Civil libertarians are strangely quiet about the last respectable bigotry in American life and public policy.

The Not So New Anti-Catholicism
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In the midst of the Democratic national convention in July, 1976, Roman Catholic Archbishop Joseph L. Bernardin of Cincinnati spoke publicly against the party’s recently adopted platform plank favoring legal abortions. The plank, he said, was offensive to many Catholics.

Stuart Eizenstat, a key aide to Governor Jimmy Carter, who was about to become the party’s presidential nominee, told the press that the archbishop’s statement “was not from the hierarchy.” “My understanding is that many in the hierarchy were extremely upset and in effect told him to cool it. No one has come to his support. I think that fellow went out on a limb.”

Archbishop Bernardin was in fact the elected president of the American bishops and was speaking in their name. After numerous telegrams from bishops protesting Eizenstat’s remark, he apologized, explaining that he had not known who Archbishop Bernardin was.

The explanation was more astounding than the original comment, revealing as it did that the Carter staff had not taken the trouble to acquaint themselves with even the most elementary facts about a minority group—Roman Catholics—who have traditionally been one of the major sources of electoral support for the Democratic party. It is inconceivable that the official leader of any other minority, no matter how small, would be contemptuously dismissed as “that fellow” by the aide to a man who hoped to be elected president of the United States. (Eizenstat is now assistant to the president for domestic policy.)

The situation had not improved when, a short time later, candidate Carter admitted publicly that he might, perhaps be perceived as having a “Catholic problem,” but pointed to the presence on his staff of another key aide, Joseph Duffey, who would keep him in touch with Catholic concerns. Carter was probably aware that Duffey had a record of proabortion activity. Misled by an Irish name, however, he was evidently unaware that Duffey is an ordained Congregationalist minister.

In early December, not long after the Carter victory, still another aide, Greg Schneider, gave an interview to the Washington Post in which he described the Catholic Church as a “farce” and said, “I think the Catholic Church does a better job of screwing people up than any other institution.” He also told the Post that he was Carter’s advisor on Catholic affairs. After the predictable protests, Schneider issued an apology of sorts, characterizing his words as “ill chosen,” “poorly stated,” and “a mistake,” but not retracting the substance of what would seem to have represented his true feelings. President-elect Carter, who had just been elected with substantial Catholic support, felt no need to repudiate publicly what Schneider had said, and Schneider continued as part of the Carter team.

Incidents as strange as these might ordinarily be supposed to signal electoral disaster for the candidate unlucky enough to have such aides. After all, in 1884 the Republican party met defeat in part because a Protestant minister tried to tag the Democrats as the party of “rum, romanism, and rebellion.” That nothing happened in 1976, and that candidate Carter did not even feel any apparent discomfort, signaled the Carter force’s recognition of something that is a badly kept secret in contemporary American life: Roman Catholics are the major minority group against whom it is still respectable to express prejudice and contempt. What the historian Arthur Schlesinger, Sr., once called the “most deeply rooted of American prejudices” is still alive and well.

The mere suggestion of such a thing is likely to provoke incredulous dismissals, since it runs contrary to a widely believed myth, held even by some Catholics who ought to know better. According to this myth, anti-Catholicism was a force operating in the earlier history of the country, deriving from its Protestant roots and fueled by nativistic hostility to immigrants. Since World War II, so the myth runs, such prejudice has largely disappeared. The “melting pot” smoothed out ethnic differences. As the country grew...
more sophisticated it also grew more tolerant. Finally, in 1960, Catholics symbolically came of age when one of their number was elected president. The spirit of ecumenism now rules, and old religious animosities are rapidly dying out.

The "era of good feeling" that characterized the early 1960's—the age of John Kennedy and Pope John XXIII—was an unusual and temporary parenthesis in the history of anti-Catholicism. President Kennedy's career reveals why this was so. Despite earlier attempts to canonize him, it is now rather widely acknowledged that John F. Kennedy was at best a marginal Catholic. His close identification with Irish-American Catholicism was useful in Massachusetts politics, but the closer he got to national office the more expedient he found it to minimize his religious loyalties. Privately, some of his intimates have revealed, he had little understanding of Catholic teachings and even less sympathy with them.

The climax of the process was his humiliating meeting with the Protestant clergy of Houston during the 1960 campaign, during which he was forced to give repeated assurances that he was a loyal American and that his religion would not interfere with his duties under the Constitution. Kennedy's Houston speech was reportedly written by John Cogley, a journalist often called "Mr. Catholic" in those years but who later revealed that as early as 1957 he had considered becoming an Episcopalian, which he finally did.

President Kennedy was able to have the best of both worlds. Many Catholics rallied to him enthusiastically as one of their own, while knowledgeable observers believed there was little chance he would behave in a "Catholic" way once elected. The election of a Catholic president was contingent on a widespread perception that he would relegate his religion to a totally ceremonial function in his life. To a great extent that rule still prevails: Catholic politicians who hope to succeed nationally are often required to make symbolic gestures dissociating themselves from the Church, with endorsement of legalized abortion now the minimum gesture required. A black, a Jew, a woman, or a Chicano elected to office is not expected to eschew support for matters of concern to his or her particular group. Often, however, a Catholic politician cannot afford to be identified with Catholic causes to even a slight degree. Despite the fact that he is not a regularly practicing Catholic, Governor Jerry Brown of California is treated by much of the press as a religious freak, and his actions are frequently explained by his once having been a Jesuit. (According to Parade magazine, "He is the most Aquinistic governor in California history," whatever that means.)

The pontificate of Pope John XXIII (1958-63) and the Second Vatican Council (1962-65) aroused enormous worldwide interest in things Catholic, and much of that interest was sympathetic to a degree never before manifest. In retrospect, however, it is possible to see the peculiar slant that sympathy took, and why the sympathy itself serves as the basis for some of the new anti-Catholicism. John XXIII was turned into a mythical figure allegedly transcending the "narrowness" of his Church, a figure bearing little resemblance to the real man of staunch peasant piety. More important, the Second Vatican Council was misunderstood to be a process by which the Church was admitting that it was an antiquated and rigid institution and was systematically bringing itself into conformity with modern society. Indeed, decrees of the Council bear no such interpretation, but this is the way they were presented to the world by the media, with assistance from Catholics who wished that it had been so.

The new philo-Catholicism thus rested on the expectation that the Church was surrendering its historic identity and, although the term was rarely used, becoming Protestant. Nuns left off their habits. The Mass was translated into the vernacular. Friday abstinence was abolished. All this gave rise to the expectation that the Church was also ready to discard its "inhumane" and "incredible" doctrines, and when this failed to happen, it simply aroused renewed animosity against an institution so willfully backward. Much contemporary anti-Catholic feeling is directed, quite simply, at the Church's refusal to die.

Unlike other minority groups, Catholics are ill-equipped to defend themselves. The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, for example, was founded only in 1973 and is small and understaffed in comparison with a group like the Jewish Anti-Defamation League. Many Catholics are also psychologically unprepared to strike back because, having been told so often that Catholics have finally been accepted in America, they wish desperately to believe it is so, shrinking into passivity when faced with evidence to the contrary. Among some of its intellectuals and professionals American Catholicism has more than its share of Uncle Toms.

The new bigotry has its own distinctively modern forms, a current favorite being the sacrilegious use of Catholic symbols in pornography, a new sport even in some college papers. The Observation Post of City College, New York, printed a cartoon of a nun masturbating with a crucifix, and the student paper at Harrisburg Community College in Pennsylvania had a cartoon on the "carnalization" of Mother Elizabeth Seton, the first canonized American saint. As products of public colleges, the latter two items were at least indirectly subsidized by public funds.

Consider the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a paper with a national reputation for liberalism and open-mindedness. For several years the Post-Dispatch has published thrice-weekly columns of opinion by a modernized version of a familiar figure in American history—the professional ex-Catholic. Jake McCarthy, a one-time public relations man for the Archdiocese of St. Louis, became disenchanted with the Church since discovering the sexual revolution and other things not generally taught in parochial schools. In the first few years of his column McCarthy made the evils of Roman Catholicism his main subject. More recently, he seems to have lost interest in religion, although he also claims to stay away from the subject because he is shocked at the "impartial" mail it generates.

A typical McCarthy column explained that Irish priests came to the United States "to earn a living from
the pockets of honest bricklayers and dishonest politicians. Thievery was cleaner in the sight of God than the body of a woman.” Diatribes against clerical celibacy have been a recurring feature along with the contention, never accompanied by proof, that the same people who oppose abortion also oppose gun control and favor capital punishment. Often critical of the churches’ failure to address themselves to social issues, he deplores Catholic “meddling” in politics on the abortion issue. In a column on Good Friday he contended that all churchgoers were hypocrites and that truly religious people like himself would stay at home that day. The same column made a favorable reference to the Jewish seder, and it is inconceivable that the Post-Dispatch would give space to a columnist who insulted Jews on their high holy days. The cardinal archbishop of St. Louis is never mentioned in McCarthy’s columns except demeaningly, but various Protestant clergy (and former Catholic priests) are sometimes praised.

Although McCarthy often characterizes Catholic doctrines as “outmoded,” he is not a rationalist. He has exclaimed over the truth revealed by ouija boards and once defended abortion on the grounds that the souls of aborted fetuses are probably reincarnated in a happier state. In common with some other anti-Catholic Catholics, such as Jimmy Breslin, he is sympathetic to the Irish Republican Army. McCarthy’s regular presence in the Post-Dispatch demonstrates the chief difference between anti-Catholicism and other kinds of bigotry such as anti-Semitism or racism: It is respectable. McCarthy has been given an award by the American Civil Liberties Union and boasts of being asked to speak to a columnist who insulted Jews on their high holy days. The cardinal archbishop of St. Louis is never mentioned in McCarthy’s columns except demeaningly, but various Protestant clergy (and former Catholic priests) are sometimes praised.

Much religious journalism, as it applies to the Catholic Church, is open editorializing masquerading as reporting. Examples abound.

- When a group of Croatian nationalists hijacked a TWA jetliner a while back, wire services gave prominent play to the claims of Dick Maurice, a Las Vegas newspaper columnist, that the bishop of Peoria, Edward O’Rourke, had frightened the passengers more than the hijackers had. The bishop’s offense, as it turned out, was that he urged people to pray and pronounced forgiveness of sins. It was later revealed that Bishop O’Rourke had been elected by the passengers as their spokesman. Some may have found his words comforting, but this was not even suggested in the wire services dispatches.

- The Associated Press in 1974 sent out two lengthy articles by Bill O’Shea, an A.P. reporter and former priest, featuring the history of his 1967 ordination class at the Chicago archdiocesan seminary. O’Shea’s picture of the seminary was unrelievedly bleak; he descended to ridiculing the way his former seminary rector pronounced his words. One former classmate who professed to be happy in the priesthood was described as “plugged into the sources of power and advancement in the Church” and, O’Shea strongly hinted, was mainly interested in security. The overall impression was that no humane and sensitive person could possibly function as a priest.

- On December 3, 1971, the day on which thirteen Catholics were killed in a pub bombing in Belfast, the Chicago Daily News service distributed an article identifying the Catholic Church as the principal obstacle to Irish unity. Irish Catholicism was identified (by unnamed “experts”) as the chief cause of mental illness and alcoholism in Ireland, and the clear implication was that the Ulster Protestants had good reasons for fearing and disliking Catholics.

- Marquis Childs, a widely syndicated Washington journalist, characterized antibusing demonstrators in South Boston as “Hail Mary-praying,” while failing to apply the same epithet to the Irish Catholic judge who ordered the busing.

- The Congressional Quarterly published an article on the abortion question in which the name of each Catholic congressman was starred with an asterisk, a form of identification not given for any other denomination or on any other issue. (The irrelevance of the designation was demonstrated by the starring itself, which failed to reveal a significant pattern of Catholic voting.)

- A New York Times television critic, John J. O’Connor, told his readers that the structure of the Nazi S.S. was “patterned on Jesuit hierarchical concepts.”

- When an abortion clinic was fire-bombed in Cleveland, the Cleveland Plain Dealer gave prominent front-page coverage to the demand of a professional anti-Catholic, William Baird, that non-Catholics retaliate by attacking churches and other Catholic institutions. No evidence was offered that Catholics were responsible for the fire-bombing.

- The National News Council has upheld complaints of religious stereotyping against both the New York Times and Walter Cronkite of CBS. The newspaper was censured for consistently identifying legislators as Catholics, even when their votes on abortion issues were at odds with Catholic teaching, while not offering religious identifications of other legislators. Cronkite was cited for accepting proabortion stereotypes and labeling the profile position as “the Catholic view.”

- Over a period of seven years (1968-75) Newsweek magazine kept up a running attack on the leadership of the Church because of its failure to rescind “outmoded” teachings. American bishops were characterized as “personally underdeveloped,” and when a small minority of Chicago priests voted to “censure” the city’s bishops, the magazine hailed the event as “of historic significance.” Pope Paul VI, during the same period, was never once referred to positively in Newsweek’s religion pages and was at various times characterized as “a
The essence of bigotry is stereotyping, taking attributes of a particular group (the lazy black, the grasping Jew, the hysterical woman) that are not entirely absent from some of its members and allowing these to stand as accurate symbols of the whole group. Jimmy Breslin’s novels portray, as one reviewer has admiringly summed it up, “the narrowness, alcoholism, ignorance, and barrenness of lower-middle-class Irish Catholic life in America,” and a large part of the educated population of America has accepted stereotypes according to which to be a believing Catholic is to invite personal disaster and stunted growth.

Many otherwise knowledgeable people refuse to admit that anti-Catholicism even exists. In recent years such diverse social groups as women, blacks, Jews, homosexuals, and Chicanos have succeeded in “raising the consciousness” of the media and the public generally about stereotypic thinking. A process of self-censorship takes place to avoid offending those whom it is unfashionable to offend. Perhaps because offending Catholics is still very fashionable, much of this suppressed hostility is now directed at them. Protests against anti-Catholic bigotry are likely to elicit only prim warnings about censorship and the need to air “controversial opinions” so that the bigot ends by casting himself as a virtuous and righteous defender of American liberties.

Had Murray Kempton written about blacks as he wrote about Irish, no respectable newspaper in the country would have given him space. The respectability of anti-Catholicism continues unabated. In 1974, for example, the prestigious Xerox Corporation published a booklet, aimed at elementary and secondary-school students, which characterized Pope Paul’s teaching on birth control as “immoral” and asked students to discuss whether the Church should be tried before an international tribunal for its “crimes.” In response to protests from the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, Xerox at first denied there was anything offensive in the booklet but finally withdrew it from circulation. It still occasionally surfaces in schools around the country, bought with public money.

A good deal of current anti-Catholic sentiment has surfaced because of the continuing controversy over abortion, but it is probably more accurate to say that abortion has not so much fomented anti-Catholic feeling as it has provided a rationale for feelings already there. Proabortionists freely employ words like “medieval” and “inquisition,” which are guaranteed to provoke Pavlovian responses in a society with a long history of anti-Catholicism. (Critics of the Catholic doctrine manage to have it both ways, calling it “medieval” and also insisting that it was not adopted until the nineteenth century.)

During the 1976 presidential campaign a Protestant theologian from Yale, William Lee Miller, who was also a strong Carter supporter, published an open letter to the Catholic bishops of the United States chiding them for the way antiabortion pickets were “harassing” the Democratic candidate. What made the letter interesting were the variety of anti-Catholic notes it sounded. First Miller professed not to know by what title to address the bishops and spent several paragraphs lecturing them on the emptiness of all titles, a solid Protestant blow against the pretensions of prelates. Then he complained because a priest who picketed Governor Carter was “still dressed in black in a way the priests I know today are not.” The antiabortionists were denied any real moral concern and were said to represent “power” and a “threat.” Most significant was Miller’s assumption that antiabortion pickets in Indiana could be stopped by an appeal to the collective body of bishops, a view of the antiabortion movement that sees Catholics as the hierarchy’s puppets. (In fact many antiabortionists regard the bishops as timid and vacillating on the issue.)

Innumerable proabortionists have sought to refute the opposition through no more sophisticated a tactic than identifying that opposition as Catholic. (Public opinion polls about abortion vary greatly in their results, depending on how the questions are phrased. One Gallup poll shows 45 percent of the population favoring some kind of antiabortion amendment to the Constitution, 49 percent opposed. Legalized abortion has been voted down in the only two states where a referendum has been held—Michigan and North Dakota.) Arthur Flemming, chairman of the Civil Rights Commission, has gone so far as to assert that the Constitution ought not to be amended when the amendment flows from “wholly or partially nonseccular, or religious, motives,” and a suit is now pending in federal court seeking to invalidate legislation supposedly enacted under religious influence (the “divisiveness” doctrine).

The absurdity of this contention becomes apparent when it is recalled that every civil rights gain since the Civil War has been brought about at least partially by strong religious pressure and that the formula would have precluded Martin Luther King, Jr., for one, from seeking to influence legislative matters. What such individuals really mean, at least in some cases, is that Catholic influence should not be tolerated.

The argument that, by opposing abortion, the Catholic Church is seeking to impose its morality on the nation and is violating the First Amendment is never balanced by the charge that Protestant and Jewish groups that approve abortion are doing the same thing. When, shortly after the Democratic convention in 1976, Archbishop Bernardin announced that the bishops were “encouraged” by President Ford’s stand on abortion and
"disappointed" in Governor Carter's, there was a hurricane of outrage in the media to which the bishops finally succumbed, in effect repudiating their original statement. There was no such reaction, however, when a month later the General Convention of the Episcopal Church officially opposed an anti-abortion amendment to the Constitution, thus in effect endorsing the Democratic stand and repudiating the Republican. The media have rarely pointed out that the majority opinion written by Justice Blackmun in the crucial Roe vs. Wade decision of 1973 established a governmental policy on abortion very close to what the United Methodist Church, to which Justice Blackmun belongs, thinks that policy should be. (A St. Paul abortion rights activist, Gerri Rassmussen, has explained to the press how her lobbying efforts stem directly from her religious commitments and her Methodist upbringing, an admission that did not deter her from once more castigating the Catholic Church for "intruding" itself into politics.)

Proabortion media regularly characterize antiabortion activities as the work of "highly organized, well-financed pressure groups," a description that could be applied with equal validity to almost any political-action group that has even minimal hope of success. If organized religion indeed threatens to "impose" its values on American society, a greater threat would seem to emanate from a group like the Religious Coalition for Abortion Rights, which lobbies vigorously in Washington and claims to represent twenty-three Protestant and Jewish organizations. (In the 1972 Michigan referendum on abortion the Board of Social Concerns of the United Methodist Church provided over half the funds to the unsuccessful campaign for legalization.) Yet the Catholic "intrusion" on the abortion question has been placed in a special category and judged by standards that seem to apply nowhere else.

Two years ago proabortion groups in Minnesota, including the student newspaper at the University of Minnesota, strongly opposed the candidacy of a Catholic doctor to head the obstetrics and gynecology department of the university hospital, despite his promise not to allow personal views to influence his policies. The doctor was finally approved, but the opposition to his appointment was a blatant appeal for religious discrimination in hiring, which is contrary to the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Senator Richard S. Schweiker (R., Pa.) has introduced legislation to prohibit medical schools from discriminating against applicants for admission who oppose abortion, a bill that Congress failed to pass in 1978, although a survey by a Chicago doctor has shown that two medical schools admit discriminating against such applicants, thirteen others state that antiabortion beliefs create "administrative problems," and a majority of medical schools question applicants about their beliefs on the subject. It does not appear to be an issue high on the civil libertarian's list of priorities.

In the past thirty years probably the most persistent source of irritation with respect to Church and State have been court decisions concerning public aid to private schools, in which judges have consistently refused, on constitutional grounds, to allow anything more than peripheral aid. Many Catholics have become rather cynical about these decisions, believing that if the majority of parochial schools were not Catholic the courts would long ago have found a way to aid them. (In fact the courts have now found a way to aid religiously affiliated colleges, the majority of which are not Catholic.) Since the time of the New Deal, the Constitution has been regarded as a very flexible instrument, capable of yielding principles appropriate to the social needs of the age. Thus, if the courts stand by the idea of a rigid "wall of separation" between Church and State, it seems reasonable to assume that they do not regard the survival of parochial schools as a desirable social good.
the fact that his political rise in Alabama was aided by his successful defense of a Protestant minister who had killed a Catholic priest. The fact of the shooting was never in doubt, but Black got his client acquitted by blatant appeals to anti-Catholic bigotry.

Justice Black never apologized for his role in the case, but it is generally assumed that he rose above the prejudices of his earlier life. However, his son, Hugo Black, Jr., has written that "the Ku Klux Klan and Daddy, so far as I could tell, only had one thing in common. He suspected the Catholic Church. He used to read all of Paul Blanshard's books exposing power abuse in the Catholic Church."

- In *Lemon vs. Kurtzman* (1970), Justice William O. Douglas voted against even limited aid to parochial schools, partly on the grounds that "zealous" teachers in those schools "may use any opportunity to indoctrinate a class." In a footnote Douglas established to his satisfaction that "in the parochial schools Roman Catholic indoctrination is included in every subject" by citing a work called *Roman Catholicism* by Loraine Boettner. The book is nothing more than an anti-Catholic diatribe, without even pretensions to objectivity, published under fundamentalist Protestant auspices. Justice Douglas's citation of the book was evidently an example of the principle, "Any stick to beat the dog," since the justice ordinarily manifested little sympathy for religious fundamentalism.

- One of the principal architects of court cases denying government aid to parochial schools has been Leo Pfeffer, long-time counsel for the American Jewish Congress. In a 1975 article Pfeffer stated bluntly: "I did not like the Catholic Church." He also reported that his daughter, when annoyed at him, used to threaten to marry "a Roman Catholic army officer from Alabama." Finally he revealed that his animus against parochial schools began when he first saw school children in uniforms and nuns in habits lined up in a school yard. When predictable protests followed his article, he replied primly that "epithets contribute little to the communication of ideas, but they can be quite destructive to civilized conversation or the search for truth." (One can imagine the public reaction if a prominent Catholic attorney were to express distaste at the sight of Jewish boys in yarmulkes.)

Anti-Catholicism, as exemplified in Justice Douglas's 1973 *Lemon* opinion, brings together strange bedfellows indeed—conservative Protestants and liberal humanists who are ordinarily anathema to one another. Throughout American history it has been militant Protestantism that has mainly nourished anti-Catholic sentiments in America, but increasingly in recent years the most bitter prejudice has originated in secular circles that see the Catholic Church as the last remaining bastion of traditional religion and therefore to be opposed at all costs. (The tactical alliance some conservative Protestants make with such people is therefore extremely shortsighted on their part.)

The career of Paul Blanshard is instructive. Although his anti-Catholic attacks were always cast in terms of true Americanism and concern for separation of Church and State, Blanshard reveals in his autobiography, *Personal and Controversial*, that he was an "utterly typical example of the sexual revolution of the 1920's" and that he was first stirred to write about the Catholic Church when he chanced upon a book about Catholic sexual morality.

Blanshard is the quintessential example of the humanist who considers his own philosophy as normative for society and who sincerely believes that someone who espouses his "enlightened" creed could never be bigoted, because, he says, he belonged to "liberal and tolerant groups far removed from the intolerant Know Nothing school of thought." This particular form of bigotry rests on the assumption that no rational person could possibly be a religious believer. Hence all religious education has to be "indoctrination," while humanistic education is "enlightenment." Blanshard is gleeful that parochial schools are being driven out of existence by financial troubles. "If we must have a rightist bloc in American elementary education, let the rightists pay for it," is his rather eccentric gloss on the First Amendment.

Paul Kurtz, editor of *The Humanist* and a professor at a state university, has noted that "the philosophy of secular humanism is becoming the dominant point of view in America and also in a good part of the Western world." There is an implicit assumption by many humanists that their philosophy is not a religion in the traditional sense and so ought to dominate the public forum, while the First Amendment conveniently excludes churches from fully entering the same arena.

Again, the late Justice Black, who once told his son that church attendance was for lesser breeds of people who "got to be scared into doing the right thing." Black also described those who favor prayers in the public schools as "pure hypocrites who never pray anywhere but in public for the credit of it." (Via such profound thoughts are high constitutional principles discovered.)

In Kansas recently Protestant, Jewish, and humanist elements have joined forces in attempting to effect the abolition of the Integrated Humanities Program at the University of Kansas, which has a heavy emphasis on the classics and medieval culture and which is accused of being Catholic-dominated. Whatever merit the charge of Catholic bias may have, it is significant that it is taken seriously, since charges of Marxist, atheist, or liberal bias in academia are routinely repulsed as threats to academic freedom.

Anti-Catholicism can be expected to continue, especially in the form of propaganda in the media and even in the educational system, a concerted attempt to deprive Catholics of moral and intellectual legitimacy in the public eye. Perhaps it is only fitting to give the last word to Paul Blanshard, who did so much to make anti-Catholicism newly respectable after World War II: "Why allow Christian salvationism to flourish side by side with scrupulously accurate science as if they were legitimate twins in our culture, when you know that the Christian doctrine of salvation is untrue?" It is not farfetched to think it just possible that the clear threat implied in Blanshard's words might someday be carried out in a thoroughly "enlightened" America.