



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

Preserving American Jewish History

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

Series A: Writings and Addresses. 1947-1991

Box 2, Folder 40, "Is There a Rise in Anti-Catholicism?", 25
October 1974.

IS THERE A RISE IN ANTI-CATHOLICISM?

Some Comments on Anti-Catholicism, Anti-Semitism,
and Jewish-Christian Relations

A Paper Delivered by Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, National
Director of Interreligious Affairs of the American Jewish
Committee before the National Executive Council of the
American Jewish Committee at the Century Plaza Hotel,
Los Angeles, California, October 25, 1974



OCTOBER 25, 1974

IS THERE A RISE IN ANTI-CATHOLICISM?

EXCERPTS FROM TALK BY RABBI MARC H. TANENBAUM, NATIONAL INTERRELIGIOUS AFFAIRS DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE AT CENTURY PLAZA HOTEL, AJC NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

- - - - -

Is there a rise in anti-Catholicism? And if there is, what is its implication for Catholic-Jewish relations in the United States and abroad?

Those questions will startle many persons as strangely provocative, somewhat sensational, and perhaps even contrived. But no one who is in close touch with the Catholic community, especially its leadership and intellectual elite, and who takes Catholic-Jewish relationships seriously, can afford any longer to ignore these questions.

A compelling reason for facing up to the issue of anti-Catholicism is that it is not being raised by marginal individuals who are grasping for headlines, but is being articulated with increasing regularity and persistence by some of the most respected spokesmen of American Catholicism, many of whom have been and are among the closest friends and allies of the Jewish community supporting the critical issues on the Jewish agenda. Foremost among the Catholic leaders who have been expressing public anxiety over the rise in anti-Catholicism as they view it are Father Theodore Hesburgh, Father Andrew Greeley, Michael Novak, Msgr. Geno Baroni and Father Virgil Blum, among others.

In an address last June before the National Catholic Press Association in Denver, Father Hesburgh said that "the Catholic

community is beginning^{"to stir,}/to feel set upon, ignored, even badly used and unappreciated," and he served warning on other groups in American society that "Catholics had been pushed around long enough".

Of particular interest to the Jewish community is the manner in which Father Hesburgh formulated his grievance: "In the last year," Father Hesburgh declared, "Jews wanted two things: massive aid to Israel and a denial of trade to Russia until emigration was liberalized. They got both. Last year Catholics wanted two things: some help for parochial schools and no liberalization of laws on abortion. They got neither." (The Long Island Catholic, June 20, 1974).

In large measure, Father Hesburgh was self-critical and blamed the Catholic pro-life forces for their ineffectiveness as "mindless and crude zealots" who "backed unworkable solutions...and called their opposition murderers," an uncivil way of carrying on "rational discussion of disagreements in a pluralistic democracy." Father Hesburgh also criticized Catholic ecclesiastical leadership for their failure to be "more highly politicized, more conscious of their inherent strength, less ready to be promised help by a president who, once he had their votes, hardly lifted a finger to help them or their two causes."

Perhaps more than any other Catholic spokesman, Father Andrew Greeley has been pressing the issue of anti-Catholicism to public consciousness. In his widely-syndicated column in the Catholic press, Father Greeley has been discussing this concern and its implications for Catholic-Jewish (as well as Catholic-Protestant) relations in articles written every two or three weeks between

last June and the present. The major themes that emerge out of the writings of Rev. Greeley and other Catholic spokesmen on this subject are as follows:

1 - Catholics resent being left out of American society.

"We are absent in the board rooms of major corporations and banks on the staffs and as trustees of the large foundations, and at the senior faculties and administrations of the large universities, and in the national media," writes Greeley.

That theme is repeated with some elaboration by Michael Novak in Commonweal (Sept. 20, 1974), who declares that "white ethnics...are being kept out of executive offices; positions on boards of directors; significant ownership in stocks, bonds and property; full professorships, research grants; expense account living, and effective voice in establishing the moral tone and national diversity of the American way of life. Economically and in moral symbolism, this is still too unvarying a white Protestant country. Both white ethnics and blacks are demanding to get in, not only into the powerful symbol system but also into full economic power and status. As long as these 'other Bostonians' are pitted against each other (ethnics versus blacks), the 'proper Bostonians' continue their unbroken hegemony."

2 - Catholics resent being made both the scapegoat and the fall guy for the country's problems that they didn't cause and having to pay for social injustices they did not create and from which they have not profited.

Greeley is critical of Catholic social activists for accepting the nativist stereotype of the Catholic ethnic as an Archie Bunker-bigot, and for turning against their own people in their

concern for racial justice. Such concern for racial justice was quite proper, of course, he writes, but they forgot to question the stereotype ethnic as bigot and forgot that nativist discrimination against Catholics is every bit as evil as racism.

He adds that many of these activists see no problem when well-to-do Jewish and Protestant suburbanites establish social programs that affect the schools, the neighborhoods, the home values of Catholic ethnics (as well as lower middle class Jews and Protestants) while the suburbanites remain free of costs for the achievement of racial justice.

Greeley cites the case of a federal court that commands (validly enough) that there be public housing throughout the whole city of Chicago, but also decrees that there need not be public housing in the suburban districts where the lawyers and judges live.

Greeley comments, "If there was any complaint against this form of discrimination from the Catholic social activists I didn't hear it. If our property values go down it serves us right (which obviates any constructive thinking about the problem, like making some kind of property value insurance available, which might go a long way toward stabilizing changing neighborhoods). After all, we were the ones who brought the slaves to this country and imposed Jim Crow, weren't we?" (St. Louis Review, Sept. 13, 1974).

Substantial segments of the Catholic population are fed up with "quotas" and "affirmative action" (such as the deFunes case) because they discriminate against Catholics.

3 - Denigration of Catholic Life and Culture

Several Catholic writers have raised objections to the manner in which non-Catholic elites have persisted in defining Catholic culture and society in denigrating terms. Thus Michael Novak levels such a charge in his review of a book called, "The Other Bostonians," by Stephen Thernstrom (Harvard University Press, 1973). Writing in the September 20, 1974 issue of Commonweal, Novak says that "Thernstrom's chief contribution concerns ethnic variation, and his chief findings are not surprising," since "his viewpoint is affluent, white and Protestant throughout." Summarizing Thernstrom's findings Novak writes:

"British-American citizens have regularly been more economically successful than the Italians and the Irish, and neither language differential nor moral upbringing seems to account for the difference. Jews did as well as, or in some ways better, than, British-Americans. 'Catholics', he (Thernstrom) writes, 'were somewhat less dedicated to educational and occupational achievements for their sons than Protestants from the same class and educational backgrounds'."

Novak reacts in these words, "The tone and implicit inference in these chapters suggest that Catholics have been somehow, in those things that really count, less admirable, less culturally advanced." By way of defense of the Catholic community, Novak says, that "Catholic life in this country was for a long time one of the most comprehensive and successful 'resistance' movements, against the 'American way of life,' with 'the preaching in the Catholic parish against the Protestant ethic of success and the teaching in the parochial schools of values not marketable in mainstream

America'. He advocates that the Catholic community "deserves study in its own terms, not solely in terms of the dominant society."



Similar resentment against the denigration of the Catholic community is reflected in a review of the book, "Real Lace. America's Irish Rich," by Stephen Birmingham (Harper & Row, 1973). Written by Robert V. Remini, history professor at the University of Illinois in Chicago, in the September 27, 1974, issue of Commonweal, the reviewer declares that Birmingham's book is "a near disaster." He spells out his complaint:

"Whereas the social study of Jews (Our Crowd, Birmingham's earlier book which chronicled the lives of rich Jews in America) was rich with detail resulting from impressive research and pulsed with an abiding respect for the deportment and achievements of Jews, in Real Lace the author offers little of weight or substance...Mr. Birmingham is extremely condescending toward his subject. He seems at times to go out of his way to mock the pretensions, foolishness and behavior of these social-climbing Irish. He repeats the old cliché about how the rich Jews go to concerts, opera, theater and ballet, buy paintings, and bequeath them to museums and universities, and purchase books, while the Irish Catholic (who it must not be forgotten is handsome, charming, witty and touched with the curse of drink) watches football on TV or indulges in high living, great houses and fast cars. 'Second only to the Church, and keeping the Faith, has been the importance of making money to American Irish families,' concludes the author. Maybe so, but this certainly does not add in any significant way to our understanding of the Irish experience in America."

Aside from this "literary evidence" for the growth of anti-Catholicism, Catholics of lesser prominence than the "spokesmen" group have begun to make public their recent experience with anti-Catholicism. Thus, a James G. Hanink writes in a letter to the editor of Commonweal (Sept. 20, 1974):

"One need only be pursuing graduate studies at a secular university to recognize the anti-Catholic sentiment is increasing. It's perfectly O.K. to be sure, if one was a Catholic, so long as one now has a healthy sense of humor about 'all that.'"

In the same "letters" column, the Rev. Virgil C. Blum, S. J., expresses his total agreement with Novak's proposal to come to grips with the problem of securing the equal rights of American minorities by organizing "to check and to chasten monolithic power" and "to make it pluralistic in practice" and "accountable to all groups in America."

An article in the St. Louis Review (Sept. 20, 1974) carries a headline that reads, "Fr. Blum's Catholic League Works to End Age-Old Anti-Catholicism." The article is an interview with Father Blum in his capacity as president of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, founded in Washington, D. C., in May 1973. The article reports:

"Recent United States Supreme Court decisions and certainly the Missouri Supreme Court (which scuttled the Free Textbook Act) clearly demonstrate, it seems to me, that the prevailing philosophy in many parts of America today is anti-Catholicism."

Reporting on recent litigation carried out by his Catholic League, Rev. Blum said, "We compelled Xerox to cease the publication and distribution of a booklet entitled 'Population Control:

Whose Right to Live?' which was highly defamatory of Pope Paul and the Catholic Church...causing Xerox to approach the League for an out-of-court settlement."

The League also "confronted" the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development by sending a letter to the Secretary, James Lynn, "telling him forcefully and bluntly that it would sue HUD if the federal agency approved provisions for the founding of the Pontchartran New Town in New Orleans which prohibited parents from founding church-related schools in that subdivision...within days Secretary Lynn assured the Catholic League that he would not give final approval to the proposals...as long as it contained these discriminating provisions."

Father Blum also compares the organization of the Catholic community with that of the Jewish community, saying, "While the Jewish community in America has 25 interest groups whose sole purpose is to influence the public policy, the Catholic community has not one single group whose sole purpose is to influence public policy."

"I would say that Catholics are political pygmies, or, if you will, political eunuchs, with respect to issues that are of vital concern to their community." He added that the Catholic League will attempt "to prevail upon American Society to recognize the validity of the values and principles to which Catholics and other religious groups adhere."

Father Blum also opined the fact that the Catholic laity do not seek to influence the making of public policy on their own initiative "because they are accustomed to wait for the leadership of the clergy in all matters that touch religious and moral values." That is the thing we would like to see changed in the Catholic League, he concluded.

Why this concern now over Anti-Catholicism?

How does one account for the recent surfacing of concern among these Catholic spokesmen?

First, there is now an apparent peaking of frustration among the most thoughtful and sensitive intelligences of the Catholic community over the turmoil that has taken place within the Church since Vatican Council II's aggiornamento. Father Greeley himself spells out that frustration in a remarkably candid description in his book, The New Agenda:

"American Catholicism is going through a period of emotional exhaustion. Powerful currents of excitement, hope, disappointment, anger, frustration and bitterness have swept the Church. Now our energies are spent.

"The American Catholicism in which I was raised and trained and which I served for almost two decades as a priest is dying. It had immense vitality and energy, marvelous organizational skills, and abundant if shallow creativity. It was marked by immense loyalty which still survives among the rank and file. But the elite of American Catholicism, both clerical and lay, have abandoned

it, and over the long haul no human organization can survive the apostasy of its elites. Immigrant American Catholicism, which reached its zenith in the years of a decade and a half after the end of World War II, lacked the leadership and the scholarship necessary to survive the crisis of the sixties...The stupidity of our leadership, the senseless stridency of our intelligentsia, and the loss of nerve of our clergy and religious destroyed a cultural form that could have easily survived and been transformed with only moderate amounts of intelligence, skill, prudence and imagination.

"The immigrant Church is dead...A new form of American Catholicism will emerge at some time in the future, incorporating much of the good that was in the immigrant Church and many of its people." (page 42).

Second, the defeat of the two priority issues on the national Catholic agenda--namely, abortion and aid to parochial schools--was frustrating in itself, but seems to have elicited a heightened emotional response because these became symbolic, as Novak suggested, of a rejection of "an effective Catholic voice in establishing the moral tone and national diversity of the American way of life." These defeats seemed to ratify that "this is still too unvarying a white Protestant country." (Novak)

Only by recognizing the symbolic importance of abortion and aid to parochial schools as Catholic indices of their status in America can one begin to understand the emotions of anger and frustration that have begun to surface in this emerging discussion of anti-Catholicism. The facts of the situation might normally not call forth such intense feeling, for on a more prosaic level of actual political achievement the Catholic community appears to have had some measure of real success. Indeed, a "right-to-life" supporter, Edward Pfingston of Flossmoor, Illinois, in a letter published in the Sept. 21, 1974, issue of America Magazine flatly claims that "Right-to-Life" tactics were, in fact, a huge success. In 1972, before the Supreme Court decision--attempts to

liberalize abortion laws were defeated by the state legislature of 41 out of 42 states. Only in Florida did revision succeed.

"Abortion on demand exists in this country because of seven men of the Supreme Court. The small but extremely effective 'right to life' movement would have won in the legislature," Pfingston concludes.

The fact that the Supreme Court, the highest tribunal of the land, made no place for the moral theological claims of the Catholic Church led Father Greeley to characterize their rejection as an act of outright "anti-Catholic bigotry."

It is quite possible that the sense of frustration and rejection was intensified as a result of the World Population Conference's adoption by 136 nations of a declaration on population control in Rumania in early September. The Vatican delegation was the only group that found it impossible to sign the declaration.

With regard to aid to parochial schools, there is also data to suggest that the Catholic Church has not suffered as complete a defeat as some of the Catholic spokesmen would claim. Thus, a survey of the present state of Catholic education reported by the National Catholic News Service (Sept. 3, 1974) states:

"Catholic education officials around the United States find enrollment declines continuing to diminish, or even reverse, and morale high among faculty, students and parents as the new school year opens.

"Many of the officials also said that, although they are determined to seek additional federal and state aid, they realize that there is little likelihood that great amounts of government aid will be given. That realization has led to greater financial accountability and responsibility."

Archbishop William D. Borders of Baltimore, chairman of the U. S. Catholic Conference's education committee, is quoted in the survey as saying, "I think that there are still some possibilities of state and federal aid. Auxiliary services (transportation, textbooks, educational materials) will be broadened much more." Dr. Edward R. D'Alessio, director of the U. S. Catholic Conference Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, emphasized that "what the Supreme Court has said has not in any way cut off any existing federal aid programs.

"Each school," he added, "should take a serious look at existing federal programs and explore its eligibilities for participation in those programs."

The survey concludes that "The determination among the Catholic school community, officials, teachers and parents, to keep the schools going, with or without more government aid, was repeatedly expressed," and that "morale across the board is very good."

Third, it is quite possible that the raising publicly of the issue of anti-Catholicism has become the considered technique by which a group of Catholic intellectuals plan to try to reorganize Catholic institutional life in order to meet more effectively the civic and communal needs of the American Catholic community. If that is the case, Jews and Protestants need to be turned in to such a development for it would have important practical consequences in ecumenical and Jewish-Christian relationships, and for the society at large.

The assumption that such a major intra-Catholic organizational change may be in the offing is based on a careful reading of statements by these key Catholic spokesmen. Thus, Father Hesburgh is quoted as saying that he looks forward to "leadership emerging in the American Church that is more decentralized, more collegial, less official...Leaders will learn increasingly that to lead in the Church they will need for their personal credibility more than the simple fact of being appointed to an office by a distant authority. They will often have to establish personal credibility after their appointment by the continual moral stature of their lives, actions and judgments." (The Long Island Catholic, June 20, 1974).

Father Greeley is less philosophical and more direct: "Until recently the Church as an organization has provided not only ecclesiastical leadership (which is proper and which I support) but also communal and civic leadership. The failure of the church leadership to make any dent in the nativist opposition to Catholic schools and its total lack of awareness that quotas and affirmative action (such as in the deFunis case) are quite evidently discriminatory against Catholics are disgraceful. Its utter silence on the scapegoating of the ethnics as racists and hawks,

and more recently its lack of concern about a Jewish group assuming the right to interpret Catholic values for the rest of society show that the ecclesiocrats are quite incapable of providing us with the kind of wise leadership we need. Small wonder we lose every time. But perhaps it's just as well, maybe it is more clear now that as far as civic and communal matters go, we are much better off doing it ourselves." (St. Louis Review, Sept. 13, 1974).

In this statement, and in several similar expressions, Father Greeley seems to be advocating a proposal of potentially great significance, namely, the organization of a new Catholic populist movement to promote the civic and communal interests of Catholic people, but outside of ecclesiastical structures. "We do not have a network of voluntary organizations like the Jews and Protestants do, or like the blacks have acquired more recently," he writes, adding that "there is no Catholic defense organization to speak out in outrage" against the abuses and defamations suffered by the Catholic community. (St. Louis Review, Sept. 13, 1974).

In addition to proposing the organization of an extra-hierarchical, voluntary movement of Catholics, Father Greeley seems also to suggest that he has a candidate to lead such a movement, namely, the Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame and former Chairman of the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights:

"...There is probably no other American today besides Father Hesburgh who is not a bishop and who can claim to speak with any authenticity to and for 50 million American Catholics--and for

that matter even for ten million American Catholics. The non-Catholics in this country are more likely to listen to Hesburgh than they are to any of the four cardinals, but after him, who? The regrettable answer is no one." (Long Island Catholic, June 20, 1974).



4 - Resentment against Protestants and Jews

The most interesting reaction to his raising the issue of anti-Catholicism, Father Greeley wrote, came from many Protestants and Jews, some of them highly placed members of the academic elite. In substance what they said was, thank heavens you finally brought this subject out into the open. We have found anti-Catholicism offensive and disgusting for years, and it's high time that someone did something about it.

To which Greeley replies, "Fine fellas, and where have you been? You have stood idly by while anti-Catholic bigotry excluded us from power centers in the upper realms of American life; while Catholics were discriminated against in elite universities (especially in the social sciences) and while Catholic ethnics are blamed for most of the problems facing the country. Now when a Catholic blows the whistle on this sort of thing, you write him a confidential letter. In the meantime you have campaigned vigorously against real anti-Semitism and racism. Now you expect me to feel good all over because you applaud discreetly when a Protestant and a Jew are called nativist bigots for the first time. Thanks a lot." (Catholic Bulletin, Aug. 23, 1974).

ANTI-CATHOLICISM AND CATHOLIC-JEWISH RELATIONS

At first blush, many members of the Jewish community undoubtedly will be surprised by the very assertion that anti-Catholicism is on the rise. That widespread consternation has to do with the question of how one defines "anti-Catholicism." Like the conventional definition of anti-Semitism, if anti-Catholicism means "hatred of Catholic people simply because they are Catholics," then this entire discussion would take on a hollow ring for most Jews. While I have not come across recent scientific data that would confirm or invalidate the charges about this form of anti-Catholicism, I think it is safe to generalize that in the experience of the majority of American Jews anti-Catholicism -- defined as hatred, prejudice against, or suspicion of American Catholic people as a group -- is unquestionably at a lower ebb today than at any time in American history or in the history of Jewish-Christian relations. Of course, there is still a residue of bigotry among some Jews -- and among some Protestants -- as there is among some Catholics, but those pockets of intransigence that refuse to come to terms with the changes brought by Vatican Council II in Catholic identity hardly justify the claims of resurgent anti-Catholicism.

If the term anti-Catholicism is being used to categorize the defeat of Catholic positions on such issues as abortion and

parochial aid, then it would seem logical to state that the term is being used so loosely as to empty it of any real meaning. This use of the term recalls the recent discussion of the confusion over "anti-Semitism" and "anti-Zionism." On one level, it is certainly valid to say that Zionism is primarily a matter of national liberation, and therefore is essentially a political issue. To be anti-Zionist should logically in no way suggest that one is anti-Semitic. There are some committed Jews who, after all, are anti-Zionist and who differ with political positions of Zionist leadership. Thus, analogically, it should be conceivable that one differs with Catholic positions without necessarily being or becoming anti-Catholic.

And yet the analogy with Zionism compels a deeper analysis that would require a larger measure of understanding and empathy with Catholic spokesmen who claim that defeat of these Catholic positions inexorably leads to some form of anti-Catholicism. The central thesis of classical Zionism is that it is a movement constituted to restore the group identity of the Jewish people in a way that will enable them to live out freely and fully the values of Judaism in a Jewish homeland thus assuring the maximum possibility of their survival and creative continuity as a religious-ethnic community. To deny the Jews the possibility of that religious-ethnic self-perpetuation is in fact to stand in opposition to Jewish self-determination in its own terms. That denial to Jews of the right to their particularity is certainly

a form of anti-Semitism. (There are, of course, more blatant forms of anti-Zionist propaganda which leave no doubt that anti-Zionism has become the new code word for masked anti-Semitism. See article by Prof. Alan Davies, Anti-Zionism Is the New Anti-Semitism, Christian Century).

In like manner, the perpetuation of the Catholic community's religious-ethnic identity is dependent in a fundamental way on its capacity to educate its children and youth in the traditions and values of its inherited faith. (The same proposition applies to American Judaism, particularly its Orthodox branch which sets high standards for maximum education in traditional Judaism as the guarantee of Jewish religious survival). One may differ with Catholic authorities as to the legality of using public funds to subsidize directly sectarian education, but to do so in a way that is insensitive to the seriousness of the education crisis for Catholic survival is in fact to manifest moral callousness to committed Catholic people and their vital needs.

It is for that reason that the American Jewish Committee has sought to break with the automatic, mechanical "nyets" to every Catholic claim for a fair hearing of Catholic positions, especially in the area of aid-to-parochial schools. While remaining steadfast in its adherence to the separation of church-and-state principle as the cornerstone of religious liberty, the American Jewish Committee has rejected confrontation tactics with Catholics, Orthodox Jews, and others and has instead sought to explore every

creative alternative possible for bringing some measure of financial relief to hard-pressed parents of children in private schools, even as we have advocated vigorous support of the public school system. Thus, the AJCommittee has established task forces that have probed the possibilities of providing federal and state aid, consistent with the First Amendment, through tax credits, voucher plans, dual enrollment and shared time. Position papers on each of these alternatives disclose how seriously this commitment to accomodation and mutual help has been pursued. From this perspective, the sweeping charge of Father Greeley about Jews as "nativist bigots" (Catholic Bulletin, August 23, 1974) would have to be rejected as unfair.

Similarly, we have recognized that beneath the strident polemics around the abortion issue there is the fundamental moral and spiritual issue in which Jews have as much a stake as Catholics, and others, namely, reverence for all human life. There are, of course, technical theological questions -- such as, when life actually begins -- which finds a diversity of views among the branches of Judaism as among Catholics and certainly among Protestants. In order to try to increase the possibilities of understanding and perhaps even to find common ground around the keystone Biblical concept of reverence for life, I have taken several initiatives with Catholic bishops and other Catholic spokesmen to convene a high-level seminar of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish theologians and clergy to study together the

religious and philosophical assumptions of our respective faiths in relation to abortion and other right-to-life issues. While there was initial interest, regrettably and for some inexplicable reasons, there have been no takers for such a dialogue thus far. This refusal creates a clearcut quandary which needs clarification: some of these Catholic officials complain that they are unable to get a fair hearing in non-Catholic America for the Catholic position on right-to-life issues and yet inexplicably have failed to accept good-faith offers for interreligious dialogue that might well lead to such a fair hearing and shared understanding. At times, one gets an impression that some Catholics prefer to hoard these positions as "pure" Catholic views. But if that is the case, one cannot have it both ways. And under these circumstances, to wield a brush that condemns Protestants and Jews as "nativist bigots" is in fact to be guilty of smear-tactics. If one is genuinely interested in building bridges of understanding around such critical questions as abortion, the way of dialogue will have to be tried as a far more promising option in pluralist America than the dead-end of confrontation and name-calling.

The question of creating new Catholic structures to defend and protect Catholic religious and civil liberties is a major issue, but it is obviously an internal Catholic issue. It is for Catholics themselves to organize as they best see fit and necessary, and any Jewish comment would be nothing less than a presumption that would deserve the back of Greeley's (and anybody else's) hand -- just as any Catholic effort to reorganize the distinctive Jewish mode of communal organization in a Catholic-style hierarchical or ecclesiastical model would be unacceptable to American Jewry.

Suffice it to say, that the Jewish community would identify wholeheartedly -- as it has in the past -- with the program of Catholic religious and ethnic groups to combat any acts of denigration and scapegoating of Catholicism and the Catholic people. There would be virtually universal Jewish support for Catholic efforts to gain entry into every area of America's business, cultural, professional, and social life from which Catholics have been excluded. Such Jewish support would derive first and foremost from the moral and ethical principles of Judaism which obligate committed Jews to seek equality, justice, and dignity for our fellow men and women. Our historic experience with the same kind of exclusion from many of the same positions in American life, and at the hands of many of the same monopoly-wielders, impels us to recognize the interdependence of our struggle with Catholics and other minority groups in seeking to realize first-class citizenship for every person.

Every Jewish civic and communal group that I know of stands ready to share our experiences and knowledge with Catholic neighbors in how to develop effective strategies to break down the barriers of "executive suite" and social discrimination, as well as to combat defamation of Catholic people. Responsible Catholic leaders need only to invite our collaboration to see how real is our good-faith to be of assistance and to join in common cause.

In reviewing all the discussions about anti-Catholicism, the bottom line that requires frank discussion that is still to be faced has to do with a new troublesome aspect of the way the issues are being framed and conceptualized. While Jews respect both the need and the right of Catholic leaders to "blow the whistle" on anti-Catholicism, there is developing a tendency in much of the writing quoted here on the subject to make "the Jews" both a foil and a stalking horse. That is both troublesome and also potentially dangerous, and it better be faced before the genii of anti-Semitism gets out of the bottle, in a way that can become non-returnable.

On one level, it is a nice compliment to read Catholic writers and spokesmen consistently refer to the record of Jewish success and achievement in America. To find that "dream" image of Jewish winners (with which some 850,000 Jewish poor and elderly would find difficulty identifying) placed side by side with Catholic ethnic "losers" can not only lead to an impetus for envy and resentment toward Jews, but can lead as well in less disciplined hands to a conclusion that somehow Jewish success has been bought at the expense of Catholic failure. That this is more than my paranoia or idle speculation can be seen in the way an elitist discussion of Jews and Catholics in politics is treated by a lesser light who has difficulty translating academic theories into bar-room wisdom literature without in fact ending up in anti-

Jewish invective.

Obviously trying to plug into the Catholic elitist discussion of anti-Catholicism, a Jim Miller writes an article in the August 29 issue of the Brooklyn Catholic Tablet on "September and the Catholic Vote." Writing on the eve of the primary vote in the New York campaign which pitted Howard Samuels, the Jew, against Hugh Carey, the Catholic, as Democratic candidates for governor, Miller declares that "Jewish militancy and a heavy Jewish vote in the primaries are responsible for the Democratic Party's being on the verge of permanently purging Catholics from running for statewide office." And to strengthen his point, Mr. Miller adds that "Congressman Hugh Carey is an Irish Catholic with 12 kids and there is a prejudice against politicians like that."

As it turns out, the one genuine surprise of the primary was that Hugh Carey outscored Howard Samuels among Jewish voters by a heavy plurality. Mr. Carey won some 34% of the Jewish vote for the state of New York, and carried by 60% the vote in the four heavily Jewish assembly districts of New York. I have yet to see any statement from Mr. Miller that seeks to overcome the contradiction between his theories and the persuasive facts of the election results. In the meantime, Jewish representatives can only worry over how this blatant manipulation of the fear of anti-Catholicism supposedly waged by Jews can perversely be transformed into anti-Semitism against Jews. Such a possibility the Synagogue

Fathers could have had in mind in potentia when they asserted in their Ethics, "Wise men, be guarded in your words!"

Beyond that, the suggestion that there is an equivalency between the Jewish issues of Israel and Soviet Jewry and the Catholic issues of abortion and parochial schools leads to moral confusion and false expectations, with a growing implication of the possibility of trade-offs and quid-pro-quos. The best response that repudiates such an approach was expressed by the Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop Jean Jadot, who in a significant address before the American Jewish Committee on October 17, 1974 declared:

"First, the basis of our dialogue must be our shared spiritual patrimony. It cannot rely on a policy of reciprocity that would demand a pairing of issues which are to be traded off on a one-to-one basis. Dialogue is open-ended, not programmed for results. The starting point is respect and the end-product, mutual understanding.

"Second, the questions of abortion and aid to private schools should be subjected to a fuller, deeper and more open dialogue.

"Many of the difficulties of an intergroup nature that arise from these questions can, I believe, be attributed not to a failure of dialogue, but to a lack of it. The fact that difficulties and tensions have arisen is an indication of the gap that exists between our respective communities and the professionals who represent these communities in formal dialogues. It is absolutely

necessary to narrow and eliminate this gap.

"What is the future of Jewish-Christian relations? Because of the present tensions, some have become pessimistic. I cannot share that view. The success of our dialogues over the last nine years is the reason for my optimism.

"I do not wish to overvalue dialogue or see it as a panacea for all our ills. It can be esteemed, nonetheless, as a precious instrument of rationality and good faith in the relations between our two communities. Any success that we have in handling controversial problems today will lead to greater Jewish-Christian understanding and cooperation in the future. The present tensions, if we face them with courage, may well turn out to be the occasion for a giant step towards the goal that we have set for ourselves.

"The chief obstacle on this path is not hostility, as it may have been in the past. Today, it is perhaps a fear of one another. It is also apathy. The great dangers are that we do not have enough trust in one another, and that we are tempted to ignore one another.

"Yet, the remedy is simple: step up our efforts, our dialogue. It is my hope that the impetus in this direction will come from both the Jewish and the Christian communities. Dialogue is no longer a luxury, but a necessity. Jews and Christians should set an example for the whole human family - an example of fraternal understanding and love."