

THE RESPONSE OF THE U.S. BISHOPS

McIntyre and Murray

Murray's Reply to McNicholas' Newspaper

The McNicholas Committee

Murray's Reaction to the NCWC Principles

"The Pattern for Peace"

At Archbishop McNicholas' request, Archbishop Samuel Stritch and Bishop Karl J. Alter collaborated with him in the preparation of the report called for at the November, 1942, meeting of the Administrative Board.

At least one other bishop took a great and active interest in the subject. Bishop Francis McIntyre, auxiliary bishop of New York, enjoyed great authority in the archdiocese during the frequent absences of Archbishop Spellman during the Second World War. He had long been suspicious of the NCCJ and refused permission of his clergy to participate in its activities.¹ During the months when the episcopal committee was preparing its statement, McIntyre often corresponded with McNicholas on the subject. Troubled by the articles being published by Jesuits in *Theological Studies* and elsewhere, both McIntyre and McNicholas had occasion to engage the question with John Courtney Murray.

Early in 1942 McIntyre had expressed his opposition to the statement of principles the NCCJ had issued, which he regularly called a "creed." That John La Farge had been one of the signers of this statement affected McIntyre's reaction when the series of articles on cooperation published in *Theological Studies* began with the New York Jesuit's essay. On September 29, 1942, McIntyre composed and signed a letter to La Farge in which he said that the article had struck him as "an apologia for the National Conference of Jews and Christians." He wondered why La Farge had not included in his documentation the "creed" published by the NCCJ, which La Farge had signed. McIntyre noted the absence of any reference to Christ in the document and thought that for the Conference of Jews and *Christians* to offer it implied a contradiction "in that it appears to deny Christ by omission."²

On a copy of this letter McIntyre wrote "not sent," perhaps because he had decided to await an evaluation of La Farge's article by Father William O'Connor, a dogmatic theologian on the faculty of St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, who sent his comments to McIntyre on October 1. He noted

¹ In a memorandum for the Apostolic Delegate, 14 December 1950, McIntyre described his attitude toward the NCCJ: "During my years in New York the National Conference made a continued, persistent and insistent effort to obtain recognition from the Church in the Archdiocese of New York. I happened to have been the spear-head of opposition. The policy prevailed of not allowing a priest to attend any of their inter-faith meetings;" AALA, Mc451.

² McIntyre to La Farge, New York, September 29, 1942; ASJS. McIntyre concluded: "Certainly this 'creed' does not come under the scope of a declaration of citizens or patriots, but of religion." McIntyre often referred to the NCCJ as the National Conference of Jews and Christians, the original title of the organization. This could be a slip, but it also reflects McIntyre's conviction that the organization worked primarily for Jewish interests.

that La Farge's article had only stated the question and had refrained from supporting or opposing intercredal cooperation. The problem lay not with cooperation "along purely civic, social, economic, political lines," but "along religious lines." He echoed Connell's article by pointing to Carleton Hayes's comments on religious pluralism. After a briefer summary of Murray's first article on the subject, O'Connor noted that the two pieces were simply opening a discussion. He himself thought "that we must be on our guard against a tendency to link up the Holy See with this religious-cooperation movement," since Rome had "limited its plea for cooperation to *social* reconstruction. There is a danger that we may extend this to the religious sphere when we seek a common Christian basis or doctrines that we hold in common with others outside the Fold." A further danger was a departure from the traditional Catholic attitude and approach:

In the matter of doctrine and of morality, the Church has always been in the position of one who has something to *give* to others. She is decidedly not in the position of a *receiver*, especially from heretics, schismatics and unbelievers. Cooperation along religious lines will reverse our traditional Catholic position in regard to matters of doctrine, and the first thing we know we shall find ourselves *receiving* a lot of notions and views on religion that are simply not Catholic.

O'Connor also thought that the degree of agreement with "other so-called Christians" was being exaggerated:

The truth of the matter is that, in a great many cases, they do not mean what we mean by such terms as God, the Divinity of Christ, and others that are supposed to mean pretty much the same to them as to us. Non-Catholics are going in the direction of more and more liberalism of belief, and they are not going to go in the opposite direction (that is, in our direction) by these interfaith meetings. On the contrary, *we shall be the losers*. We shall be pulled in the direction of liberalism by them even unconsciously, while they will certainly not be pulled in the direction of rigid orthodoxy by us. How can they be? In these meetings and in these cooperative movements all that is distinctively Catholic will not be brought to the fore and we shall find ourselves moving in the circle of ideas that we are supposed to have in common with Protestants. In other words, we contribute nothing of our own which they have rejected, and we accept only what is agreeable to them. We shall be the losers in any such arrangement. We shall find ourselves getting the non-Catholic reaction to our doctrines together with a sympathy for it.

"Why then," O'Connor asked, "should we soft-pedal our distinctively Catholic doctrines and think that we can meet other Christians on another basis? The inevitable result will be a lessening of regard for the distinctively Catholic doctrines when we are emphasizing so much the other beliefs that we are supposed to have in common." He repeated his view that papal statements were being twisted and warned of the danger that people might conclude that Catholics were abandoning their convictions about "the unique and exclusive character of Catholic unity." Catholics appeared to be the only ones who had to surrender their principles and doctrines, "while the other side gives up nothing." Finally, O'Connor placed the issue in a larger context:

I think this cooperation idea can easily become part of a larger philosophical movement abroad today in which the notion of anything fixed and permanent and exclusive in religion or in anything else is ridiculed and denied. We are about the only ones left in the world to have fixed truths and eternal principles to fall back on and to teach; and it has always been the mission of the Church to *offer* these to others--to invite them to come and see for themselves. This incidentally has been proved to be the most effective method of helping people religiously in the long run. Cooperation on a religious basis will quickly break down this Catholic attitude unless it is carefully watched.

While awaiting further clarification in later articles in *Theological Studies*, he ended by restating his suspicion: "I am afraid that we may have to pay too high a price for interdenominational

cooperation. The beginnings of these movements have to be watched; as the Imitation of Christ tells us: 'After-remedies may be too late.'"³

Pleased by this "splendid letter," McIntyre then suggested that O'Connor write a similar letter to La Farge for possible publication, something he would himself also do.⁴ Ten days later, O'Connor wrote again to say that he had written to Murray from whom he had received "a fine letter in reply."

The next issue of THEOLOGICAL STUDIES is going to have an article on the Canon Law aspect of this question and he tells me "it is quite severe, and quite thorough." This is what I suspected; namely, that the first article was only the "state of the question," as it were, but ultimately the conclusion will be against any kind of so-called Intercredal Coöperation. I have an idea that the final result of this series will be all that could be desired and will come up to our expectations.⁵

This exchange must have been fresh in McIntyre's mind when, a month later, he attended the November, 1942, meeting of the Bishops at which McNicholas was given the task of drawing up a statement on cooperation. The day after the Administrative Board commissioned this statement, a memorandum on the NCCJ was prepared in the New York Chancery, probably by McIntyre himself. It first described the "purpose in theory" of the organization: "to analyze and allay prejudice," "to establish a basis of cooperation," and "to immunize the public mind and emotions against propagandas [*sic*] of misinformation and hatred by developing mutual understanding and appreciation." The note then went on to discuss the NCCJ's "purpose in practice." In New York it had not been perceived to take part in "anything religious." It had refused to participate in "the Released Time Movement," which many Jews opposed, and had turned down invitations to cooperate "in the formation of movements of religious groups." McIntyre then stated his view that "the object of the National Conference of Jews and Christians is to relieve the pressure from [*sic*: "on"?] the Jewish people by having them appear on an equal basis with others, with the implication that the union or amity, as they call it, is on a religious basis." The section ended with a reference to the "Creed" the NCCJ had published in February in which "there is no mention of Christ, Christianity or Christian principles. This is a clear indication of a grave sin of omission." In the last section McIntyre described the policy of the Archdiocese of New York: not to allow priests to take part in round-table discussions or other meetings of a religious character, but "to cooperate through laymen in movements of a patriotic or civic nature."⁶

Shortly afterwards, McIntyre sent a copy of the NCCJ "Creed" to McNicholas, who replied that he also could not defend it theologically. McNicholas briefly referred to his correspondence with Connell and regretted that the latter had omitted some relevant points in his article. He did not think that Cardinal Hinsley was "pursuing the wisest course in his *Sword of the Spirit*. I do not think it

³ O'Connor to McIntyre, Yonkers, October 1, 1942; ASJS.

⁴ McIntyre to O'Connor, New York, October 3, 1942; ASJS. No copy of such a letter from McIntyre can be found in the ASJS.

⁵ O'Connor to McIntyre, Yonkers, October 13, 1942; ASJS. I have not found the exchange between O'Connor and Murray.

⁶ "Memorandum," Nov. 10, 1942; ASJS.

would be suitable for our conditions here." But he did hope "to get a formula by which Catholics, Protestants, and Jews meet as citizens."⁷

Meanwhile, as *Theological Studies* continued to publish its series of scholarly contributions to the debate, two popular essays on the question of cooperation, published by Jesuits in *Columbia*, the periodical of the Knights of Columbus, drew the attention of bishops unfriendly to the cooperative movement. In May, 1943, Bernard A. Tonnar, a Jesuit scholastic, published an article on papal policy with regard to cooperating with non-Catholics.⁸ Setting himself the question whether there had been "any noticeable change in papal policy since the time of Leo XIII," Tonnar replied by identifying and illustrating two periods: a "Repression period" under Leo XIII and Pius X, and an "Encouragement period" under Pius XI and Pius XII. Circumstances had dictated the popes' policies during the two periods, the earlier dominated by the need to combat various "isms" and to defend the unique claims of the Catholic Church, the latter defined by the attack on the very foundations of society and the need to promote the collaboration of all religious people. While Tonnar's article reveals some acquaintance with the public discussion of the issue, it was published before the major articles by Parsons and Murray and was written, the author has said, without the knowledge or help of either man.⁹

Two months later, Wilfred Parsons devoted an article in *Columbia* to the annual meeting of The Catholic Committee of the South, an organization founded in 1939 to address the problems peculiar to that area of the country.¹⁰ Parsons introduced his summary of the convention's deliberations with a summary of his recent article in *Theological Studies*, arguing that according to the popes the crisis of the times required the collaboration of all religious people to regenerate society by a return to the divine moral law. In a remark that would attract much criticism, he said that this was our first duty, and "not, as unfortunately many still seem to think, to win the recognition of the spiritual authority of the Church." Catholics by themselves were powerless to bring about the reform of the temporal order, but they could take the lead in the work of regenerating society, and this was in fact now "a peremptory command" of Pius XII. Parsons likened the Catholic Committee on the South to the Sword of the Spirit begun by British Catholics and argued that "Southern Catholics were ahead of them. They were even ahead of Pius XII." The Committee provided "a magnificent opportunity to test out the ideas of Leo and the two Piuses."

The appearance of these two articles in a popular Catholic journal provoked McIntyre and McNicholas, both of whom seemed to find in them evidence of a distinct "Jesuit" campaign and undertook actions which were to require John Courtney Murray to defend his program and position.

⁷ McNicholas to McIntyre, Norwood, Dec. 3, 1942; ASJS. With the letter McNicholas sent a copy of his 1932 instruction on the question. On January 2, 1943, McIntyre sent McNicholas pages from *The New York Times* for Dec. 26th as well as "a pamphlet recently issued by Dr. Everett Clinchy"; McIntyre to McNicholas, January 2, 1943; ASJS.

⁸ Bernard A. Tonnar, "Papal Policy on Cooperation with Non-Catholics," *Columbia*, 22 (May, 1943) 7, 18-19.

⁹ Letter of Tonnar to JAK, New Orleans, 1990.

¹⁰ Wilfrid Parsons, "No Lavender, No Old Lace," *Columbia*, 22 (July, 1943) 6, 17.

McIntyre and Murray

In 1942, with McIntyre's permission,¹¹ Murray had participated in a course on "Religion and Society" given under the auspices of the Institute for Religious Studies at Jewish Theological Seminary in New York.¹² The other participants in the course were Robert M. MacIver, Liston Pope, Ben Zion Bokser, and H. Richard Niebuhr. The following description of the course was provided:

In this course the first three lectures will be devoted to analysis of the role which the sociologist believes religious traditions can play in the development of a better society. The following lectures will briefly indicate how the various traditions contribute to the creation of a better society, and the picture they draw of such a society. The lecturers are quite independent of one another in their approach to the problem; each presents his views positively, and retains sole responsibility for them. However, the lecturers met at a preliminary meeting, to exchange views and to arrange an orderly procedure for the course.

The program lists Murray as speaking on February 10, 17, 24, and March 10, 1942. From his notes and from the stenographic transcription of his talks it is clear that he spoke about the Church's mission in the socio-temporal order.¹³ This set of lectures was discussed in the first chapter.

On May 19, 1943, Murray wrote to McIntyre to request a similar permission for a new course at the Institute in the winter of 1944. In his lectures, which would deal with "the problems and the opportunities" facing the Church,¹⁴ he would present "an exposition of (1) the mission of the Church in the temporal order, as a point of Catholic doctrine, and (2) the ideas of the *Sertum Laetitiae*, the three Christmas Eve Allocutions of Pius XII, and the last three Pastoral Letters of the American episcopate." Requesting simply "the canonical mission to preach," and not the permission required by Canon Law,¹⁵ Murray recalled that McIntyre had permitted him to lecture two years earlier: "My experience at the time was that in the circumstances one had a useful opportunity to present integral Catholic doctrine to a group that gave evidence of thoughtfulness and sincerity."¹⁶

¹¹ I have not found this correspondence between McIntyre and Murray in 1942, but the Woodstock College Archives contain a letter from Murray to John La Farge, Woodstock, May 24, 1941, which appears to refer to Murray's request: "I had a letter from Bishop McIntyre. Says he: 'there seems to be no objection to your participation in the program of the Institute for Religious Studies. The circumstances that we object to do not seem to be present in the outline as contained in your letter.'

"Not enthusiastic, but at any rate, there it is. I shall try now to get up to the meeting that Dr. F. [Finkelstein] is arranging, on the 28th. And some time in the farther future I shall want to have a talk with you with regard to the 'line' I should take, and the ideas to be put forth in the actual lectures. I shall be very grateful for your counsel, and in view of past kindnesses to me I feel somehow free to call on it."

¹² Formerly known as "The Institute of Interdenominational Studies," The Institute for Religious Studies described itself as "A Graduate School conducted with the cooperation of Catholic, Jewish and Protestant Scholars."

¹³ AWC, Murray Papers, File 419. The stenographic report of Murray's lectures is in the Archives of the Institute, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York.

¹⁴ In the ANCWC/USCC, Education Dept., files on the NCCJ, there is a printed brochure listing Murray as scheduled to speak on February, 1, 8, 15, and 29, 1944 on the subject, "The Problems Faced by Catholicism in the Changing World of Today." Similar titles were to be addressed by the Protestant and Jewish speakers.

¹⁵ Murray may here have been relying on Bouscaren's analysis of this paragraph of the Code.

¹⁶ Murray to McIntyre, Woodstock, May 19, 1943; ASJS. Murray's presumption of rapid approval may have rested also on John La Farge's participation in the previous year's program at the Institute; see his article, "A Survey of Proposals for Postwar Reconstruction: A Catholic View," in *Religion and the World Order: A Series of Addresses and*

McIntyre replied two days later, insisting that Murray did indeed need the permission required by Canon 1325, par. 3, but also expressing reservations about the line of thought he feared Murray might follow: "If the lectures you intend to deliver will be formulated in any way after the recent article that appeared in Columbia Magazine of the Knights of Columbus, our opinion is that this course should not be given." McIntyre ended by inviting Murray to come to see him to discuss the issue.¹⁷

Because, it seems, this letter was mis-addressed, Murray did not receive it for almost a month. Meanwhile, McIntyre was so disturbed by Tonnar's article on cooperation that he again consulted Fr. O'Connor, apparently also intimating what he proposed to do about it. McIntyre's letter has not been found, but O'Connor replied that the article could give a false impression of a change in papal policy. All cooperation *in sacris* remained forbidden; what the two most recent popes were encouraging was different: "united efforts on the part of all who believe in God to save civilization from threatened destruction by atheistic communism." O'Connor found Tonnar's piece confused and fallacious: "The Pope is not concerned with the preservation of non-Catholic forms of Christianity as such, nor does he call upon all to unite in order to save all forms of religion. The collaboration encouraged by Pius XI was for the preservation of fundamental human and civil rights; it was certainly not a collaboration to preserve the various forms of Christianity that exist in the world." While Tonnar had sometimes noted this distinction, "the general tenor" of his article suggested a non-existent reversal in papal policy.

But because he thought Tonnar had made some proper distinctions and was not tolerant of *communicatio in sacris*, O'Connor advised McIntyre not to report the matter to the Apostolic Delegate but to ask Murray to come "to explain the extraordinary interest the Jesuits seem to be taking in this question right now and the apparent encouragement they are giving to inter-faith unity movements. Perhaps if they can be made to see the Conference of Jews and Christians as you see it, with the danger of encouraging indifferentism always associated with its activities, they might take a different line." O'Connor was concerned about the effect of a stronger reaction:

Theological Studies is trying to be a high-class periodical and Father John Courtney Murray is doing a good piece of work with it, at least as far as most of the articles are concerned. I fear the consequences to him and the magazine if the Apostolic Delegate were to receive the report you as a Bishop are about to send. This is the main reason why I suggest having Father Murray see you first. I feel sure that a frank discussion of this question with him will lead to profitable results.¹⁸

It was only on June 20, 1943, that Murray replied to McIntyre's letter about the lecture-series at Jewish Theological Seminary. He expressed his readiness to abide by the bishop's permission despite the awkward fact that he had already "half-committed" himself; he also explained his understanding of the permission required. The heart of the letter set out what he wished to do in his lectures:

Discussions, ed. F. Ernest Johnson (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1944) 67-75.

¹⁷ McIntyre to Murray, New York, May 21, 1943 (copy); ASJS. The reference, of course, was to Tonnar's article in *Columbia*.

¹⁸ O'Connor to McIntyre, Yonkers, May 30, 1943; ASJS.

Thirdly as regards the circumstances of the program: my lectures constitute a distinct and separate unit; I am the sole speaker; the atmosphere is that of a class; the aim is the presentation of integral Catholic truth in entirely dogmatic fashion--that is what the audience (a superior one, composed mostly of ministers and graduate students) come to hear. There is no thought of "reaching agreement," or of going into controversy. The single point is to state what the Catholic Church, in view of her own doctrine and discipline, conceives to be her problems and opportunities in the contemporary scene. No publicity is given to the course.

As I said in my last letter, my thought was to use the *Sertum Laetitia* as a sort of text for the course, and perhaps distribute it. Following it, I should elaborate the problems of the home and the school, and their underlying causes, materialism and excessive worship of liberty. The social question would have somehow to be touched. It is, of course, in that connection that our Holy Father issued his invitation to "our separated brethren" to a "salutary union of thought and policy." It would seem to me necessary to give some explanation of the meaning of that invitation. I anticipate, however, that discussion of this question is the source of your Excellency's anxiety. I can only say that any exposition I would give would be academic, from the standpoint of theological principle--the standpoint maintained in the recent articles in *Theological Studies*--on the grounds that the theologian may and must attempt to explain the official documents of the Church, while at the same time he sedulously avoids discussion of matters of diocesan policy, etc. If, however, your Excellency should object to such a theoretical discussion, that text of the encyclical could be left aside. After asking for a decision soon, Murray ended by disclaiming any association with the article in *Columbia*.¹⁹

McIntyre's reply on June 23 was direct and clear:

My reference to the article in "Columbia" did not mean to convey that you wrote that article. However, if you intend to discuss the subject treated in that article, we shall respectfully ask that you not give the course.

We understand the circumstances under which the course has been given in previous years, but then were of the impression that the lectures were on philosophy or strictly Catholic doctrine.

Our policy has not changed, but we do wish to register ourselves as being emphatically opposed to the articles which have recently appeared in *Theological Studies*, and to the above referred article in *Columbia*.

I have recently taken up this subject with your Father Provincial.²⁰

Before Murray could reply to this letter, things were further complicated. On June 23, 1943, Willard Johnson, assistant to the president of NCCJ, wrote McIntyre a letter which could not have led the bishop to look more favorably on Murray and his Jesuit colleagues. Johnson cited the articles in *Theological Studies* by Murray and Parsons as indicating "that His Holiness Pope Pius XII is desirous of cooperation between Catholics and non-Catholics," and he wished to know "whether or not these new developments in Catholic policy will open the way for increased cooperation of Catholics in the New York Archdiocese with the National Conference of Christians and Jews."²¹

McIntyre immediately sent a copy of the letter to Fr. James P. Sweeney, superior of the New York Province of Jesuits, citing it as evidence that the NCCJ was taking advantage of the articles by the several Jesuits, and asking Sweeney's advice on how to reply to the letter.²² Sweeney replied that he thought Johnson's letter "a piece of impertinence that does not deserve an answer." He noted that

¹⁹ Murray to McIntyre, Woodstock, June 20, 1943; ASJS.

²⁰ McIntyre to Murray, New York, June 23, 1943 (copy); ASJS. In a letter written the following day to Murray's Provincial, James P. Sweeney, McIntyre referred to his having spoken with him about the matter "a few days ago;" McIntyre to Sweeney, New York, June 24, 1943 (copy); ASJS.

²¹ Johnson to McIntyre, New York, June 23, 1943; ASJS.

²² McIntyre to Sweeney, New York, June 24, 1943 (copy); ASJS.

neither he nor McIntyre had control over Tonnar, who belonged to the Missouri Province, nor over *Columbia* magazine. Acknowledging that he did exercise censorship over *Theological Studies*, Sweeney said that he had reviewed its recent articles and defended the raising of the issue:

While I do not think that the Conference of Christians and Jews is productive of any great good, I do think it is very useful to discuss the morality of association with non-Catholics. It is a difficult question but Catholics should know what is right and wrong in the matter of cooperation with those not of our faith, even though non-Catholics may try to take advantage of our statements.

Sweeney advised McIntyre that the bishop had no duty to answer a letter clearly trying to embarrass him, but that if he chose to do so he might simply say that "the Archdiocese of New York does not take its policies from the private opinions that are expressed by writers in various magazines. It's [*sic*] policy is the same as it was before THEOLOGICAL STUDIES discussed the question of intercredal cooperation."²³

Perhaps at least in part because of Sweeney's defense of the articles in *Theological Studies*, McIntyre decided to ignore the advice of Fr. O'Connor, and on July 7th he sent a dossier on the subject to the Apostolic Delegate with a lengthy accompanying letter:

I hesitate to annoy your Excellency with the following matter, and it is only after reflection that I am compelled to do so.

1. The matter concerns the articles which have appeared within the past year in the Jesuit Magazine "Theological Studies" and particularly the article seemingly written by a Jesuit scholastic named Tonnar, which appeared in the "Columbia Magazine" recently:

I lean to the opinion that the articles in "Theological Studies" have been instigated more by the National Conference of Christians and Jews than by the movement in England. Father La Farge has been more or less closely associated with the National Conference of Christians and Jews for a long time.

We have rubbed elbows with the National Conference of Christians and Jews here in New York for many years, perhaps twelve or fifteen. I am looked upon as their enemy #1 here, because the Chancery in New York throughout these years has steadfastly refused to allow a priest of the diocese to partake in their "Round Table Religious Discussions" or "Interfaith Meetings." They have brought all possible pressure to change this attitude.

We have told them definitely that we will participate with them in civic and patriotic matters, but not in meetings that have the appearance of a gathering that suggests religious unity. This attitude is dictated by the conviction that the National Conference of Christians and Jews is not in any way--and they admit it--concerned with religion, but strive to keep before the public eye that Catholics, Protestants and Jews are not opposed to each other in religious beliefs. This seems to be the policy of Mr. Everett Clinchy, the Director, and I think is purely utilitarian. He does not seem to be at all concerned with the inevitable philosophy behind his tactic, which is basically to seek a least common denominator in religion and so present to the public the idea that one religion is as good as another.

I am sending to your Excellency under separate cover the several copies of "Theological Studies" containing these articles. The article of Father Parsons in the most recent issue most closely approximates the article of Mr. Tonnar, S.J., in "Columbia" copy of which is also enclosed.

²³ Sweeney to McIntyre, New York, June 24, 1943; ASJS. In the end, McIntyre did reply to Johnson along the lines suggested by Sweeney: "I am sorry that I must disagree with your interpretation of the several articles referred to in your letter.

"I assure you that there have been no developments or changes in Catholic doctrine, and the attitude of the Archdiocese of New York will remain as it has been clearly explained to your representatives on many occasions in years passed [*sic*];" McIntyre to Johnson, New York, July 10, 1943; ASJS.

2. The article by Mr. Tonnar, S.J., in "Columbia" seems to present an additional objection, because it attempts to interpret the utterances of the Reigning Pontiff and his immediate successors [*sic*, corrected in margin to: "predecessors"] in a way that indicates a change in policy on the part of the Church, and I wonder very much if such an interpretation is correct.

Both the articles in "Theological Studies" and this article of Mr. Tonnar, S.J., prompted the Conference of Christians and Jews to write to me a letter, copy of which your Excellency will find herewith.

I thereupon took occasion to confer with the Very Reverend James P. Sweeney, the Jesuit Provincial here. I told him that I was disturbed about the matter and wanted to bring it to his attention before taking further steps. I have his letter yesterday in reply and enclose a copy herewith. I think your Excellency will agree with me that it is entirely unsatisfactory. I can hardly agree with Father Sweeney that the utterances of a Jesuit Father in a Jesuit Magazine can be considered a "private opinion."...

P.S. I have obtained some comment from one of our Seminary professors, Father O'Connor. That is also enclosed.²⁴

Two days later Murray, unaware that the issue had been taken to the Delegate, sent a vigorous defense of the *Theological Studies* articles to McIntyre:

Your letter of June 23rd came during my absence on retreat work; this is my first opportunity to acknowledge it. In conformity with the wish expressed in it by your Excellency, I shall not discuss the question of intercredal cooperation at the Institute for Religious Studies.

Of more actual importance to me, however, was the statement that your Excellency is "emphatically opposed to" the articles on the subject in THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. This is important because it is the first adverse criticism of them that I have received. The general run of comment made to me might fairly be summed up in the words of a Bishop who wrote that the articles were "most timely and convincing."

Important, too, was the statement that your Excellency had "taken up this matter" with my Provincial. I shall be interested to hear just what was taken up. Anything reprehensible in my personal conduct, or temerarious in my personal opinions, is rightly referred to my own Provincial. However, if the policy of THEOLOGICAL STUDIES is in question, the more proper court of representation would be the Board of American Provincials, since it is to them collectively that I am responsible, as head of an interprovince enterprise.

At all events, both the judgment expressed, and the action taken, by your Excellency make it necessary for me to endeavor more fully to understand your mind. It is difficult to avoid an interrogatory form, but your Excellency will understand that my single aim is at my own enlightenment.

I am frankly puzzled by the formula: "emphatically opposed to the articles, etc." (In question are the articles in THEOLOGICAL STUDIES; the article in COLUMBIA is none of my concern.) May I explain?

I can understand opposition to particular activities in which Catholics and non-Catholics might collaborate--let us say, those of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. (On occasion, I have myself implicitly opposed them by refusing to participate in their trio teams.) But I thought we had made it clear that our discussion transcended such

²⁴ McIntyre to Cicognani, New York, July 7, 1943 (copy); ASJS. At the end is written: "The enclosures are:

1. Copy of letter from Conference of Christians and Jews attached.
 2. Copy of letter to Father Sweeney attached.
 3. Copy of letter from Father Sweeney attached.
 4. Copy of Father O'Connor's letter in the form of a memorandum from x to x with this additional paragraph "It must of course be noted that the author does at times make the proper distinctions and does seem anxious to disclaim any toleration of "cooperation in sacris."
- [#5 is handwritten in ink:] 5. Letter from Bp. McIntyre (copy) to Mr. Willard Johnson, N.C.C. & J. dated 7/10/43." See also the note acknowledging receipt of the dossier by Luigi Raimondi, Secretary to Cicognani, on July 13, 1943. As we shall see, Cicognani was himself concerned about the matter.

particular activities, in order to concern itself expressly with a vastly more important issue. Moreover, we necessarily took a standpoint higher than that of any individual diocesan policy. Our aim was more ultimate--the position of the theological problem implicit in certain utterances of the Holy See regarding co-operation among all men of good will towards the reconstruction of the social order, and the development of the canonical norms, theological principles, and papal directives available for its solution. I do not see exactly how I am to understand opposition to such a discussion. I can, of course, accept an unexplained refusal to permit me to lecture on the subject before a New York audience; the reasons therefore, whether deriving from distrust of my competence or from the particular conditions of New York City, are perhaps not subject to inquiry. But, if left unexplained, emphatic opposition to a scientific discussion, in a theological journal, of a subject that (it seems to me) the Holy See itself has proposed for such discussion is less readily intelligible. My puzzlement increases when I hear that I have been delated to my religious Superior, as for some offense, when the offense is not apparent, and is not specified. Am I at fault simply because I have brought up the question?

However, it may be that your Excellency wished to express, not opposition to the sheer publication of the articles, but disagreement with their content. This would be a different matter. The bases for disagreement are clear: Is there error or imprudence in the assertion that a problem exists, or has there been inadequacy or falsity in the manner of stating it; has the canon law on the subject been satisfactorily explained; above all, have the papal texts (which are really the starting point of the whole discussion) been correctly interpreted, and have the general conclusions from them been drawn with reasonableness. These are, briefly, the central issues. I feel that I may speak for those whom I invited to write on the subject, as well as for others, when I say that light on these issues is earnestly desired. My motive in inaugurating their discussion was simply the conviction that a clear, objective, theologically grounded theory of intercredal co-operation, as suggested by the Holy See, is a contemporary desideratum, and that it is the function of a theological magazine to attempt to formulate such a theory. The whole question is admittedly delicate, and requires great exactitude and dispassionate objectivity of thought. If the thought expressed in our pages has not been exact or objective, it is imperative that it be criticized and completed. But may I frankly and with all respect submit that for your Excellency simply to register emphatic opposition to our work is, from our particular point of view, unhelpful. On the other hand, it would be most helpful to know the particular points on which your Excellency disagrees, and your opposing arguments, views, etc.

Perhaps I have made clear at least the genuine sense of puzzlement out of which I write. I ask pardon again for writing with some freedom. But the issues involved here are far more important than my own insignificant self, and consequently I felt that I must take a risk that I would otherwise gladly avoid. Any clarification of these issues that your Excellency may see fit to afford would be gratefully received.²⁵

The correspondence between Murray and McIntyre appears to have ended with the latter's reply to Murray's self-defense:

I have your letter of July 9th. If you are interested in discussing with me the questions raised in your letter, I would repeat the suggestion made in an earlier letter that you call upon me for that purpose. Your lengthy interrogatory and argument do not lend themselves to satisfactory treatment in a letter.

I wish to call attention to the fact that our letters did not contain an "unexplained refusal" of the permission you requested. We were disposed to grant the permission, if the lectures to be given were in accordance with our understanding of the classes you had previously given at the Jewish Theological Seminary: on philosophical and dogmatic theological subjects. Our letter gave a definite reason for injecting this condition, and I am hopeful that we may continue to enjoy the privilege of expressing opinion on the presentation of material printed in even Theological Studies.

We also agree with you that the subject is one "more ultimate than the policy of an individual diocese", and it is only from that viewpoint that we have viewed these articles. However, I cannot refrain from seeing a line of continuity in the articles of Father La Farge, Father Parsons and Rev. Mr. Tonnar, and because this thread of thought seems to permeate writers of your community, I deemed it proper to confer with your Provincial. Again as an editor, I am sure that you will recognize the misinterpretation you make in my comment regarding the Provincial. This is a separate and

²⁵ Murray to McIntyre, Woodstock, July 9, 1943; ASJS.

distinct paragraph of my letter, and therefore does not justify your interpretation as applying it to yourself individually. After all my opinion and the attitude of the Archdiocese of New York make very little difference in this matter, and we shall leave it to more competent minds to carry on any discussion the subject may warrant.²⁶

In this letter McIntyre did not inform Murray that he had referred the matter to the Delegate, unless this is implied in the final reference to "more competent minds."²⁷

This exchange did not end the matter, however. A week after Murray wrote his long letter, Willard Johnson invoked the Jesuit's name in a reply to McIntyre. He again cited the articles by Murray, Parsons, and Tonnar to justify his inquiry to the Archdiocese:

As you will recall, one of the requests we have made in the past was that of permission to use priests on programs with clergy of other creeds. It is interesting to note that Father Murray in his last article interprets the statements of the Pope as suggesting the use of priest-theologians to give assistance to lay leaders of cooperation. One of these duties, he suggests, is that of appearing on public platforms with the clergy of other creeds to interpret the Catholic position in matters of common concern. Incidentally, in the thousands of such programs we have presented we have never allowed theological debate.

Another indication of change is that, during the fifteen years of our activity, we have reached the point where at least 85 bishops and archbishops of the nation give permission to priests to take part in our programs. Several members of the hierarchy have appeared recently on our programs with clergymen of other creeds.²⁸

McIntyre immediately sent a copy of this letter to the Apostolic Delegate. He questioned the accuracy of Johnson's last paragraph and added a notice about his exchange with Murray:

I have had some correspondence recently with Father Murray. He sought permission to lecture next winter before the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. Heretofore he had given a course there with our permission on Catholic philosophy. This time the indication was that the course would be on a topic along the lines of this discussion in Theological Studies. We told Father Murray if that were his intention we would prefer that he not give the course. He responded, and while he acquiesced in our decision, he made several references to the fact that we were placing a diocesan policy above the general attitude of the Church.²⁹

No reply from Cicognani to either of McIntyre's letters is found in the New York Archives.³⁰

²⁶ McIntyre to Murray, New York, July 14, 1943 (copy); ASJS. The carbon copy of this letter does not include any closing words or place for signature, so that I cannot be sure that there was not a second page.

²⁷ McIntyre may also have had the U.S. Bishops in mind. On June 25, 1943, he sent the NCWC a suggestion for that year's annual Bishops' Meeting: "The attitude of the Jesuit Fathers as expressed in articles in "Theological Studies" and in an article in "Columbia" by a Father Tonner [*sic*], S.J. In these articles the recent Popes are presented as advocating and declaring a changed policy by the Church in its relations with non-Catholics;" ACUA, NCWC/USCC, Box 70: NCWC Bishops' General Meeting: Program 1940-44.

²⁸ Johnson to McIntyre, New York, July 21, 1943; ASJS.

²⁹ McIntyre ended: "All this merely as information"; McIntyre to Cicognani, New York, July 24, 1943; ASJS.

³⁰ In 1950 McIntyre was among the bishops whom the Apostolic Delegate consulted about the International Conference of Christians and Jews. In the memorandum he wrote in response, McIntyre recalled the "complaint" he had made at the time when "the Conference enlisted support of several Jesuit Fathers." He also added, something not otherwise known: "At the same time I took the matter up with Father McCormick of the Jesuits, when I was in Rome in 1945;" AALA, Mc415.

Later in the year McIntyre also denied permission to John A. Ryan to give a lecture at Jewish Theological Seminary on "American Economy and World Economy."³¹ Ryan had already accepted the invitation, but wrote to McIntyre in case the Archdiocese might have objections. McIntyre's reply noted that "some of the Jesuit priests" had lectured "on philosophical subjects." Now, however, he cited some of the Archdiocese's canonists on "the possible violation of the regulations of the canons by such a participation." Acknowledging that canonists disagreed on the issue, he still concluded that "because of this difference of opinion and the possible 'admiratio' by the clergy, we think that it would be more prudent were you and we not to expose ourselves to this danger."³²

Ryan immediately withdrew his acceptance of the JTS invitation.³³ Before responding to McIntyre, however, he sent a copy of the Bishop's letter to Murray, who in his reply summarized his correspondence with the New York Chancellor which he read simply as a prohibition of his addressing the issue of interreligious cooperation. "However, the prohibition was not explicitly extended to an [*sic*] participation in the program of the Institute for Religious Studies. And consequently, interpreting this *secundum stylum curiae*, I intend to go ahead with the lectures, avoiding the prohibited topic."

Murray went on, however, to note that McIntyre had never raised the question of canonical interpretation in his letters nor had he referred to the "admiratio" of the clergy. On the latter, he noted that the Institute had been "given a clean bill of health by the diocesan priest appointed to survey Catholic activities with non-Catholics." He asked Ryan's view of the canonical issue and urged him to raise it with McIntyre. He was primarily interested "in clear declarations of principle," because of "the fog with which the whole matter is surrounded. This business of 'co-operation' can be foggy enough at times, without further obscuring the atmosphere! Besides, it always makes me slightly uncomfortable when I don't know where I am."³⁴

Ryan accepted Murray's suggestion and finally wrote to McIntyre on October 8th, informing the Bishop that he had withdrawn from the JTS program. But he added that he did not think canon law forbade the type of lecture he had intended to deliver nor that it would involve "any taint of illicit cooperation." He thought he had also had positive reasons for accepting the invitation: "the desire to bring Catholic doctrine and its applications to an important group of those 'without the fold.' In the course of the last thirty-five years I have more than once addressed completely nonCatholic groups and in every case was satisfied that I had done no harm, but instead a fair amount of good."³⁵

³¹ Ryan had given a paper on "Religious Foundations for Enduring Peace" in Rabbi Louis Finkelstein's Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion on September 12, 1943; his correspondence with Finkelstein is found in ACUA, Ryan Papers, Box 11/22, with the text of his paper in Box 11/29.

³² Ryan to McIntyre, Washington, September 20, 1943 (copy); McIntyre to Ryan, New York, September 22, 1943; ACUA, Ryan Papers, Box 11/22.

³³ Ryan to Louis Finkelstein, Washington, September 24, 1943 (copy); ACUA, Ryan Papers, Box 11/22.

³⁴ Murray to Ryan, Woodstock, September 28, 1943; ACUA, Ryan Papers, Box 11/22.

³⁵ Ryan to McIntyre, Washington, October 8, 1943 (copy); ACUA, Ryan Papers, Box 11/22. Ryan sent a copy of this letter to Murray, who replied that he found it "admirable, in content and tone." "Let us hope that some clarification, at least, results, though the hope must be slim;" ACUA, Ryan Papers, Box 11/22. Wilfred Parsons also received a copy of the letter and replied to Ryan: "The truth is that they up there [in New York] cannot grasp the distinction between

Another prominent Catholic social thinker also had to deal with the issue. In June 1942 Paul Hanly Furfey received an invitation from Herbert L. Seamans, New England Regional Director of the NCCJ, to participate on a panel with a minister and rabbi at an all-day conference for public and parochial school teachers. Furfey consulted Msgr. Joseph M. Nelligan, chancellor of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. "I am frankly a bit doubtful about the activities of this organization. It seems to have been criticized indirectly in a recent issue of the *Ecclesiastical Review* and I do not feel free to accept the invitation without consulting you." Nelligan replied that he would see "no objection whatsoever" to Furfey's participation, but added: "Our feeling here is that there is not much to be accomplished by this Organization as far as we are concerned. The Archbishop has taken a rather passive attitude towards the whole thing." He noted also that Furfey would have to consult the local ecclesiastical authorities in New England. In the end Furfey declined the invitation, offering a frank explanation of his decision:

Although the ecclesiastical authorities did not refuse me the necessary permission I found, on consulting with a number of persons whose judgment I value, that the common opinion was that projects like this do not accomplish any great amount of good. It is true that they help toward better understandings between religious groups and they aid in removing prejudices. On the other hand, it is the feeling that a Catholic speaker is placed in a somewhat false position. We cannot hold the doctrine that all religions are equally good; yet the circumstances of these meetings tend to produce this impression no matter how scrupulously careful the speaker is to state the opposite viewpoint.

After thanking Seamans for the invitation, Furfey added: "I hope you will realize that my refusal was dictated purely by considerations of general policy. Certainly my own impulse would be to accept with alacrity."³⁶ It would not be long, however, before Furfey became a strong public critic of Murray's views on the matter.

Murray's Reply to McNicholas' Newspaper

Around the same time, three editorials in *The Catholic Telegraph-Register*, the official newspaper of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, took issue with articles by Jesuits on cooperation with non-Catholics. The first of these criticized Tonnar's article in *Columbia*, pointing out some inaccuracies but mainly opposing the article's implication that the Popes favored some kind of inter-confessional unity. The editorial argued that the Popes had not proposed setting up an organization and that "a crusade for Christian principles could be undertaken by Jews, Catholics, and Protestants without any attempt to unite these three groups in the loosest sort of organization." After outlining eight principles others could be invited to endorse, it ended with the strong statement that the cooperation favored by the Popes "excludes all organization on the basis of religion and probably all organization of any sort with mixed religious groups. Catholics may meet in conference as

cooperation--forbidden or allowed--on the one hand, and on the other, the single appearance of a Catholic priest before a group of non-Catholics to preach Catholic doctrine to them. These people would have forbidden St. Paul to preach to the Areopagus;" Parsons to Ryan, Washington, September 28, 1943; ACUA, Ryan Papers, Box 11/22.

³⁶ Seamans to Furfey, New Haven, June 29, 1942; Furfey to Nelligan, Washington, July 3, 1942 (copy); Nelligan to Furfey, Baltimore, July 6, 1942; Furfey to Seamans, Washington, July 17, 1942 (copy); ACUA, Furfey Papers.

citizens with all groups to consider the truths of natural religion, the domain of reason, and the ethics based on it."³⁷

The second editorial replied to Parsons' article in *Columbia*. Referring to the Jesuit as a "clever journalist," it took exception to his claim that the first duty of Catholics was not "to win the recognition of the spiritual authority of the Church" but to regenerate society:

These are strange words coming from a theologian. The time has not passed in which to win a recognition for Christ, living in His Church, and for the authority of the Church which is the authority of Christ. By implication, Father Parsons can be interpreted as saying, "preach the natural law but don't overemphasize the Athanasian Creed."

The editorial also criticized Parsons for not indicating how Catholics are to cooperate with others and for his statement that the Southern Catholics were even ahead of Pius XII. "We would remind him that the leadership of the Holy See is not similar to that provided by our politicians of today who are answerable to their electorate." It warned against a "spirit of compromise" among those promoting cooperation and included the forthright statement: "In *Columbia* Father Parsons, like his confrere, Father Tonnar, is not defending the position of the Holy See."³⁸

Finally, two weeks later, a third editorial broadened the attack:

Terms are used about co-operation with non-Catholics that are offensive to theological and Catholic ears. When we say that Catholics should co-operate in an inter-credal [*sic*] movement, or an inter-faith movement, or an interdenominational movement, or in a non-sectarian movement, we should not convey the meaning even by implication that the Catholic Church is merely one of creeds, or one of faiths, or one of denominations, or one of sects.

This column is greatly perplexed by many of the statements of the Jesuit Fathers on co-operation with non-Catholics. Its judgment is that they are not defending the position of the Holy See. It is assumed that the Jesuits, of all religious orders, would be the valiant defenders of the Holy See.

Later it again referred to the Jesuits:

The ideas proposed by some of the positive theologians of the Jesuits that there is an evolution in the Papal programs or in the practical decisions of the Popes offering solutions for the evils of our day seem entirely unwarranted by any statements in Papal documents.

The writer repeated the earlier statements that the Pope was not recommending that Catholics "put aside anything that the Church has said for the safeguarding of doctrine and morality. The decrees and the decisions of the Church must stand unchanged and unchangeable." The Pope is not recommending "some sort of super-organization that would in any way be at variance with the decisions of the Holy See and that might give a wrong impression of what the divinely organized society of the Church is." The editorial proposed as a formula for co-operation in the U.S. "the norms or constitutions of the Boy Scouts," with a name such as "Association to Defend Rights." And it excluded certain proposed models:

In the judgment of this writer, the Conference of Christians and Jews is not workable and cannot do the thing that the Popes have been entreating all men of good will to do. The Sword of the Spirit as set up in England does not suit our conditions. Much of its work is better organized by the National Catholic Welfare Conference.³⁹

³⁷ "Co-Operating with Non-Catholics," *The Catholic Telegraph-Register*, July 9, 1943; ASJS.

³⁸ "Co-Operation with Non-Catholics," *The Catholic Telegraph-Register*, July 30, 1943. ASJS.

³⁹ "Co-Operation with Non-Catholics," *The Catholic Telegraph-Register*, August 13, 1943; ASJS.

While not written by McNicholas, there can be little doubt that these editorials sought to reflect his views on cooperation. The third one in particular used language nearly identical to that employed by McNicholas in his correspondence.⁴⁰ If anything, McNicholas would have preferred a stronger stand in his newspaper; he wrote McIntyre that he thought his editor's comments on Tonnars' article "far from being a strong refutation of it."⁴¹

McNicholas sent copies of the three editorials to the Apostolic Delegate, adding his own comments:

I dislike the term "inter-credal" which Father Parsons seems to be promoting. We also have inter-faith, inter-denominational, and non-sectarian movements. Our Catholic laity seem to be informed enough to avoid non-sectarian movements, but why theologians use these other terms as though the Catholic Faith were merely one of the creeds, one of the faiths, or one of the denominations, I cannot understand.

At the November meeting of the Bishops in Washington last year, I was appointed to gather documents or norms for the Bishops on this matter.

Perhaps I am too apprehensive, but I see great danger in anything like an organization that would be known as an inter-credal, an inter-faith, or an inter-denominational conference. I do not understand why the Jesuits are so solicitous about promoting it. I am convinced that the Conference of Jews and Christians [*sic*], if not dangerous to the Faith, is an attempt to use the Catholic Church, not for the advancement of the Catholic religion, but for some purpose that the Jews and Protestants have in mind.

Archbishop Stritch and I are exchanging letters on the subject. We agree that no formula has been found up to the present. We both agree that there should be some way in which Catholics can meet with all groups of citizens of the United States, but revealed or supernatural religion must absolutely be excluded in discourses, in addresses, in debates, etc.

Cicognani's reply revealed his own concern:

Like yourself, I feel that this is a matter which must be handled with the utmost caution, because of the latent dangers which lie hidden in any attempt to line up the Church with other faiths, as though she were just one among many. I shall be interested to see the results of the correspondence which you are presently exchanging with Archbishop Stritch on this matter, and I trust that some steps can be taken to prevent zealous members of the Church from going too far in their attempts to promote harmony and good will.⁴²

⁴⁰ See his remarks about Cardinal Hinsley in his letter to McIntyre on December 3, 1942, quoted above. In a letter to William R. Castle, an Episcopalian, McNicholas wrote: "I have followed with much interest the Sword of the Spirit movement. Much of its work in this country is being done by the National Catholic Welfare Conference.... I am sure it will be clear to all who have studied the question that, in the domain of supernatural religion and in the full revelation of Christ, there can be no co-operation between the Catholic Church and other groups of the Christian family. We ought to be able, it seems to me, to meet as citizens;" as quoted in the Report of the General Secretary to the Administrative Board in May, 1943; ACWC/USCC. Finally, on August 13, 1943, he wrote to McIntyre: "Such priests as Fathers Tonnar and Parsons seem to me to start out with the thesis that the Holy See is calling for some sort of superorganization other than the Church to save modern society. As positive theologians they fall readily into the error that there is some sort of an evolution in the statements, letters, etc., of the Popes;" ASJS. See also his letter to Cicognani, quoted below.

⁴¹ McNicholas to McIntyre, Cincinnati, July 9, 1943; ASJS. He added: "I find one paragraph in reference to the late Holy Father extremely offensive, of which the enclosed editorial says nothing."

⁴² McNicholas to Cicognani, August 15, 1943 (copy); Cicognani to McNicholas, Washington, August 20, 1943; AACinc, McNicholas papers, 24/27.

The Jesuits indicted by the editorials took steps to clarify the issue. Parsons wrote to ask for a meeting with McNicholas about the editorial which had referred to him and which he felt had missed his point. McNicholas agreed to the meeting and stated his concern:

Your article in *Theological Studies* disturbs me, also your article in *Columbia*. Father Tonnar's article must be set aside. Apart from an accurate theological statement and upholding the position of the Holy See, I am sincerely interested in the position of your Society. I do not like to see anything come from the pen of a Jesuit which does not reflect perfectly the mind of the Church and that of the Holy See.⁴³

McNicholas and Parsons met for four hours on September 5th. The Archbishop described their conversation in letters to Stritch and Mooney. While he admired his old friend's "honesty and directness," it was clear to him that Parsons was not a theologian. McNicholas had pointed out journalistic expressions in his *Columbia* article that "were very offensive to theological ears," and Parsons had acknowledged the problem. He said he told Parsons that "while the Bishops would welcome the united wisdom of the Society of Jesus" in the work of social reconstruction, he warned that he "did not like to see any members of his Order taking a position that might not be tenable and which would give wrong impressions to non-Catholics." The conversation ended with McNicholas "not sure at all that I convinced him that the position which he takes is not safe and may not be tenable."⁴⁴

Murray's response, when sent a copy of the third editorial,⁴⁵ was to write to Msgr. Edward A. Freking, editor of the Cincinnati Catholic newspaper. With it he enclosed a long reply to the editorial, "a personal, friendly communication," he called it, "though it deals rather frankly with several of the things in the editorial that gave me pause." At the end of the letter Murray wondered whether Freking might accept an article by him: "The article could be submitted to your diocesan censors, and if it contradicts any point of papal doctrine, I should expect it to be rejected."⁴⁶

Murray's enclosure was an eight-page, single-spaced typed text, which was at once a helpful summary of his own position and a lively repudiation of the criticisms of the editorial. It may be that Murray went to this length because he suspected that it was McNicholas who was really responsible for the editorials.

COMMENT on the editorial, "Co-operation with Non-Catholics"

Let me first register some points of agreement. First, I am entirely in accord with the writer's judgment on the National Conference of Christians and Jews: it cannot do what the Popes wish done. I would add that it has had at least one certainly harmful effect: it has confused the issue in the matter of co-operation, and created much prejudice in Catholic minds against the whole idea. Actually, when co-operation is mentioned, a great many people instinctively think of the N.C.C.J., and of a priest, minister, and rabbi on the same stage, making declarations of amity. They are inclined to suppose that one who speaks a word of co-operation is therefore endorsing the N.C.C.J. and its goals, bases, formula,

⁴³ Parsons to McNicholas, South Norwalk, August 24, 1943; McNicholas to Parsons, Cincinnati, August 29, 1943 (copy); AACinc.

⁴⁴ McNicholas to Stritch, Cincinnati, September 16, 1943 (copy); McNicholas to Mooney, Cincinnati, September 22, 1943 (copy); AACinc. I have not found any material on this visit in the Parsons Papers at Woodstock College.

⁴⁵ The editorial in question, "Co-operation with Non-Catholics," is the one that appeared in *The Catholic Telegraph-Register* on August 13, 1943, and not the one with the same title that appeared on July 30, 1943, as Fogarty, *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy*, pp. 350-51, suggests.

⁴⁶ Murray to Freking, Woodstock, August 22, 1943; AAC.

techniques, etc. This is unfortunate. It obscures the fact that there is a Catholic concept of co-operation, not vulnerable by the criticisms launched against the N.C.C.J.

Secondly, I agree that the organization of the Sword of the Spirit is not feasible in the American scene. At the same time, I think that an alliance between this movement and some existing organization in the U.S. is desirable in the interests of a necessary international Catholic solidarity.

Thirdly, I emphatically second the urgent invitation, given by the editorial to capable theologians, to study and write about the problem of co-operation. I trust it meets with greater response than my own similar invitation in THEOLOGICAL STUDIES.

Fourthly, I agree with the editorial insofar as it states that we should do nothing in this matter that is at variance with the wishes of the Holy See, or that would compromise the Church, her doctrine, or her unique character as the one true Body of Christ. This should go without saying.

However, the editorial raises a number of questions. First, it was evidently inspired by some Jesuit utterances. Naturally, I am particularly anxious to know whether, and how far, the strictures laid on "Jesuit theologians" reach my own writings on the subject of co-operation. Moreover, since, as Editor, I have a measure of responsibility for the articles that have appeared in THEOLOGICAL STUDIES, I should like to know the author's specific judgment with regard to them. (I presumed to send a complete set to Msgr. Freking.) These articles were designed, not to trace a concrete program (which would be beyond the scope of the magazine, and is a matter for the Bishops anyway), but to attempt to bring some theoretical clarity to a vexed issue. Quite a few responsible persons--Bishops among them--wrote to me, emphasizing the necessity of the discussion we inaugurated, and commending the high academic level of the articles published. I am, therefore, anxious to have further opinions as to how far we succeeded at least in making a contribution to the solution of the problem.

I recognized in the editorial a reference to an article by Bernard Tonnar, S.J., published in *Columbia* in May, 1943; his is the only article I know that maintains any sort of "evolution" in the papal policy. (Hence I do not understand the attribution of this view to "some of the positive theologians of the Jesuits." Perhaps I should state my own views with reference to this article. I regard it as unfortunate that it was printed at all, and doubly unfortunate that it was reprinted by the N.C.C.J. (without the author's knowledge, incidentally). In my judgment, which I have already expressed to its author, its central thesis is without foundation. To speak of "evolution," or of a period of encouragement succeeding to a period of repression is at least quite misleading. The principles that have inspired Pius XII's statements on co-operation were formulated quite as clearly by Leo XIII and Pius X. The cardinal principle is the Church's duty to civilization.

At the same time, I think that Pius XI and Pius XII have endeavored more insistently to focus public attention on these principles; they have more clearly drawn the conclusions from them, and have uttered these conclusions more frequently. This latter fact is explained, I think, by two things that have happened in the time between Leo XIII and Pius XII. First, outside the Church there has been an evolution, or better, a devolution: the religious and moral bases of human society have been undermined ever more grievously and men's grip on the fact of the sovereignty of God and the relevance of His law to social life has increasingly weakened. Two World Wars have broken out. Secondly, inside the Church there has been a growth in concern over the misdirection and disorder in earthly civilization; with increasing clarity (though Leo XIII was clear enough) the Church has seen and spoken of the profound spiritual problem that exists at the heart of the temporal order, created not simply by heresy, but by apostasy from God. In consequence, the Holy See has done two things. First, it has attempted to bring all the faithful, clergy and laity, to a more acute consciousness of the mission of the Church in the temporal order, of their own responsibility for its discharge, and the consequent desperate need for intensified Catholic thought, prayer, and organized action. (I should be interested to know your view of the Holy See's success among us in this regard.) Secondly, out of its clear view of the immense scope of today's problem and its its [*sic*] precise nature (it concerns the natural unity of mankind and the natural bases of human society) the Holy See has called on all who believe in God to co-operate with the Church in a common effort to bring the temporal order of human life under the direction of the law of God. In the papal view, the Church, of course, is to provide the leadership, in fact as well as in word; however, the Popes seem also clearly to imply that only a common effort will be adequate to the task in hand, which is nothing less than the establishment of a new national and international order.

This, in broad and rather inadequate outline, is the way I conceive the situation. I should not myself speak of evolution: it might convey the wrong idea. There has been no change, in any proper sense, in the papal policy; there has

certainly been no relaxing of old laws; and above all there has been [*sic*: not been?] slightest consent given to any blurring of the line that sets the Church off in her uniqueness from other religious bodies. At the same time, I do not see how it can be denied that there has been some development, in an intimately Catholic sense. It has centered in the doctrine of the mission of the Church in the temporal order; it has issued in the theology of Catholic Action (not well understood in America); and it has led to the constitution of a Catholic concept of co-operation--which I am inclined to regard as a linear development of the idea of Catholic Action. I have on several occasions called this concept of co-operation "new": I meant that it is distinct (1) from the great public doctrinal disputations of the sixteenth century, (2) from the "church reunion" movements in nineteenth-century England, in which Catholics began to participate, and were stopped, (3) from the co-operative movements of Protestant inspiration, such as were typified by Stockholm, Lausanne, etc., (4) from the type of co-operation--also of Protestant inspiration--which is envisaged by the N.C.C.J., and by many "liberals" around us. The Catholic concept seems to me to have these characteristics: (1) its finality: the *finis operis* is the right order of human society, which must be established on sound religious and moral grounds; (2) its basis: the sovereignty of God and the moral law, whose denial and abandonment is the radical evil of our times; (3) the peculiar kind of unity into which it brings the co-operating personnel: (a) it brings into unity religious persons, not religious bodies (churches) as such; the Pope's invitation is to all *men* of good will, not to dissident churches as such; hence there is no question of equating faiths or churches; (b) it establishes among these persons a unity that is neither purely religious nor purely civic, but that partakes of the nature of both--it is constituted on the basis of faith in God, but for the purpose of common effort in the temporal order.

Let me turn now to the statement: "A formula for co-operation in the United States has not yet been found." Some important distinctions are here overlooked. First, one must distinguish between a theological and an organizational formula. The former concerns the doctrinal and moral soundness of co-operation; the latter, the practical structure, the techniques of common action, etc. adopted by the co-operators. Moreover, from the theological standpoint one must distinguish between the legitimacy of co-operation (the soundness of the idea of co-operation in itself) and its expediency (the soundness of the idea in particular circumstances, which includes consideration of its possible or probable effect on souls, the danger of scandal, wrong impressions, etc.) I am thinking of St. Paul: "Omnia mihi licent, sed non omnia expediunt...non omnia aedificant."

It seems to me that a theological formula vindicating the legitimacy of co-operation is accessible in papal documents. Summarizing, without quoting texts, I should put it thus: "Co-operation is legitimate (1) for goals that remain within the temporal order, at the same time that they concern its religious and moral aspects; (2) on the basis, not of some vague interconfessional, least-common-denominator creed, but of the clear principles of the natural law. For these goals and on this basis, the co-operation can embrace all who believe in God. And their common action will be directed (1) at a universal reawakening to the fact of the sovereignty of God and to the universal obligation of the moral law with respect to national and international society; (2) at the incorporation of the precepts of morality into social institutions, through (a) common agreement on certain "middle axioms" (prominently, the religio-social truths which the Pope has emphasized especially in his Christmas allocutions), and (b) that measure of common action which can prudently be undertaken with a view to the reduction of these axioms to institutional form in the political, economic, and social field."

The formula according to which the expediency of co-operation may be judged is also readily stated: "Co-operation is expedient in that measure and in that form in which the Bishops judge it to be expedient. Their judgment depends on a balance of two other judgments: the first regards the contemporary necessity and value of co-operation according to the mind of the Holy See; the second regards the possibility of putting forth an intelligent and energetic effort to explain clearly, courteously, and as publicly as possible the meaning, purposes, etc. of co-operation, its limits, etc., with a view to preventing, not necessarily all, but certainly any serious misinterpretation, *scandalum pusillorum*, etc."

So much for the theological formulas, as I see them. It may be true to say that they have not yet been found in the United States. On the other hand, I do not know many people who are engaged in a frenzied search for them. At all events, the above are my formulations. Doubtless they could be improved. But I think I can substantiate them as they stand by all the necessary texts. Their clarity could be improved by less condensation, but I see this comment is getting long, and there are things yet to be said.

As regards the formula for organization, it is true to say that none has yet been found suitable for the U.S. Again, however, this may be because Catholics have not yet intelligently sought one. They have contented themselves with (doubtless rightly) condemning the formulas put forth by non-Catholics. They have not even built up their "operation" in the temporal order (e.g., with regard to the peace settlement), to the point where a formula for "co-operation" might well suggest itself. In England, on the other hand, where Catholic initiative was finally stimulated by catastrophe, a formula for the organization of co-operation was found, and was judged acceptable by the English hierarchy: "Parallel action in the religious, joint action in the social and international field." In practice, two variant and alternative techniques have been worked out, the "Nottingham idea," and the "Hitchin idea," as they are called.

It is at least conceivable that some adaptation of this principle might be made, suitable to the American scene. I do not presume to pronounce in the matter. My interest is simply in the theory of co-operation, and my knowledge of concrete circumstances is quite limited. For this reason my comments on the organizational problem in the June issue of THEOLOGICAL STUDIES confined themselves to matters of principle and of history; the few practical suggestions were made with diffidence. At that, I thought I had suggested with sufficient clarity (1) that any sort of "superorganization" (meaning a single association with mixed membership) does not merit the Catholic preference (had I wished to pronounce on the American scene, I would have said definitely that none but a federative form of organization could be considered, wherein the Catholic association would be distinct and autonomous); (2) that the co-operation as such would be in the hands of experts, preferably laymen, and that the ordinary faithful would simply "operate" on the lines of the distinctively Catholic program (if they could be got to do this, it would be wonderful). Moreover, in a previous piece I hinted at my own pessimism as to practical possibilities in America, first, because our own operation in the social, and especially in the international field is hardly strong enough to support, as an adjunct, a fruitful effort at co-operation, and secondly, because the necessary lay leadership is in a woeful state of underdevelopment.)

The foregoing remarks may serve to clarify somewhat certain aspects of my own position. May I now get out my own little axe? In general--not to put a tooth under it, as they say in Ireland--I think that this editorial represents exactly the kind of writing that should not be done on the subject of co-operation, if, that is, one desires to contribute to popular education on the subject. It is confused and confusing, hazy, and unfair to the point of injustice.

First, it centers attention, and lays major emphasis, on the problem of organization. This problem is at once secondary in its immediate importance and primary in its difficulty, and for both reasons should not be the initial problem attacked, especially in popular writing. Putting second things first, and the *obscurius* before the *obscurum*, are always fertile sources of confusion. The thing of primary immediate importance--the thing that needs initial explanation to the popular mind--is the "idea" of co-operation itself--what it means and does not mean, what are its limits, its bases, its goals, its field, and above all, its inspiration in the needs and problems of our time--this last point is of cardinal importance if the idea is to be at all grasped. In fact, the major constructive suggestion in the editorial--that priests should study the problem--would have been much more effectively embedded in a statement of the problem itself, rather than in a paragraph wherein certain unstated opinions of others are brought under suspicion (but of this in a moment).

Again, the starting point of the whole discussion is badly obscured--I mean the Pope's agonized concern, as common Father, not only of Catholics and all Christianity but also of the whole human family, for the temporal life of humanity. This is rather parenthetically stated, as a thing to be taken for granted. It is indeed a thing to be taken for granted; but I wonder how many Catholics take it as such in any operative way--in such a way that their own thought, preoccupations, attitudes, and action (and prayer) really reflect the papal concern. Yet until this concern is acute and widespread, there is hardly much use in going on to talk of co-operation. Actually, the papal invitation to co-operation is simply one product of this concern, and is unintelligible apart from it.

For these reasons I say that the editorial is confused and confusing. Secondly, the positive suggestions in the matter of organization are vague to the point of unhelpfulness. A "sort of superorganization" is ruled out, as contrary to the papal wishes. This may well be so, but it is not proved. For one thing, so far as I have been able to discover, neither Pius XI nor Pius XII have made any concrete suggestions, positive or negative, as to the precise organizational form that co-operation should or should not take. This is a matter for the Local Ordinaries, not for the Holy See, to decide. At any rate, the point would be more effective were there a definition: what sort of superorganization would be at variance with the decisions of the Holy See? and with what decisions would it be at variance? (The *Singulari Quadam*, for instance,

tolerated and permitted a "sort of superorganization" in the form of an interconfessional trade union with something more than sheerly economic purposes. The *Mortalium Animos* ruled out a sort of superorganization in the form of an interconfessional "church," but nobody is talking about such a thing.)

Again, the suggestion about the Boy Scouts would have to be considerably elaborated before any definite organizational idea would emerge. Moreover, the federation of autonomous organizations would not of itself, I think, remove all danger of indifferentism; the sheer fact of federation might well shock some sensitive Catholic souls, and would have to be explained, and we would be back at what I called the primary problem. Furthermore, I doubt if the suggestion that the association be simply of of [*sic*] "patriotic citizens" (à la "Citizens for Victory," etc.?) exactly reflects the mind of the Holy See. Attentive reading of the papal documents suggests to me the idea that the Pope has addressed men as invested, not simply with the civic virtue of patriotism, but with the virtue of religion (belief in God, sense of subjection to His law). Again, an association motivated simply by national patriotism would hardly be designed to achieve one of the Pope's major objectives, a just international order. Finally, no one who understands the papal position has proposed, to my knowledge, that the organization be "on the basis of different religious *groups*," as groups. As I have already suggested, the idea is not to bring religious groups together in their corporate entities as religious groups, but to bring religious men together on the basis of the religious and moral principles, pertinent to the social order, which the Pope supposes to be held within all truly religious groups. Co-operation in the papal sense has nothing to do with "super-churches," or, in general, with the union of faiths or churches.

My next and last criticism is directed against a central tendency of the editorial. Over the whole piece there looms, like a sinister shadow, that perennial menace, the Society of Jesus. Actually, it can easily be read as an indictment of "the Jesuit Fathers." And no warrant is given for the indictment. I am looking at it now from the standpoint of the popular mind--that of the average Catholic reader, for whom, I suppose, the *Telegraph-Register* is published. From this standpoint the editorial might well suggest something like the following reading: "Co-operation with Non-Catholics (this is about the N.C.C.J.). In the discussion of this subject terms offensive to theological and Catholic ears have been used by some people--in particular by the Jesuit Fathers. The Jesuit Fathers have made some very queer statements on the subject (they must be queer indeed, when a leading editorial in our diocesan paper undertakes to deal with them). In fact, the Jesuits hold some position or other that is contrary to the position of the Holy See (they hold this position as a body--they always stick together anyway). Actually, they have betrayed their traditional loyalty to the Holy See. The Pope does not want any sort of superorganization of Catholics with non-Catholics (some sort of "bigger church"). (Apparently, therefore, says the reader, the Jesuits have advocated such a superorganization.) The Pope has not changed his position (whatever it was--that one must always proclaim the Catholic Church to be the one true Church, I suppose); but some Jesuit theologians think he has. Therefore, all capable theologians should study this question, and combat the Jesuits' position, which must be highly dangerous indeed. Ah well, they always were a slippery lot--these Jesuits."

Doubtless this would be an unfair interpretation of the editorial. But I wish I could be sure that it would not be made by anybody. Again, I am thinking of the mind of your average reader; perhaps I do him an injury, but I doubt if he is highly informed and judicious, and I am sure he does not hold his breath waiting for the next issue of THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. At any rate, it is my considered opinion that the editorial in its central tendency and from the point of view of its average reader, is most unfairly damaging. It is rather disconcerting when one learns that the people of a whole Archdiocese are told flatly by the their [*sic*] official paper that the Jesuits, as a body, are not defending the position of the Holy See--and the writer has not the courtesy (at least to his readers) to explain what the position of the Holy See is, and why the Jesuits are not defending it, or what, indeed, the Jesuits have actually said, or why the unnamed opinions are attributed to the whole Order. (The last suggestion, were it not so gratuitous, would be amusing--offhand, I myself would have difficulty in naming six Jesuits whose interest in intercredal co-operation is even seriously academic.)

At any rate, to put it bluntly, it seems to me that the writer, if he has chosen to say as much as he did, is under serious obligations to say more, and to prove it with chapter and verse. Otherwise, his definitely prejudicial statements lay him open to the charge--here I recur to understatement--of irresponsible journalism. It is, I think, at least that when suspicion of erroneous or temerarious opinions is attached to others, without proof. And I find it difficult to see what gain for the Catholic Church there is in that sort of thing. It is, incidentally, exactly the technique that we Catholics resent when it is used against us by those outside the Church.

Ultimately, this question of co-operation is a serious issue put to the whole Church. Given its delicacy and difficulty, every utterance on it should be conscientious and responsible. For my own part, I have tried to contribute something to its solution. If anything I have said cannot be squared with sound Catholic doctrine, I have a right to be informed of the fact through other channels than that of a diocesan paper, that I may reconsider and, if need be, retract. But I do not see how any advance to a solution is made by editorials like the one under discussion. Warnings against indifferentism, etc., are in order; but they should not be launched in the void. Disagreements are perhaps inevitable in judging values, giving interpretations of certain papal utterances, estimating concrete situations, etc. But dealing in suspicions is not only intolerable but useless. What is needed in [*sic*] clear, courteous, coldly intelligent argument, wherein opposing opinions are represented exactly and honorably.

I see I have written at considerable length, but the matter is of some importance, and it demands perfect frankness and clarity. I think I have achieved the former, and some measure of the latter, though I have written with more haste than I should like to use in a matter like this. I hope, too, that the spirit of my comments will be understood to be one of charity--love of the truth. And I should appreciate a reply in the same spirit and with the same qualities.

Perhaps I should add that I have written this, and my former articles, too, quite off my own little bat. Neither it nor they need be taken as an expression of "the Jesuit line." Such a thing does not exist.

The vigor of Murray's response may perhaps be due to a number of factors: (1) his correspondence with McIntyre had ended scarcely a month before; (2) he already knew that McIntyre had taken up the issue with his Jesuit superior; (3) he probably knew that McNicholas, Freking's bishop, was preparing the statement on co-operation for the NCWC; (4) perhaps he knew that others were speaking of a "Jesuit" position on the matter.

Freking's reply to this letter and memorandum has not been found, but Murray's answer on October 2 thanked him for clarifying "the framework of reference" of the editorials; it repeated, however, his doubts that they were "an effective means of correcting any wrong ideas about co-operation that might possibly have been occasioned by the articles in *Columbia*, to which you refer." Murray ended by turning down Freking's invitation to write a letter on the subject, citing the press of the moment and the lateness of the date.⁴⁷

The criticisms received did not prevent Parsons and Murray from publishing their articles in pamphlet form.⁴⁸

The McNicholas Committee

The larger context of the exchanges between Murray and McIntyre and McNicholas was, of course, the decision of the U.S. Bishops to draw up guidelines for intercredal cooperation. In June, 1943, Bishop Gerald O'Hara of Savannah-Atlanta sent McNicholas a copy of the letter of Leo XIII to Archbishop Satolli disapproving of interfaith meetings, and in the next months McNicholas passed it on to Stritch and McIntyre.⁴⁹ Stritch's reply described how he saw the issues facing McNicholas'

⁴⁷ Murray to Freking, Woodstock, October 2, 1943; AAC.

⁴⁸ Parsons, Wilfred, and Murray, John Courtney, "Intercredal Co-operation," (Washington, D. C., Catholic Association for International Peace, 1943.)

⁴⁹ O'Hara to McNicholas, Savannah, June 9, 1943; AACinc; McNicholas to McIntyre, Norwood, July 9, 1943; ASJS. To McIntyre McNicholas also enclosed the editorial in his newspaper critical of Tollar. In his reply McIntyre expressed his agreement with the editorial and added, "I hope I am not an extremist on this topic of the subject of the theological studies and *Columbia* articles, but I must confess that they are annoying." McIntyre to McNicholas, New York, July 15,

committee. He was not sure of the relevance of Leo's letter which he interpreted to refer to "debates on religion." The problem they were facing now was meetings designed to promote good will and charity among Catholics, Protestants and Jews. Stritch saw two dimensions to the problem, the first reflecting Connell's concerns, the second Murray's:

In the first place, there are latent dangers in this procedure, for no matter what reservations are made, the effect is to put the Church on the level of sectarianism and Judaism. Then, despite restrictions, there is usually a sort of plea for a least common denominator, vague religion, in our social and public life. In the second place, we are faced with a difficulty. The grave danger comes today from materialism and atheism. We are not strong enough successfully to stop its growing influence. There is need of our gathering to ourselves the support of all who believe in God and the Natural Law. It is not enough just for us to make pronouncements or to carry on our activities. If we are practical, we must in some way associate with ourselves in our fight against materialism and atheism all believers in God in our communities.

After remarking that he did not think that the NCCJ was "as large a danger as some people would have us think," Stritch continued his reflections, which seemed to bring him down on Murray's side:

But apart from this organization the plain fact is that in our struggle against materialism and atheism we have much potential strength in many non-Catholics which we are not using. Perhaps the thing for us to do is to organize our own forums in a popular way, invite non-Catholics to attend and then rely on their doing something as citizens. Still, this is not satisfactory. Where there is no sort of organization, there is no real strength. Besides, in this struggle we really do need the organized strength of the sects and even of the synagogue. My hope has been that you will find a formula for us which will be theologically sound and practical. I do think that it is not the mind of the Holy See that we should be quite so tight and narrowminded as some of us have been in the past. Certainly there is no possibility of our collaborating [*sic*] with the sects and the synagogue in any familiar sort of way. How about putting it this way? - It is possible to consider God and the Natural Law in civil life, abstracting from the teaching of the Church. Could we at times ask citizens to meet together to do the great civic duty of opposing materialism and atheism in our civil life? It may be that we could make the distinctions. Pope Pius XI certainly told Catholics in Germany at one time to work with the sects, and doubtless he had in mind that this work was to be done on a citizen basis. I hope that we shall get some enlightenment from you, for I confess that, although I have thought this thing through and through, I have not reached a satisfactory formula for fixing a program.⁵⁰

Six weeks later, Stritch sent to McNicholas reflections prompted by a reading of the articles by Parsons and Murray, which had just appeared as a pamphlet and about which he now had reservations. He thought the two Jesuits' "conclusion was larger than the premises" and was unwilling "to admit that so far we have had in papal letters a call for a new sort of organized effort." On the other hand, he argued, "In civic life we should ask our Catholic people to support all who stand for basic truths of right reason." He concluded his comments:

We must find the right formula. It is just common sense that in these perilous times all human society who believe in God and God's Law have something in common for which they must work and strive against the materialism of the times. I confess that I do not get satisfaction out of these articles of Father Parsons and Father Murray. Maybe I am too dull.⁵¹

McNicholas' thoughts on the question were expressed in a letter to McIntyre ten days later with which he enclosed two of the editorials in his archdiocesan newspaper:

1943 (copy); ASJS.

⁵⁰ Stritch to McNicholas, Chicago, June 23, 1943; AACinc.

⁵¹ Stritch to McNicholas, Chicago, August 3, 1943; AACinc.

I am astonished that Father Parsons would write such nonsense as appeared under his name in the July issue of *Columbia*. I am analyzing his article in *Theological Studies*. I confess that I am not at all impressed. Such priests as Fathers Tonnar and Parsons seem to me to start out with the thesis that the Holy See is calling for some sort of superorganization other than the Church to save modern society. As positive theologians they fall readily into the error that there is some sort of an evolution in the statements, letters, etc. of the Popes.⁵²

On the same day, McNicholas also sent copies of the two editorials to Stritch, whose reply expressed his pleasure "that you said pointedly so many things that needed saying." But the problem of "the right formula" remained:

The time has come when the bishops must speak and teach, lest many of our people be led astray. My mind finds satisfaction only in a formula which limits cooperation to the civic field and excludes every sort of formal cooperation with the sects and the synagogue. I have done something which I have given over to some theologians to examine. If it comes through all right, I shall send it to you. Meanwhile, keep up your work, for it is important that we speak out on this subject.⁵³

This correspondence took place while the military and political situation in Italy was undergoing major changes. On July 19, 1943, American planes bombed Rome; a week later, Mussolini resigned, and on August 12th, American planes again bombed Rome. On September 8, Italy surrendered and German troops at once occupied Rome. Spellman, Stritch, and Mooney were involved in intense conversations with the American government over the fate of the city.⁵⁴ McNicholas described his fears to Stritch:

I am sure you are sick at heart these days, thinking of the so-called protective custody of the Holy Father by the Nazis. We seem utterly helpless to do anything. Perhaps the best thing for us to do is to get down on our knees and pray for a miracle of liberation. We must, naturally, feel that the Holy Father has provided for every contingency, for the government of the Church in all countries during the virtual imprisonment of the Sovereign Pontiff, and even for the election of the Pope in case the Nazis, in a frenzied or satanic mood, maniacally try to destroy the Church at its fountain source. It seems to me that there is nothing that these Nazis would not do.

Despite these fears, McNicholas informed Stritch that he would be unable to attend the meeting of the Administrative Board of the NCWC which Archbishop Mooney had called. But with the same letter McNicholas sent Stritch Murray's letter to Freking and his comments on the editorials in the archdiocesan newspaper; he also drew attention to Furfey's critical letter in the most recent issue of *Theological Studies*.⁵⁵

Stritch replied that McNicholas had to attend the meeting, which would be dealing with "matters of great urgent importance." "In these tragic times we must do our utmost, and things at home must yield to things which affect the interest of the whole Church." Among these issues was surely the fate of Rome:

⁵² McNicholas to McIntyre, Norwood, August 13, 1943; ASJS. The editorials were those of July 30 and August 1, 1943. McIntyre replied that both editorials were "splendid" and expressed the hope that they would gain the attention of the authors to whom they responded. A day later, he sent McNicholas copies of his recent correspondence with the NCCJ. McIntyre to McNicholas, New York, August 17 and 18, 1943 (copies); ASJS.

⁵³ McNicholas to Stritch, Aug. 13, 1943, Cincinnati (copy) (AACinc).

⁵⁴ See Fogarty, *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy*, 291-306.

⁵⁵ McNicholas to Stritch, Cincinnati, September 16, 1943 (copy); AACinc.

The news from Rome is tragic. As late as the early part of this week there were communications with the Vatican. One does not know what may happen from hour to hour. Our only answer is prayer and the doing of our full part to prevent further catastrophes. So do come to the Meeting, for we shall need you.

This sense of tragedy and urgency affected Stritch's comments on the question of cooperation:

Every day it is more and more important that we work out the formula for the cooperation. The stark fact is that we have reached such a pass that we alone, even with all our efforts, are not able to withstand the pressure of certain destructive influences. I could show a peace-plan which would amaze you, and it is not the elaboration of a communist. We must get into action and get into action without delay. After reading the paper of Father Murray I sat at my typewriter and without thought of style or exact expression put down for you roughly my thoughts. I am enclosing this memorandum. It proposes a big thing, and yet I do not see how we can escape doing it. Every resource we have must be marshalled to the defense of fundamental rights, and we must not spare expense in doing it. Take my memorandum, refine it, improve it, and let us see that we get something very concrete to propose to the Board. We must set the whole Catholic body of the nation on fire with enthusiastic demand for the prevalence of right. Scholarly studies will be ineffective. Now we must show the strength of opposition. In this effort we ought to call for the support of non-Catholics and try to awaken to action every lover of human rights. The whole program would not be fully Christian but the first campaign towards a really Christian social order. It must start with the statement of the Bishops in November. My thought is that this statement should be a strong plea for the truths of reason in social reconstruction. It must be prepared carefully. Read again *Summi Pontificatus*. There is much in that we could use, although I think we ought to make the points our own and not quote the Pope.⁵⁶

With his letter, Stritch enclosed a four-page memorandum prefaced by the statement: "The Bishops of the United States must find without delay the theologically sound and practically safe formula for wide vigorous co-operation between Catholics and certain non-Catholics in our country in fixing the religious and moral truths, deriving from human reason, as the basis of the new social order, national and international." While recognizing certain difficulties attending the problem, he argued that these should not prevent the Bishops from using "the opportunity which the right sort of co-operation offers us in these tragic times in our effort against the elements which are actually succeeding in discarding all thought on God and the Moral Law in plans for social reconstruction. Simply condemning objectionable sorts of co-operation is not sufficient. We must give the formula for the right sort of co-operation if we are going to be true to our duty."

Stritch went on to recall the emphasis recent Popes had placed on this task, whose concrete fulfilment they left to the discretion of local bishops. While there had been no change in Catholic teaching, there had been a growing emphasis on the need for co-operation. "Two points seem clear in the Papal Statements: 1) there should be action and therefore some sort of organized action; 2) there be no surrender of Catholic truth and therefore no formal co-operation between the Church and the Sects or the Synagogue." Its purpose would be "the recognition of God and the Moral Law in temporal society, that is, the recognition of the right bearing of the sovereignty of God and of the Natural Law on social action. It should be formally social, but not formally religious, and it should extend beyond merely civic cooperation to include "social activities which are not strictly political."

⁵⁶ Stritch to McNicholas, Chicago, September 18, 1943. Convinced by Stritch's letter, McNicholas the next day cabled that he would attend the Chicago meeting (AACinc).

Stritch then included a paragraph which seems to have been intended to meet criticisms such as those that Furfey was expressing. He acknowledged that "the mere recognition of the religious truths of reason in social action does not realize the ideal of Catholics and is a minimum which for perfection demands also the recognition of the truths of Faith." The truths underlying the kind of co-operation he was urging represented only a minimum, and Catholics should desire the maximum. Thus "we must always be careful lest we give the impression to our people that this sort of co-operation aims at a satisfactory Catholic ideal. Our own organized effort in social action must go far beyond the aims of this co-operation."

But the practical fact was that by themselves Catholics would not be able "to withstand the forces of Materialism in human society." The only hope lay in working with the millions of others who hold truths in common with them but did not share their Catholic faith:

If it is objected that these truths do not offer the basis for a Christian social order, we may answer that they do offer the beginning for such an order, and on them we may hope eventually to build the complement which Faith inspires. In our efforts to secure the support of non-Catholics to our demand for these truths in the social reconstruction, we must make clear that they satisfy us only in part. Perhaps we may say that working for the recognition of these truths we are making a first campaign for the winning of modern society to Christ.

Stritch then addressed the question of organization. The bishops might urge Catholics to co-operate with non-Catholics while not adopting a "least common denominator" approach to religion or doing anything to compromise the Church's unity. Catholics would then be free to choose what organizations they would cooperate with. But Stritch was convinced also of the need for "some sort of co-operation on a national plan." "Social Institutes" might be set up with which non-Catholics would be invited to co-operate. But this too would not be sufficient, and so Stritch proposed that the NCWC might undertake "the promotion of an understanding of the social bearing of these truths and drawing up plans for social action." In doing so the NCWC must be circumspect, particularly in its dealings with the Council of Churches and "the Jewish Group," by which Stritch seems to have meant the NCCJ. Parallel action would seem to be the wisest policy, without any kind of federation with these groups and "no thought of a common program among them." He referred to the conversations recently undertaken with those groups to devise a common statement of principles on social issues, and to the proposal of the NCWC that the three groups issue their common statement separately. Stritch ended his memorandum with ten specific conclusions, the practical ones describing activities the NCWC should undertake and even proposing that the plan might require a budget of \$250,000!

Ten days after Stritch sent this memorandum to McNicholas, the Administrative Board met in Chicago. McNicholas reported on the task he had been assigned and offered for discussion four general directives on inter-religious cooperation.⁵⁷ At the Nov. 8, 1943, meeting of the same Board, McNicholas' report was read and the four proposed norms, slightly modified, were discussed and approved for submission to the general body of the Bishops:

⁵⁷At the same meeting Bishop Alter reported on the discussions that were to result in the publication on October 7th of "The Pattern for Peace," described below; "Minutes of the Administrative Board NCWC, Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois, Sept. 28, 1943; ASJS.

1. Cooperation with all men of good will in securing the recognition of the sovereignty of God and the supremacy of the moral law in social life is urgently needed.
2. Cooperation to this end with other *religious groups* should be established through committees which will engage in *joint conference* but in *independent action*.
3. Cooperation to this end by means of joint action *with men accepting these principles and who are organized exclusively for social and civic purposes is commended*.
4. *Joint cooperation of Catholic committees and other religious committees under the auspices of civic or social groups is commendable.*⁵⁸

At the general meeting of the Bishops, these norms were accepted and ordered distributed along with McNicholas' full report. A copy of the latter was sent out in the "NCWC Notes" of December 15, 1943.⁵⁹ The first part of this report gave the four norms cited above. The second part reproduced and translated the Letter of Leo XIII issued after the Chicago "World Parliament of Religions" and the pertinent sections from two documents of Pius XI. Comments about these texts appeared to place the bishops on the side of Connell's interpretation and to take issue with the position that there had been a change in papal teaching. Leo XIII's text was introduced with the following remarks:

The Latin text is here given, also its translation by Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., of the Catholic University. In the October issue, 1943, of the Ecclesiastical Review, Father Connell has an article on the letter of Pope Leo XIII. This letter clearly tells us that we cannot take part in gatherings such as the "World Parliament of Religions." It need not be said that the decisions of the Holy See "*de indifferentismo*" are in full force. Papal documents indicate clearly that the Catholic position has in no way changed when there is question of "*communicatio in sacris*" or when there are dangers to the faith of the individual or the Catholic body.

As for the quotations from Pius XI:

The invitation of the Holy See "to collaborate" or "to co-operate" with groups not of the Catholic faith, to oppose atheism and the subversive errors of our day, cannot be understood as a change in the position of the Holy See in guarding the deposit of faith and in dealing with erroneous doctrines. Some statements made in recent publications can give a wrong impression.

The last part of McNicholas' report, under the subtitle "Co-operation of Catholics with Other Groups," simply reproduces eight texts of recent popes, introduced by the following paragraph:

Pope Pius XI and His Holiness, Pius XII, have strongly and incessantly urged "collaboration" and "co-operation." They have not, however, indicated the procedure, which is left to the Bishops who will take into consideration local conditions.⁶⁰

Murray's Reaction to the NCWC Principles

⁵⁸ "Minutes of the Meeting of the Administrative Board, NCWC, November 8, 1943," p. 2; ASJS.

⁵⁹ McNicholas was not pleased that the notes were published. On 20 December 1943, he wrote to Mooney of his astonishment to see them printed in the NCWC notes: "The new assistant ... asked me for the notes as I was leaving one of the sessions. I think I told him they were unfinished.

"I am sure your eye and your ear were offended by 'joint co-operation.' I presume it would be a good thing if co-operation in each group could be assured regarding our principles. I do not say this to justify 'joint co-operation;'" AACincinnati (copy).

⁶⁰ "NCWC Notes," Dec. 15, 1943; ASJS.

In mid-December Bishop Alter sent identical letters to Parsons and to Murray, praising the pamphlet on "Intercredal Cooperation" in which their *Theological Studies* articles had been republished. On two points he thought their position needed to be expanded: that other "men of good will" should cooperate with the Church and follow its leadership and that "the problem of organization" be addressed. For the latter he sent them a copy of the formula of the Administrative Board which he said "has been submitted to the hierarchy for consideration," suggesting that the Board's decision was not yet definitive.⁶¹ Parsons reply agreed on the first point made by Alter, but wondered that the Board's formula suggested that "the cooperation with secular organizations on the part of the Church will be closer than with those which are professedly religious. I would gather that the Pope would see a closer bond between those who profess Christ openly than between those who do not."⁶²

Murray's reply to Alter was longer and more detailed.⁶³ In the course of an explanation of the purpose and argument of his articles on cooperation, Murray noted "the beginnings of two divergent schools of Catholic social thought, roughly equivalent to the *Kölner Richtung* and the *Berliner Richtung* of pre-World War I Germany. One has only to think of men like Dr. Paul Hanly Furfey on the one hand, and of Father John La Farge on the other." Murray then went on to meet the Bishop's request for comments on the four principles adopted by the Administrative Board.

The first of them he thought excellent, exactly reflecting the Pope's urgent call and stating a principle he hoped would be "firmly anchored in the minds of Catholics." He had a personal reason for hoping the Bishops would endorse the principles, greatly clarifying the issue:

Let me add one reason, out of others, for saying this. You may remember the paper I wrote, "The Declaration on World Peace: An Interpretation"; part of it was published in your diocesan paper, last October. I sent it to the Editor of the *Ecclesiastical Review*, with the personal but unofficial approval of Archbishop Mooney, and amended according to some valuable suggestions made by him. It was returned with the explanation that, although the censors at Catholic University found no fault with its content, it was judged inopportune to publish it, since the issue was "controversial," and publication of the paper might risk the disfavor of some of the Bishops. Chiefly in view was Archbishop McNicholas (since his name was freely mentioned, I suppose I may mention it to you, though obviously in confidence.)

The curious thing is that the central thesis of the paper, if I am not greatly mistaken, could be summarized in the words of this first "Principle of Co-operation." Evidently, therefore, there exists some doubt as to whether the Bishops are at one in endorsing this fundamental principle, which is antecedent to all discussion of modes of organizing co-operation, of the safeguards that should surround it, of the personnel to be employed in it, etc. etc. My point is that the sheer enunciation of this principle, even by itself, would help considerably toward clearing the atmosphere.

On the practical questions, while Murray thought the principles "entirely unexceptionable" and adequate as general norms, he found them unclearly related to one another and in need of clarification of the term "action." He proposed that they speak of "parallel action" rather than of "independent action" in order to express both "our unique religious identity" and "our community

⁶¹ Alter to Parsons and to Murray, Toledo, 17 Dec 1943 (copies); AAToledo.

⁶² Parsons to Alter, Washington, 9 Jan 1944; AAToledo.

⁶³ Murray to Alter, Woodstock, 3 Jan 1944; AAToledo. A retyped copy of this reply is also found in the papers of John La Farge, WCA. On November 30, 1943, Bishop Thomas H. McLaughlin of Paterson had sent Murray a lengthy letter on the Parsons-Murray articles, on the same day also sending a copy of it to his old friend, John La Farge. The same file includes La Farge's reply and the copy of Murray's response to Alter.

of social purpose with other 'men of good will.'" Finally, he proposed a greater emphasis on "the necessity of Catholic initiatives." It was not enough for the bishops simply to sanction Catholic participation in co-operative setups of non-Catholic creation and inspiration." There was "a larger issue":

I have maintained that a program of co-operation, at once courageous and prudent, is a necessary means towards establishing Catholic influence in its proper position of primacy in determining the currents of our social life and shaping the form of our social institutions. Actually, we do unfortunately have to begin by "playing along"; inevitably, there will be awkwardness, dangers (though I think people sometimes underestimate the danger waiting for us on the other side--relegation to a purely marginal and ineffective place in the national life). The point, however, is that from perhaps non-ideal beginnings we can make the power and beneficence of our ideas felt, and ultimately become able to assume effectively the leadership which at the moment we can only assert (is that last statement overly pessimistic?). At all events, an explicit encouragement of initiatives would perhaps serve a useful purpose.

On an appended page, besides reproducing the four points, Murray proposed some revisions. He would have left the first point as drafted; for the others he proposed:

2. Co-operation, always toward this same end, is commended in the following form:

a) With organizations adhering to these principles, and constituted directly for social and civic purposes, co-operation may take the form of joint action.

b) With non-Catholic religious groups co-operation should be established through committees that will engage in joint conference, but in parallel action.

c) With committees from non-Catholic religious groups, operating under the auspices of civic or social organizations, cooperation should be established by Catholic committees; their co-operation may take the form of joint action.

He then suggested an additional point:

It is recommended that Catholics, mindful of their duty of spiritual leadership even in the temporal community, and acting with the proper ecclesiastical guidance, should assume the initiative in establishing co-operative relationships, in accordance with the norms just laid down.⁶⁴

[What was the final form of the principles?]

"The Pattern for Peace"

While Archbishop McNicholas and his committee were preparing their report and directives, the NCWC's Social Action Department became involved in a concrete exercise of interreligious cooperation, the result of which was the issuance on October 7, 1943, of a document, called "The Pattern for Peace," which summarized seven basic principles on which to build a just peace.⁶⁵

Discussions at the end of 1942 with the Federal Council of Churches on such a statement appear to have been unfruitful, but in July, 1943, Fr. McGowan approached Msgr. Ready with a new proposal: that the Social Action Department work with the Church Peace Union and the Commission for the Organization of the Peace to draw up a joint statement that would be signed by leaders of the

⁶⁴ On 10 Jan 1944, Alter thanked Murray for his "valuable comment," which needed "further consideration;" AA Toledo.

⁶⁵ The text may be found in *The Catholic Mind*, 41 (November, 1943) 45-46.

Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant faiths and then by other signatories of the three faiths.⁶⁶ Ready replied that he thought it unlikely that either Archbishop Mooney or Archbishop Stritch would sponsor the statement, the latter having made it clear that he was "against lining up with other groups." Ready suggested that the Catholic Association for International Peace might promote "such joint action, with the advice of the Bishops' Committee."⁶⁷ Two weeks later Ready was informed by Father John Hayes of the Social Action Department that Bishop Alter, the chairman of the Bishops' Peace Committee, had "replied favorably in the matter of a joint statement of peace principles by Catholics, Protestants, and Jews" and had promised to sign it if a satisfactory text could be composed.⁶⁸

In early August, Conway, La Farge, Murray, and Hayes met with Alter and amended a draft "enunciation of principles" that was accompanied by indications of Catholic sources on the matter. Alter sent a copy of the draft to Archbishop Mooney to whom he also conceded "the possibility of some misunderstanding amongst our own Catholic people. The question is whether the good to be obtained outweighs any possible harm." Alter suggested that the harm might be greatly reduced "through carefully prepared press comments and articles which would appear simultaneously with the statement of principles" in such journals as *America*, *Our Sunday Visitor*, *The Commonweal*, "The Denver Register Chain," and the NCWC News Service.⁶⁹

Mooney found the draft-statement generally acceptable but raised questions about how it should appear. For Alter to sign it as chairman of the Social Action Department might imply the involvement and commitment of the Administrative Board. Mooney therefore suggested that the members of the Board be consulted to see whether they endorsed the publication of the text "independently but simultaneously" by the three religious groups. If they did not wish to sign it, then it might appear over Alter's signature as honorary chairman of the Catholic Association for International Peace. In view of the Catholic discussion of inter-religious cooperation, Mooney thought it better "not to issue a joint statement, but to express simultaneously our adherence independently to the statement of principles of the moral law respecting the organization of peace." While acknowledging that this might appear to be "a distinction without any difference," Mooney thought that "this procedure would emphasize the adherence of each group to the same principles rather than the aspect of religious cooperation." This would require that each group write its own "preamble" to the statement.⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Memorandum from McGowan to Ready, July 1, 1943; ACUA, NCWC/USCC, Bishops' General Meeting: Committee: Bishops' Peace Committee 1943; McGowan said that the idea came "from a conversation that Clark Eichelberger of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Henry Atkinson of the Church Peace Union, and a Jesuit, Father Conway of Regis College, Denver, had."

⁶⁷ Ready to McGowan, Washington, July 1, 1943; ACUA, NCWC/USCC, Bishops' General Meeting: Committee: Bishops' Peace Committee 1943.

⁶⁸ Hayes to Ready, Washington, July 16, 1943; ACUA, NCWC/USCC, Bishops' General Meeting: Committee: Bishops' Peace Committee 1943.

⁶⁹ Alter to Mooney, Toledo, 9 Aug 1943 (copy); AAToledo.

⁷⁰ Alter to Conway, Toledo, 20 Aug 1943 (copy); AAToledo.

As another way of avoiding theological controversy, Alter wondered whether the Carnegie Foundation might be persuaded to assume authorship of the statement to which the three groups might then say that they gave their consent. But he quickly abandoned the idea "since it seemed to subordinate the position of the Church or perhaps make it secondary to the Carnegie Institute itself," and also because the papal pronouncements urged that the Church take the initiative in such actions.⁷¹

On September 17, 1943, Msgr. Ready sent a copy of the draft and the background documentation to several members of the Administrative Board, describing the statement in brief, explaining that it would be issued simultaneously but separately by Catholic, Protestant and Jewish groups, each of which would write its own preamble, and asking them to approve Archbishop Mooney's signature of it as Chairman of the Board.

Archbishop Spellman's reply, although it approved Mooney's signature, was mixed: he thought the background material failed "to distinguish sufficiently between what is essential and what is expedient." He added:

The Catholic Association for International Peace falls into the error of stressing details which are open to serious question; the Protestants fall into the same error, but more grievously; and the Jews, most grievously.

Passing over the background material, the statement itself I would modify by addition in two points. To point one: "...in the moral law, *and expressed in the Ten Commandments.*" And to point three: "of international concern, *the guiding principle of which shall be the Ten Commandments.*"

I do not suppose we can have the signature of Modernists to the proposed additions, but I hate to surrender to their distrust of Revelation.⁷²

McNicholas also sent Mooney some suggestions for changes, some of which were incorporated into the document.⁷³ But he too did not seem entirely enthusiastic:

⁷¹ Alter to Mooney, Toledo, 25 Aug 1943 (copy); AAToledo. At this point the editorial in the *Catholic Telegraph-Register* attacking the Jesuit articles on cooperation appeared to represent a difficulty in the way of the statement. Conway prepared a memorandum to show how the statement did not fall under the strictures of the editorial. A copy of Murray's long letter to Freking was also made and sent by Alter to Mooney who said that it "impressed me very favorably;" Mooney to Alter, Detroit, 1 Aug [*sic*: Sep] 1943; AAToledo.

⁷² Spellman to Ready, New York, September 18, 1943; ACUA, NCWC/USCC, Box 64: NCWC Administrative Board: Statements: Declaration on World Peace 1943.

⁷³ McNicholas to Mooney, Cincinnati, September 17, 1943; ACUA, NCWC/USCC, Box 64: NCWC Administrative Board: Statements: Declaration on World Peace, 1943. The most important of the changes McNicholas suggested concerned the sentence that all individuals and nations are "subject to the will of God as embodied in the moral law," which he thought departed from the Thomist view that they depend on "divine reason or wisdom." The final text of the document says that they are "subject to the sovereignty of God and to the moral law which comes from God." According to a memorandum from Fr. McGowan to Msgr. Ready, September 23, 1943, this change was approved by the Protestant and Jewish representatives; ACUA, *Ibid*. A letter from McGowan to Ready, New York, September, 1943, indicates some last-minute changes suggested by the Jewish group; ACUA, NCWC/USCC, Bishops' General Meeting: Committee: Bishops' Peace Committee 1943.

I am too tired to think these days. I realize that the seven basic principles must be *in ordine practico*. Someone who has not a "tired mind" (Boston's expression) should take time out to see if these seven keys are really the most basic necessary principles to insure a just and lasting peace.⁷⁴

At the September 28, 1943, meeting of the Administrative Board in Chicago, Bishop Alter reported on the progress of the document, which would be preceded by distinct preambles written by each group and would be issued "by all simultaneously but not jointly."⁷⁵

The declaration was issued on October 7, 1943, signed by 24 Protestant and Orthodox leaders, 24 Catholic Bishops, the heads of Rabbinical bodies, and 100 other clerical and lay leaders from each faith. The seven principles were endorsed by each group, but they were issued separately and simultaneously with brief introductions by the different religious leaders. The Social Action Department of the NCWC prefixed the following paragraph:

We present for the consideration of all men of good will the foregoing postulates of a just peace as embodying principles of the moral law and their prime applications to world problems of our day. To our mind they express the minimum requirements of a peace which Christians can endorse as fair to all men. They are the foundation on which Catholics in a free world can work from deep motives of Christian justice and charity for the building of a better order.

Interestingly enough, McNicholas, Stritch, and Alter all signed the Declaration; but while La Farge's name appears in support of it, Murray's does not.⁷⁶ That Spellman did not sign it is perhaps explained by Bishop McIntyre's continued opposition. Msgr. John A. Ryan, head of the Social Action Department, wrote to Spellman to ask if he wished to sign the text. No reply from Spellman has been found but there is a reply from McIntyre with a series of questions about the statement: whose were the auspices? had Mooney and Stritch approved it? what use would be made of it? was Ryan acting officially in proposing it? had the "coalition" behind it been approved by the administrative board of the NCWC (he added that Spellman did not recall any such approval)? Ryan replied that all the activities of the Social Action Department had been directed by the Executive Department of the NCWC and referred McIntyre to Msgr. Ready.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ McNicholas to Mooney, Cincinnati, September 20, 1943; ACUA, NCWC/USCC, NCWC Administrative Board: Statements: Declaration on World Peace, 1943. In this letter, McNicholas expressed uneasiness about a reference to "parallel educational programs." In the end the paragraph about practical steps to implement the document was dropped entirely.

⁷⁵ "Minutes of the Administrative Board NCWC, Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois, Sept. 28, 1943; ASJS.

⁷⁶ While the Statement was in preparation, *America* published Francis E. McMahon's article, "Catholics and Peace: Work of the C.A.I.P.," *America*, 69 (July 3, 1943), 345-46. It gave a prominent place to the statement upon its publication, *America*, 70 (October 9, 1943), 14-16, and continued to promote it in later issues (October 23, 1943), 59, (January 1, 1944), 337. Oddly, although *The Commonwealth*, 38 (May 21, 1943), 129, had informed its readers that the CAIP was "actively engaged in discussing and formulating the outlines of a just and enduring peace," it took no notice of this joint Statement when it appeared.

⁷⁷ McIntyre to Ryan, New York, October 1, 1943; Ryan to McIntyre, Washington, October 4, 1943; ACUA, Ryan Papers, Box 11/22. Ryan appears to have mentioned this exchange to Murray, who wrote shortly after the statement appeared that Fr. Conway was encountering difficulties from the New York Chancery: "a number of offers to speak, which [he] is prevented from accepting, not daring even to apply for permission," Murray to Ryan, Woodstock, October 13, 1943; ACUA, Ryan Papers, Box 11/22.

In his only known comment on this text, Francis Connell's concerns about Catholic doctrine on religious freedom obliged him to clarify the second of the principles enunciated: "The dignity of the human person as the image of God must be set forth in all its essential implications in an international declaration of rights, and be vindicated by the positive action of national governments and international organization. States as well as individuals must repudiate racial, religious or other discrimination in violation of these rights." In his article in *Columbia*, December 1943, reprinted as a pamphlet, Connell wrote that a Catholic could not subscribe to this "if it is interpreted in the sense that a Catholic government has no *real right* to show special favor to the Catholic Church or to restrict anti-Catholic movements; but he could agree with it, without compromise of principles, if it be understood to signify that the *most practical policy* for the peace and well-being of mankind today is the universal elimination of all religious discrimination on the part of both Catholic and non-Catholic governments."⁷⁸

Having participated in the preparation of the statement⁷⁹ Murray also wrote an interpretation of the text, which was widely printed, at least in part, in Catholic newspapers.⁸⁰ His attempt to have it published in *The Ecclesiastical Review* was unsuccessful. The new editor of the Catholic University journal, Joseph Clifford Fenton, expressed concerns which Murray summarized for Archbishop Mooney:

His position was this: (a) no exception was taken by himself or the C.U. censors to the content of the article; (b) but he was unwilling to publish the article in one of the first issues under the explicit editorship of the C. U. board; (c) for he feared that its publication would be somehow displeasing to Archbishop McNicholas; he had noted the two articles (during the summer) on co-operation in the Cincinnati *Telegraph-Register*, and believed they were written by the Archbishop himself.

Naturally, I respected his editorial scruple, and let the matter drop just there, without saying more.⁸¹

Bishop McLaughlin expressed his concerns about cooperation in letters both to Murray and to his old friend, John La Farge. La Farge replied that he shared some of the Bishop's concerns, but that he saw larger issues:

However, I believe we have also to take into consideration that number who might be relatively small but who are absolutely quite large and are growing, of really very sincere and earnest persons outside the Church who are trying

⁷⁸ Connell, *Freedom of Worship: The Catholic Position*, 13.

⁷⁹ In his reply to Furfey, Murray used his part in the preparation of the text as an argument: "When three Catholic priests (myself included) entered the study circle from which the Pattern for Peace emerged, none of us checked at the door anything but his hat. Moreover, any number of points of Catholic doctrine were brought squarely into the discussion;" "On the Problem of Co-operation," p. 206n.

⁸⁰ Murray, "The Catholic, Jewish, Protestant Declaration on World Peace," typescript, undated; AWC. Slightly revised and expanded, this was published in pamphlet form, *The Pattern for Peace and The Papal Peace Program* (Washington: The Catholic Association for International Peace, 1943). The NCWC Archives also contain a two-page text of Murray's: "The Aftermath of the 'Declaration on World Peace'"; ACUA, NCWC/USCC, NCWC Administrative Board: Statements: Declaration on World Peace 1943.

⁸¹ Murray to Mooney, Woodstock, November 4, 1943; AAD; see a similar explanation in Murray's letter to Bishop McLaughlin, Woodstock, January 3, 1944 (copy); WCA, La Farge Papers. Given their future relations, it is worth noting how Murray judged Fenton at the time: "I think the Review will prosper under Father Fenton's direction; he has some interesting plans."

to feel on these fundamental matters as we do, particularly in matters of the natural law and who appreciate the leadership of the Church in maintaining certain principles of the natural law. It seems to me there is more or less the crux of the question, how to encourage them and give them a certain leadership and guidance which can only be done by a certain degree of cooperation and yet not fall into the hands of the other type who would simply like to exploit us. That, it seems to me, is a matter for prudence and particularly to judge of actual personalities and concrete movements as they fall under our observation.

He also noted objections similar to those of Furfey:

With regard to the fulfilment of the natural law, again I believe that we need to bring out clearly the proper stand between two extremes: one is what might be called the supernaturalist idea, which I find a rather alarmingly large number of our Catholic preachers and radio orators are rather apt to assume, namely to forget the natural law and leave everything to purely supernatural means. The other extreme, of course, is the secularistic, materialistic and shallow humanitarianism. It seems to me the need the natural law needs [*sic*] to be explained but also together with it the fact that it cannot be fulfilled, as you say, without the aid of Divine grace.⁸²

Four months later, La Farge wrote to Mooney to thank him for his recent endorsement of the Pattern for Peace but expressing also his disappointment that a greater effort had not been made to publicize it. He then complained at some length that the tactics of the NCCJ were actually impeding the acceptance of the Pattern in many circles, including among some Bishops. The NCCJ's attempt to take over the Pattern for Peace was possible because of the vacuum created by the failure of the three religious groups that had signed the document to set up any mechanism for interpreting and promoting it. He proposed the establishment of a committee to see to these tasks.⁸³

A week after La Farge wrote this letter, Edward A. Conway, S.J., gave a talk at the annual convention of the CAIP on "The 'Pattern for Peace' and Public Opinion."⁸⁴ After reviewing the reception the document had received in the secular and religious press and the influence it had had on debates in the U.S. Senate, Conway noted that the crucial question now was one that had been raised within the Senate itself, whether the document represented the thought, not only of the religious leaders who had signed it, but of their people as well: "How many votes does the *Pattern* actually represent?" And he urged the members of the Association to engage in a great nationwide effort to make it known and to explain it.

When Murray published his own interpretation of "The Pattern for Peace," he referred to this speech by Conway and echoed its remark about the significance of the fact that through the document "the voice of religion was raised resoundingly in a senatorial debate." But he also shared Conway's concern that the declaration had now to be met by an effort to influence American public opinion, without which "secularist thinking will largely preside over the work, even now going on, of rebuilding the world."⁸⁵ Catholics were becoming increasingly aware of their duty of providing leadership, which, Murray thought, must take two forms:

First, there is the effort intelligently to explain the integral Catholic program, and vigorously to work for its realization. Secondly, there is the will to take the initiative in co-operative efforts, or at least to take part wholeheartedly

⁸² La Farge to McLaughlin, December 11, 1943, New York (copy); WCA.

⁸³ La Farge to Mooney, April 4, 1944, New York (copy); WCA.

⁸⁴ The text can be found in the ACUA, Papers of the NCWC/USCC.

⁸⁵ Murray, *The Pattern for Peace*, 24.

in joint initiatives, according to formulas approved by their bishops, towards making religious and moral principles operative in the social order.

Noting that "in the concrete world of affairs, leadership belongs to those who exercise it," and not simply to those who claim it, Murray expressed his fear that Catholics might "fall between two stools--on the one hand, a reluctance to co-operate with sound initiatives from without, and, on the other hand, an unwillingness or inability to offer any initiatives of our own."⁸⁶

Murray interpreted *The Pattern for Peace* as one legitimate form of the cooperation for which the Pope had been calling. It was not, strictly speaking, a joint statement; issued simultaneously by the three groups, however, it was "a perfectly synchronized three-front attack against all secularist thinking on the problems of peace."⁸⁷ He noted again that the Pope had not laid down specific instructions for how cooperation ought to be organized, leaving that to the pastoral wisdom of bishops. While agreeing that bishops should be concerned, first, with "the unity of the Church and the integrity of the faith" and alert to the danger of indifferentism, he noted that Pius XII had not expressed this concern in his call for the cooperation of religious people. The danger could be met by good instruction on the idea of cooperation. But the second principle that must guide the bishops was no less important: "the equally necessary Catholic concern for the common good of humanity, even in its temporal life." "This concern for civilization," he argued, "is itself an obligatory act of the virtue of charity." And here there was another danger:

Serious attention must be given to the question whether grave damage may not accrue to the life of humanity, if we stand aside from the efforts of other religious men in the direction of world peace, even under pretext of pursuing our own more complete program. Finally, it must be honestly considered whether religious forces will be actually effective in shaping the world of tomorrow, if they are not somehow united in their action.⁸⁸

Perhaps with an eye upon his debate with Furfey and Connell, Murray also noted that Pius XII's concern had been genuinely universal: "he has not succumbed to the easy fallacy of many of our Catholic publicists, who seem to concentrate exclusively on the faults of 'those without.'"⁸⁹

Transition/conclusion re JCM's development: this whole discussion shows how intensely he was concerned about the Church's role in addressing the spiritual crisis in the temporal order; in the unpublished lectures of 1940 and 1942, he had grounded this in central Christian doctrines, a basis he never repudiated. The "full Catholic solution" remained part of his thinking. But the urgency of the task, and the inadequacy of merely Catholic efforts to meet it, made it necessary, he thought, for Catholics to work out means for cooperating with other religious bodies. Without such cooperation it would not be religious people who shaped the reconstructed world order after the War. The divisions of religious people, and their inability to join their forces, would leave the field to secularist groups.

⁸⁶ Murray, *The Pattern for Peace*, 28.

⁸⁷ Murray, *The Pattern for Peace*, 16.

⁸⁸ Murray, *The Pattern for Peace*, 17-18.

⁸⁹ Murray, *The Pattern for Peace*, 19.

This the context in which to understand his decision to move to the question of religious freedom, which by the end of the War was clearly the main reason why Protestants and Jews were reluctant to engage in cooperative activity with Catholics, whose ideal and goal, they thought, remained that of eventually taking over the U.S. and turning it into a confessional state à la Franco's Spain.