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

Series C: Interreligious Activities. 1952-1992

Box 23, Folder 2, Greeley, Andrew, 1973-1976.

3101 Clifton Ave, Cincinnati, Ohio 45220
(513) 221-1875 phone, (513) 221-7812 fax
americanjewisharchives.org

national opinion research center

NORC

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
6030 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637
753-1300 Area Code 312
KENNETH PREWITT, *Director*

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF
AMERICAN PLURALISM

M E M O R A N D U M

To: Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum

From: Andrew M. Greeley

Date: May 24, 1976

It is proposed that NORC begin a program of monitoring changes in intergroup attitudes in the United States.

Although there has been some systematic monitoring by both NORC and by some of the commercial survey organizations of changing racial attitudes in American society, relatively little attention has been paid to changes in other intergroup attitudes. A number of major "one-shot" surveys have taken place, but there has been little attempt made to follow up these studies to see if with the passage of time and the increase in educational attainment of Americans, unfavorable attitudes toward other groups in the society have in fact decreased. James Davis has recently demonstrated in a replication of the famous Stouffer civil liberties study that Americans have grown substantially more "liberal" in their attitudes toward dissent in the last quarter century. But relatively little comparable information exists about their attitudes toward members of other religious groups.

A certain optimism has permeated the American thinking about intergroup attitudes until recently. Such optimism, it would seem, results from a combination of the assimilationist and evolutionary perspective. As the various ethnic and ethnoreligious differences among Americans diminish, it was thought, and as education and enlightenment spread in the society, the ignorance and prejudice which feed intergroup hatred were also expected to diminish. However, it has recently become obvious that economic and social success does not lead to the disappearance of ethnic differences. The evolutionary optimism does not seem nearly so self-evidently justified now as it did fifteen years ago. Hence it is not as easy to assume that nativism vanished with the election of John Kennedy, or that anti-Semitism died a slow death in the years after the Second World War. It may well be that prejudice ebbs and flows in a society depending upon social and economic conditions. In an era of economic hardship or of political uncertainty and loss of confidence, it may well be that prejudices against other groups within the society may increase. It also may be that some of the hatred once invested in a given outgroup may be transferred to another outgroup when it becomes unfashionable to actively scapegoat the first group. Thus, instead of a model of evolutionary progress, one perhaps might approach

EASTERN OFFICE: • 817 Broadway • New York, New York 10003 • Telephone: 677-4740 • Area Code 212

intergroup relations in the United States with a model of"brushfires"--once one is put out, another may spring up.

In the present state of our knowledge, there is relatively little evidence to support either the evolutionary assimilationist or the brushfire models of intergroup attitudes and relations. The issue is so important for the success of American pluralism, however, that it does seem legitimate to begin a program of research which will provide evidence for choosing between the models or, as is usually the case in social research, evidence leaning toward the development of a third model that combines features of the first two.

There has actually been one relatively little known attempt to monitor changing inter-religious attitudes in American society. The Catholic Digest commissioned studies in 1952 by Ben Gaffin Associates and in 1965 by the Gallup organization to measure a wide variety of American religious attitudes and behaviors. These studies, pioneer efforts in replication research in American social science, have received relatively little attention --perhaps because no major analysis of them has ever been published. John Thomas' Religion and the American People comments on the marginal data from the first study and Andrew M. Greeley, in his section of What Do We Believe? (a book coauthored by Martin E. Marty and Stuart E. Rosenberg), has undertaken some analysis of the first and second study. However, the data cards from the earlier Gaffin project were lost long before 1965, so that systematic longitudinal analysis was not possible, and Greeley could only make use of the published cross tabs from the original project in his analysis.

One of the more disturbing findings of this analysis was that while anti-Jewish feelings among Catholics had declined between 1952 and 1965, anti-Catholic feelings among Jews had notably increased, as well as opposition toward Catholic parochial schools.

Table 4.1. Attitudes Toward Religious Schools
(Percent)

	1965			Change Since 1952		
Attitudes	Catholic	Protestant	Jewish	Catholic	Protestant	Jewish
Bad for country	2	14	37	0	-6	+9
Not as good academically	5	16	34	-1	-5	+15
Better academically	46	22	23	-2	+4	+2
In favor of bus, textbook aid	73	40	25	-6	-1	-17
In favor of tax support	55	32	17	-8	-2	-14
In favor of released time	71	44	35	-5	-5	-8

Table 4.2. Trends in Attitudes Toward Religious Schools by Age and Education

a. Age

Item	18–34			35–50			Over 50		
	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish
Bad for the country	11	2	40	14	2	37	15	1	34
In favor of tax support	37	47	8	30	54	14	29	68	35
N	(881)	(379)	(36)	(1,219)	(530)	(62)	(988)	(253)	(29)

b. Education

Item	Grammar School			High School			College		
	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish
Bad for the country	15	1	40	13	2	27	14	3	42
In favor of tax support	40	66	40	35	60	30	17	31	4
N	(719)	(203)	(15)	(1,671)	(703)	(44)	(705)	(246)	(69)

Table 5.2. Changes in Jewish and Catholic Attitudes Toward Each Other 1952–1965
(+% = favorable change; –% = unfavorable change)

Item	Catholics Toward Jews	Jews Toward Catholics
Prejudice against other	+7	–15
Prejudice from other	+6	–14
Interfere with our liberties	+1	–6
Unfair in business	+8	+2
Dishonest in public office	+5	–8
Don't respect our belief	–5	–10
Would vote for the other as President	+26	+27
Would not want intermarriage	+17	–17
Employers would discriminate	+6	–6
Stick together too much	+5	–3
Getting too much power	+21	+6
Clergymen not intelligent	0	–17
Clergymen don't promote understanding	+3	–17
Clergymen don't promote civic cooperation	+4	–13
Clergymen don't set good personal example	+1	–5
Try to influence press	+5	–7
Their magazines not fair	+2	–12
Have had unpleasant experience with other that caused dislike of other	+1	–4

Table 5.3. Anti-Catholic Feeling Among Jewish Groups

	Young	Middle	Old	Grammar School	High School	College
Catholics look down	44	29	13	33	41	48
Catholics interfere	25	17	10	6	13	25
Catholics don't respect faith of others	56	46	28	13	31	60
Catholics discriminate	51	36	44	33	25	44
Catholics stick together	61	33	58	46	45	47
Catholics after power	31	27	31	20	27	33
Clergy not intelligent	36	22	14	7	12	38
Clergy doesn't promote goodwill	36	29	28	20	15	43
N	(36)	(42)	(29)	(15)	(44)	(69)

Table 5.4. Jewish Attitudes Toward Catholics by Belief in God and Congregational Affiliation

	Believe in God Belong to Congregation	Believe in God Do not Belong	Do not Believe Do not Belong
Catholics look down on us	57	36	36
Catholics try to interfere	30	34	7
Catholics don't respect our beliefs	62	63	22
Catholics discriminate	50	29	29
Catholics stick together too much	57	37	43
Catholics are getting too much power	33	34	27
Clergy not intelligent	40	29	12
Clergy doesn't promote understanding	43	32	27
N	(40)	(38)	(41)

Even more disturbing for those who believe in evolutionary progress, it was younger Jews and often better educated Jews who were most likely to have demonstrated an increase in opposition to parochial schools (Table 4.1), most likely to be opposed to Catholic parochial schools (Table 4.2), and the most likely to have unfavorable attitudes toward Catholics (Table 5.3) Also the most religious Jews (Table 5.4) were the most likely to have unfavorable attitudes toward Catholics

Not much was made of these findings in part because in an era of ecumenical good feeling it did not seem appropriate, in part because the author of the analysis was reluctant to make a vigorous public case based on a sample of 125 Jews, and in part because both Jewish and Catholic agencies did not choose to take the findings seriously.

However, since this 1965 report there have been race riots, campus unrest, the Vietnam war, the Watergate scandals, and the decline of confidence in corporate institutions, as well as major changes in the structure of American Catholicism as a result of the Second Vatican Council and the birth control encyclical Humanae Vitae. It therefore seems appropriate to undertake a new analysis not only of Catholic-Jewish attitudes but of a whole spectrum of intergroup religious attitudes and behaviors in American society, using the new and sophisticated analytic techniques developed for longitudinal analysis since 1965.

We therefore propose a project with the following seven components:

1. A replication of the 1953-1965 questionnaire (with perhaps some questions eliminated on a national sample of the same size (an equal 3,000) as the two previous studies. Such a survey will provide not only measures of chnaging attitudes since 1965 but also, together with the additional data to be collected, a baseline for sophisticated analysis of changes which might occur in years to come.

probing of Jewish attitudes toward Cathos, should question whether American born or other

2. In addition to questions from the earlier surveys, we would add related questions on general political and social attitudes, as well as specific issues (Israel, abortion, birth control, etc.) which might related to intergroup attitudes. In its present form, the Gaffin-Gallup questionnaire provides relatively little material for explaining the "why" of intergroup attitude change. It does not seem unreasonable, for example, to think that in a time when general confidence in the corporate institutions is at a low ebb, suspicion of other groups would increase. We can determine in the proposed 1976 study whether there is a present relationship between feelings of frustration, dissatisfaction, economic unease, uncertainty about the future, and declining confidence in government on the one hand and hostility toward outgroups on the other. But we cannot link the change in intergroup attitudes to the change of other social attitudes since we do not have measures of these linkages as they existed in 1965. However, by establishing and specifying the linkages in 1975, we will make possible at a later time analysis of the impact of general social and political changes on interreligious changes.

3. The 1953-1965 studies paid no attention to ethnic and racial issues. There was not even a separate ethnic question on the questionnaire and no attempt was made to measure attitudes toward blacks or Latinos or the attitudes of black Protestants toward Catholics and Jews. It is our intention to develop questionnaire items dealing with ethnicity and race and add them to the basic questionnaire.

4. The measurement of attitudes and values has improved considerably since 1953 when the Gallup-Gaffin questionnaire was first designed. Our intention is to develop tests and use in the present project new and more sophisticated measures of interracial and interrelitious attitudes and to link these new measures with the old ones and thereby establish a baseline for the future use of the newer and more sophisticated measures that can be projected back into the past to establish long-term trends.

major 2 metropolitan areas — not a why smaller — Atlanta, e.g.

5. In addition to the national sample of 3,000 respondents, we propose to oversample 1,000 respondents in Chicago and New York City to measure the possibility that the different political and structural relationships and the different cultural environments that exist among various religious communities in different cities of the country may have notable impact on intergroup attitudes. There is certainly ample impressionistic reason to think that Jewish-Gentile relationships are more cordial in Chicago than in New York. The hypothesis of regional variation in intergroup attitudes is too important for both theory and policy to be ignored. Oversampling in these two cities will also guarantee a much larger sampling of Jews. (NORC's sampling department will endeavor to design a system of weighted stratification to ensure adequate samples of Jews in both Chicago and in New York.)

6. In all those families where there are adolescent children (about 35 per cent, according to NORC past surveys), "do-it-yourself" questionnaires will be given to these adolescents in order to measure both the attitudes of young people toward other religious and racial groups (existing research seems to show that young people are more likely to have hostile attitudes toward other groups than their elders) and also to analyze the factors facilitating and impeding the transmission of intergroup attitudes from parents to children.

7. Finally, having designed and executed the survey and produced the monographic report from it, NORC would begin to lay plans for a small-scale replication of the project in 1980 and a major replication in 1985.

If funding became available soon enough, NORC would hope to go into the field with a questionnaire before the end of 1976 so that a ten-year interval with the previous study might be maintained as closely as possible. After the collection of the data and the preparation of analytic computer tapes, a year and a half would be devoted to the preparation and publication of detailed monographs by the various members of the survey staff. (who would represent in some fashion, incidentally, the three major denominational traditions). A preliminary report could be made, however, within a year of the launching of the project.

AMG:ja
cc: Ken Prewitt, Norman Nie, David Greenstone, Bill McCready

Rabbi Lewis Eron

Universal Press Syndicate
Andrew M Greeley - Secular column

As we inch our way cautiously into the third century, it is time for us Americans to engage in a little healthy heresy. An on the top of my list for helpful healthy heresies is the following outrageous proposition:

Some problems are no soluble.

I realize that such a dictum runs against the grain of our Lockeian optimism. Every problem must have a solution. If there is something wrong in the world the reason that it has not been made right must be either lack of effort or malice on the part of them (they vary from time to time; the best capegoats currently are the "multinationals").

If there is enough hard work, enough good will, enough sincerity, enough willingness to sacrifice, then the solution will be found and the problem will go away. Note well the reasoning: there is a solution out there somewhere; what we have to do is find it.

The most obvious example of a problem without a solution is Northern Ireland. Protestants and Catholics have killed one another in that battered corner of the British Isles for 400 years and are likely to continue doing it for 400 more. People ask me, "What's the answer?" and are shocked when I say, "There isn't any." There has to be an answer, you see.

Well, maybe there is one solution--a United Nations peace keeping force made up of Nigerians, Sudanese and Ghanans. Racial hatred would eliminate religious hatred almost over night.

But in the real world there are no answers.

I am beginning to suspect that the same thing must be said about the Middle East. The current liberal left conventional wisdom is that the Israeli should be willing to trade land for peace--give up the Sinai, the West Bank and the rest of the Golan Heights, in return for a guarantee of peace from Egypt, Syria, and Saudi Arabia in the years to come.

I will confess that I found this conventional wisdom attractive. There seemed to be reasonable evidence that the Egyptians and perhaps even the Syrians finally want peace and that many of the Palestinians would settle for a West Bank homeland. It looked like now was a good time for Israel to take the gamble of trusting Sadat and Assad, especially since Israel's ultimate security is not in borders but in American support.

But the Lebanese disaster and the recent airline terrorism make me wonder. It is not so much a question of whether you can risk trusting Sadat and Assad--I think you probably could--but whether they can deliver their own constituencies. Lebanon suggests that they cannot. Arab factionalism and Islamic intolerance have destroyed that once prosperous and peaceful country in as insane a civil war as humankind has ever known. The forces which tore Lebanon apart would tear apart any agreement between Israel and the Arabs and the religious hatreds which surfaced in Beirut would hardly stay underground in Palestine.

The Palestinians are a tragic people; they surely have the right to some kind of homeland. Presumably, their extremists are no more typical

of the ordinary Palestinian than anyone else's extremists are. But Palestinian extremism was still the match which lit the fire in Lebanon. Unless the Arabs can restrain their own lunatic fringe or unless the Russians decide to stop playing the spoilers game in the Middle East (not very likely), then the problem will continue to be insoluble. It is a melancholy conclusion--doubtless even more disturbing to American Jews than to anyone else.

One minor consolation: the conflict is still relatively new, thirty to fifty years, depending on when you start to count. We Irish have been killing each other over religion for more than ten times that many years.

national opinion research center

NORC

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
6030 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637
753-1300 Area Code 312
KENNETH PREWITT, *Director*

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF
AMERICAN PLURALISM

April 23, 1976

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
American Jewish Committee
Institute of Human Relations
165 E. 56th Street
New York, New York 10022

Dear Marc:

Here is the paper you requested. It's obviously dynamite. (I've given up caring about a lot of things lately.) So I think I should write my own press release, which I will send in a few days.

Cordially yours,

Andrew M. Greeley

AMG:hr

EASTERN OFFICE: • 817 Broadway • New York, New York 10003 • Telephone: 677-4740 • Area Code 212

WHAT HAVE YOU DONE FOR US LATELY?

by

Andrew M. Greeley

Comments to a meeting of the American Jewish Committee

Washington D.C.

May 12, 1976

WHAT HAVE YOU DONE FOR US LATELY?

Andrew M. Greeley

Let me begin by saying that while I am wearing a Roman collar and sporting my defiant shamrock, I am in no sense speaking as a representative of the hierarchy or of the Catholic Church. On the contrary, I have the distinct impression that a substantial proportion of Catholic church leader- would be delighted if I went away and never came back. Unlike my friend Mr. Michael Novak, I make no claim to speak for millions of either Catholic ethnics or Irish. Thus I represent this evening no more than a constituency of one.

But that never kept and Irishman quiet before.

I propose tonight to make six general observations about Catholic-Jewish relationships in the United States and then refer to five specific "flashpoints."

My first general observation is that it seems to me that on the basis of both the data and my impressions, the general relationship between American Catholicism and American Judaism is excellent--perhaps better than the relationship between the two historic offshoots of the Sinai religious tradition are anywhere in the world. With the exception of New York City, the excellence of this relationship ought to be the context of our reflections. No other comments I make in the course of the evening should be interpreted out of that context. I said, "except New York City" advisedly, because there is, I think, something

potentially very unpleasant in Catholic-Jewish relationships in the New York metropolitan area. I am not a New Yorker, I have never done research on the subject, and I do not trust my impressions sufficiently even to detail them tonight; but it may well be that you have a critical problem in that area.

I would also add that as far as I can see, there is no decline in the overwhelming Catholic support for the American alliance with Israel. My impression is that that support is not based on the moral excellence or justice of Israel's cause (and it would be a mistake for you gentlemen to appeal to that motivation) but is based on the fact that Americans admire the spunk and modernity of Israel and support it strongly because such support is something their Jewish fellow Americans still want very much. Would such support survive another oil embargo? No nation would be wise to try to blackmail the United States of America for very long; they would find it to be extremely counterproductive.

Secondly, I would observe that some of the most exciting scholarly work being done anywhere can be found in the historical, archaelogical and theological rediscovery of the Second Temple era. It seems to me that in this rediscovery, scholars are uncovering linkages and connections between the two descendants of Second Temple Judaism that no one would have dreamed possible just a short time ago. Without going into the details, one can now say, I think with some confidence, that Christianity and Judaism, as they exist today, are quite clearly two offspring of the same fundamental religious traditions and of the same critical religious era we call the Second Temple. Such an insight does not mean that the two offsprings are about to merge, but it does mean that they have far more in common than was previously thought. Indeed, one could go

so far as to say that there are some aspects of the Second Temple era and experience that are perhaps better preserved by its contemporary Christian offspring than they are by the contemporary Jewish one. Such a subject is beyond my scope tonight; I simply want to note and take encouragement from the remarkable scholarship being done by researchers of both heritages in this decisively important period of human history.

Third, I wish to comment that it seems to me when we speak of "Catholic -Jewish relationships" we engage often in the fallacy of misplaced concreteness. For there is no such thing as one Catholic or one Jewish community. Among the six million American Jews and the fifty million American Catholics, there is a wide plurality and diversity of viewpoints, interests, commitments, values, and goals. Some Jews and some Catholics may be locked in angry combat, but it would be a mistake to see that as typical of Jewish-Catholic relationships or to generalize from it to the existence of very serious problems between the two communities. I do not suggest that such combats may not be serious--some of them are; but I am suggesting that they are not necessarily legitimate bases for more generalized diagnosis. Thus there is doubtless an acute conflict between the Catholic Right to Life movement and abortion groups which have many Jews in their membership. The Right to Life movement is not representative of American Catholicism despite its claims to be, and I presume its adversaries who happen to be Jewish are not representative necessarily of Judaism either. The abortion conflict is indeed going on between some Catholics and some Jews, but it is not a conflict between the two communities and I think should not be defined as such.

Fourth, among the small groups within American Catholicism that are sometimes in conflict with American Jews may be listed the American Catholic hierarchy. Recently, at the instigation of Cardinal Krol, it made an unfortunate reference to Catholic-Jewish relationships. There was a time, not so long ago, when the hierarchy could be taken seriously by non-Catholics because it was taken seriously by Catholics. I would submit that that is no longer the case. The decline of intelligence and competence in the Catholic hierarchy since the Vatican Council (a decline that one hears was part of the Roman design) and, above all, the two-faced reaction of the hierarchy to the encyclical letter Humanae Vitae badly injured its credibility with American Catholics. Cardinal Krol does not have one-tenth, maybe not one-fiftieth, of the impact on the rest of the church that Cardinal Spellman did twenty years ago. (And the good Cardinal Spellman probably had much less impact than you gentlemen thought he did.) Cardinal Krol speaks to and for a very small group of American Catholics. I can understand why he upset you; often he upsets us too; but please don't take him seriously--we don't.

There is emerging in America a "communal Catholic," that is, a Catholic who is loyal to his tradition and heritage--even proud of it; but who does not take the clergy or hierarchy seriously as intellectual, political, moral or social leaders. You will not be able to understand American Catholicism unless you realize how powerful this tendency is.

Fifth, while generally there are good feelings between the two communities, I am compelled to report that a number of different data sets that are available to me indicate that pro-Catholic feelings among Jews have declined in the last decade while pro-Jewish feelings among Catholics have either held steady or increased. Hence, at the present time, there seems to be stronger pro-Jewish feelings among Catholics than vice versa. Our data

sets do not enable us to explain this change or even to hazard a guess as to what implications it might have for the future. My own personal hunch is that it may be part of the more general phenomenon of scapegoating Catholics that I think has been going on in American society for some time now. It is not a specifically Jewish phenomenon . I would urge, as I have urged before, joint research by representatives of both communities on this subject. (I also think there ought to be joint research on the rather acute problem which I perceive to exist in New York.) I do not expect this joint research will occur, but I would be lax in my responsibilities if I did not at least urge it.

Finally, I am impressed by the importance of the stylistic differences among American religioethnic collectivities. I think all of us for too long bought the melting pot-assimilationist view of things and just assumed that cultural diversity would go away. In fact, many of the differences persist--some major, some minor--among the ethnic groups in American society; and some of these even minor differences turn out to be aggravating and important without our even being aware of the fact that they are at work. If we have abandoned the assimilationist perspective--and I take it we have--then we must be much more sensitive to the stylistic cultural differences. We must strive to understand them, enjoy them, and to prevent them from prohibiting out conversations and our common work. Let me be more explicit.

Three of the differences that I can talk about I think have been pretty well documented by our research. Jews and Irish Catbolics (to take two groups at randam) are very differnt from one another in their approach to expressing affection for children, drinking, and their political participation. The differences are not universal; there are many Irish who don't

drink and I suppose there are some Jewish alcoholics, though I have never met any. But an Irishman who believes that a relaxing evening is not possible without the drink taking and a Jew who is disgusted by anyone who takes more than one drink are going to have a very powerful hidden agenda in their interaction unless they are quite self-conscious about the origins and the nature of these differences. It is not necessary, incidentally, to say that the other style is as good as mine; it is enough to understand why it is different. (Let me add that in this particular area, I am much more likely to be on the Jewish side than the Irish.) Similarly, while Jewish affection for (and anger toward) children are explicit, direct, and forceful, the Irish expression of effection is much more likely to be indirect, circumlocutory, and passive. It does not mean that the Irish love one another or their children any less than Jews, but we have very different ways of showing it. The Irishman with a Jewish neighbor is likely to be deeply offended by what he takes to be the emotional self-indulgence of the Jewish parent, while his neighbor is likely to be appalled at the Irish coldness with their children. Again, one must make major efforts to avoid value judgments on these subjects and take them into account in our common work and conversations.

Finally, the data show that the typical Polish and Italian approach to solving a civic problem is to call one's precinct captain or one's brother-in-law (who may, incidentally, be one and the same person), while the Jewish and Protestant tendency is to summon a community meeting and form a civic organization. The Irish, hyperactive political types that they are, are likely to engage in both behaviors. The tendency for Jewish and Protestant types to dismiss the personal contact approach to politics as old fashioned and possibly corrupt is, I think, very strong. So, I suspect,

would be the Polish and Italian propensity to think the "civic" approach is stuffy, self-righteous, and moralistic. The Irish propensity to think that putting all of your eggs in one participative basket is dumb may well be the strongest tendency of all. Unless we are aware of these stylistically different approaches to political participation, we may misunderstnad thoroughly what the other is about.

There are other differences which I cannot document with data but about which I have very strong impressions. First of all, the matter of communication: the Catholic ethnic in general, the Irish Catholic in particular, is prone to indirect, cicumlocutory, informal, and soft-spoken communicative style. The Irishman, for reasons having to do, perhaps, with the Penal Times is reluctant to give a direct answer and much prefers to answer a question with another question or to respond not verbally but with a shrug of the shoulder, a wink of the eye, or absolute silence. The Irishman is likely to make a request very casually and indirectly. The English phrase, "would you ever...?" (as, "Would you ever come to Washington to give a talk?") is the translation of a Celtic phrase (which escapes me). It represents, I think, the strong cultural tendency of the Gaelic linguistic tradition to avoid sharp or abrupt communicative styles. There are no swear words in Gaelic, for example, and when a modern Irish-speaking person wishes to swear he falls back on English words. Indeed, the language does not even have a word for "hello" or "goodbye." One enters the house and says "Peace be to this house"; when one leaves, one says, "Jesus and Mary be with this house." One meets someone on the street and says, "Jesus and Mary be with you"; the response is, "Jesus and Mary and Patrick be with you."

(Presumably in the pagan days, there were appropriate deities used in their place.) The Jewish communicative style, as I understand it and as I have experienced it, is rather more direct, to put the matter mildly. My sister the theologian works at De Paul University with two Jewish colleagues (which is a whole other story altogether). She remarked to me once that she felt she had a very difficult time making her Jewish colleagues understand the problems she was experiencing in the environment. I told her, "What you've got to understand is that there are two Jewish ways of talking--loud and louder. Shout at them and they'll hear you." With some effort she learned to shout and now things are much better. Similarly, not so long ago I was having a minor altercation with one of my colleagues at NORC. Not having had much sleep the night before, I did a very rare thing and started to shout at him. He beamed; his eyes lit up, his mouth expanded in a great warm smile. "You're shouting at me," he said with delight. "You're damn right I'm shouting at you!" I shouted. "How marvelous!" he rejoiced. "You know, in all the years you've known me, this is the first time you've shouted at me."

The idea that shouting at a person could be a compliment until then had escaped me completely. I quickly pointed out to him the important social psychological fact that it takes a lot for an Irishman to work up enough anger to really start shouting, but then when he does, he's likely to remember it for twenty years.

This is anecdotal, of course, though I gather that a lot of people can match the same anecdote. It is a differnce about which we must know and understand much more, it seems to me, if we are to get along well with one another.

I also have the impression that Jewish political and social action is powerfully influenced by guilt rhetoric. I sometimes have been appalled at the highly exaggerated appeal to guilt and personal responsibility for various world problems. In fact, it has always seemed to me that the issues, while serious and demanding great personal concern, hardly involved any personal guilt. I didn't cause it not to rain in the Sahel, for example. The guilt rhetoric seems taken to be for granted and is very effective in dealing with people within the Jewish community. It is, I would hastily point out, however, usually very counterproductive with the Catholic community and particularly within the Irish Catholic community. You can appeal to fairness, justice, decency, generosity with a Catholic audience; but don't try to make us feel guilty for things we did not personally do because it turns us off very quickly. The Irish, for example, may be very likely to feel guilty at having let mother down, indeed, that is a burden of guilt we carry through our lives (I have the impression from some Jewish novels that that may be one of your problems too), but that is about the only kind of guilt we do feel. Our social guilt is minimal. Mind you, you can get us to be socially generous, but I am suggesting it's a mistake to use guilt to motivate us. It won't work.

I would urge that these and similar stylistic differences are of very considerable importance, that we do not know nearly enough about them, and that they ought to be the subject of joint research. I don't think this research will occur--at the risk of repeating a now familiar theme--but I think it ought to occur.

Let me add hastily that these stylistic differences are matters of degree. There are indirect, soft-spoken Jews and loud-mouthed, direct Irishman, God only knows. But I would at least offer to you as a plausible hypothesis for further exploration that differences in communicative style may be rather more important than we had previously thought.

I now turn to five specific flashpoints. They are not areas where I expect major crises, but they are areas of potential or actual misunderstanding that can occur between individuals and groups within the communities about which we ought to know more and to which I think we should pay more attention. It occurs to me that some of you may well be offended by the points I am about to make. For that I am sorry, because I have no desire to give offense. On the other hand, Rabbi Tanenbaum asked me to come to speak the truth, and honesty compels me to say that from the Catholic viewpoint, at least from the viewpoint of this Catholic constituency of one, these are problems--not great big hairy ones, but nonetheless problems of some importance to which attention ought to be paid.

First of all, the white ethnic, blue-collar, racist, hard-hat, chauvinist hawk image has become a favorite whipping boy for the national media, elite and popular. One needs someone to hate, someone to blame for what's going wrong in society, and the middle American and the hard-hat ethnic have become the favorite targets since it is no longer legitimate to blame blacks or Jews. This Catholic ethnic inkblot was not created by Jews, indeed the AJC's ethnic America project has vigorously resisted it. Nonetheless, many of those of both the university and the media world who propagate it are Jewish, and one has the impression that some of them rather enjoy flailing

away at the white ethnic bigot. Some Catholics are sophisticated enough not to equate a given Jew who is propounding the ethnic stereotype with Judaism; others are not, particularly when the stereotype looks like an attack on Catholicism as such. There may be a substantial amount of educational work to be done within the Jewish community to make it clear that the stereotype is not only demonstrably false but also counterproductive.

Secondly, there is still substantial discrimination against Catholics, particularly practicing Catholics, at the upper levels of America's elite culture. The national media, certain governmental agencies, many if not most of the great national foundations, and in the finest elite universities, discrimination against Catholics is rife. It is justified by the viciously bigoted argument of Catholic intellectual inferiority, an argument which simply does not admit of refutation even if you have overwhelming data to disprove it. Again, Jews did not create this discrimination, and in the case of the foundation world, are probably almost as much victims of it themselves as are Catholics. Nonetheless, it must be said in all candor that some Jews aid and abet it and continue to propound the myth of Catholic intellectual inferiority. One is hard put to see very many Jews, who have been so vigorous in their criticism of racism and sexism, raising much in the way of objection to anti-Catholic nativism. As more and more younger Catholics begin to move into this world of the intellectual and cultural elites and discover, as Michael Novak did, how strong the nativistic biases are, they will be offended when they see some Jews propounding nativist bigotry and practicing nativist discrimination. Some of the more sophisticated may well be able to distinguish between what individual Jews do and Jewish traist and propensities, others may not.

I could easily make a case that my problems at the University of Chicago were almost entirely the result of machinations of anti-Catholic Jews. The case would be true, although I would also have to add very quickly the fact that almost all of my friends and supporters at the University of Chicago were also Jews who were astonishingly pro-Catholic. I do not think every Catholic who to his way into the world of the upper academy will be able to say that.

Third, one of the new generation of Catholic ethnic who is now showing up at the best graduate schools of the country is no longer disposed to take a stand of apology and shame over the past and his own heritage. He doesn't really feel inferior; he doesn't feel that being Polish, Italian, or Irish is second rate, mediocre, or anything of which to be ashamed. When he learns from a bright, arrogant, young faculty member that the conventional wisdom of the liberal upper academy views him and his people with scarcely veiled if unintentional contempt, he is not likely accept it. There was a generation of Catholic would-be intelligentsia who for one reason or another thought that the only way to make it in the academy was to deny their past, their heritages, their religion. They found, as Michael Novak did, that even then they couldn't make it. But the present generation will not go the self-abasement route; on the contrary, they will fight back. And when that smart, arrogant, articulate , self-confident junior faculty member turns out to be Jewish, he runs the risk of stirring up needless anti-Jewish sentiment. Again, one can easily argue, and I would completely agree, that it is not only Jews who propound the stereotype of Catholic cultural inferiority, and by no means do all Jews do so--indeed a majority of Jewish academics do not. I am simply

saying that when a Jewish scholar does this to a Catholic student, one has a flashpoint situation.

Fourth, there is a propensity for many non-Catholic scholars to ignore the impressive economic and educational achievements of American Catholics. In fact, our recent research on their achievement, I think, has generally been pooh-poohed if not dismissed by many non-Catholic social scientists. The Poles and Italians, obviously an inferior people, simply couldn't be as successful as the NORC data claim they are. May I say that those are fighting words? More particularly, I think there is a strong tendency among many Jews to ignore, deny, or minimize the immense importance that the Catholic parochial schools have made to the success and self-confidence of the ethnic immigrants. They overlook completely the fantastic popularity of the inner-city Catholic schools to members of the black community. Black enrollment in Catholic school, most of it non-Catholic, goes up each year by as much as 70,000 or 80,000 students. It is the only educational alternative, the only option for freedom of choice available to most inner-city blacks. Candidly, such a service deserves not to be ignored. Presumably we do not expect and will not get gratitude from the Jewish community forthis important social service, but it is time at least to end the pretense that the service is not occurring. I disagree with the content, the tone, and the timing of Cardinal Krol's complaint about Jewish opposition to Catholic schools; and yet I think I understand the feeling. I think that much opposition to Catholic schools is in fact anti-Catholic, and I note that the certified, liberal, card-carrying Jewish intellectual Adam Walinsky thinks the same thing. I am not prepared to say how much of the interminable hectoring about separation of church and state is crypto-bigotry, but some of it surely is; and the nasty, vicious tone

of the opposition leaves little doubt that there is more at stake than constitutional principles.

It is, by the way, worth observing that the correlation between Catholic school attendance and the absence of antisemitism is even stronger than it was when we did our first study ten years ago. There seems to be no more effective way of diminishing antisemitic feelins than to support Catholic schools. But then that was clear ten years ago too.

In fact, the real enemies of Catholic schools are not their opponents within the Jewish community but the Catholic hierarchy which has lost its nerve. There is, as our recent research shows, more than enough money and willingness to spend it in the Catholic communities to sustain and indeed expand the parochial school system. Cardinal Krol is shifting the blame away from those who ought to bear it when he attempts to blame Jews for the decline of Catholic schools. Quite apart from the question of state aid, one must simply say that one has the impression that a very substantial number of American Jews hate and despise Catholic parochial schools--and systematically ignore evidence about their positive benefits. I will not attempt to explain the reasons for this hatred (I suspect in part it is simply a hatred of Catholicism as such), but tonight I simply wish to make the point that given the strong and, indeed our evidence shows, undiminished Catholic enthusiasm for such schools, confrontation between the strong Catholic support of what we think of as "our" schools and the strong animosity that many (though I dare say not most and certainly not all) Jews feel toward the schools is surely a potential flashpoint in our relationships.

Finally, I wish to say something about the very delicate issue of reciprocity or, more concretely, about the issue of "what have you done for us lately?" An increasing number of American Catholics are beginning to say, "We have gone down the line more than once with you on support for Israel and

for freedom of Soviet Jewry. When are you going to do something for us in return? We have been told in response, indeed we have been told by Rabbi Tanenbaum that issues of Israel and Soviet Jewry are issues of such surpassing moral excellence that they are simply not subject to barter, negotiations, and deals. I must candidly say that I think such a response does not indicate sensitivity to what is being said. No one is suggesting that we do a straight-player trade, Israel for parochial schools. What I am suggesting is that when a relationship begins to be perceived as a one-way street by some of the people in it, there are potential trouble spots.

To put the matter even more bluntly. Why is it that all Jewish issues, and only Jewish issues, are of surpassing moral excellence? Why is it that all of our issues are relatively less important and seem to make no major claim at all on moral concern? Justice for the people of Israel is supremely important but justice for the Catholics in the nasty little colonial regime in the north of Ireland is not. Freedom for Soviet Jewry is of capital concern, but freedom for the Catholic captive nations is not. One is told that Ulster is a very complicated problem and that political realism demands that one give up any hope for liberation of the captive nations. Complexities and realism affect our issues but not yours. I begin to wonder why. I was told once, after addressing (for free) an audience of Jewish women, that the world had a moral obligation to support Isael to expiate for the holocaust. No such moral obligation existed for the Catholic cause in Ulster. I asked her if she had ever heard of the potatoe famine, and she said no, she had not.

Let me speak more personally. I have for many years played the role of one of the house priests of the AJC. I have spent many weekends flying (coach) to participate in AJC meetings. The beds were uncomfortable, the accomodations poor, the food terrible, the discussions interminable and often involving

loud family quarrels in which I had no interest and to which I could make no contribution. The meetings were often, though not always, dreary, dreadful and depressing, salvaged only by the civilized Jewish custom of serving sweet rolls in the middle of the morning. I often thought my presence was ritual and that no one really gave a damn about what I said so long as their was a token priest in evidence. O.K, so I did this, partly as a favor to friends, partly out of some generalized intention of improving the quality of human relationships in American society. One does such things not because one expects any sort of strict trade-off but at least (if one is Irish, at any rate) with the expectation that if one needs help, one's new-found friends will be there. But when I found myself the victim of anti-Catholic bigotry at the University of Chicago, my AJC friends were simply not around. The lights went out in the barroom, in other words, and there I was all by myself. There is here, I think, perhaps a very important difference in ethnic style. The Irish may well expect more in return for favors than do other groups. If this is an important difference in style, then we must know more about it. I can only say that think that loyalty to one's friends and allies, while it may be exaggerated among the Irish, is a critical part of American political life. At least some of the Jews with whom I have worked do not understand fully how critical it is. Furthermore, I must say that one segment of the AJC exploited me, abused my trust, privately insulted me, publicly ridiculed me, and then, by way of what I gathered was an attempt at reconciliation, suggested that I was merely upset because I had been outfoxed in the grantsmanship contest. Anybody thinks they can do that to an Irishman and expect him to forget it the next week, the next year, or ever, simply doesn't know much about Irish history or the Irish personality.

Now I found myself wondering during the course of this totally one-way relationship with the AJC what was going on. Part of it, doubtless, was my Irish propensity to expect more loyalty from friends than one could reasonably expect; but it also seems to me now that what was at work was an assumption on the part of the AJC that I expiating, doing penance for the crusades, the pogroms, the holocaust. I suspect that this interpreation may have been reinforced by some Catholics whose profession it is to engage in dialogue with Jews. My work for the AJC through the years was simply a way of piling up expiation points in order to begin to approach Jews in moral excellence. Well, the thought that I have expiated a little more tonight will doubtless give me great consolation when I arrive at the hotel in Miami at 2:00 a.m. for a talk I'm going to give at the American Psychiatric meetings five hours later. Doubtless my quest for moral excellence will be modestly enhanced by the sacrifice of most of a night's sleep in the cause of an AJC meeting.

However, let me be very blunt, ladies and gentlemen. You are not going to get very much farther in dialogue with Catholics if you assume that what we are about is expiation or striving to reach your moral excellence. I am here tonight not to expiate but because a friend asked me for a favor, and I know that when push comes to shove, I can ask him--if not his organization--for one, and because I believe that loyalty to one's friends and not lectures about obligation, guilt, and superior moral excellence is what keeps a society going. I said at the beginning that I am speaking tonight only for myself, and yet, I suspect that in this matter at least I reflect the general Catholic position: human relationships are based on loyalty and not on the expiation of guilt and the recognition of superior moral excellence and the cauees of others.

The reciprocity issue is doubtless a complex one, and it is not yet a serious flashpoint if only because there are not very many of us who have worked long enough in Jewish agencies to have become disillusioned by the fact that loyalty and friendship seems to mean one thing to us and another to you. Granted that this is an understandable difference in style. I would merely submit that it may be a critically important one in years to come.

On the most general level of reciprocity, I should like to politely wonder when American Jews will, to modify slightly the question of Norman Podhoretz, face their "Catholic problem." There is strong and powerful anti-Catholic feeling in the Jewish community. The empirical evidence shows it, the impressions of many Catholics indicate it, and not a small number of Jews will acknowledge it--though usually off the record. Yet this problem has never been faced publicly and dealt with. Not all, not a majority, not even a large minority of Jews are anti-Catholic; yet some are--unless you wish to argue that Jews alone of humankind are free from bigotry. I think that Catholics have acknowledged the existence of anti-Jewish feeling in the last years since the Council, and have worked against them--though perhaps not effectively enough. As far as I can see, there has been no reciprocity at all from the Jewish side. I wonder if there ever will be.

Catholics have studied their own antisemitism. Jews, as far as I know, have not studied their own anti-Catholicism. I have been monitoring anti-Jewish attitudes among Catholics for ten years (they keep going down). I am unaware of any Jewish scholar who has been monitoring anti-Catholic attitudes among Jews.

If the answer is that we must expiate for the past and you have no need to consider the hatred of the present, then whatever one may say of reciprocity, when one refuses to stand by one's friends, it is almost an inevitable law of human nature that after a while they will not be your friends any more.

I said at the beginning that generally the quality of Jewish-Catholic relationships are excellent. I realize that the apocalyptic style of the AJC thrives on crisis. I do not think there is a crisis in Catholic-Jewish relationships; I think rather that there are certain problems and that they ought to be honestly described and carefully studied before they become serious. What discourages me slightly as I now depart for Washington National and Miami Beach is that I do not detect the slightest sign of willingness to study them.

February 20, 1974

Father Andrew Greeley
Director
Center For Studies of American Pluralism
University of Chicago
6030 South Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dear Andy:

This is a long overdue note to thank you personally for the magnificent statement that you issued during the Yom Kippur War. Real peace and reconciliation will only come to the Middle East when there is a clear understanding of the real issues and your words helped put everything into perspective.

I am pleased to enclose a copy of my article that appeared in the January 1974 issue of Worldview. I hope you find it of interest.

Once again, thank you for your real contribution towards peace in the Middle East. With warmest good wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

Rabbi A. James Rudin
Assistant Director
Interreligious Affairs

AJR:FM
Encl.

February 6, 1974

Rev. Andrew M. Greeley
Director, Center for the
Study of American Pluralism
NORC
University of Chicago
6030 South Ellis Ave.
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dear Andy:

In recent conversations with distinguished Catholic Bishops and theologians on the subject of the Holy Year 1975, I was asked a number of stimulating questions about the meaning and practice of Jubilee Year in Biblical and Rabbinic Judaism.

That prompted me to undertake a more systematic inquiry into the concept and practice of Jubilee Year in Jewish tradition. The results of that study I have written in a paper, "Holy Year 1975 and Its Origins in the Jewish Jubilee Year."

I am pleased to enclose a copy of that paper. I would be most grateful for any criticisms or suggestions that you would have that would help me strengthen the document.

If you would find the study useful for sharing with others involved in Holy Year observances, by all means feel free to distribute it.

With warmest personal good wishes and my continued prayers for God's blessings over you, Iaam.

Faithfully yours,

MHT:ps
Enc.

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
National Director
Interreligious Affairs

memorandum

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

date January 30, 1974

to Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum

from John Slawson

subject Rev. Andrew M. Greeley

Thank you for the copy of your splendid letter to Andrew Greeley. And I am most appreciative to you for "remembering", although you do know how very much you and Zach Schuster actually did on the battlefront in Rome.

My best to you.

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Institute of Human Relations • 165 East 56 Street, New York, N.Y. 10022 • PLaza 1-4000 • Cable Wishcom, N.Y.

January 22, 1974

Rev. Andrew M. Greeley
National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago
6030 South Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dear Andy:

I had the best of intentions months ago - when you first sent me a draft of your article on Jesus - to write and tell you what a masterful, even brilliant, article you wrote. But the Yom Kippur war and its aftermath, the energy crisis, and the Compendia project (see enclosed release) among other things have simply overwhelmed me, and another good intention died stillborn.

You have mastered the literature and have crystallized the best understandings of our common heritage so magnificently that I frankly don't know of anyone who has done it better. We are really very much in your debt.

Minor reservation: AJC didn't think we were "lobbying" at Vatican Council II. We thought of it as "education." In the book I will someday write about my experience at the Council, I plan to call it in part, "The greatest sermon on Jewish-Christian Relations in 2,000 Years."

Maybe the calm reaction to your Times article is an indication that an emergent consensus does exist between Jews and Christians on many shared religious themes. At least, I would like to think so; it means my 20 years of work in this vineyard - together with that of many friends like yourself - have not been in vain.

Incidentally, you need to know that John Slawson was the guiding genius in our work relating to the Vatican.

I hope we can get together one day soon!

Again, with appreciation and best regards.

Cordially,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
National Director
Interreligious Affairs

MHT:MSB

January 22, 1974

Rev. Andrew M. Greeley
National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago
6030 South Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dear Andy:

I had the best of intentions months ago - when you first sent me a draft of your article on Jesus - to write and tell you what a masterful, even brilliant, article you wrote. But the Yom Kippur war and its aftermath, the energy crisis, and the Compendia project (see enclosed release) among other things have simply overwhelmed me, and another good intention died stillborn.

You have mastered the literature and have crystallized the best understandings of our common heritage so magnificently that I frankly don't knowoof anyone who has done it better. We are really very much in your debt.

Minor reservation: AJC didn't think we were "lobbying" at Vatican Council II. We thought of it as "education." In the book I will someday write about my experience at the Coumcil, I plan to call it in part, "The greatest sermon on Jewish-Christian Relations in 2,000 Years."

Maybe the calm reaction to your Times article is an indication that an emergent consensus does exist between Jews and Christians on many shared religious themes. At least, I would like to think so; it means my 20 years of work in this vineyard - together with that of many friends like yourself - have not been in vain.

Incidentally, you need to know that John Slawson was the guiding genius in our work relating to the Vatican.

I hope we can get together one day soon!

Again, with appreciation and best regards.

Cordially,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
National Director
Interreligious Affairs

MHT:MSB

cc: John Slawson

NORC

national opinion research center

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
6030 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637
684-5600 Area Code 312
JAMES A. DAVIS, Director
PAUL B. SHEATSLEY, Survey Research Service Director

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF
AMERICAN PLURALISM

January 16, 1974

Mr. Mark Tannenbaum
The American Jewish Committee
165 East 56 Street
New York, New York 10022

Dear Mark:

How about that!

Cordially,

Andrew M. Greeley

AMG.vr
enclosure

January 16, 1974

Mr. John Slawson
Suite 2C
220 East 57 Street
New York, New York 10022

Dear Mr. Slawson:

Thank you very much for your kind letter of January 3. I'm a little disappointed in the reaction to the article. Irish trouble-maker that I am, I thought it would offend both Jew and Gentile; on the contrary, both sides seem to respond positively. Maybe the distance that separates us is not nearly so great as we have thought in the past.

It was very good of you to write. I hope we get a chance to meet again soon.

Cordially,

AMG.vr

Andrew M. Greeley

bcc: Mr. Mark Tannenbaum
Mr. Irving Levine

JOHN SLAWSON ■ Suite 2C, 220 East 57 Street, New York, N. Y. 10022, PLaza 1-4000

January 3, 1974

Dear Dr. Greeley:

We are all indebted to you for your perceptive and scholarly article "A Christmas Biography", which appeared in the New York Times Magazine Section (12/23/73).

It is a gem and has the potential of producing a constructive impact on the thinking people of America.

I personally convey to you my gratitude not alone for this important article, but for the enlightment that your research and creative contributions have given all of us during these many years.

All good wishes for the New Year and for continued and uninterrupted productivity.

Sincerely yours,

John Slawson

Dr. Andrew M. Greeley
National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

January 26, 1973

Rev. Andrew M. Greeley, Dir.
Center for the STudy of American Pluralism
National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago
6030 S. Ellis Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dear Andrew:

I hope the enclosed copy of VITAL SPEECHES will be of interest to you. I reread the paper and I was again struck by its fascinating and provocative nature. I certainly hope that the VITAL SPEECHES issue will receive wide circulation.

I hope all is well with you and your work and I know you will be assured of my best wishes for the coming year.

Cordially,

Gerald Strober

GS:as
Enc.

January 23, 1973

Rev. Andrew Greeley
Program Director
N.O.R.C.
630 South Ellis
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Dear Andy:

I don't know whether you have seen the enclosed article that appeared in the December 27, 1972 issue of the Christian Century. It relates to the Wake Forest Conference on Civil Religion. I hope you find it of interest.

We are in the process of putting together all the papers and we hope to print the proceedings in the near future.

I thought you made a most important contribution to the conference and I was so pleased that you were able to participate.

With best personal regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

Rabbi A. James Rudin
Assistant Director
Interreligious Affairs Department

AJR:FM
Encls.