



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Preserving American Jewish History

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

Series C: Interreligious Activities. 1952-1992

Box 37, Folder 6, La Farge Institute, 1975.

4

The
John
LaFarge
Institute

4/69

The John
Courtney
Murray
Forum

106 West 56 Street, New York, N.Y. 10019 (212) 581-4640

April 9, 1975

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

Dear Rabbi Tanenbaum:

As you may recall, the discussion on "the new anti-semitism and the new anti-Catholicism" sponsored by the John LaFarge Institute had been tentatively scheduled for March 19. That meeting had to be postponed. The new date for the discussion is Tuesday, April 29. We will begin around 10:00 AM, share an informal lunch and conclude around 4:00 in the afternoon.

I have included some questions that have developed during preliminary conversations on the topic. Your own reactions and contributions to this agenda will, of course, be appreciated.

The LaFarge Institute will be happy to assume any travel expenses connected with the meeting.

I look forward to hearing from you and seeing you on April 29.

Sincerely,

Joseph A. O'Hare, S.J.
Joseph A. O'Hare, S.J.

Is there a "new anti-Catholicism and a new anti-Semitism"?
Have old prejudices become fashionable again?

Does criticism of Israel, e.g. her posture in negotiations with Arab nations, sometimes or often express what is really an anti-Semitic bias? Is anti-Zionism the new anti-Semitism?

Does the Catholic community get a fair hearing for its position on abortion and aid to private education?

Does the new permissiveness in the media encourage the mocking of beliefs held sacred by Catholics or Jews? How seriously should one take ethnic humor?

Has the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights been successful in combatting anti-Catholic bias? Is this the most effective approach to the problem thus far developed?

Is it useful or illuminating to draw an analogy between Jewish causes, like aid to Israel and defense of Soviet Jewry, and Catholic causes, like abortion and aid to private education?

Within the Catholic community, accusations have been made that Irish American Catholics dominate Catholic life in a way that is prejudicial to other ethnic Catholics. Is this a useful and constructive path to follow?

In some of the writing on anti-Catholicism, continued comparisons are made to the more aggressive manner in which Jewish interests are promoted. Although the point of such references is explicitly that the Catholic community should follow the Jewish example, is an implicit statement being made (or at least received) that Jewish success has been bought at the price of Catholic failure?

April 16, 1975

Reverend Joseph A. O'Hare, S. J.
The John LaFarge Institute
106 West 56th Street
New York, New York 10019

Dear Father O'Hare:

Thank you for your letter of April 9th.

I am pleased to accept your invitation and look forward to seeing you on April 29th.

I would be interested if you have any reactions to the paper that I shared with you on "Is There a Rise in Anti-Catholicism?"

Please give my warmest good wishes to Don Campion and my other friends at America.

Cordially,

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
National Director
Interreligious Affairs

MHT.RR

THE JOHN LAFARGE INSTITUTE

Conference on: "Is There a New Anti-Semitism and a New Anti-Catholicism?"

Tuesday, April 29, 1975, 10:00 A. M. to 4:00 P. M.

PARTICIPANTS

Rev. Msgr. Geno Baroni

President, National Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs

Oscar Cohen

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

Jessica Feingold

The Institute for Religious and Social Studies

James Finn

Editor, Worldview magazine

Rev. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S. J.

Department of Sociology, Fordham University

Rev. Edward H. Flannery

Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations, National
Conference of Catholic Bishops

Milton Himmelfarb

The American Jewish Committee

Rabbi Leon Klenicki

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

Irving M. Levine

Institute on Pluralism and Group Identity

Rev. Joseph A. O'Hare, S. J.

Executive Director, The John LaFarge Institute

Philip Scharper

Orbis Books, Inc.

Rabbi Arthur Schneier

Park Avenue Synagogue / The Appeal of Conscience Foundation

Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum

National Director of Interreligious Affairs, The American
Jewish Committee

Rev. Charles M. Whelan, S. J.

Professor of Law, Fordham University

(over)

INVITED, BUT UNABLE TO ATTEND

Rev. Virgil Blum, S.J.
President, Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights

Rev. Andrew M. Greeley
National Opinion Research Center

Rev. Msgr. George G. Higgins
United States Catholic Conference

James Hitchcock
St. Louis University

Stuart Hubbell
Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights



Working Agenda for the John LaFarge Institute Conference on

"Is There a New Anti-Semitism and a New Anti-Catholicism?"

Tuesday, April 29, 1975

John LaFarge Lounge / America House

I. Towards a definition and perception

Is it anti-Catholic to support liberalized abortion laws?
Is it anti-Semitic to criticize the state of Israel?
Should ethnic humor be taken more seriously? (A salute
to General Brown and Secretary Butz.)
Does a new permissiveness in entertainment encourage
the ridicule of Catholic and Jewish beliefs and culture?
If so, what then?

II. Is it useful or illuminating to draw an analogy between Jewish
causes, like aid to Israel and defense of Soviet Jewry, and
Catholic causes, like abortion and aid to private education?

III. What is the role of organizations like the Anti-Defamation League
of B'nai B'rith and the newly formed Catholic League for Religious
and Civil Rights? Can the activities of such organizations ever be
divisive and counter-productive in a pluralistic democracy? Why
or why not? When and when not?

IV. Is anti-Catholicism a religious bias or a social bias? How serious
are ethnic divisions among American Catholics? Do social dif-
ferences play a role in the abortion controversy, i. e. upper-class
liberals vs. working-class families.

V. In some of the writing on anti-Catholicism, continued comparisons are
made to the more aggressive manner in which Jewish interests are
promoted. Do such comparisons, intentionally or not, provoke anti-
Semitic reactions.

ADDENDA

A Civil Rights League for Catholics--address of Virgil C. Blum, S. J.

Excerpts from a paper "Is There a Rise in Anti-Catholicism?" by
Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum.

A Civil Rights League
for Catholics

by Virgil C. Blum, S. J.

On October 23, 1974, Father Virgil C. Blum, S.J., gave the following talk at a meeting of Chief Administrators of Catholic Education in San Diego, California. Father Blum, a political scientist, teaches at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and is the founder of the national Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights. His publications include the book, *Freedom of Choice in Education* (New York, 1958).

There comes a time in the history of every people who for centuries have been discriminated against when they rise up to demand equal rights. Equal rights in the political arena, equal rights in business and industry, equal rights to freedom of worship, equal rights to freedom of education, equal rights to advocate and advance their ideas, values and principles. The time has come for American Catholics to throw off the shackles of second-class citizens, to demand the rights of full-fledged citizens. For too long we Catholics have docilely accepted discriminations.

Observers of American society have noted the existence of anti-Catholic prejudices. Even non-Catholic scholars have been appalled by the enduring anti-Catholicism that has long been the cankerous sore of our democratic society. Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., of Harvard University, declared: "I regard prejudice against [the Catholic] Church as the deepest bias in the history of the American people." And Professor Peter Viereck of Yale University declared: "Catholic-baiting is the anti-Semitism of the liberals."

Several years ago, when Catholic parents entered into political debate to obtain public funds for the education of their children in church-related schools, the Supreme Court in *Lemon* (1971) gagged them, depriving them of their First Amendment rights of freedom of speech, press, assembly and petition. The Court said such political activity by Catholics has "devisive political potential," and that "political division along religious lines was one of the principal evils against which the First Amendment was intended to protect." This makes a mockery of our political rights. Deprived of these rights, we are second-class citizens.

It must be said however, that the Supreme Court was not creative when it degraded Catholics to second-class citizens. The major political parties have in effect been treating Catholics as second-class citizens for decades. Nation-wide, from 65 to 70 percent of Catholics regularly vote the Democratic ticket. Yet, as a Jewish liberal, Adam Walinsky, administrative assistant to the late Senator Robert Kennedy, declared, "liberal Democrats" have consistently "treated defeats of Catholic interests as triumphs over the devil," and their greatest triumphs were the defeat of legislation providing "aid to parochial schools."

Most Catholics are working people. Yet, George Meany, AFL-CIO attacked tax credits for Catholic parents before the House Ways and Means Committee. In Philadelphia the Catholic school teachers are organized by the American Federation of Teachers of the AFL-CIO. The spokesman of these teachers, presumably speaking in the best interest of the teachers who had elected him, made sharp attacks on tax credits before the House Committee. What are these spokesmen of the AFL-CIO telling us? They are shouting through the halls and chambers of the Capitol, "Catholics are political pygmies." Most Catholics are politically simplistic; they vote the party, not the issues. Consequently, the Democratic Party and the AFL-CIO can, to quote Walinsky, "twist a broken bone into the flesh" of Catholics without loss of votes.

Wisconsin is about 33 percent Catholic, most of whom live in the cities. Six of seven state-wide elected public officials, including the governor, are Democrats, all of whom owe their election to an overwhelming plurality of Catholic votes. Yet, the Democratic party at its 1972 state convention adopted resolutions that are an affront to most Catholic voters. The party called for free abortions and sterilizations on demand, and opposition to tax credits for parents who send their children to church-related schools. Walinsky is right about the Democratic party, not because the party is evil, but because Catholics do not have, or are not members of, interest groups that effectively represent their interest.

Americans spend a lot of time and rhetoric talking about the equality of all citizens regardless of race, creed or color. Yet, in two hundred years of national history only five Catholics have been ap-

pointed to the Supreme Court. On the other hand, five Jews have been appointed. There are 49 million Catholics; there are 5.5 million Jews. Why are Jews treated differently than Catholics? Catholics are discriminated against in judicial appointments because they have no political clout; Jews, on the other hand, are giants in the political arena.

The Catholic minority in some states has developed political clout. Laws have been enacted providing textbooks, bus rides, auxiliary services and even tuition grants and tax credits for children who attend Catholic and other non-public schools. Indeed, Catholics have developed some political clout in some states, but this clout does not extend to the judicial branch of government. Yet, the judicial branch is just as political, just as subject to political pressures, just as motivated by personal prejudices as policy makers in the legislative and executive branches. However, the way to bring pressure to bear on appointed judges is vastly different than on elected public officials.

The great political analyst Arthur Bentley in his book *The Process of Government* said: "It is possible to take a Supreme Court decision in which nothing appears on the surface but fine-spun points of law, and cut through all the dialectic until we get down to the actual groups of men underlying the decisions and producing the decisions through the differentiated activity of the justices." In other words, as Bentley wrote, "there is no court decision that is not the expression of force and force in tension."

Who are these "groups of men underlying the decisions and producing the decisions through the differentiated activity of the justices"? What are the "forces in tension"? These groups of men, these forces in tension, are the closely organized, well financed, competently lead interest groups that are highly articulate, and are able, often through control of segments of the mass media, to influence the public policy-makers through the creation of the operative ideas of our society. Many of these interest groups and opinion-makers are anti-Catholic; they demand policies and decisions from our courts that are injurious to Catholic interests and violative of their rights.

The Constitution contains no provisions to guide the justices in deciding where the secular ends and the sectarian begins in education. Justice Jackson pointed to this fact in the *McCullum* (1948) released-time case. In cases involving religion and tax-supported secular education, whether in public or nonpublic schools, Jackson declared that the justices must follow their "own prepossessions," since there is nothing in the Constitution to guide them. According to Webster's Dictionary, "prepossession" means "bias" or "prejudice." In other words, all church-state cases that come before the Supreme Court are decided on the basis of the prejudices of the nine justices.

Clearly, the majority of the Court in the *Nyquist* (1973) case were guided by anti-Catholic prejudices. The anti-Catholic prejudices of justices may be personal, as with Justice Douglas, or justices may feel compelled to embrace the anti-Catholicism loudly and articulately expounded by the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *American Jewish Congress*, the *American Civil Liberties Union*, and other such organs and organizations. In the education issue, these newspapers and groups have succeeded in defining the terms of the controversy about tax credits or tuition grants for tuition-paying parents as separation of church and state. This is not the issue. The issue is the religious freedom of parents in the education of their children. But Catholics and other religious-minded citizens have allowed anti-Catholic groups to define the terms of the controversy. This has had tragic consequences. For, he who defines the terms of the controversy has the controversy half won. As a result, our parents are today penalized for the exercise of the constitutional right to send their children to God-centered schools.

What do I mean? I mean that Catholics separately, or in conjunction with certain Protestant and Jewish groups, have never organized an adequately funded and competently lead national education interest group. Consequently, we have never been able to articulate for the American people, loudly, clearly and persistently the importance of freedom and diversity in education in a pluralistic society, our claims in justice to a fair share of the education tax dollar, and the fact that a constitutional right penalized is a constitutional right suppressed. We have not, through highly diversified national information programs educated our fellow citizens, created the operative ideas of society—ideas exerting force in influence,

and the value presuppositions of our society which, in the final analysis, are the basis of judicial decisions. We have relinquished the field—the whole field of the creation of the operative ideas of society to antagonistic groups.

As a result, we suffer court and agency decisions that are blatantly anti-Catholic. After ruling in the *Walz* (1970) case that tax benefits for churches for religious worship are constitutional, the Supreme Court ruled in the *Nyquist* case that tax benefits for parents for tuition payments for the secular education of their children in Catholic schools are unconstitutional. Why? Because, said the Court, the tax benefits "flow primarily to parents of children attending sectarian schools," meaning of course Catholic parents. This is a religious test. Of more than 50 million taxpayers who receive tax reductions, none, except Catholics, are subjected to a religious test. The Court did not strike down the tax benefits of public school education in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and some other states because such benefits flow almost exclusively to Protestants. Nor did the Court strike down 113 college education programs in 39 states that provide tuition grants to students attending church-related colleges and universities. Why not? There are twice as many Protestant colleges as Catholic. On the very same day the Court struck down the New York tax credit law because it was of financial assistance primarily to Catholics, it ruled constitutional a South Carolina law that provided financial assistance exclusively to Protestant denominational colleges.

When the black community became aware that judges in the state and federal courts were writing their racial prejudices into the constitution, they rose up to challenge this legalized discrimination. They organized the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and the Urban League. They fought racism in the mass media, in legal and popular journals, in social and political gatherings, in scholarly conventions, in labor and business committees, in the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government. In a word, blacks used the democratic processes to fight for freedom and equality. The black community learned important lessons about working through the democratic processes from the American Jewish community. The Jewish community best demonstrates how minorities must operate in American democracy if they are to win acceptance and equal rights in our society. They know that American society is pluralistic in name

only, unless religious and ethnic minorities claim their rightful status through the democratic processes.

The Jewish community has brilliantly responded to the demands of the democratic processes. Jewish leaders know that in American democracy the people are king. They know that the political clout of their community—in the legislative, executive and judicial branches—is directly proportionate to their ability to apply X-ray therapy to bigotry, and to their ability to create public understanding of their ideas, values, principles and objectives. Jewish leaders know that these goals cannot be achieved except through the activities of national interest groups that are competently led and adequately funded. The Jewish community has organized 25 national interest groups whose sole purpose is to influence public policy. Among these, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith are the most influential.

To fight against anti-Semitism and to establish the equal rights of Jews in American society, this trio of Jewish interest groups have both a large annual budget and a network of local and/or regional organizations. The American Jewish Committee has a budget in excess of \$7 million and 84 regional offices; the American Jewish Congress has a budget in excess of \$2 million and more than 300 local offices, and the Anti-Defamation League has a budget in excess of \$6 million and 28 regional offices. The activities of these groups and of the 22 other national Jewish interest groups are coordinated by the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council. Through this Council the constituent organizations seek agreement on policies, strategies, and programs and on the best means and techniques for most effective utilization of their collective resources for common ends.

Jewish understanding of our system of government and their masterful use of the democratic processes has given them tremendous influence in the press, radio and television, in our legislative chambers, in our executive offices, and, most of all, in our courts. As a result, the social and political clout of the Jewish minority of 5.5 million is, no doubt, 10 times greater than the social and political influence of 49 million Catholics.

Why?

You all know the answer. While the small Jewish minority has 25 national interest groups whose sole purpose is to influence the making of public policy, the

large Catholic minority until last year did not have a single national organization with this purpose. To speak bluntly, American Catholics have abdicated their rights as citizens. They have failed in their duties as citizens. They are second-class citizens—by choice. It is true, of course, that the Catholic community has some national organizations that give a small portion of their time, effort and resources to the difficult task of influencing the making of public policy. For example, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Catholic Hospital Association, the National Conference of Catholic Charity, the National Catholic Educational Association, and the National Catholic Counseling Service. But the Catholic community has no effective national interest groups to create a public understanding of its ideas, values, principles and objectives through the fashioning of public attitudes on vital issues. It has no effective interest groups to create the operative ideas of society, the presuppositions of our democratic society. Consequently, it can exert little positive influence on the making of public policy, particularly in the judicial branches of government. In a word, American Catholics are political pygmies. And because they are political pygmies, their religion is often defamed, their customs, practices and beliefs are ridiculed, and their rights and liberties are suppressed.

To try to establish the first-class citizenship of Catholics in American society, the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights was founded in May, 1973. The League is a Catholic anti-defamation league and a Catholic civil rights union. It is committed to serve the Catholic and other religious communities, to provide assistance to individual Catholics and others in cases involving religious freedom, or religious and moral values.

The Catholic League does not concern itself with issues that are interfraternal, that are disputed by diverse groups within the Catholic community. For example, the League does not get involved in the question of whether parents or teachers should determine the quality of sex and religion education in Catholic schools. Catholic League activities concern issues that are outside the Catholic community, not within it. In the pursuit of its objectives, the League engages in four kinds of activities: (1) education, (2) negotiation, (3) confrontation, and (4) litigation. I shall allude to these several kinds of activities as I discuss what the League has been about during the past sixteen months.

Let me start my discussion of League activities by referring to the case that brought the League nation-wide recognition. I refer to the Xerox case. The Xerox Corporation published and distributed to high schools a booklet entitled, *Population Control: Whose Right to Live?* The booklet is, in our opinion, insensitive to the rights of the Catholic community, and, when used in public schools, violative of the free exercise of religion rights of Catholic students and their parents. The booklet charges Pope Paul with responsibility for the death by starvation of millions of children. It gives a biased analysis of *Humanae Vitae* and the population problem and it proposes that a Catholic student bring criminal charges in a world court against the Catholic Church for crimes against humanity.

Efforts were made to negotiate with Xerox officials, to prevail upon them to cease publication and distribution of the booklet. Xerox refused. The League then informed the officials of Xerox that it would pursue its objectives in the courts, and issued a press release to that effect. Xerox thereupon approached the League and urged that the case be settled out of court. The League replied that it would accept such a settlement on condition that Xerox agree to certain stipulations. Xerox agreed to the stipulations. It agreed to stop publication of *Population Control* forthwith, to cease distribution of the booklet and to prohibit any third party from reproducing and distributing the booklet.

Another case that indicates what a national organization with some clout can do is the HUD case. The Department of Housing and Urban Development agreed to give a grant of \$50 million for the development of Pontchartrain-New Town, a subdivision of New Orleans, for 90,000 people. The draft copy of the plan for New Town expressly prohibited the building of any church-related schools in the subdivision.

In a confrontation with James T. Lynn, secretary of HUD, the Catholic League charged that the exclusion of church-related schools from New Town constituted an abridgement of the constitutional right of parents to send their children to church-related schools. Moreover, it advised Secretary Lynn that the League would bring suit to block the founding of New Town if the exclusionary provision were not removed from the agreement. Secretary Lynn responded by ordering the discriminatory provision be eliminated from the plans for New Town.

There is not time to summarize all the issues and cases in which the Catholic League has been involved. But let me review a few more of them. The League vigorously protested in an exchange of letters with the Agency for International Development (AID) the federal subsidization of the distribution in Panama of the highly offensive *Los Supermachos* comic book showing a Spanish peasant woman kneeling before a statue of the Blessed Mother, and praying in these words: "Little Virgin, you who conceived without sinning, teach me to sin without conceiving."

The League is providing legal research and financial assistance for the defense of Dr. Frank Bolles, a Protestant physician in Boulder, Colorado, and chairman of the local Right to Life Chapter. The district attorney brought criminal charges against Dr. Bolles for sending anti-abortion literature through the mails. Charges were dismissed in the trial court, but the court of appeals reversed. The case is now before the Colorado Supreme Court.

The League strongly protested the publication in *Observation Post*, a student newspaper at City College in New York, of a half-page cartoon of a nun masturbating with a crucifix. After an exchange of letters, University President Robert Marshak assured the League that he would do everything in his power to prevent a recurrence of such an incident.

In conjunction with several parent and school groups, the League filed a hard-hitting amicus brief before the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Barrera ESEA Title I* case (1974). As you all know, the Court ruled that disadvantaged children attending church-related schools have a right under Title I to "comparable" education benefits. When two teen-aged black girls in Alabama were sterilized under HEW regulations, the League sought and was granted leave to participate in the case in defense of the right of poor, mentally incompetent black girls not to be involuntarily sterilized by HEW. CBS ran the *Maude* two-part pro-abortion episodes in November, 1972. In total disregard of the right of the people to hear both sides of a controversial issue on television, CBS scheduled a re-run of the *Maude* pro-abortion episodes in August, 1973. The League and other Catholic organizations vigorously protested the CBS violation of the fairness doctrine, and the violation of the right of the people to hear views opposed to abortion. The League is now involved in litigation in defense of the constitutionality of a shared-time program

in Traverse City, Michigan. This case is likely to go all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. *Screw* is a hard-core porno newspaper published in New York City. In its April issue it carried a series of shocking pornographic pictures of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, Pius X, and St. Theresa. The League registered a strong protest with the U.S. Post Office and started legal investigations that will result, it is hoped, in prosecution and, finally, in the prohibition of further distribution of such sacrilegious pictures.

The Catholic League provided legal counsel to assist the Catholics and public school superintendents of New Hampshire in the drafting of the provisions of an education voucher demonstration program, funded by the National Institute of Education (NIE). Recently, Circuit Judge Louis Ceci of Milwaukee ruled that public funds appropriated for the care of sick people in the county hospital could not be used by the hospital to pay for such non-health purposes as abortions on demand. The American Civil Liberties Union brought suit to overturn the Ceci ruling. The Catholic League is submitting an amicus brief in Judge Ceci's defense. The League will shortly intervene in a John Doe case in support of a parent-complainant whose 15 year old daughter was instructed by the Michigan State Health Department in the use of contraceptive devices and provided with a three-month supply of three different devices, without the knowledge or consent of her parents. The state claims absolute rights in directing the sex life of teen-agers.

The League is supporting the right of Episcopalian parents to establish a church-related elementary school in Northwest Washington, without regard to adverse impact it may have on enrollment in two local public schools. The League provided legal counsel. In its education activities, the League is sending its *Catholic League Newsletter* to a wide diversity of opinion and policy-makers throughout the nation and it has distributed to them hundreds of thousands of educational and informational materials.

I have given you a brief summary of some League activities, but I have told you nothing about the Board of Directors. For lack of time, I cannot now give you a biographical sketch of each director. Suffice it to say that the Board of Directors is comprised of clergy and laity, of men and women, of black, Spanish and other Catholics; of individuals from across the political spectrum—from moderate right to moderate left.

But I have been told that when the Catholic League organized, liberals refused to support it because its board was too conservative. When I began to put together the board of directors of the League, I was determined to have a politically well-balanced board. To balance the two or three conservatives of high visibility, I invited two liberals of national reputation to serve on the board. One accepted the invitation tentatively, but withdrew his acceptance the day before the board organized in Washington, leaving me holding the bag. The second liberal delayed giving me his "no" answer until after the organizational meeting. So, we organized with highly visible conservatives, but without a single highly visible liberal. However, we have taken steps to correct the imbalance. Since our organizational meeting, we have added four individuals to the board, two of whom are moderates and two are liberals.

I would like to suggest, however, that it would perhaps be more fair to judge the Catholic League on the basis of the value of its activities for the Catholic community. Obviously this does not resolve the question of whether the League is liberal or conservative. In this connection, let me ask you several questions. Is it more liberal to defend the right of an unborn child to life, or to defend the right of privacy of the mother? What about the Dr. Bolles' case? The League is defending the right of Dr. Bolles to freedom of expression in sending anti-abortion materials through the mails. But what about the right of privacy of the householder to whom the materials are sent? What is the liberal position in the Relf case—the case involving the sterilization of the two poor, mentally incompetent black girls? Is the liberal position the defense against the involuntary sterilization of such girls or is the liberal position that of the great liberal, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, in *Buck v. Bell*—"Two generations of imbeciles are enough..."

The League has offered to defend the right of hospital administrators to resist demands to perform abortions. We contend that such demands violate the rights of conscience of the hospital administrators. Is it more liberal, on the other hand, to contend that a woman has the right to have an abortion in the hospital of her choice, or at her greatest convenience?

Personally, I do not think the Catholic League should make decisions, select cases, and determine its positions in specific cases on the basis of political con-

siderations. It should base its decisions on the principle of religious freedom, on the basis of religious and moral values, on the right of the Catholic community not to have its religious beliefs, customs and practices defamed or ridiculed. This mission is so important for the future of the Catholic Church in America that nothing, least of all politics, should deter the officers and directors from their commitment. The Catholic League wants to be of service to the whole Catholic community, and specifically to the Catholic schools of America. Catholic schools have in the past enjoyed the kind of freedom in decision-making that is a *sine qua non* for maintaining their integrity as Catholic schools. As you know, the freedom to hire and fire teachers on the basis of religious commitments and moral values is now being challenged before state civil rights commissions. And, moreover, there is now a movement afoot to liberate teenagers from restrictions imposed by parents and the schools. The authority of the parents and the authority of the schools are now being challenged in administrative agencies and courts. The implications of this movement are considerable for the Catholic school. We hope that the Catholic League will soon be able to be of assistance to all Catholic schools in providing expert legal counsel to meet challenges to their integrity, to their mission as Christian teachers of youth and to be of help to them in many other ways. The League has already been involved in five church-related school cases: the Barrera Title I case, the New Town and Washington exclusion cases, the Michigan shared-time case, and the New Hampshire education voucher case.

The Catholic League has a long way to go in raising funds and organizing regional offices before it will become truly effective in serving the anti-defamation and civil liberties needs of the Catholic community. We need the full cooperation and full support of all segments of the Catholic community. We need and would greatly appreciate the full cooperation and full support of the Chief Administrators of Catholic Education. The Catholic League has an extremely difficult, a highly sensitive, a very costly, but a highly important job to do for the Catholic community we are attempting to serve. We would appreciate your help.

MHT
Received from
No RC (Greeley's office)
7/11

SUBSTANTIATING GREELEY'S THESIS

Rona M. Fields, Ph.D.

Sometimes a case study is a useful device for documenting a thesis. The Rev. Andrew M. Greeley's thesis that there is rising anti-Catholic feeling among Jews has set off a tempest of subjective appraisals. Unfortunately, many of these arguments are based on the implications of Greeley's statements rather than on the validity of his analysis. It is especially gratifying to me to note that in the United States today, hardly anyone really likes to be called a "bigot". Despite the popularity of Archie Bunker, there are few who would identify with him amongst the audience of the New York Times, anyway. But denials of its manifestations do not necessarily eliminate the behaviors of social prejudice nor the damages inflicted by bigotry.

My own experience of left-leaning Jewish intellectuals has been from the combined positions of being one of them; having spent my professional life studying social prejudice and violence; having also strong roots and identification with the Irish particularly, the struggle of the Northern Irish against British imperialism.

I came to Clark University directly from Northern Ireland where my children and I had spent several terrible and beautiful months in the Catholic ghettos of Lower Falls, Belfast, and the Bogside in Derry. I had by this time acquired a little bit of an Irish accent, and, as a gift from a group of youthful Republicans, a huge Tri-color, which I immediately installed in the window of my new office.

That first year, I taught, among a number of subjects, Irish Culture and Politics and Women's Studies. It was not long before the rumors started that these two areas of specialization were inimicable. In fact, it was suggested that "Dr. Fields, as an Irish Catholic should not have been hired to teach Women's Studies because she was bound to be anti-abortion and therefore, anti-feminist." It was further suggested that since my closest relationships in Worcester were in the Irish Community, I was also, probably a "reactionary". Nor did my erstwhile colleagues, nearly all of whom were nominally Jewish (but not practicing Jews), do anything to dispel these rumors by helping students learn to critically appraise ideological positions as distinct from ethnic identification.

The following year, when I initiated an Irish Culture Festival at Clark, the Chairperson of the Board of Trustees and the Acting President (a man from my own department), were incensed that I had not gone through them before "getting us involved with those people." I had gone through Cultural Affairs, which was the appropriate office for the previous year's Black Culture Festival. It took a lot of argument and explaining before the Chairperson of the Board (a woman from an old New England Yankee industrialist family) and the President (a former Peace Corpsman, and yes, Jewish) accepted the role of the University as a cultural agent for the largely Irish-American community of Worcester.

Perhaps the most dramatic moment of my own painful experience came when my book on Northern Ireland (published in London) was ordered off the market after I had myself been detained and tortured in Crumlin Road Gaol in Belfast (1973). When I returned to Clark I pleaded with my departmental colleagues to make some sort of protest in my behalf to the British and American governments. I asked them to join with many other colleagues from Britain, Ireland, Canada

and the U.S. in petitioning for the release of my book. My departmental colleagues, all self-proclaimed radicals (one of whom was a co-founder of the SDS) refused to take any public stance in my behalf. A few months later, they, as a group, protested the treatment of anti-government political dissenters in Korea. It occurred to me then that their anti-Irishness is part of the kind of reverse racism to which many radical and liberal intellectuals are heir. While they quickly recognized the relationship between colonialism and racism, by their identification as "white men", they see themselves obliged to run to the aid and protection of "helpless colored peoples". At the same time, they cannot face the fact of their own vulnerability by recognizing the exploitation which has been transpiring on a grand scale in Ireland for eight hundred years, where white men have been as degraded as any black or brown men. I had one question about my thesis. That had to do with colleagues Jewishness. How could they reconcile their history as a downtrodden, powerless, struggling minority with their "white men's burden?" It took me a little longer to understand that. It became apparent at the time of the Yom Kippur War, that my colleagues identified Jews as exploiters and rushed to the defense of the Arabs! They were strongly anti-Zionist. This answered my question, and perhaps will answer some of those who were unable to find in their knowledge of Jews and Jewishness any substantiation for Greeley's thesis. In the case of these Jewish intellectuals (and others I have encountered elsewhere) their anti-Irishness is not at all a product of their Jewishness but is instead a direct production of their anti-self.

But does this apply generally? I would like to have been able to study the students and faculty of this University to find out if their anti-Irishness has any correlation with their lack of self-knowledge. Simple demographic

factors won't tell the story, I fear. For instance, many of the men in my department are married to non-Jews. According to classic theories of prejudice that would suggest that they are not all prejudiced. However, I know them to be male chauvinists (something a little harder to prove, but I think a well designed questionnaire could establish that) and by virtue of their condescending attitude towards women could very well be on intimate terms with non-Jews (female type) without granting them either equality of intellect or purpose.

Anyway, I've written two more books since that first one was shredded and I am being careful not to write only on Ireland and Irish. One of the books is on the first year of the revolution in Portugal (Praeger, 1976) and the other, which will come out in a few months is on the Irish thing again. Somehow, though when I write about the Portuguese and the Chicano (an earlier work) my colleagues see that as Social Science, or as Psychology or Sociology. When I write on the Irish, they tend to describe it as being "on Ireland." That sort of thing is damned dangerous for an academician. The way I see it, is that I can only afford to have every other book I write "on Ireland" if I am to become a real "Scholar".