list. I'd be grateful to receive the foreign policy material.

I'm forwarding separately a Boston College press office account of Ray Helmick's Belgrade trip.
Hope to see you next Tuesday at the final Advisory Committee meeting.

Jack

Kosovo: A War of Values and the Values of War

By J. Bryan Hehir


Copyright 1999 by America Press All rights reserved

The Rev. J. Bryan Hehir is Professor of the Practice in Religion and Society
at the Divinity School and the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs
at Harvard University in Cambridge, Mass.

IN A NEW YORK TIMES COLUMN commenting on religious issues (4/17), Peter Steinfels makes a measured criticism of religious leaders and moralists who fail to provide either clear foundations or clear conclusions for their assessments of the war in Kosovo: "What is distressing is how often the moral pronouncements offer only the surface of a position without following that line of thought through to its logical conclusions or its rock-bottom principles." This critique is characteristically precise and deserves a response. What follows is one person's response to it—an effort toward clarity and specificity on Kosovo.

My "rock-bottom principles" are entirely unoriginal. In this case, as in multiple other instances of conflict and war, I find the traditional
categories of the just-war ethic (developed with the combined resources of religious conviction and philosophical analysis) still the most adequate instrument of moral analysis. The strength of the ethic lies in its complexity, its multidimensional method of analyzing the use of force. The same complexity often makes it difficult to produce unanimity on conclusions. But Mr. Steinfels is right: Solid principles should yield specific choices, even in the dense web of moral issues that constitutes the puzzle of Kosovo.

Just Cause.

Kosovo requires a multidimensional ethic, because morality does not lie in one place in this conflict, which George Will has called "a war of values." The moral challenge for policy arises from the intersection of competing moral demands. The first question of the traditional ethic is determining just cause: Are the values at stake in a particular conflict of such character that the conscious, systematic taking of life (and risking lives) may be required to preserve them? At one level, the story of Kosovo yields a decisive yes to this question: over one million people driven from their homes by brutal methods of killing, rape, burning and looting of their villages. As Mark Danner points out in The New York Review of Books (5/6), this purge of the Kosovars was not the result of the fog of war, but the product of "planned rationality." In Kosovo, prefigured by the ethnic cleansing of Bosnia, the world (both individual citizens and their states) knows exactly what is happening, and we know who is responsible. If the product of this planned rationality does not constitute just cause, it is difficult to know what the category means.

While that is my first conclusion, it is useful to note that just cause has been a much debated issue in the United States over the last two months. The critics of just cause have relied on at least three arguments.

First is an issue that is at the heart of Kosovo but extends well beyond it: The claims of sovereignty are weighed more heavily at times by some than the horrors of ethnic cleansing. The argument is that Serbian tactics and strategy are reprehensible, but that Kosovo is an internal issue, a struggle for self-determination within a sovereign state, and it is folly to open the road to external actors becoming engaged in the innumerable conflicts of self-determination across the globe. In brief, Kosovo is not Hitler's Germany of 1939 or Hussein's Iraq of 1991. The casus belli must be strictly defined, and "humanitarian intervention" does not qualify as a reason to resort to war. Henry Kissinger exemplifies this position: "'Humanitarian intervention' asserts that moral and humane concerns are so much a part of American life that not only treasure but lives must be risked to vindicate them. No other nation has ever put forward such a set of propositions."

Second, NATO is the wrong agency to respond to Kosovo; it is a defensive alliance never contemplated to be catalyzed into action by internal conflict.

Third, from the perspective of U.S. foreign policy, this kind of war is a diversion from the necessary tasks the "one superpower" of the world should take on. As Charles Krauthammer puts the case: Humanitarian conflicts are
for middle-size powers, not for the United States. These are large arguments, each of which I oppose.

The first of these arguments is the most important, because Kosovo, like Somalia, Rwanda and Haiti before it, does challenge a fundamental conviction of realist statecraft, which draws a radical distinction between the external behavior of states and their internal policies. In brief, aggression must be opposed (e.g., the Persian Gulf war), but not repression.

My support of Kosovo as just cause is part of a larger argument, which calls for recasting the moral-legal-political calculus of policy in the direction of justifying some interventions for humanitarian reasons. Recasting NATO's purposes, therefore, is for me a subordinate corollary of a prior premise; I believe the number of interventions should be tightly contained (by political and moral criteria), but the offensive/defensive argument is not a conclusive reason to oppose NATO policy in Kosovo. For similar reasons, the Krauthammer arguments about the sole superpower, while decisive in some cases, are not determinative of an entire policy. Again, in my view, just cause is established beyond doubt in Kosovo.

Noncombatant Immunity.

The complexity of the just-war ethic builds into moral analysis a continuing tension between just cause and just means; compelling moral causes must be pursued with limited means because not all are implicated in the evils of war, so only some are to be targeted, restrained, captured or killed. In what Raymond Aron called "the century of total war," the issue of what constitutes limited means has been at the heart of the arguments about war and morality. In passing it should be noted that the learning curve on this question shows progress. The article by John Ford, S.J., in Theological Studies in 1944 on "The Morality of Obliteration Bombing" stands as a singular critique of World War II, where the policy was pursued by both sides and opposed by very few. The post-war debates, the nuclear arguments over 30 years and the Persian Gulf war analysis all served to restore the principles of "just means" to a central place in the public policy arguments. Civilians have already been hit in the NATO air campaign, not because they were targeted but in spite of precautions taken to protect them. Unlike the 1940's, war in the 1990's requires both apologies for such actions and extended explanations that the policy is designed to exclude civilian targets. Such arguments were not considered necessary in World War II.

Favorable comparisons with the past are not sufficient, however, to address NATO policy in Kosovo. Maintaining "limited means" faces two different kinds of challenges. The first arises, paradoxically, from the realist voices who at first doubted or opposed the decision to engage NATO in Kosovo. The arguments from Kissinger, Krauthammer and others are that, however mistaken the policy is, the only objective now is "to win." Senator John McCain, whose life experience and strategic judgments give him unique credentials to be heard on questions of war and peace, also makes this argument: "What shall we do now? Win, by all means necessary." In one sense the objective is
uncontested; to defend the just cause one must defeat the adversary. The problem with the statement is that it implies that the objectives of just cause might ultimately require that limits be set aside as an encumbrance. Here too lies a realist principle: The realm of war is not hospitable to moral limits; once initiated, the moral objective is to end the war with victory and then return to life within the moral universe where restraints on behavior can be observed.

It is reasonable to infer that because this argument in some form always lurks beneath the surface of any war policy, Pope John Paul II--a participant observer of a war without limits in the 1940's--has consistently placed himself in opposition to initiating the use of force. He has done this in spite of crucial statements where he has defended the just-war ethic. While not pacifist in principle, he has been consistently nonviolent in policy prescription--resisting "just revolution" claims of theologians, the "just war case" made by President Bush for the Persian Gulf war and by word and deed distancing himself from NATO policy in Kosovo. Peter Steinfels understands the logic of the position but questions its adequacy. There is, I believe, good reason to do so. My judgment would be that Pope John Paul II's position is informed not only by the nonviolent convictions that have marked his pontificate, but also by his intellectual and experiential understanding of the Balkans. These are powerful resources in assessing the problem of Kosovo.

But the record of Slobodan Milosevic in the 1990's provides a compelling case to say that there is here a personality and a policy of the kind the just-war ethic was designed to confront. Anyone invoking the systematic taking of life (war) for moral reasons should do so with hesitation. But the logic of the argument from Augustine through Vitoria, Michael Walzer and Paul Ramsey has been the same: Some facts propel hesitant individuals and states to the ultimate means of politics, because failure to use them threatens the very foundations of political community. Mark Danner's article ("Endgame in Kosovo") traces the "planned rationality" of Milosevic's policy in Bosnia and Kosovo through five steps: 1) concentration of the target population; 2) decapitation of its leaders; 3) separation of men and women; 4) evacuation of women, children and elderly; and 5) liquidation of those whom Milosevic opposes.

These are the facts that lead me to a second conclusion, that the Holy See's invocation of the statement of Pius XII, "Nothing is lost with peace. All can be lost with war" does not capture the problem of Kosovo. Milosevic regards peace as time to evacuate and/or liquidate. Neither NATO nor the United States nor the European Union nor the United Nations should allow this explicit strategy to proceed unchallenged.

Then, it would seem, those opposing Milosevic "must win." Yes; but win rightly. A multidimensional ethic is bound by limits that cannot be transgressed, lest "just causes" become crusades. So those who say nonviolent resistance is not sufficient (the position of this article) must oppose the version of realism that is reducible to winning at all costs.

The Air War.

How does NATO policy stand up under the just-means tests? There are two
broad questions: How has the air war been conducted? Will air power be adequate as a means? Both strategic convictions (Milosevic will fold if hit) and political judgment (NATO publics won't support a ground war) yielded the NATO strategy of exclusive reliance on air power. Accepting that strategy for the moment, how should it be judged? There are three historical reference points (the 1940’s, the 1960’s and the 1990’s) and two criteria (noncombatant immunity and proportionality).

The three prior uses of air power involve World War II, Vietnam and the Persian Gulf war. The aforementioned obliteration bombing of World War II failed every aspect of the moral calculus from Dresden through Tokyo to Hiroshima; moreover, post-war studies of its strategic effectiveness in Germany complemented the moral judgment that it should not be imitated or repeated. Vietnam, in retrospect, is a classic case of the gap between intention and consequences; the Pentagon Papers contain a picture of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara seeking a policy of force within limits but producing a policy of massive destruction carried out with a logic and rationale that made it both devastating and ineffective. It produced a reaction against restraints that echoes through the Kosovo debate as Senator McCain criticizes Clinton policy as "McNamara-esque" in its restraints.

The Persian Gulf war strategy sought both to silence the moral critics and to provide a free hand for the generals. The result was a policy that could not be fairly indicted as obliteration bombing (because civilians were not targeted) but left gaping questions and documented doubts about the proportionality of depriving a civilian society of water, electricity and minimal health care facilities—while still in the secure control of the dictator who provoked the conflict. In brief, World War II failed the moral test because of its intentions and methods, Vietnam failed because of its consequences, and the Persian Gulf war was defensible in intention but left doubt about both means and effectiveness. The Kosovo campaign is being planned and analyzed in light of these analogies and "lessons"; where does it fit?

As in the Persian Gulf war, there are quite convincing characteristics of the policy that convey a determination not to target or strike civilians purposefully. The primary moral criterion of just means appears to be an intrinsically important guide to policy. This conclusion (my third) can be challenged on at least two grounds. First, civilians have been hit by NATO attacks on at least three occasions: two civilian trains and a convoy of Albanian refugees. All were horrific, none was intentional, and they therefore do not contradict the conclusion drawn above about the policy.

Second, a more complicated assessment: What risks of civilian casualties ("unintended" or "collateral" casualties) is the NATO policy willing to run?

Here one must enter the dense specificity of casuistry; cases need to be distinguished. One example of the dilemma faced by risks to civilians was the cruise missile attack on the Serbian Internal Ministry in the center of Belgrade. The strike successfully demolished the ministry’s headquarters (a component element in Milosevic’s repressive polices) and did not hit a hospital in the same city block. But was it worth the risk? More precisely, if the target comes up again for a strike (as it could) should the risk be run again? I would acknowledge the first success and vote against another strike as prudentially too risky for civilian casualties. A similar case
the bombing of the Serbian national television studio. Without doubt the
Government-controlled media have been an essential element in the Milosevic
strategy; there clearly are grounds for considering it a strategic target.
But I found the willingness to attack it when staffed by civilian
technicians a fateful step in the direction of relaxing crucial restraints
on power.

Those restraints will become ever more important (and threatened) if the
war continues into the summer. Beyond the specific cases mentioned looms a
decisive challenge for those who legitimate this intervention. NATO's
announced plan is to expand the bombing strategy to "Phase IV." While the
specifics of this step have not been made clear, its theme—the
intervention of the air war with relaxation of political controls—has been openly
articulated. One example of "Phase IV" is the introduction of B-52's using
"dumb bombs" (i.e., not precision guided) in a policy of area bombing.
While this is likely to be in Kosovo, not Belgrade, the difference between area
bombing and obliteration bombing is always a fragile barrier. If that
barrier is crossed, the intervention will immediately begin to lose its
normal legitimacy.

In my judgment, NATO strategy thus far has met the just-means test of
noncombatant immunity, but it will not sustain that record if the "must
win" dictum is pursued without qualification.

Reasonable Hope of Success.

The second, more complicated challenge to limited means arises from within
the ethic itself. One criterion of the doctrine is "reasonable hope of
success"; in other words, war should not be undertaken if there is no
reasonable hope of achieving one's objectives. The norm seeks to connect
ends and means in something more than a purely mechanistic or utilitarian
fashion. There should be some moral fit between objectives and contemplated
strategies; war should not be initiated or continued if the use of force
seems without definable purpose. Policy can fail the moral test either
because it exceeds moral limits or because it is ineffective in achieving
legitimate objectives.

Proportionality.

The tension inherent in this norm lies between the possibility of success
and proportionality. If strategic advocates propose that success can be
attained only by violating noncombatant immunity, the moral judgment is
simple: There is no justifiable war that is pursued by murderous conduct. A
more complex decision arises when the proposal is that standards of
proportionality must be loosened to achieve success. The nature of the
proportionality criterion is that it is inherently open to revision; a claim
that it is too tightly drawn and should be revised in the name of a
competing norm cannot be instantly rejected. But continuous, incremental
relaxation of standards of proportionality can yield simply another version
of "must win." NATO air strategy in Phase IV is steadily being escalated in
the face of Serbian atrocities and resistance; and, at some point, sooner
rather than later, those who support the basic strategy must be willing to
resist proposals for continual escalation. Senator McCain, for example, has
been quoted as advocating dropping the bridges around Belgrade and turning
out the lights. Both the Vietnam and Persian Gulf war images play into this recommendation. The Senator's deep frustration with Vietnam yields opposition to incrementalist strategies that fail to take the war to its perpetrators; the Persian Gulf war legacy of strategies that turn off lights, water and sanitation on civilians is a reason to pause. I would drop some bridges (those carrying military supplies) at night and not turn off the lights.

This casuistry of the air war strategy inevitably raises the question whether air power alone can ever promise reasonable hope of success. The public debate is often about the politics of using ground troops, but the question is pertinent to the moral calculus of Kosovo. It can be argued that continual reliance on air power alone will not stop the ethnic cleansing (it has not yet done so) and will systematically increase the risk to civilians, precisely because of the tensions between success and the risks to proportionality that will be run by incessant escalation of bombing in or near Belgrade. The use of ground troops will directly confront Milosevic's scorched-earth policy, it will certainly mean combatant casualties, and it may reduce the drive to bring ever increasing pressure on the population of Belgrade. To some degree (and only to a degree) the focus of the war would shift to Yugoslav troops in Kosovo. How then should the decision about ground troops be evaluated? Fred Kaplan, a seasoned military analyst and journalist, echoes the dominant strategic view outside the NATO policy process when he says there is no record of an embattled state changing its objectives or policy solely because of air attacks upon it.

On both strategic and moral grounds, therefore, it is necessary to conclude that ground troops should not be ruled out absolutely from a strategy seeking to be efficient and ethically acceptable. Ground troops will inevitably widen the war (for NATO, the U.S. and Serbia) and will bring new issues of proportionality to the forefront of the policy and public debate. I would not rule out ground troops (my fourth conclusion), but I would acknowledge that proportionality is a category that must be used before one acts, continuously reviewed during a war and assessed retrospectively after a war. Hence, if ground troops are used and the war widens, the debate between possibility of success and the cost of proportionality has to continue. In Vietnam a point was reached where neither success nor the limits of proportionality were being realized.

That memory must weigh in assessing the decision to make Kosovo an "air-land battle." The complexity of this decision is highlighted in William Pfaff's proposal (New York Review of Books, 5/6) advocating a ground assault on Yugoslav forces in Kosovo. He makes a convincing case that a quick assault from North and South could put NATO in control of Kosovo. His argument that the Kosovo Liberation Army could then successfully dispose of Serbian forces in the mountains is less convincing, and his prediction that Kosovo could be sustained independently without NATO forces is not persuasive at all.

In my judgment a ground war will widen the conflict, will change the factors involved in assessing the proportionality of the conflict and will ultimately make the success of the policy more likely. Ultimately is a
wiggle-word because it envisions the possibility of a long and bitter conflict. Peter Steinfels wants clarity from religious-moral voices on how many casualties are too many and how many months are too long for this war. I have argued that proportionality is a judgment that must be made over time, and I do not think it reduces to the specific numbers he seeks, at least in an a priori judgment. In part, proportionality will depend on the objectives sought and the skill by which it is pursued. This brings me to a final set of comments on the NATO strategy.

NATO Strategy.

To affirm that NATO has a just cause is not necessarily to be enthusiastic about the policy that has been pursued. I noted above that support for the specific decision to engage Kosovo is part of a broader argument that seeks to revise accepted norms about humanitarian intervention. In other places I have argued that the status of sovereignty should be relativized and a broader range of justifications for intervention should be legitimized (see Johnathan Moore, ed., Hard Choices, Rowman and Littlefield, 1999). In the face of multiple internal conflicts, the phenomenon of failed states and the human rights obligations incumbent on sovereign states, the virtually absolute status given to the nonintervention principles in law and U.N. practice does not serve individuals in the international community well. Both the status of sovereignty and nonintervention should be relativized. Hence, the NATO decision to intervene was and is, in my judgment, a justifiable and necessary action.

Like all military interventions, this one should be subordinate to a broader political purpose pursued by diplomacy. Because NATO is now at war, diplomacy should be intensified, not set aside. It should have two purposes. First, Kosovo in humanitarian terms is a major question; in terms of global politics it is a minor issue. Hence, one function of diplomacy is to attend to the U.S.-Russian relationship, which is vital to world order and is under severe stress because of the war. Second, military power in Kosovo is a means to an end; the end should be a political settlement, which restores and protects the ethnic Albanians. Since the end must be political, it should be pursued diplomatically even now.

The original definition of objectives of NATO policy has been surpassed by events. The idea of restoring the autonomy of Kosovo within Serbia might have been possible before the purge of the Kosovars, but is hardly feasible now. On this point Henry Kissinger and others are correct in calling now for the objective of an independent Kosovo removed from any Serbian control. This goal will require an international force in place for some time to deter irredentist inclinations of Serbs, who have shown us they do not forget defeat easily. While a non-U.S. or non-NATO force may make reaching a diplomatic agreement easier, there should be no illusions about the fact that such a force must implicitly be understood to be supported by NATO politically and militarily. Equally important in planning for the post-war security status of Kosovo should be planning for the reconstruction of both Kosovo and a post-Milosevic Serbia. The latter may not coincide with the end of the war, but NATO policy should sustain the argument that this war has not been fought against Serbs as such, but against a policy of Serbia in the
1990's that, to use the traditional terms, violated the conscience of humanity.

Hope for Diplomacy.

To return to the Steinfels questions: The "bed-rock principles" used here have been traditionally applied to inter-state warfare. Intervention is a harder case, but for this student of the ethic they do provide some clarity.

To summarize: The cause is just; force is necessary; it must be kept limited; it is desirable but not likely that a ground war be avoided; it is crucial to win but only within limits; the future in Serbia and Kosovo will not be a return to the past. The design for the future will ultimately pass to the diplomats, for war is not an end in itself; but Kosovo is a case where war must play its role so diplomacy can follow.
Kate Britton wanted the President to know that there's a special EWTN --
global Catholic channel -- on Mary's house, which he is apparently
interested in. She apparently spoke to the POTUS on Sunday, then happened
to see that this special is going to be on tonight at 10 PM. It's called
"All are Invited."
Also,
She has learned of a "personal connection" the P. has to Medjugorje in
Bosnia. She learned of this through Father Pearson in Emmetsburg, MD.
She thinks the Pres. would like to know of this connection and if he is
interested, she would like to speak to him personally or have him "give
permission" to me to hear about this and then tell him...
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MEETING WITH HOSPITAL GROUPS ON MEDICARE REFORM

Tomorrow, you are scheduled to meet with Dick Davidson and Tom Nichols from the American Hospital Association, Reverend Michael Place and Jack Bresch from the Catholic Health Association, Larry Gage and Chris Burch from the National Association of Public Hospitals, David Skinner from the New York and Presbyterian Hospitals Care Network, Tom Glynn from Partners Health Care System, and Jerry Klepner, who is representing the American Association of Medical Colleges.

BACKGROUND

The Catholic Health Association and the National Association of Public Hospitals represent the constituency of providers that have been consistently supportive of the Administration's health care agenda and are likely to be less aggressive in complaining about provider cuts. They will be most open to the argument that the dedication of the surplus is an extraordinary contribution by the President and will be more trusting of our commitment to work with them on short term BBA reforms. The public hospitals are particularly appreciative of the carve-out out of managed care payments that reallocate disproportionate share payments directly to hospitals.

The American Hospital Association and the American Association of Medical Colleges continue to strongly advocate for us to explicitly identify administrative and or legislative initiatives that will directly benefit them. While they acknowledge that the dedication of the surplus is helpful, they feel that their membership requires more specific initiatives for them to be more supportive or at least less critical of the President's Medicare reform proposal. Clearly, their first priority continues to be relief from HCFA's preliminary interpretation of the reductions in reimbursement for outpatient departments.

There is no question that the hospitals want to use their leverage to extract as many commitments from us as possible before even contemplating sending a message of support on our Medicare proposal. Moreover, they fear alienating Republican chairmen, who they hope will produce a freestanding provider give-back bill later this fall. Since they are unsure about how much they can expect from either the Republicans or the President on this issue, they are reluctant to send an open ended message of support, regardless of the concerns we commit to addressing.

Last week, we held an informal meeting with Chuck Ruff to discuss alternative interpretations of the outpatient department payment reduction language included in BBA. He and his staff are working aggressively to determine options in this regard, and have hinted that it may be possible for us to develop an alternative interpretation (contrary to the preliminary HCFA reading) by citing ambiguous language as well as the burdens the government will face through litigation. We are not likely to
know how this issue will be resolved until later this week at the earliest.

On a related matter, the hospitals have yet to succeed in extracting a letter of Congressional intent from either Congressman Thomas or Senator Roth. However, the hospital community has indicated, that they have yet to give up hope of obtaining such a letter. Although no one suggests that a letter from Congressman Thomas or Senator Roth would necessarily be dispositive, all agree that it would significantly enhance the likely hood that an alternative interpretation could be developed.

TALKING POINTS

We all recognize that the irresponsible tax cut produced by the Republicans will be vetoed. However, it is important to point out that even a much smaller tax cut, in the range of $400 to $600 billion, would seriously crowd out surplus dollars directed to Medicare.

In fact, even the $295 billion tax cut designed by Senate Democrats cut significantly reduced the Medicare commitment. In the absence of a very strong push-back from all interested parties, the amount dedicated to Medicare will almost inevitably decline. Tax cuts or discretionary priorities will almost inevitably reduce the level of this commitment.

I raise this because we have three Medicare funding priorities that are at risk, two of which are likely to be priorities of your own. If we don’t secure a significant surplus contribution to Medicare, not only will the drug benefit be at risk, but a significant contribution of revenue to BBA provider give-backs will be as well. In addition, as the surplus dedication declines, so too will those dollars dedicated for solvency, effectively increasing the likelihood that we will see Medicare cuts that meet or exceed those in the BBA as the baby boomers retire.

We recognize that you are seeking specific commitments to administrative or legislative provider give-backs. As you have noted, the President has been very public in his recent remarks about his concern for hospitals. This, combined with the President’s $7.5 billion quality assurance fund and the redirected disproportionate share payments to hospitals, lay the foundation for the type of assistance you seek. Moreover, we continue to work hard on the issue of reimbursement to outpatient departments, but still need a letter from Senator Roth and especially from Congressman Thomas to clarify Congressional intent on this matter.

Lastly, we should not take for granted that every Republican in the Congress consistently cites the Breaux-Thomas plan as the most meaningful and appropriate reform for Medicare. It’s bipartisan name provides camouflage for provisions that I believe we share a mutual concern over. In particular, as reported out of the Commission, it does not dedicate one dime of the surplus to Medicare, provides no provider relief from BBA 1997, assumes a straight extension of BBA reductions in provider reimbursement, and its premium support proposal coerces beneficiaries in managed care into low paying managed care plans that receive no full geographical adjustment in urban areas.

We wanted to have this meeting to discuss our common interests and to make certain that we do not take positions that inadvertently harm our visions for reform, which are not too dissimilar from one another.
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RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (EXTERNAL MAIL)
CREATOR: ddreyer@charm.net@INET@EOP@RX
CREATION DATE/TIME: 20-AUG-1996 20:58:00.00
SUBJECT: Sorry to bother you, but...

TO: Klein_J
CC: Jennings_C

TEXT:
Dear Jen and Chris:

If my facts are correct: This is something from left field that
involves health care, politics, and the good name of the First Lady. You
may already know about this.

Apparently a Catholic Hospital in the Philadelphia District formerly
represented by Marjorie M-M was promised an 8.5 million dollar HHS grant
for an ambulatory care clinic. There is a perils of Pauline story about
the money -- granted, rescinded, restored, etc. in Appropriations. The
money is in limbo; key Members of Congress like John Murtha want the
grant to go through.

Apparently, also, the First Lady went to the site of the clinic and
broke ground at a press event.

I am told all of this by an acquaintance of mine who represntes the
hospital and who has knowledge of Republican politics in PA. He says we
are on the verge of offending the Catholics and having a broken promises
story worked in the local press. He may be in touch with the White
House on this: Mr. P. C. Koch is his name.

I have no way to validate independently the information I have recorded.
But, if its true and it can be fixed, we can avert a problem. If its
true and it isn't fixed, we could have a problem. I thought I'd pass it
on to you with the hope and belief you would know the right thing to do.

Best,
D2
Per your request, I have identified some viable initiatives that OPL can pursue within the next six months to engage the Latino community in the President's initiatives for his second term.

1. Health Insurance for Uninsured Children - The National Hispanic Religious Leaders Partnership for Community Health is a formal coalition of interdenominational Hispanic religious leaders, which represent a diversity of churches, including: Catholic, Methodist, Presbyterian, Pentecostal, Episcopal and Baptist. Members of this organization come from heavily populated Hispanic areas -- California, New York, Florida, Texas, Puerto Rico, etc. This organization was created to develop a network to assure the support and delivery of primary health care services, particularly to the disadvantaged and underserved, in the Latino community. In his State of the Union the president referred to 10 million children lacking health insurance, a sizable portion of these kids are Latino. These churches can help disseminate information and identify some of the needs in large communities where there are uninsured children. The administration needs to take advantage of this untapped resource.

The Partnership is planning to have an Hispanic Religious Leaders Summit in May/June in D.C. (We don't have any paper on this yet.) The administration should be visible and active at this conference. Additionally, HHS should require that each regional administrator reach out to these folks on a regular basis.

2. Education -- Many of our young adults in the Latino community do not have access to, or cannot afford four year institutions. Therefore, many of them start their education in community colleges and/or vocational schools. In the President's State of the Union address, the President proposed a tax credit for college tuition through the HOPE Scholarship program. This Spring, the President and other principals' (along with Sec. Riley) need to reinforce this message by participating in commencement ceremonies at community colleges in states with large Latino populations. As an example, we have a request from Miami Dade Community College, which is the largest community college in the country (and has the highest Hispanic enrollment in the country,) for the President/VP/First Lady to speak at their commencement ceremony in May. One of the principals' should participate in this event. We should also look at community colleges in other states, including, California, New York, Illinois and Texas.

I have other ideas with regard to budget, education, juvenile justice and D.C. initiatives, but I would like to know if this is line with what you are thinking.

Thanks.
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL  (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Barbara D. Woolley  ( CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 11-MAR-1998 14:49:42.00

SUBJECT: Weekly

TO: Marjorie Tarmey  ( CN=Marjorie Tarmey/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

RURAL OUTREACH

On April 3, 1998, Secretary Glickman will host a family farm forum in Lexington, KY, to discuss tobacco, production agriculture, farm safety net issues. In attendance will be Gov. Patton and Sen. Ford. This is in response to a request by both the Governor and one of the participants of your meeting with family farmers in mid-December in the Roosevelt Room where you received a request to come to Kentucky to host a Farming Summit in Kentucky.

HEALTH CARE

Reactions to your speech at the AMA was outstanding and well worth the wait. They were thrilled with your remarks. One of the women Board of Trustees met with the Vice President on the Patients Bill of Rights on Wednesday and she told the Vice President of the overwhelming positive reaction to your speech.

The Catholic Health Association brought to our attention a situation regarding HCFA's interpretation that managed care risk plans be required to certify that they would cover medically necessary, elective abortions in order to qualify as a Medicare risk plan. CHA has been given inconsistent reports from HCFA regarding whether and when HCFA requires a health plan to certify coverage of elective abortions. A requirement to certify coverage of elective abortions would create an enormous problem for CH plans when they apply to HCFA to be certified as a Medicare+Choice plan. Catholic health plans should not be excluded from participation in the Medicare risk plan program or the Medicare+choice program because of their religious belief that the provision or coverage of abortion is morally wrong. CHA is getting pressure from the pro life side.
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL  (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Barbara D. Woolley ( CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [ WHO ] )

CREATION DATE/TIME: 22-MAY-1998 17:37:28.00

SUBJECT: Health Care Meeting Update

TO: Marjorie Tarmey ( CN=Marjorie Tarmey/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Maria Echaveste ( CN=Maria Echaveste/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [ WHO ] )
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
1. Patients Bill of Rights Event, women's health focus - Thursday, May 28
2. Quality Forum Meeting/Event w/ VPOTUS - June 17
3. VPOTUS Family Health Conference - June 22, 23 [looking at an announcement on Medicare Benefits (Osteoporosis, Cancer and Diabetes); Kids Health Outreach Interagency Report;]
4. White House Presidential Letter on Assisted Suicides due out next week.

Minority Tobacco Issues - you should know, Jeanette and the minority groups are still asking for 25% of the tobacco funding. Chris has repeatedly told them to not target funds. They sent over some new language their working on the caucus's with and it still contains the targeted funds. I showed it to Chris who was frustrated that they continue to push for targeted money. We have set up a meeting with Jeanette and Ruth Perriot on Wednesday morning with you and Chris.

I also need to update you on a meeting Maureen and I had with Chris and Elena on the Catholic Health Association "conscience clause" and Medicare and Abortions. Chris is planning on meeting with the legal folks from HHS, HCFA, OMB, White House legal counsel on Tuesday and CHA on Wednesday next week.
I received a call today from Jono Shaffer of SEIU in Los Angeles. They know that the VP is coming to do a GOTV rally in LA the afternoon/evening of Oct 21 and have requested that he attend an interfaith prayer service that they are holding from 4:30-6:30 PM at St. Emydius Catholic Church in South LA, 10900 California Street in Lynnwood.

Jono says this is 20 minutes from LAX and 25 minutes from Theodore Roosevelt High School.

This service, which is open to the press, will conclude a 24 hour vigil at the church for "Justice, Reconciliation, and Growth."

The focus of the service is on the effort of workers at 10 hospitals in the LA and Sacramento areas owned by Catholic Healthcare West (they own a total of 50 hospitals in western states) to organize. They are meeting with stiff opposition, harassment etc from management, and the people at the service want for management to act in a more just manner.

Catholic Healthcare West is owned by 9 groups of nuns, not the Catholic Church itself, though the diocese does have moral authority over hospital management, if not legal authority. Obviously, that makes me uncomfortable, to be protesting against a group of nuns and indirectly the
Catholic Hierarchy. On the other hand, this service is being led by an interfaith group of clergy, including many Catholic parish priests.

They are expecting 300-500 people, though that is dependent on attendance at the Coordinated Campaign GOTV rally. The attendees will be local health care workers and SEIU officials, and the service will be led by an interfaith group of clergy. They have invited a number of local elected officials, but they can't guarantee turnout because of the GOTV rally. They have also invited John Sweeney and are hopeful that he will attend, but they don't know yet. They would like for the VP to stop by and speak briefly.

I am assuming that trying to add this on at such a late date would be extremely difficult. Particularly for an open event like this which would likely need to be magged. Also, it does not appear to me that there will be any serious negative consequences if we regret. So I recommend against trying to do this, though I'd love to hear from other who might have a different opinion. However, if President Sweeney is actually attending it might be very difficult for us to be 20 minutes away and not to attend. In any case, I am uneasy about the idea of protesting against a bunch of nuns. Another possibility would be for the VP to mention it in his remarks at the GOTV rally. If Counsel's office could vet this situation and find out if there any problems either with attending or mentioning it in his remarks that would be great. I'd like to be able to tell Jono what we're able to do by Friday.

Thanks
The idea of doing anything remotely hostile to the Catholic Hospitals has raised very red flags with the people in the West Wing who work on health care issues -- they were very, very strongly opposed to even mentioning it at the CC rally because the Catholic Hospitals have been extremely helpful to the Administration in situations when it would have been easy for them not to be. These are important friends that it would be a serious mistake to alienate.

Therefore, unless I hear otherwise from anyone else here I will call Jono this afternoon to regret, saying that we will not be able to fit the vigil into our schedule because it is all blocked already, and I will not mention any other options.
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)
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CREATION DATE/TIME: 12-JUL-1999 14:48:37.00

SUBJECT: jack bresch, catholic health ass

TO: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP@OVP [UNKNOWN])

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:
I gave him your phone number to call and set up a meeting with you. He wants to talk to you about the vpotus and signing their health care pledge. Possibly doing an event to highlight it in the catholic press. Jack is a good friend to this administration and a good dem. Totally loyal and a must for you to meet!!! He's great.
RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)
CREATOR: Sarah A. Bianchi (CN=Sarah A. Bianchi/O=OVP [UNKNOWN ])
CREATION DATE/TIME: 12-JUL-1999 15:58:30.00
SUBJECT: Re: jack bresch, catholic health ass
TO: Barbara D. Woolley (CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO ])
READ: UNKNOWN
TEXT:
sounds great will return call right away. Also when you get a chance let's sit down and go over groups you think I should go hear from this summer.

sb

Barbara D. Woolley@EOP
07/12/99 02:48:36 PM
Record Type: Record
To: Sarah A. Bianchi/OVP@OVP
cc: Subject: jack bresch, catholic health ass

I gave him your phone number to call and set up a meeting with you. He wants to talk to you about the vpotus and signing their health care pledge. Possibly doing an event to highlight it in the catholic press. Jack is a good friend to this administration and a good dem. Totally loyal and a must for you to meet!!! He's great.
This is extremely helpful and exactly what MBC wanted. Thanks, so much!

---------------------- Forwarded by Christine A. Stanek/WHO/EOP on 11/06/99 12:59 PM ---------------------------

Barbara D. Woolley
11/06/99 11:51:54 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Mary E. Cahill/WHO/EOP@EOP
cc: Christine A. Stanek/WHO/EOP@EOP
Subject: BBA Meeting

November 6, 1999

MEMORANDUM TO MARY BETH CAHILL

FROM: Barbara Woolley

RE: Proposed Meeting with John Podesta and BBA Groups

Purpose: The purpose of the meeting continues to show that the White House is fully engaged on the BBA issue and to get credit for working on behalf of BBA givebacks.

Background: The groups understand the President is engaged on this issue. However, they were not hearing from Jack Lew, Chris Jennings, or Gene Sperling on this issue. It was not until the Senate Democrats called the Administration to the Hill and folks from the White House made their most supportive comments that the groups clearly see the White House engaged. A meeting would again say the White House is engaged.

Timing: Tuesday, depending on a Wednesday adjournment.

Participants: Dick Davidson, President, American Hospital Association

Rick Pollack, American Hospital Association
Tom Nickles, American Hospital Association
Rev. Michael Place, President, Catholic Health Association
Jack Bresch, Catholic Health Association
Larry Gage, President, National Association of Public Hospitals

Chris Burch, National Association of Public Hospitals
Ralph Muller, Chair, American Association of Medical
Colleges

Jordan Cohen, President, American Association of Colleges
Dick Knapp, American Association of Medical Colleges
Tom Glynn
Vic Fazio
Bruce Yarwood, American Health Care Association
Val Halamandaris, President, National Association for Home Care
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RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Barbara D. Woolley (CN=Barbara D. Woolley/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 16-MAR-1999 10:41:50.00

SUBJECT: Request for 2 Meetings - Social Security

TO: Sylvia M. Mathews (CN=Sylvia M. Mathews/OU=OMB/O=EOP @ EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Janet L. Graves (CN=Janet L. Graves/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

Jena V. Roscoe (CN=Jena V. Roscoe/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])
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TEXT:
Would you have time to meet with the following 2 groups on Social Security and Medicare? We would like to do them early next week prior to the next SS/Medicare event. Thank you for your consideration.

1. The ethnic community has been enthused about the President's social security plan and I think we have an unique opporunity to engage the ethnic community on this issue. We would be able to mobilize their national networks and speciality media in building support for this initiative.

I would propose that a roundtable discussion be scheduled with Gene and the major ethnic organizations. This can be planned for whenever is appropriate and convenient with Gene. Gene's willingness to discuss this initiative with the community one-on-one will have a huge impact.

Listed below is a sample of the groups that I would invite to participate:

Jim Zogby, Arab American Institute
Fred Rotondaro, National Italian American Foundation
Phil Piccigallo, Order Sons of Italy
Sophia Miskeweicz, Polish American Congress
Ron Cruz, Portuguese American Leadership Council
Andy Manatos, National Council of Hellenes
Aram Hamparian, Armenian National Committee
Hala Maksoud, American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee
Armand Scala, Congress of Romanian Americans
Frank Koszorus, Hungarian American Coalition
Michael Sawkiw, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America
Ilir Zherka, National Albanian American Council
Sharon Daly, Catholic Charities USA
Pat Conover, Religious Coalition on Social Security
Patricia King, US Catholic Conference

2. AFRICAN AMERICAN CONSTITUENCY

WHO: Executive Director or Senior Health Policy Representatives from the following groups:
WHAT/WHY: They would want to raise the following concerns. The last meeting did provide enough time for some organizations to address their concern:

The National Medical Association and National Urban League would like for the Social Security Initiative to propose efforts to reduce poverty among African Americans.

NMA and NBNA would like Medicare to include a Prison Drug Program that provides rehabilitation of inmates.

National Urban League is concerned about the increase of the retirement age to 67. It is a fact that in the African American community a high percentage of people retire by age 62 and thus receive early retirement benefits. Therefore, African Americans are having to wait 3 years before they can receive full retirement benefits. During this time frame, due to health reasons, age and the job market, these individuals have difficulty finding employment to supplement their incomes. Thus, raising the retirement age to 67 makes it further burdensome to this community since it elongates that time frame that these individuals are just receiving their early retirement benefits as opposed to receiving full benefits.
## Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
### Clinton Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE</th>
<th>SUBJECT/TITLE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESTRICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001. email</td>
<td>Steven Pifer to Beverly Roundtree and Elizabeth Verville, re: Pope TPs (8 pages)</td>
<td>10/02/1995</td>
<td>P1/b(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002. email</td>
<td>Matthew Lorin to Elizabeth Verville, re: pope (8 pages)</td>
<td>10/02/1995</td>
<td>P1/b(1), P5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003. email</td>
<td>Alexander Vershbow to Marcel Thomas, re: FW: Pope (3 pages)</td>
<td>10/06/1995</td>
<td>P1/b(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004. email</td>
<td>Richard Saunders to Marcel Thomas re: Pope Talking Points (3 pages)</td>
<td>10/06/1995</td>
<td>P5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
NSC Emails
MSMail-Record (Sept 94-Sept 97) ([Catholic and Bishops...])
OA/Box Number: 590006

## FOLDER TITLE:
[01/06/1995 - 01/10/1997]

## RESTRICTION CODES

**Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]**
- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
- PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

**Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]**
- b1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b5 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(5) of the FOIA]
- b6 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b7 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

---

Whitney Ross
2007-0088-F
wr326
Here are some edits.

[[ POPETPS.DOC : 1835 in POPETPS.DOC ]]

TALKING POINTS

Introduction:

"Your Holiness, it is a great pleasure and honor to see you again and preside at your departure ceremony."

Bosnia:

"I want to reiterate what the President said to Your Holiness on Wednesday regarding the Balkans. We now have a chance to help the parties make peace."

"As you know, last Thursday, our Special Envoy negotiated a cease-fire agreement among the warring factions in Bosnia."

"The cease-fire will take hold one minute after midnight on October 10. The halt in hostilities will continue for 60 days or for the duration of a peace conference scheduled for October 25."

"We recognize the special role that religious leaders must play before there can be a lasting peace in the region. We are most
grateful for your strong support for a peaceful resolution to the conflict, and the Church's efforts to ease human suffering in the former Yugoslavia.

The Vatican and Catholic Church of Croatia, as well as Orthodox leadership and Orthodox Church of Serbia, will be important to the healing process.

I hope that your meeting later this month of bishops from the former Yugoslavia can lend support to the peace process and increase tolerance and understanding among the people of the region.

I would appreciate hearing what insights you have gained in talking with Church leaders and the faithful in the region about the prospects for overcoming ethnic and religious hatred.

Human Rights:

We have raised our concerns about human rights abuses in China at the highest levels and presented China with a list, including persons incarcerated for peacefully expressing their religious views.

I personally raised this issue with Premier Ling Peng of China last March at the United Nations World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen.

We support the Vatican's efforts to normalize relations with Beijing and hope an agreement can be reached on contentious issues of appointment of bishops and relations with Taiwan.

We have told Vietnam that human rights performance and restrictions on religious freedom (particularly recent trials of political dissidents and Buddhist monks) will affect the warmth and depth of our bilateral relations.

We would like to coordinate our efforts and hope the Vatican will join in encouraging the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to invite the UN Special Rapporteur on Religious Freedom to Vietnam.

Foreign Assistance/Africa:

As you may be aware, I am planning a trip to Africa (South Africa, Egypt and perhaps Botswana or Ethiopia) in December.

I am very interested to learn of your impressions on your recent trip to Cameroon, South Africa and Kenya, which I understand was your eleventh and your first official South African visit.
If Raised:

Indonesia/East Timor:

I agree human rights situation in Indonesia and East Timor is a cause for concern. We believe that the solution is for Indonesia to provide a greater say in decision-making.

We commend the Vatican's efforts to encourage Indonesia to maintain the distinct cultural and religious identity of East Timor and to foster the UNSYG-sponsored dialogue between East Timorese and other Indonesian groups.

Conclusion:

Your Holiness, it was an honor to meet with you again. On behalf of the American people, I would like to wish you Godspeed and a safe journey back home.
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